

Minutes of the Transportation Committee

The Transportation Committee of the McLean County Board met on Tuesday, May 7, 2002 at 7:30 a.m. in Room 700, Law and Justice Center, 104 West Front Street, Bloomington, Illinois.

Members Present: Chairman Bass, Members Emmett, Hoselton, Owens, Johnson, Selzer

Members Absent: None

Staff Members Present: Mr. Terry Lindberg, Assistant County Administrator; Ms. Martha B. Ross, County Administrator's Assistant, County Administrator's Office

Department Heads/
Elected Officials Present: Mr. Jack Mitchell, County Engineer, County Highway Department

Others Present: Mr. Jeff Tracy, Civil Engineer, McLean County Highway Department; Ms. Jennifer Sicks, Transportation Planner, McLean County Regional Planning Commission; Ms. Christine Brauer

Chairman Bass called the meeting to order at 7:30 a.m. and declared the presence of a quorum. Chairman Bass presented the minutes of the April 2, 2002 meeting for approval.

Motion by Owens/Johnson to approve and place on file the minutes of the April 2, 2002 meeting of the Transportation Committee. Motion carried.

Chairman Bass presented the bills as prepared and recommended for transmittal to the Transportation Committee by the Auditor's Office.

Mr. Owens remarked, under the category of Equipment Maintenance and Repair, that there are several payments made to Clay Dooley, Inc. for large amounts. He asked for an accounting of what those charges represented. Mr. Mitchell responded that the charges attributed to Clay Dooley, Inc. were for the purchase of tires and equipment repairs. The payment of \$458.00 made to Martin Equipment was for parts for one of the John Deere pieces of equipment used at the Highway Department. A bill for \$28.13 submitted by Heritage Machine and Welding, and a bill for \$2,051.82 submitted by Koenig Body and Equipment were for work on one of the tandem trucks that went into a ditch during the winter season, breaking a spring and damaging the truck's outer body.

Ms. Johnson asked for more information regarding the two (2) bills to Tower Cellular for \$129.00 and \$3,453.00 respectively. Mr. Mitchell explained that there is a State bid for Motorola radios. The Department recently purchased three (3) radios from Tower Cellular, which is a local Motorola dealer, for the State bid price of \$3,453.00. Additionally, three (3) antennas were purchased for the radios for \$129.00.

Motion by Emmett/Owens to approve the Bills as presented and recommended by the Auditor's Office. Motion carried.

Chairman Bass presented the Illinois Department of Transportation ("IDOT") Intergovernmental Agreement for an Access Management Grant. Mr. Mitchell explained that this grant is as a result of an Illinois Tomorrow Grant that the Highway Department applied for in Fiscal Year 2001. The Intergovernmental Agreement must now be approved in order for the funds to be distributed. He stated that questions may be directed to Jeff Tracy, Highway Department Civil Engineer.

Mr. Mitchell stated that the grant amount is \$40,000.00. It will address access control on the County highways as well as on City of Bloomington (the "City") and Town of Normal (the "Town") streets. It is a joint project.

Mr. Hoselton asked how much the total project is expected to cost. Mr. Mitchell responded that \$40,000.00 is the total amount of the grant. There is \$4,000.00 that will be split among the three (3) governmental entities. They are authorized to spend up to \$10,000.00.

Chairman Bass asked whether the oversight of the project takes place through the County Highway Department. Mr. Mitchell responded that his department would oversee the project.

Mr. Jeff Tracy, Civil Engineer, stated that the Highway Department is attempting to establish a standard policy for everyone with regard to grant amounts that apply intergovernmentally.

Mr. Owens asked what the grant amount would cover. Mr. Mitchell responded that it is to develop an access management plan.

Mr. Selzer asked whether any personnel costs would be covered through the grant amount. Mr. Mitchell responded that the funds would cover the costs of a consultant.

Motion by Selzer/Owens to recommend approval of the Intergovernmental Agreement with the Illinois Department of Transportation for an Access Management Grant.

