

****APPROVED MINUTES****

Mason, Michigan
March 16, 2009

The Board of Ingham County Road Commissioners met for a regular meeting on Monday, March 16, 2009, at 6:00 P.M. in the Board Room of the Road Commission's Austin E. Cavanaugh Administration Building located at 301 N. Bush Street, Mason, Michigan.

Present: Joseph A. Guenther, Chair, Shirley M. Rodgers, Vice Chair, Thomas M. Mitchell, Member, James Dravenstatt-Moceri, Member, and Norman L. Gear, Member.

Also Present: William M. Conklin, Managing Director, Deborah L. Bellows, Secretary to the Board, Tina M. Henry, Finance Director, James L. Charles, Interim Director of Operations, and Robert H. Peterson, Director of Engineering.

Chair Joseph A. Guenther called the meeting to order and led with the Pledge of Allegiance.

AGENDA ITEM #3 – LIMITED PUBLIC COMMENT.

Marv Allen of Mason. Mr. Allen stated he is a retiree of the Road Commission and worked here from 1964 to 1995. He said he wanted to thank the Board and its finance staff for changing the retirees health care coverage to Humana. Mr. Allen said he paid \$79 a month in 2006 for Medical Part D. When the Road Commission changed to MERS Premier Health and the drug rider was no longer able to be split out from the health coverage and because he had always been able to waive the drug coverage, his monthly cost jumped to \$484 in 2008, and \$674 per month in 2009. Mr. Allen indicated his monthly cost with Humana is \$248 per month, a savings of about \$5000 a year. He said that for a retiree on a fixed income, this is a tremendous saving. Mr. Allen said he speaks solely for himself but wanted to make sure the Board knows how much this is appreciated not only by him, but by many retirees, and especially those who make less a month in their pensions than he does. He thanked the Board for giving staff the latitude to research this and come up with an acceptable solution to health care costs for the retirees.

AGENDA ITEM #4 – ADDITIONS TO THE AGENDA.

- A. Purchase of a used equipment trailer. To be added as Agenda #9G.

AGENDA ITEM #4 – CONSENT AGENDA.

Moved by Commissioner Rodgers and Supported by Commissioner Mitchell, that the following items be approved under consent:

- A. Agenda Item #5 – Minutes.
- B. Agenda Item #6, #6A and #6B – Routine and Special Permits.
- C. Agenda Item #8 – Accounts Payable.
- D. Agenda Item #9A – Re-approval of the Final Plat of Georgetown Phase 2.
- E. Agenda Item #9B – Final Plat of Delhi Downtown Development.

5 yes, 0 no. Motion carried unanimously.

Agenda Item # 5 – Minutes.

Moved by Commissioner Rodgers and Supported by Commissioner Mitchell, that the minutes of the meetings of February 16, 2009, and March 2, 2009, be approved as presented. 5 yes, 0 no. Motion carried unanimously.

Agenda Item #6, #6A and #6B – Routine and Special Permits.

Moved by Commissioner Rodgers and Supported by Commissioner Mitchell, that routine and special permits be approved as follows:

09-0077 09-0084 09-0076 09-0078 09-0080
09-0081 09-0083

- A. Permit #09-0036 applied for by Sunrise Aggregates LLC for a haul route on various roadways in Vevay Township for the purpose of hauling to and from its gravel pit located on Ives Road.
- B. The following permits are automatically allowed for milk haulers and agricultural commodities haulers during spring weight restrictions pursuant to statute:

Milk Haulers:

- (1) #09-0023 for Traver Milk Hauling for various locations in Stockbridge Township.

Agricultural Commodities Haulers:

- (2) #09-0079 for Rupp Seed Inc. for hauling on Barnes Road between Aurelius Road and Eifert Road.
- (3) #09-0082 for Cremer Farms for various locations/townships.

5 yes, 0 no. Motion carried unanimously.

Agenda Item #8 – Accounts Payable.

