



MACON COUNTY HIGHWAY DEPARTMENT

2405 N. Woodford St. Decatur, IL 62526

217-424-1404 FAX 217-424-2516

MINUTES

June 26, 2013

The Macon County Transportation Committee meeting was held on Wednesday, June 26, 2013 at 5:30 p.m. located at the Macon County Office Building, 141 S. Main St., Decatur, IL.

Transportation Committee Members Present:

David Williams

Gary Minich

Kevin Meachum

Kevin Bird

Jerry Potts

Suzanna Zimmerman

Transportation Committee Members Absent:

Keith Ashby

Highway Department Support Staff Present:

Bruce Bird, County Engineer

Amanda Askew, Office Assistant

Mark Funk, Road Supervisor

Mark Page, Shop Supervisor

Others Present:

Mike Baggett, Asst. States Attorney

Jay Dunn, County Board Chairman

Rick Harris, 5660 W. Washington St. Rd., Maroa, IL

Mark Koenig, Koenig Body & Equipment, Inc.

Craig Rogers, JX Peterbuilt

Call to Order:

The meeting was called to order by Chair David Williams at 5:30 p.m.

Roll Call:

David Williams

Gary Minich

Suzanna Zimmerman

Kevin Bird

Kevin Meachum

Approval of the Minutes:

Jerry Potts made a motion to approve the minutes from May 22, 2013, seconded by Gary Minich. Kevin Meachum voted present. Motion Carried 5-0

Approval of the Bills:

Jerry Potts made a motion to accept the bills as presented, seconded by Suzanna Zimmerman. Motion Carried 6-0

No Public Comments

Old Business

Temporary bridge crossings:

David Williams passed out a copy of an email that Rick Harris had previously sent to him. Bruce Bird stated at the last meeting we had a discussion with Rick about the possibility of having a low water crossing or a temporary crossing around our bridge closures. Rick had mentioned that something similar to that had occurred in Dewitt County. I contacted the Dewitt County Engineer, Craig Fink; the copy of his email is in the packet. The email is self-explanatory it is a matter of principle that they do not use those and they have a specific clause or provision they put in their project documents that says the contractor shall be responsible for preventing public use of temporary low water crossings. I also contacted IDOT and spoke with Greg Jamerson, Project Implementation Engineer for District 7. The main thing I asked him is that they typically do stage construction on their bridges, but I know that they close some of them. I wanted to know what their procedures were and what they looked at. He cited a recent project in Cumberland County on 121 that they completely closed and had a marked detour for it. It came down to anything that has less than 3000 ADT that is what they would consider a closure. ADT is the average daily traffic. If you applied that 3000 ADT to our roads that you would do a stage construction on would only apply to 4 roads, Baltimore, Lost Bridge, Brush College, and County Highway 30 between Elwin and Mt. Zion. That is the information I found. David Williams stated that in Rick Harris' he references Phil Coberline, is there any merit in contacting this individual to see what could be done along the lines of what he did or do we feel that the guidelines have changed? Bruce Bird replied one thing to consider is whenever the contractor moves in and closes a road, from a liability standpoint, from behind the barricades anything that happens on that road that is closed is their liability. If you are going to mandate that they keep a portion of their work zone open during certain periods of time I don't know what that would do for our liability versus the contractors liability. I am pretty confident that if the contractors had something in there that was going to mandate they had to keep it open that they would put something in their bid in order to cover that liability in one way, shape, or fashion.

Rick Harris stated I also put down the Route 54 east of Clinton that had happened a couple of years ago that they put a complete run around and what they used was a square concrete culvert. The road was shut down for 3 month or so. They even put a signal up. So the person you talked to at IDOT must not cover that area. The other one on Route 54 they had to detour all the traffic through the town of Kenney and North to Route 10. They had a bridge north of Kenney that they made a run around. There is still a road on the side of it. What I am saying is I am not worried about the bridge that is here now I am more concerned about is that we are going to have to replace a lot bridges in this County, and this is just the start of all our infrastructure. We saw in the paper where Decatur is going to spend 17 million dollars putting in water meters. The County is going to end up spending a lot more than 17 million putting in bridges. I think we need to be farmer friendly. I do not care about it being closed except from April 1 until June 15 and September 1 until the end of October, if you could have an opportunity to be able to get around. In Austin Township the 16 ft. wide road, a combine is 15 ft. wide there is no place to go. I do not know where we are supposed to put them. It is called trespassing if I pull out in somebody's field and they don't like you. A couple of years ago when you blacktopped the road some of us went south on one road and north on another road with the field cultivators so we didn't intersect and meet. We were not able to that until the bridge on Lincoln Trail was open. There are not a lot of roads that we can go around because a four wheel driveway is 33,000 pounds I do not know what bridge you want me to go across that is and 11 ton bridge or a 13 ton bridge but if it falls through I think I am going to be the one expected to pay for it. I do not know how you expect us to get anywhere to do anything. This bridge will hopefully be done sometime in October; I know I will be in the field before then. To leave

