

## Minutes of the Transportation Committee

The Transportation Committee of the McLean County Board met on Tuesday, January 8, 2002 at 7:30 a.m. in Room 700, Law and Justice Center, 104 West Front Street, Bloomington, Illinois.

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

Members Absent: Member Emmett

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: Ms. Jennifer Sicks, Transportation Planner, McLean County Regional Planning Commission; Ms. Christine Brauer

Chairman Bass called the meeting to order at 7:37 a.m. Chairman Bass presented the minutes of the December 4, 2001 meeting for approval.

Motion by Selzer/Johnson to approve and place on file the minutes of the December 4, 2001 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.

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

Mr. Hoselton asked whether the telephone expenses listed were inclusive of all of the units utilized by the Highway Department. Mr. Mitchell confirmed that the listing was all inclusive.

Mr. Owens asked what the listing for Dues and Memberships referred to. Mr. Mitchell responded that it was a listing for the National Society of Professional Engineers.

Motion carried.

Chairman Bass presented the letting results from the January 3, 2002 letting. Mr. Mitchell explained that the letting was for aggregate, stockpile materials for Townships, and F.O.B. aggregate. He explained that the F.O.B. aggregate is where the County and some of the Townships acquire gravel and rock or chips at some of the quarries and gravel pits.

Mr. Mitchell remarked that Mr. Hoselton had earlier pointed out that the Resolution for this letting omitted the firm of Valley View in the third section listing. He further remarked that the omission was inadvertent. He explained that on the F.O.B projects, all bids are accepted, subject to mileage and availability. Then the bid, plus 15 cents per ton mile, is calculated to determine whose bid is the most cost effective for the areas considered. The most cost effective areas are then selected for materials acquisition. If the necessary materials are not available at the first location, then the second most cost effective location is selected, and so forth.

Motion by Selzer/Hoselton to recommend approval of the bids from the Letting results from the January 3, 2002 letting, as submitted.

Mr. Hoselton noted that the Gridley Road Section listed in line GR14 only lists Towanda Company. However, Limestone Transit submitted the same quote. He asked why only one company's bid was accepted. Mr. Mitchell explained that, in the event that the low bid is a tie between two companies, the State Motor Fuel Tax procedures allow for options in addressing the situation. Those options range from drawing lots to splitting the work between the companies. Additionally, the Road Commissioner, in the case of a Township project, may make the selection of which company to whom the award is made.

Mr. Mitchell commented that in instance of Gridley Road Section 02-18000-00-GM, the Road Commissioner made the selection, and chose Towanda Company because that company received the award for his other project on Gridley Road, as well.

Mr. Hoselton asked whether the Highway Department notifies the losing bidder, when a tie occurs. Mr. Mitchell responded that the other bidders are notified, but that may not occur until everything for the project is approved.

Chairman Bass remarked that all bids, then, are accepted for such projects, and then providers are selected based upon accessibility and availability. Mr. Mitchell confirmed that this was correct. He reminded the Committee that there is only one correction to the Resolution, and that is to add Valley View to the listings on the first page of the Resolution.

Motion carried.

Mr. Mitchell presented a document entitled County Motor Fuel Tax, Motor Fuel Balances and Transactions for the Committee's examination. He explained that this is in response to the Committee's request for further information regarding the ongoing status of many of the Highway Department's projects. Mr. Mitchell explained that the form, as presented, is taken from the information currently available at the Highway Department and depicts a one project as an example. He asked whether the report, in its present form, would be sufficient to address the Committee's need for more specific information regarding the Department's projects.

Mr. Selzer stated that the sample report is not what he had anticipated, as it is not specific enough and does not clearly delineate the status of the project. Mr. Mitchell commented that the report is missing some information, as it was unclear to him what precise information the Committee would like to see. One change he suggested would be to list the actual road name in each report, as opposed to the Section name, since the road names are more immediately recognizable.

Mr. Mitchell requested specific guidelines as to what information the Committee would like to receive in each report. He stated that he would then work together with the Information Services Department to design an appropriate form to efficiently convey information to the Committee.

Mr. Hoselton commented that using the common names of roads rather than section numbers would be very helpful. Many people are not able to identify roads by their section numbers.

Mr. Hoselton asked whether 5% retainage is customarily kept. Mr. Mitchell remarked that on Motor Fuel Tax construction projects, the Highway Department engineers make out the pay estimates, submit it to the bookkeeper to prepare the claim, and then submit

the claim to the Auditor's Office for payment. The contractor has no input into the initial pay estimates, but quantities must be agreed to prior to making final payment.