Mr. Emmett asked for clarification on the terms of the funding of the grant. He asked whether the total amount of the grant is \$40,000.00 plus a local match, or is the total inclusive amount \$40,000.00. Mr. Mitchell responded that the amount is \$40,000.00 total. Mr. Tracy stated that the State of Illinois will only award \$36,000.00, with the normal match being 10%. He stated that if the cooperating entities can't obtain the services of a consultant for that amount, the State will not award any further money.

Mr. Hoselton asked whether this grant is for Bloomington and Normal alone or whether it will include the County, as well. Mr. Mitchell responded that the County is included. It comes through the Regional Planning Commission and is meant to address the local metropolitan area.

Mr. Tracy explained that the Planning Commission is trying to compose a document that Bloomington, Normal, and McLean County will adopt. He stated that the final document will also need to be suitable for use with the townships and villages.

Ms. Johnson stated that language in the Intergovernmental Agreement should be changed to state that the payment for services under this contract will not exceed the \$36,000.00 amount of grant funds, plus the local match. She stated that the local match amount would be at the discretion of the County.

Mr. Mitchell noted that the current language is partially correct. If the grant amount is added to the local match amount, that should total \$40,000.00.

Chairman Bass asked what is the time frame for completion of the project. Mr. Tracy responded that once the contracts are approved, an RFP can be issued to the consultants.

He stated that it is hoped that a finished document would be available by the end of the year. However, it may take longer than that, in the event that unforeseen circumstances arise.

Chairman Bass asked whether the consultant to be retained would have a short term or a long-term contract. Mr. Tracy stated that an estimated time to complete the project is between 4-6 months. However, the time period could be negotiated.

Chairman Bass asked whether the retention of the consultant would be under the County Engineer's jurisdiction. Mr. Mitchell responded that jurisdiction would be joint with both Bloomington and Normal, as the other governmental entities involved in the project.

Motion carried.

Chairman Bass presented the 2002 Colfax Joint Culvert and Bridge Petition. Mr. Mitchell explained that there is one main ditch that drains through the Village of Colfax. The culvert is located on that main ditch. There is approximately 160 feet that has fallen into disrepair and needs to be reconstructed so that it does not become a hazard.

Mr. Mitchell noted that he has consulted with the Colfax Village Engineer and it is agreed that a 72-inch pipe will serve well for this application. An aluminum box culvert was considered, but it is prohibitively more expensive.

Mr. Mitchell stated that the materials price for the job has already been established through the Highway Department's culvert bid. A high hoe would be rented and utilized to remove the old pipe and set in the new pipe. Labor for the rest of the project would be shared between Highway Department and Village of Colfax personnel.

Mr. Mitchell noted that the issue was presented to the Village's governing board on the previous evening. However, he stated that he had not yet been informed of their decision. Therefore, he recommended approval of the project, subject to the approval of the governing board of the Village of Colfax.

Motion by Hoselton/Selzer to recommend approval of the 2002 Colfax Joint Culvert and Bridge Petition, subject to the approval of the governing board of the Village of Colfax.

Mr. Owens noted the stated 50/50 split on costs. However, he also noted that the Petition specifies that the cost of the new structure exceeds 0.02% of the assessed valuation of the Village. He asked whether that would be a problem for the Village of Colfax.

Mr. Mitchell explained that this provision is according to State law. Mr. Mitchell also stated that the County Highway Department is required to aid villages that petition for such aid, if the village population is fewer than 15,000.

Mr. Emmett asked whether the \$85,000.00 amount is the total cost of the project. Mr. Mitchell responded that it is estimated to be the total cost of the project, including back fill dirt, street replacement, labor and equipment. Mr. Emmett then asked for confirmation that the County would submit a bill for labor. Mr. Mitchell confirmed that there would be a partial reimbursement for labor and equipment rental.