Moved by Commissioner Rodgers and Supported by Commissioner Mitchell, that the accounts payable for the two week period of February 16-March 1, 2009, be approved as follows: check numbers #92628 through #92734, totaling \$302,523.42. 5 yes, 0 no. Motion carried unanimously.

Agenda Item #9A – ReApproval of the Final Plat of Georgetown Phase 2.

RESOLUTION RE-APPROVING THE FINAL PLAT OF GEORGETOWN SUBDIVISION PHASE 2 LOCATED IN MERIDIAN CHARTER TOWNSHIP.

RESOLUTION #017-09

Moved by Commissioner Rodgers and Supported by Commissioner Mitchell. 5 yes, 0 no. Resolution carried unanimously.

BE IT RESOLVED that upon recommendation of the Director of Engineering, the Board re-approves the Final Plat of Georgetown Subdivision Phase 2 located in Section 14 of Meridian Charter Township. The proprietor is the Eyde Company.

Agenda Item #9B – Final Plat of Delhi Downtown Development Authority.

RESOLUTION APPROVING THE FINAL PLAT OF DELHI DOWNTOWN DEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY (DDA) SUBDIVISION LOCATED IN DELHI CHARTER TOWNSHIP.

RESOLUTION #018-09

Moved by Commissioner Rodgers and Supported by Commissioner Mitchell. 5 yes, 0 no. Resolution carried unanimously.

BE IT RESOLVED that upon recommendation of the Director of Engineering, the Board approves the Final Plat of Delhi Downtown Development Authority (DDA) located in Section 24 of Delhi Charter Township. The proprietor is the Delhi DDA.

AGENDA ITEM #7 – MANAGING DIRECTOR REPORTS.

A. Upcoming Meeting with Meridian Township. Managing Director Bill Conklin reported that he is scheduled to meet with the Meridian Township Board of Trustees on March 17th to discuss the federal aid projects, long range plans, and the roundabouts planned to be constructed in Meridian Township.

B. Ingham County Drain Commission. Mr. Conklin reported the result of a meeting with the Drain Commissioner and his staff a week ago. Topics of discussion were the Holt Road Branch of Deer Creek Drain issue, the Gilbert Drain proposed project, and orphan road drains. The Board asked that staff schedule a meeting for the Board to meet with the Drain Commissioner to discuss these issues. Possibly the March 30th meeting.

C. Ingham County Parks Department. Mr. Conklin indicated the Parks Department has requested the use of Road Commission equipment. There was discussion on the process to be followed and how this would be charged out. It was the consensus that any equipment used by the Parks Department, or any other governmental agency, would be provided with operator and will be charged the MDOT rental rate plus the operator time/fringe.

D. Administrative Fee Charged to Other Entities.

Mr. Conklin inquired as to the Board's intent on charging the new Administrative Fee formula on all goods and services, or if it is only for the local road work being done in 2009. The Board previously adopted a new formula to be used for the charges on the local road work with the caveat that it will be reviewed in the fall to see how it works. Mr. Conklin asked if this new formula should only be used on the local road projects until we can determine if it will work, and if it is successful, we can change it for everything at that time.

Commissioner Gear asked the Managing Director's opinion. Mr. Conklin said he thinks the new formula should be used for all accounts receivable, any goods and services being charged out. He said he believes that is the best way to handle the process. Chair Guenther stated he thought it was the consensus of the Board that the new formula would be used on everything so that there would be one consistent rate, one process and one formula for everything being charged out. Commissioner Dravenstatt-Mocerri agreed that there should be one consistent formula for everything.

While on this subject, Mr. Conklin brought to the Board's attention an old and seemingly useless policy regarding the overhead charge schedule. The policy was adopted in 1998 and sets up fixed overhead amounts to be charged for varying invoice total amount categories, with a cap of \$1800. He indicated that Finance Director Tina Henry was not made aware of this policy when she hired into the accounting department nine years ago and only recently discovered this policy, and further that she has not used these formulas for any charges on goods and/or services. He suggested the Board may want to declare this policy obsolete and remove it from the active policies manual.