Mr. Mitchell explained that in the initial stages of the project, 10% retainage is withheld. Once the project is more than 50% complete, the retainage amount drops to 5%. When a project is completed, and inspection paperwork and final reports are awaited, the retainage amount drops to 2%.

Mr. Hoselton asked whether this procedure amounts to the Highway Department doing the bookkeeping for the contractors. Mr. Mitchell stated that the contractors also do their own bookkeeping. He further stated that before final payments can be made, the Highway Department prepares the list of final quantities of materials and send it to the contractors for their approval and acceptance. Final payments are based on the quantities utilized.

Mr. Mitchell explained that this method is called a unit price contract. The low bidder bids each individual unit price and runs the extension with a big quantity. Whichever bidder totals the low number becomes the low bidder for the project. The Highway Department then works with those units to make all of the pay estimates.

Mr. Selzer remarked that he would like to meet with Mr. Mitchell and Mr. Hoselton to develop a simple report format for the Committee's project reports. He suggested that information reported could include: the location of the project; the estimated time frame of the project; the total price of the project; the local/state budget; payments received/made; and a general notes section. In this way, most of the pertinent facts for any given project are easily accessible and available, as the project progresses.

Mr. Hoselton remarked that he is not questioning Mr. Mitchell's methods. However, he would like to be informed as to how the various projects are progressing.

Mr. Selzer stated that each Committee member could be issued a notebook, suitable for accommodating continuous updates. Then each month, or upon request, project updates could be provided to Committee members so that books can remain current.

Mr. Mitchell asked at what point in time would the Committee like to start and end each report. Mr. Selzer responded that he considers a project to be begun when the first financial appropriations are authorized. Mr. Mitchell explained that there may be considerable time between financial authorization and actual construction.

Chairman Bass stated that there are many projects that are ongoing. The Department could give a history of a project that has already begun, and then provide regular updates

Minutes of the Transportation Committee Meeting  
January 8, 2002  
Page Five

for that project.

Mr. Hoselton remarked that he would like to have engineering costs included in the update sheet. Mr. Mitchell stated that in-house engineering costs are already listed. With regard to other jobs, a consultant is hired and those fees are tracked, as well. Mr. Mitchell suggested that a map be included in the periodic project updates in order to assist in locating the section.

Mr. Selzer asked whether an internal project code is utilized for local billing on projects, or is all project information coded to the section number. Mr. Mitchell responded that the section numbers are used for this purpose.

Mr. Selzer asked how billing is handled prior to section numbers being assigned. Mr. Mitchell explained that on the Federal program a Transportation Improvement Program ("TIP") sheet must be turned in for the upcoming three (3) fiscal years. Since costs have risen, increased accuracy is needed. The time invested to prepare these figures is then charged to the Highway Department's office.

Mr. Selzer stated that he and Mr. Hoselton will prepare a draft of a form, incorporating the type of information that the Committee has requested. Once prepared, the form will be presented to the Transportation Committee for its consideration.

Chairman Bass asked whether Committee members had received any new information regarding the efforts of State Representative Dan Rutherford to acquire funding to assist with the repair and maintenance of Interstate Highway overpasses in the north portion of the County. Mr. Hoselton remarked that he would meet with Representative Rutherford shortly. He stated that he had been notified that the Illinois Department of Transportation ("IDOT") was not amenable to the request by the County that IDOT upgrade the overpasses and then turn over jurisdiction to McLean County. Mr. Hoselton stated that he is continuing to pursue this topic with Representative Rutherford.

Mr. Mitchell remarked that the last section of the Towanda-Barnes Road is scheduled for the January 18, 2002 State letting.

Mr. Hoselton commented that the repair and upgrade of the railroad crossing in Towanda was very successful. Mr. Mitchell stated that there are currently two (2) lifts of hot mix to add to the crossing. It will settle in the spring and should then be at its final grade.

Chairman Bass asked whether there would be any travel restrictions to the Towanda-Barnes Road when spring arrives. Mr. Mitchell explained that the south portion of the road, from Route 150 to Ireland Grove Road would remain posted. The north portion of

Minutes of the Transportation Committee Meeting

January 8, 2002

Page Six

the road will most likely be open to traffic. Once the project is completed, no portion of the road is expected to be posted.

There being nothing further to come before the Committee at this time, the meeting was adjourned by Chairman Bass at 8:06 a.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Martha B. Ross  
Recording Secretary