my house I can go west now that the bridge is open. I hope your contractor does a better job than their contractor did on the bridge because it is rough. I can go by Craig Culp's house; I will call CILCO and see if they can lift up the power lines so it is high enough to get under it. Then you can come back down and go Duroc. All those roads are 16 ft. wide. You can go west where I live, I cannot go down Drummer, Bantam, and I have to go clear up to Bearsdale. When I go down Bearsdale the only opportunity I have to come back west is School Road. This is fine on this one bridge but when you get down there by where John Rotts used to live and you have two more bridges. Unless you guys get Wise Rd. opened and some of these other bridges open. We are not going to have anywhere to get from north to south. I have heard a lot of people complain when I was sitting in a Farm Bureau meeting about the bridge on CH 41 across the Sangamon. I am just trying to come up with an idea or a solution to try and put in some places to go somewhere. I tried to get David to come back and look at the culverts north of my house, I don't know if he did or not. They are the type of things have been there since 1960 and they are 15 ft. culverts. There is a company by the name of Dial that with cranes can lift them up the culverts and put them on your own County flat bed and move them to another ditch and put them back in there. When I talked to Wes he said that he gave the County a temporary easement to do that. He said when they came back they picked up the rock and there was virtually no mess, if you know Wes Anderson that is quite an accomplishment.

Gary Minich stated I can certainly sympathize with your problem. I would like to take a look at this temporary culvert he is talking about more closely than we have. David Williams stated Bruce if I understand what you were saying is that if we are going to do that we will have to work it into the contract. Bruce replied yes, you would have to put it into the contract. The State does one of two things. They will either do a stage construction where they put up temporary stop lights and basically cut the bridge in half. Most of their bridges are the type where you can cut them in half, the bridges we have about half of them you could and the other you could not base upon the design. If you are talking about a total run around you have to build that run around to the safety standards. David Williams asked if that was something you were going to look at as far as cost wise. Bruce replied we do not have any cost things I would have to look at some comparable projects that IDOT has done lately. I would suspect it is a rather large difference between a total closure and putting a run around in. Kevin Meachum stated the old rule of thumb is that stage construction adds about 35 – 40% to the projects total cost when you look at a bypass road which is building a whole new road to the same standards as the new bridge project. It could be upwards of 40 – 50% more on the contract to build the bypass because you have to build it then you have to tear it back down. There is a lot of expense here that I don't know if the County can afford. I understand where this gentleman is coming from. But also at the same time maybe the County can work with the Township and maybe do some widening of an existing roadway with some gravel and beef a Township road up to accommodate the farming seasons but I do not know if that cost effective either. That is all going to boil down to the all mighty dollar. I think we need to look at an alternative through our local Townships. David Williams stated I think we have got our pulse on this, Bruce, will you talk to Paul Heft and Brian Gillman and Gary Brelsfoard and maybe Kevin Bird to put some things together and report back to us next month. Bruce replied yes, do you want me to track down costs with what IDOT has and what they expect. David Williams stated we would have to make it to IDOT standards, right? Bruce replied yes, this bridge on County Highway 21 is being built with Federal funds so yes you have to build it according to the Federal standards. David Williams stated however you see it feasible. Kevin Meachum stated the only reason I mentioned it might be more cost effective to beef up a Township road versus putting a bypass in because of the cost and we might be able to do it with internal funds and look at what we can do by fixing a Township road and assist them. Then at the same time we are accommodating all the farmers in that area. Bruce stated Rick it seems to me that the thing you are more concerned about is the width than anything else, right?

Rick Harris replied I am worried about the weight and the width. I would like to ask Kevin Bird, what they did up on this one, it is just a white rock and they put up a camera, if you were not a farmer and you went across it you got a ticket in the mail. It was only a County thing that a County opened it up in the morning and closed at dark. They had somebody that opened it and locked it up. It was not a run around, it was not a detour it was just an agricultural crossing. They said that made a difference. I do not know what you can do in Townships different than you can do in the other. I just know that Kenney Rd. has four bridges that you are going to do. That is just one little small County road in the whole County and this is just the start of it. I do not care if I cannot go down there with my pickup; it is the combine, the tractor and planter, the tractor and the field cultivator. Those things are the only problem. If it can be shut off to everything other than that that is fine. You can't go anywhere; I can drive to Maroa with a semi and go wherever I need to. That is not the problem. The problem is the combine travels at 15 or 20 mph. You put the combines on Route 51 where a neighbor a David's got hit with a tractor. I do not think anybody in this room wants that to happen. I sure don't. David Brick has been hit on Route 51. There is no place to go to get away. I have even gone clear west over to the Chestnut blacktop to go down that way. I know are talking about building a wind farm in the fall. When they come in to do stuff are they going to put in big culverts? Can you put a big culvert in, in a Township anymore? Kevin Bird replied it just depends on the situation if it is a Federal job we have to abide by the same rules as the County. The wind farm is a whole different thing as well. They are basically building new roads. Rick Harris stated well up north by Bloomington when they put those in on the road ditch, I hauled some rock. They put in 6 feet of white rock. All they do it put it up above when they get done, they come in a sweep it up with a broom and clean it up. You have your original old road back. Everybody thinks they are going to get a great new thing, they are not going to. I think everybody is in for a big shock for that. They one east of Bloomington there was one place that in a ¼ mile they dropped 1,000 loads of rock. That is how they got over it. David Williams stated your points are very well taken and we will keep our finger on it and we will move in a little different direction next month. Bruce will report back and we will see what we can find out.