Commissioner Rodgers stated that while she would agree to having one consistent formula to be used for everything, she wondered if there might be a specific reason this policy was adopted that would still be a good explanation today. She suggested the minutes be researched for any possible information and that this be brought back at a future meeting to consider.

RESOLUTION AUTHORIZING THE FORMULA TO BE USED IN CHARGING AN ADMINISTRATIVE/ OVERHEAD FEE ON ACCOUNTS RECEIVABLE FOR ALL CHARGES ON GOODS AND/OR SERVICES PROVIDED BY THE INGHAM COUNTY ROAD COMMISSION.

RESOLUTION #019-09

Moved by Commissioner Mitchell and Supported by Commissioner Gear. 5 yes, 0 no. Resolution carried unanimously.

BE IT RESOLVED that upon recommendation of the Managing Director, the Board authorizes staff to charge the Administrative Fee based on the same formula as what is currently being charged on the local road projects, on any and all goods and services that are charged out under the Accounts Receivable. This formula will be calculated based on the calculations used in the example given in the memorandum to the Board authored by the Managing Director under date of February 5, 2009. This will be for a trial period through 2009. At the end of 2009, the Board will determine whether this formula for charging the administrative fee on all goods and services provided by the Road Commission will be formalized into an official policy, or whether it needs to be reviewed again.

AGENDA ITEM #9C – AWARD OF PROPOSAL #1547.

Director of Engineering Bob Peterson reviewed his recommendation for award of Proposal #1547 for the 2009 pavement marking program. He recommended award to the low bidder, M&M Pavement Marking of Grand Blanc. This bid is about \$46,000.00 under budget. Chair Guenther asked since this bid is under budget, if the remaining money in the budget could be used toward the shortfall on the Williamston Road project. Mr. Peterson said there is additional pavement marking needs that this money will be used for. Interim Director of Operations Jim Charles stated if Stimulus money is used for additional chip seal projects as is currently being discussed, some of this money will be needed to replace pavement marking after the chip seal surface is down.

Commissioner Gear asked if waterborne paint is the most current technology for pavement marking, or if there might be something better out there. Mr. Peterson said no, but better material would consist of polyurea or thermoplastic, and that would about double the cost. Commissioner Gear asked if we could use a test area to see how much longer the polyurea or thermoplastic markings would last compared to the cost. Managing Director Bill Conklin stated the waterborne paint has the best life for the money. Mr. Charles stated waterborne paint works well, especially in Michigan. With the polyurea or thermoplastic, the snow plows would scrape those markings off quicker than the paint.

RESOLUTION AUTHORIZING AWARD OF PROPOSAL #1547 FOR THE 2009 PAVEMENT MARKING PROGRAM.

RESOLUTION #020-09

Moved by Commissioner Mitchell and Supported by Commissioner Gear. 5 yes, 0 no. Resolution carried unanimously.

BE IT RESOLVED that upon recommendation of the Director of Engineering, the Board authorizes award of Proposal #1547 for the 2009 pavement marking program to the low bidder, M&M Pavement Marking for its low bid price of \$328,850.00.

Additional Pavement Marking Needs.

Mr. Peterson informed the Board that about this time every year we also accept bids to replace the symbols and common text pavement markings using a spray on two part polyurea material. Symbols and common text pavement markings include cross walks, stop bars, turn arrows, "ONLY" markings, railroad cross-bucks, and "SCHOOL" markings. He said last year the Road Commission received only one bid for this material, as was also the case in 2007. A comparison of the low bids for 2006, 2007, and 2008

revealed that polyurea application costs increased 11% from 2006 to 2007 and 27% from 2007 to 2008. It is anticipated that another 10% to 20% increase in polyurea costs could be possible this year, therefore, the Engineering Department looked into other types of pavement marking materials over the winter.

Mr. Peterson indicated their research revealed that MDOT is moving away from using spray-on pavement markings, such as polyurea, urethane, and thermoplastic, and going with overlay cold plastic pavement markings. Cold plastic pavement markings are sold by the roll or as pre-cut symbols and common text. The markings are glued to the roadway using a chemically activated adhesive, much like laminate cement.