Mr. Hoselton asked who is the engineering firm for this project. Mr. Mitchell responded that the firm of Lewis, Yockey and Brown is the engineering firm that is working on this project.

Motion carried. Ms. Susie Johnson voted "present."

Chairman Bass presented the proposed Special Event Road Closure Permit. Mr. Mitchell explained that during the April 2002 meeting, the Committee had requested that the Highway Department develop a form for use when various entities requested road closures and signage for special events within the County. Mr. Mitchell stated that there are four villages who typically make such requests on an annual basis for their special events. Those villages are Lexington, Ellsworth, Chenoa, and Towanda.

Mr. Hoselton asked whether the proposed permit form had been approved by the Civil Division of the State's Attorney's Office. Mr. Mitchell responded that it had been examined by the legal department.

Chairman Bass asked where the proposed form came from. Mr. Mitchell responded that it was drafted at the Highway Department office.

Mr. Selzer asked how the provisions in the Road Closure Permit Requirements sheet were determined. Mr. Mitchell responded that, although the road closure form is new, it is similar to the bicycle permit form. He noted a somewhat confusing provision by stating that point number 2 indicates that the sponsoring agency or group is responsible for furnishing all signs, barricades and personnel described in the traffic control plan, but that in provision number 10 the group is to reimburse the County for those items. He stated that this was confusing. Mr. Mitchell responded that provision 10 is meant to protect the Highway Department in the event that any road damage occurs during the time that a road is blocked and a detour is indicated.

Mr. Selzer asked whether the Highway Department would ever provide detour signs or barricades to road closure applicants. Mr. Mitchell responded that the County would do so. Mr. Selzer then asked whether a charge would be assessed for such service. Mr. Mitchell responded that most of the small villages throughout the County do not have adequate barricades or signage, and the County has loaned out these items in the past in order to be helpful.

Mr. Mitchell stated that when the idea of developing the Road Closure Permit was first discussed, charges were only to be assessed to private for-profit groups who would, in turn, profit from the proceeds of their event. Other governmental entities would be served as a courtesy.

Mr. Selzer asked how the rates would be determined. Mr. Mitchell responded that there is a standard rental fee for barricades and signage, and that is the amount that would be assessed to for-profit applicants.

Mr. Selzer commented that many provisions in the Road Closure Permit are still ambiguous and confusing. He stated that the policy should either be uniform for all applicants or it should clearly state who is to be assessed a fee and who will not be assessed.

Mr. Hoselton asked whether there has been a problem in the past with road closure procedures. Mr. Mitchell stated that for other groups in the past, signs and barricades were loaned at no charge. In the case of the annual Prairie Air Show, the County incurred personnel overtime charges in order to provide signs, barricades and traffic control for this event. He noted that reimbursement for an event of this type would be appropriate.

Mr. Selzer noted that the Prairie Air Show is a non-profit enterprise, and it is a commonly held misconception that the program is a for-profit activity.

Mr. Hoselton asked how the policy of charging some groups and not others would be stated in the proposed policy. He noted that the determining factor could be the use of County employees to set up and take down barricades and signs, and therefore, recouping any incurred labor charges. For example, an entity could request that the Highway Department post the signs and place the barricades for an their event. In such a case, the Highway Department would incur labor charges over and above their usual duties.

Chairman Bass noted that Paragraph 2 of the Road Closure Permit Requirements sheet states that the applicant is to furnish all signs, barricades and personnel, while Paragraph 10 indicates that the applicant is to reimburse the County for all labor, equipment rental,

and materials needed for the event. He explained that all applicants may not have materials of their own and would need to borrow materials from the Highway Department. Mr. Selzer responded that the Requirements listing could address that by stating that materials are available for a rental fee. He noted that the policy provisions, as currently drafted, are ambiguous. Additionally, Mr. Selzer commented that whatever the provisions are in the final draft of the policy, they should be consistent.