New Business:

H-1856-7-13

Resolution appropriating funds for construction expenses on the Washington Street bridge replacement over Lake Fork Creek.

Bruce stated WHKS is doing the engineering on this project. This should be the final appropriation. The bridge is open. Motion made by Jerry Potts, seconded by Suzanna Zimmerman.
Motion Carried 6-0

H-1857-7-13

Resolution appropriating funds for construction expenses on the Ocean Trail Road bridge replacement project.

Motion made by Kevin Meachum, seconded by Jerry Potts. Bruce stated Schmidt Construction is the low bidder on this one. They will not get started on it until the end of July beginning of August because of the timing of the beams to be delivered. Motion Carried 6-0

H-1858-7-13

Resolution appropriating funds for construction expenses on the 2013 Coordinated Micro surfacing Project.

Motion made by Kevin Meachum, seconded by Kevin Bird. Bruce stated we had the bid opening for this today. Micro surfacing Contractors, LLC out of Peoria was the low bidder. Motion Carried 6-0

H-1859-7-13

Resolution appropriating funds for the purchase of a tandem dump truck.

Motion made by Jerry Potts, seconded by Suzanna Zimmerman. Bruce stated you have both the bidders' proposals. We had one from Prairie International and one from Mclean County Trucking DBA JX Peterbuilt out of Bloomington. We have a compliant check list yes or no. The Peterbuilt is just a shade over \$10,000 more and it meets all of the specifications we had in there. The International does meet the specifications on about 25-30% of the items. If you take a look at the warranty on the front page the Peterbuilt is quite a bit more extensive than the one that comes with the International. Kevin Meachum stated I know this one is a little bit more money, but how many trucks do we have that meet these requirements besides this one. Bruce replied are you asking this particular brand. Kevin replied are there other brands that meet these same criteria. I want to make sure that we are not are making specs that we will get only one bidder on. Bruce replied the biggest difference between the two bids on the specifications is that we decided to start specking out more aluminum body panels and body items. Just because of corrosion issues we have had the past packages that we have received. Kevin Meachum stated it is salt that is doing that, it is going to be exposed salt on a regular basis. Bruce replied right, and we put in the specifications a little more armor for the wiring harnesses. That is pretty much two of the biggest issues we have had with our current fleet. We have had a lot of wiring issues because the harnesses were not armored for the service that we put them through especially in the middle of the winter. We have had some of the body packages that still have to keep in our fleet that we've had to send off an be painted because of corrosion issues. Kevin Meachum stated I just want to make sure that we are not limiting ourselves to one certain kind of truck, due to the fact that we want all these certain things. Yes they are great but I want to make sure that several companies can bid this. Bruce replied we are not pigeon holing ourselves to one manufacturer. Jerry Potts asked if the engines were the same. Mark Page replied these are about 50 more horsepower than the ones we have. We have 300 horsepower in the current trucks and the new one is 350. We spoke to Peterbuilt about them having a bigger engine. I talked to the City and to a couple other owners that had Peterbuilts, they said that was the only complaint they had that they were a little underpowered and about 50 more horsepower would have helped them out. We are in the 300 to 345 area. Jay Dunn stated I have a problem with the resolution. At the end it says for it is resolved it says they recommend McLean County Trucking Peterbuilt Bloomington as the low bidder. They are not the low bidder the way I look at it. I think that language needs to be changed to reflect what is really going on. Bruce asked do you want to call it the lowest responsible bidder. Jay Dunn replied that would be fine with me. Bruce stated we can make that change. Kevin Meachum asked if we have had trouble with some of the previous equipment and we are trying to break that cycle and get a better truck they take feedback from the employees that are driving them. I put faith in what Mark Page and Mark Funk are saying. These guys do drive them every day; they know what is good about them and what is bad about them. Maybe spending a little extra money we can get an extra year out of it so we don't have to buy a new truck. David Williams stated that is why we will put it as the lowest responsible bidder. Bruce stated when we were putting the specs together, what started this was we were having issues so we called other Counties that had different models in their fleet. The big thing that came back from all of them was that the State bid was minimal and weak for the most part. You will basically get a truck that is less than heavy duty for what you are typically going to put it through. Virtually all of them have got to the point where they just put together their own specifications. We melded a bunch of those specs together and listened to what they guys had to say and that is what we came up with. Mark Page stated what we looked at was trying to get a truck that is going to last us for 15 to 20 years. Motion Carried 6-0.