The cold plastic material is proving to be more durable, does not require special equipment to apply, and keeps its retro-reflectivity longer. Retro-reflectivity is a measure of the amount of light that is reflected back to the driver from the vehicle's headlights during night-time driving. On top of its higher durability and safety aspects, the material could be applied by Road Commission crews. Based on his department's research, Mr. Peterson believes switching to overlay cold plastic pavement marking materials can give us more "bang for the buck" if we discount the fact that our crews' labor is already accounted for in the budget.

Mr. Peterson referred to a spreadsheet he provided that shows a comparison of costs associated with two cold plastic pavement marking products offered by 3M Company and last year's polyurea pavement marking program. We would need to bid out the material purchase, but these values were readily available and easy to demonstrate the relative costs. The polyurea marking program for 2008 cost about \$47,350.00, including labor and materials. The 3M cold plastic costs are between \$35,000 and \$66,000 for material only. The more expensive amount is for the 100% pre-cut, heavy duty cold plastic material and the least expensive amount is for the normal material in both roll stock and pre-cut configurations.

Mr. Peterson suggested that if the Road Commission's crews did the work, there would only need to be budget for purchase of the pavement marking material and rental of a machine to remove the old markings prior to applying the new markings. If we were to have the same size program as last year using the normal cold plastic material, the total budget would be about \$36,000.

Mr. Peterson said the 2009 budget for symbols and common text is \$50,000. He suggested that we use no more than \$40,000 of the budget to purchase the normal cold plastic material, rent the pavement marking removal equipment, and have our crews cut and install the new pavement markings. This program will be evaluated for efficiency and savings and a report given to the Board later this year.

Mr. Peterson recommended the purchase of cold plastic pavement marking material, up to \$40,000, and obtain the equipment necessary for Road Commission crews to install the annual symbol and common text pavement markings.

Chair Guenther asked about the equipment needed for this work. Mr. Peterson said the only piece of equipment needed is the grinder, which will be used to remove the old markings. He said the cost for rental is \$580 for a week. Purchase of one of these machines is \$7,000. If this works, we may want to consider the purchase in the future. Chair Guenther asked how long this project would take. Mr. Peterson said, weather permitting, about one week.

RESOLUTION AUTHORIZING PURCHASE OF COLD PLASTIC PAVING MARKING MATERIAL.

RESOLUTION #021-09

Moved by Commissioner Rodgers and Supported by Commissioner Mitchell. 5 yes, 0 no. Resolution carried unanimously.

BE IT RESOLVED that upon recommendation of the Director of Engineering, the Board authorizes staff to set a date to receive bids for up to \$40,000 worth of cold plastic pavement marking material for use by the Road Commission's crews to lay symbols and common text pavement markings at various locations

during the 2009 construction season. The Board also authorizes the rental of the proper equipment to remove old markings prior to applying new ones.

AGENDA ITEM #9D – AWARD OF PROPOSAL #1549.

Director of Engineering Bob Peterson reviewed his recommendation for award of Proposal #1549 for reflective sign faces and recommended award to the low bidder, Vulcan Signs of Foley, Alabama. Commissioner Dravenstatt-Moceri asked how an out of state vendor could possibly be less than a company right here in Charlotte? Interim Director of Operations and former Sign & Signal Manager Jim Charles stated it has to do with the bulk rate these companies get from 3M, the manufacturer of the sign face material. He said that Vulcan is a much larger company and orders a larger stock and is able to get a better bulk rate on the material. Dornbos Sign of Charlotte is a much smaller company and does not order its stock in as large a quantity.

RESOLUTION AUTHORIZING AWARD OF PROPOSAL #1549 FOR REFLECTIVE SIGN FACES.

RESOLUTION #022-09

Moved by Commissioner Dravenstatt-Moceri and Supported by Commissioner Gear. 5 yes, 0 no. Resolution carried unanimously.