Mr. Mitchell remarked that, in the event that an applicant incurs labor charges for the Highway Department's labor to place signs and barricades, then there should be a charge assessed for the materials, as well. If an applicant only wishes to borrow materials, and supply its own labor, then there should be no charge for materials.

Ms. Johnson stated that, if there is to be a rental charge for signs and barricades, then it should be uniform for all applicants, whether the Highway Department places materials on site or not. Mr. Hoselton suggested that an addendum be added to the existing form that can be initialed by both parties to the agreement. That addendum would delineate any special provisions that are not otherwise specifically addressed anywhere else in the form.

Mr. Selzer commented that the County should be reimbursed for any expenses it actually incurs, regardless of what classification applies to an applicant. Whether the applicant is a for-profit or not-for-profit entity.

Chairman Bass asked to have this issue clarified for the record. Mr. Selzer stated that the County should expect to be reimbursed for any actual costs incurred. Signs are already owned by the Department, so there would not be a rental charge to use them. However, actual labor expenses incurred for an event would be 100% reimbursable.

Mr. Selzer noted that there are other confusing and duplicative statements in the permit requirement sheet. For example, Paragraph 7 of the Road Closure Permit Requirements sheet indicates that the applicant must secure permission for the road closure from all road districts, municipalities or other governing bodies that may be involved. He asked whether the Highway Department should assume that responsibility when it approves the permit. The consensus of the Committee was that the Highway Department should not assume this responsibility.

Mr. Selzer remarked that a listing of entities to contact should be made available for applicants so that they know who to contact, once their permit is approved. Mr. Emmett commented that by making the packets too specific for individual entities, the Highway Department would actually create more work. He suggested that the packets be kept as general as possible.

Ms. Johnson stated that the packet should include clearly stated instructions and contact information for those entities throughout the County who must be contacted in the event of road closures for special events. She noted that many applicants would not know intuitively which entities should be contacted. Clear instructions should be included as a part of the general packet.

Mr. Selzer stated that a contact telephone number for the McLean County Sheriff's Department should be listed as the contact for applicants. Once applicants have notified the Sheriff's Department that a road closure permit has been granted for a special event, the Sheriff's Department could then notify all other appropriate entities, rather than entrusting such action to individual applicants.

Mr. Mitchell stated that the villages within the County are the most frequent applicants for road closures. Most of the time, applicants from the villages are well versed in whom to notify in the case of a special event road closure. He commented that to make the new form unnecessarily lengthy and complex was self-defeating. Mr. Selzer remarked that first-time applicants would not know whom to contact regarding their proposed road closure. Therefore, the permit form needs to be both specific and comprehensive. Mr. Mitchell explained that such instances could be addressed on an individual basis at the time that the permit application is submitted, and extraneous information need not unnecessarily complicate the basic form.

Ms. Johnson asked what are the ramifications for failure to notify certain applicable governing bodies when a road closure permit is filed. Mr. Mitchell responded that there are none stipulated in the permit requirements form.

Mr. Terry Lindberg, Assistant County Administrator, stated that the Committee might be at risk of accepting liability by creating forms and regulations that are too specific. He noted that it is reasonable to put a contact telephone number of the Sheriff's Department on the form. However, perhaps other information could be disseminated on an individual basis, as it applies to applicants.

Mr. Emmett commented that the packet should be kept simple. Mr. Selzer responded that even though the packet is simple, it should be specific.

Mr. Owens remarked that most governmental bodies, regardless of size, would know who they needed to contact with regard to a road closure. He stated that private parties would need more guidance.

Chairman Bass asked whether a statement could be placed in the text of the policy form that would state that any closures of roads or detours must be approved by the County

Engineer's Office. Mr. Selzer suggested that initial applications could be approved by the Transportation Committee, but that subsequent applications could be approved through the Highway Department office. Mr. Mitchell stated that he was in agreement with such a proposal.

Mr. Selzer asked whether the proposed form could be brought back to the June Transportation Committee meeting for reexamination, incorporating the proposed changes. Mr. Mitchell responded that he has event proposals to bring to the Committee for its consideration in June 2002. Therefore, he would like to have a form that is useable. It could be amended at a later date, if necessary.