G- -7-13

Resolution increasing the Matching Fund line item #031-000-7780 by \$1.2 million for the Country Club Road Project.

Motion made by Kevin Meachum, seconded by Suzanna Zimmerman. Bruce stated this has to go to finance that is why there is not a number on it. We have to increase the line item under matching by \$1.2 million to finish off all of the cost on the Country Club Road project. It is a function of absolutely nothing other than me forgetting to put in this time last year when we started doing our budget. The money is going to be available and the contract is already been signed off on. There is no increase in cost. There is no increase in anything other than what we are already on the hook to pay for. It is just increasing the actual budget to make everything legal so we can make those payments. Motion Carried 6-0.

H-1860-7-13

Resolution requesting reclassification of portions of CH 34 and CH 35 through Macon County.

Motion made by Jerry Potts, seconded by Suzanna Zimmerman. Bruce stated this is very similar to the one we had last month where IDOT wanted us to have a resolution to change the designation on US 51 through Macon County to keep it consistent. The difference here is that where our County Highway 35 goes down and matches to the County line with Shelby County. Shelby County is trying to get some federal funds for a project on that short stretch of road. To do that they have to have it upgraded from a local road to a minor collector. If they do that since it matches our County Highway then we have to do our County Highway 35 the same way. Well County Highway 35 doesn't match up with another road so then we have to do County Highway 34 until it goes all the way over to 128 and matches up on both ends. It is a paperwork thing. In the future it would probably make it easier for us to build things with Federal funds on those roads. It really doesn't hurt us at all or put us on the hook for anything. Motion Carried 6-0.

Bruce stated on items A and B, Jay reminded me in the recent past we have wanted the vendor in the resolution. It did not make it into the copy here. I apologize and we will make sure that we make those changes.

County Engineer's Report:

Bruce stated things are progressing out on County Club Road since the last time we met. The official marker of weather they are going to get done in time or not is the percent complete versus how many working days they have left. They tipped over from on to the other. They will not get done within the allotted time unless they decide to work a lot overtime and that just has not been in the cards. There are liquidated damages built in if they go over. We have had multiple conversations with the contractor dealing with this issue. There are procedures that are laid out in the IDOT specs of how we are supposed to handle it. We will be handling that exactly in that fashion. They will get it done but within the working days that allotted right now they are more than likely not going to get it done, doesn't mean they can't but it looks like they won't.

The bridge on Kenney Blacktop was closed on Monday the contractors are moving in and doing the demo work when it isn't raining. They have built this type of bridge before and they have a lot of form work that shortens up a lot of the work. They seem to think they are going to get it done in short order. We will see how they progress.

The memo for the budget process came out. They want to make sure that we have our preliminary budget to you guys by the meeting next month. We will make sure we have that ready for the next meeting.

Typically the meeting in July or August right before Farm Progress is held out at the grounds. Because of the timing of things this year the forth Wednesday in August is the show. I do not think anybody here or anybody at Farm Progress is going to want us to have a meeting out there in the midst of the show. David Williams stated we want to do it in July. Bruce stated that will back it up to July and the issue with that is that there will be nothing for us to look at other than a few empty tents. David Williams asked if we wanted to change our August meeting date. Kevin Meachum asked if we can do that. David Williams stated we just have to advertise. Bruce stated if you really want to meet in July we can or we can meet in August and meet on the third Wednesday instead of the forth. That would put it right before the show. David Williams stated I will be out at Farm Progress that forth Wednesday working. Bruce stated I think it would be really difficult for all of us to make the meeting at that time. David Williams asked what the committee's preference on that is. Everyone agreed that the third Wednesday would work just fine.

The Maintenance crews are finished mowing even with all the rain.

No Miscellaneous Business

No Closed Session

Adjourn:

Jerry Potts made a motion to adjourn, seconded by Kevin Meachum. Motion Carried 6-0

Meeting adjourned at 6:12 p.m.

The next Transportation Meeting held at the Macon County Office Building will be Wednesday, July 24, 2013 at 5:30 p.m.

Minutes submitted by:
Kathy Gerhold & Amanda Askew
Macon County Highway Department