BE IT RESOLVED that upon recommendation of the Director of Engineering, the Board authorizes award of Proposal #1549 for reflective sign faces to the low bidder, Vulcan Signs of Foley, Alabama, for its overall low bid prices on the various sizes of face material.

AGENDA ITEM #9E – AWARD OF PROPOSAL #1550.

Director of Engineering Bob Peterson reviewed his recommendation for the award of Proposal #1550 for aluminum sign panels. He recommended award to the low bidder, Osburn Associates of Logan, Ohio.

RESOLUTION AUTHORIZING AWARD OF PROPOSAL #1550 FOR ALUMINUM SIGN PANELS.

RESOLUTION #023-09

Moved by Commissioner Mitchell and Supported by Commissioner Rodgers. 5 yes, 0 no. Resolution carried unanimously.

BE IT RESOLVED that upon recommendation of the Director of Engineering, the Board authorizes award of Proposal #1550 for aluminum sign panels to the low bidder, Osburn Associates of Logan, Ohio, for its overall low bid prices on the various sizes of aluminum sign panel material.

AGENDA ITEM #9F – AWARD OF PROPOSAL #1551.

Director of Engineering Bob Peterson reviewed his recommendation for award of Proposal #1551 for steel sign posts. He recommended award to the low bidder, Rathco Safety Supply of Portage, Michigan.

RESOLUTION AUTHORIZING AWARD OF PROPOSAL #1551 FOR STEEL SIGN POSTS.

RESOLUTION #024-09

Moved by Commissioner Mitchell and Supported by Commissioner Gear. 5 yes, 0 no. Resolution carried unanimously.

BE IT RESOLVED that upon recommendation of the Director of Engineering, the Board authorizes award of Proposal #1551 for steel sign posts to the low bidder, Rathco Safety Supply of Portage, Michigan, for its total low bid price in the amount of \$11,704.00.

AGENDA ADD ON #9G – EQUIPMENT TRAILER PURCHASE.

Interim Director of Operations Jim Charles indicated the Fleet Manager has been looking the last few years for a good used low-boy equipment trailer. The one currently owned by the Road Commission is very old (1978) and is not in very good condition. He stated we have just learned that Tom's Asphalt Company is going out of business and selling off all of its equipment. They have an equipment trailer that is in very good condition and have accepted an offer from us for \$10,500.00. Mr. Charles stated we will need to put new tires on it and retro-fit it to our truck, but it is otherwise in excellent condition and to purchase one new would cost \$40,000.00. The cost for new tires will be \$290.00 each. This trailer has a hydraulic lift.

RESOLUTION AUTHORIZING THE PURCHASE OF A USED EQUIPMENT TRAILER.

RESOLUTION #025-09

Moved by Commissioner Rodgers and Supported by Commissioner Mitchell. 5 yes, 0 no. Resolution carried unanimously.

BE IT RESOLVED that upon recommendation of the Interim Director of Operations, the Board authorizes the purchase of a used equipment trailer from Tom's Asphalt Company for the purchase price of \$10,500.00.

AGENDA ITEM #11 – COMMISSIONER COMMENTS.

A. Commissioner Rodgers inquired as to whether an answer has been received from the City of Williamston and Williamstown Township regarding their participation in the local share cost of the Williamston Road project. Mr. Conklin replied no.

B. Commissioner Rodgers stated she was not able to attend the Diversity luncheon which was held recently. She asked if anyone from the Road Commission attended. Mr. Conklin stated he attended, and of course Kelly Rankin-Gomez as she is on that committee, and Rahman Shareef. Commissioner Rodgers stated she would like to see more employees attend that luncheon in the future.

C. The Board stated that it wished to thank Ms. Rankin-Gomez for her hard work and dedication as a member of the Diversity Committee in sponsoring the annual Diversity luncheon.

No public comment was offered. The meeting adjourned at 7:30 P.M.

Joseph A. Guenther, Chair

Deborah L. Bellows, Board Secretary