Mr. Mitchell noted that the Committee had identified several other conflicting items. He asked that those items be noted so that he can address them in his revisions.

Mr. Selzer stated that Paragraph 4 and Paragraph 6 relate to each other and should be written together. Mr. Mitchell responded that he will redraft the permit requirements combining the wording in Paragraphs 6 and 4 into one paragraph, with the wording of Paragraph 6 to appear first.

Mr. Owens asked whether there is a fixed amount that can be charged for labor. He noted that this should be clearly stated for the information of the applicants. Mr. Mitchell responded that the labor amount fluctuates during the year, depending upon where employees are on the salary scale at any given point in the year.

Ms. Johnson observed that this could prove inequitable to applicants. One applicant might pay a certain charge per hour to cover labor for an event, only to have another applicant pay a different rate, for the same type of service for their event.

Mr. Hoselton suggested that the form use a blank line for the labor figure. Labor amounts can then be added on an individual basis at the time the application is submitted.

Mr. Mitchell stated that the Department's collective bargaining contract dictates that employees who are low on overtime are to be given the first chance to receive overtime opportunities. Therefore, he will have some difficulty justifying varying overtime charges to applicants. Mr. Hoselton replied that a fixed rate per hour should be stated, and that rate should reflect the high end of the salary range of eligible Highway Department employees.

Ms. Johnson asked for clarification regarding the issue of liability for the County, as it pertains to the implementation of the new form. Mr. Lindberg responded that the more

steps which are required of an applicant, and the more incumbent it is on the Highway Department to provide detailed information for applicants, the more liability the County

Minutes of the Transportation Committee Meeting
May 7, 2002

Page Ten

assumes. He remarked that the Committee should consider this carefully and design its form documents with this possibility in mind.

Mr. Mitchell asked whether he should make the modifications to the form that have been discussed to this point, prepare an amended form, and present the amended form to the Committee for its consideration at the June 2002 Committee meeting. Mr. Owens asked whether the Highway Department would be responsible for notifying annual applicants of the change in procedure from what they are accustomed to. Mr. Mitchell responded that in the past, there has been no written application. Therefore, his department would take on the responsibility of explaining the changes.

Mr. Hoselton asked whether a map would be included with the printed applications for the convenience of the applicants. Mr. Mitchell responded affirmatively.

Mr. Owens asked to have the proposed changes to the first draft of the permit application stated for the record. Mr. Mitchell listed the proposed changes as follows: change the abbreviation of C.H. on the first page of the application to the words County Highway; Paragraph 3 of the Permit Requirements sheet will include the appropriate telephone number of the Sheriff's Department for notification purposes; Paragraph 6 will be incorporated into Paragraph 4; Paragraph 10 will include a per hour labor charge of \$50.00 per hour; remove one of the Authorized Representative lines. He stated that he declines to make changes to Paragraph 2 until he has an opportunity to check with a few of the applicants who typically supply their own signs and barricades.

Ms. Johnson asked what the listing of Enclosures refers to on the last page of the application. Mr. Mitchell responded that the listing pertains to other entities who must potentially be notified of an impending road closure.

Motion Owens/Emmett to recommend approval of the Special
Event Road Closure Permit form, as amended. Motion carried.

Chairman Bass presented the bid results from an April 24, 2002 letting for mulch and grass seed. Mr. Mitchell remarked that historically, informal quotes have been accepted for grass seed and mulch, due to the fact that expenditures for these items have been below the \$10,000.00 ceiling for formal written bids. However, this year will be an exception, in that the \$10,000.00 ceiling is expected to be exceeded. Therefore, formal bids must be awarded for the purchase of grass seed and mulch, using Motor Fuel Tax ("MFT") funds.

Mr. Mitchell explained that there is a mitigating factor with regard to procedure this year.

Minutes of the Transportation Committee Meeting

May 7, 2002

Page Eleven

Bid forms were made available to several different companies. Only two (2) were returned. The firms submitting bids were: Midwest Construction in Springfield, Illinois; and, Evergreen FS, Inc., Bloomington, Illinois. However, the bid by FS was not submitted on the bid forms, which makes it ineligible for consideration by the Committee. Mr. Mitchell explained that since this contract is governed by Motor Fuel Tax regulations, he is prohibited from reading or considering the FS submission, even though it is thought that the FS bid is the lower of the two quotes submitted.

Mr. Mitchell commented that if the Committee desires to reject the bids originally submitted, and rebid the project, the lowest bid that was read must now become the new estimate for the project.

Mr. Hoselton asked whether Evergreen FS, Inc. would be likely to resubmit a bid using the correct form and procedure. If so, he recommended that the Committee table the item until the paperwork has been properly submitted. Mr. Mitchell asked whether he should verify with Evergreen FS whether they desire to resubmit their bid.

Mr. Hoselton noted that the bid could be resubmitted for consideration at a Stand Up meeting prior to the May, 2002 County Board meeting. Mr. Mitchell remarked that this situation is somewhat unusual in that this job has not been placed for bids in the past. He attributed the confusion to a lack of communication regarding the bid procedure for this job.

Mr. Selzer stated that all bids should be rejected and allow them to be resubmitted using the proper procedure. Ms. Johnson commented that the bid from Midwest Construction Products was submitted utilizing the proper procedure.

Mr. Mitchell stated that the bid from Midwest Construction Products could be accepted now, if the Committee desired to do so, since it is in proper form. He noted that they did comply with all specifications, and their bid is below the estimate for the job.

Ms. Hoselton stated that, in the event that Mr. Mitchell inquires as to FS's desire to resubmit their bid, a Stand Up meeting could be conducted prior to the May 21st County Board meeting to approve the bids, as resubmitted. Ms. Johnson replied that this situation would not be fair to Midwest Construction Products, since they submitted their bid correctly the first time. She noted that a presumption that the Evergreen FS bid was lower should not be a consideration.

Motion by Hoselton/Selzer to award the bid for grass seed and mulch to Midwest Construction Products, Inc.

Minutes of the Transportation Committee Meeting
May 7, 2002
Page Twelve

Ms. Johnson remarked that it is unfortunate that the Committee could not allow Evergreen FS to resubmit its bid utilizing the correct procedure.

Chairman Bass stated that this is the first time such a situation has occurred. Mr. Mitchell reiterated that this is the first time that formal bids were required for grass seed and mulch. The need for bids was precipitated by the fact that estimated cost for the job exceeded the informal quotation ceiling of \$10,000.00.

Chairman Bass asked whether all potential bidders for this job were adequately informed that there were required forms and a specific procedure. Mr. Mitchell replied that correct forms were sent out, but no specific instructions were indicated.

Mr. Selzer retracted his seconding of the motion made by Mr. Hoselton to approve the bid submitted by Midwest Construction Products, Inc.

Mr. Emmett remarked that the lack of continuity in correct bid procedure resulted from the fact that such formal bid procedure had never before been utilized for grass seed and mulch work. He asked whether the Highway Department had adequately informed the bidders that there was to be a change in procedure from past years. Mr. Mitchell responded that specific statements regard a change in the bid procedure were not made. Rather, bid forms were sent out to potential bidders to be utilized.

Mr. Hoselton retracted his motion recommending approval of the bid by Midwest Construction Products, Inc. for grass seed and mulch.

Motion by Owens/Emmett to reject all bids for grass seed and mulch, and conduct another letting utilizing the proper bid forms, procedure, and notification. Motion carried.

Chairman Bass presented the Danvers Section 02-00038-04-WR MFT Appropriating Resolution. Mr. Mitchell stated that this project is included in the Highway Department's Five-Year Plan. The Department is currently working on the Danvers-Yuton Road. The portion of the road which is under construction bounded by the Yuton Elevator and the west side of the local school building.

Mr. Mitchell remarked that this portion of the road was a hot mix road that was built 20 years ago. It is now being widened and resurfaced. However, the portion of the road that passes through town is an old oil and chip road, which is in poor condition. It is in need

of widening, resurfacing, and updated drainage work. This makes it a fairly extensive project.

Minutes of the Transportation Committee Meeting
May 7, 2002
Page Thirteen

Mr. Mitchell commented that the Highway Department's engineer met with the Mayor of Danvers, who expressed his thanks that the road would soon receive much-needed upgrades.

Chairman Bass asked whether any new right-of-way acquisition would be needed in order to complete the project. Mr. Mitchell responded that no new right-of-way is needed for this project. Rather, the project is to be completed on existing highway.

Chairman Bass asked when the bid letting for this project would occur. Mr. Mitchell responded that he hoped to have the results of the letting ready for the June 2002 Transportation Committee meeting.

Chairman Bass asked when the Department expected to break ground on the project. Mr. Mitchell responded that sometime during the summer of 2002 is the anticipated date of commencement for this project.

Motion by Emmett/Johnson to recommend approval of the Resolution
For Improvement by County Under the Illinois Highway Code for
Danvers Section 02-00038-04-WR utilizing MFT funds.
Motion carried.

Mr. Mitchell presented the Project Status Report for Section 113 of Towanda-Barnes Road. He stated that no billings have been received for this project to date. The tile and culvert work is progressing, but dirt work is being postponed until the weather becomes drier.

Mr. Mitchell explained that he also included the project status of the Danvers-Yuton Road in the Report. He explained that the binder has been applied. The Department is waiting for the road surface to be applied, then the road shoulders can be done.

Mr. Selzer asked whether either the County or municipalities ever pay for road work that is funded from another source other than Motor Fuel Tax funds. Mr. Mitchell remarked that the Danvers Road Section Resolution that was just approved also included funds from the County Bridge Fund and the County Highway Fund. He commented that drainage work is a legitimate use of Bridge Fund dollars.

Mr. Mitchell explained that traditionally, McLean County has utilized Motor Fuel Tax strictly for road purposes. The Bridge Fund has been utilized for culverts, large bridges

and drainage work within large projects. Occasionally, County Highway funds are utilized, for such projects, but not as a rule.

Minutes of the Transportation Committee Meeting
May 7, 2002
Page Fourteen

Mr. Mitchell further explained that the Motor Fuel Tax is its own fund. The matching tax is its own fund, for which the County levies \$0.0375, to be utilized solely for roads. The Bridge Fund levy is \$0.05, and it is its own fund. The County Highway Fund levy is \$0.75, and it is also its own specific fund for road purposes.

Mr. Emmett noted that Section 113 of the Towanda-Barnes Road currently has an Appropriated Total of \$4,509,000.00, and Projected Costs of \$5,476,248.13. He asked where the difference in funding will come from to meet the final costs of the project. Mr. Mitchell responded that he will bring a Supplemental Resolution to the Committee for its approval in the future. Mr. Mitchell explained that the project was initiated in 1993. However, by the time construction began on the project in 2001, costs had risen.

Chairman Bass stated that he would need a motion from the Committee in order to go into Executive Session to discuss collective bargaining and a land purchase.

Motion by Owens/Selzer to go into Executive Session to discuss collective bargaining and a land purchase. Those people to remain for the Executive Session are: Chairman Bass; all members of the Committee; Mr. Terry Lindberg, Assistant County Administrator; and, Ms. Martha Ross, Recording Secretary. Motion carried.

The Committee went into Executive Session at 8:57 a.m.

The Committee came out of Executive Session at 9:29 a.m.

There being nothing further to come before the Committee at this time, the meeting was adjourned by Chairman Bass at 9:29 a.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Martha B. Ross
Recording Secretary