



**Champaign County Board
Highway & Transportation Committee
County of Champaign, Urbana, Illinois**

6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43

MINUTES – Approved 8/8/2014

DATE: Friday, June 6, 2014
TIME: 9:00 a.m.
PLACE: Highway Building Conference Room
1605 East Main, Urbana, IL

Committee Members

Present	Absent
Lorraine Cowart (Chair)	
Lloyd Carter (Vice Chair)	
Christopher Alix	
John Jay	
Jim McGuire	
	Diane Michaels
Max Mitchell	
Michael Richards	

County Staff: Jeff Blue (County Engineer), Deb Busey (County Administrator), Tracy Wingler (Highway Maintenance Supervisor), Linda Lane (Recording Secretary)

Others Present: Pattsy Petrie (County Board Member), Bill Vavrik (Applied Research Associates)

MINUTES

I. Call to Order

Committee Chair Cowart called the meeting to order at 9:03 a.m.

II. Roll Call

A verbal roll call was taken and a quorum was declared present.

III. Approval of Agenda/Addendum

A. Highway & Transportation Committee Meeting – June 6, 2014

MOTION by Mr. Jay to approve the agenda; seconded by Mr. Mitchell. Upon vote, the **MOTION CARRIED unanimously.**

IV. Public Participation

None

V. Approval of Minutes

A. May 9, 2014

MOTION by Mr. Mitchell to approve the May 9, 2014 Highway & Transportation meeting minutes; seconded by Mr. Richards. Upon vote, the **MOTION CARRIED unanimously.**

44 VI. **County and Township Motor Fuel Tax Claims – May 2014**
45 **MOTION** by Mr. Alix to receive and place on file the County and Township Motor Fuel Tax Claims for May
46 2014; seconded by Mr. Carter. Upon vote, the **MOTION CARRIED unanimously.**
47

48 VII. **Resolution Appropriating \$138,000.00 from County Motor Fuel Tax Funds and Authorizing the County**
49 **Board Chair to Sign a Contract for Pavement Management Study – Section #005-00401-02-ES.**
50 Mr. Blue stated they had received a proposal from Applied Research Associates (ARA), the company that
51 has been doing the pavement study for the past five years. He noted that the proposal is for five years
52 but the resolution is only for three years with the ability to extend the contract for two years. Mr. Blue
53 explained that by using this system they have been able to extend asphalt pavement life and schedule
54 maintenance in a timely manner. He summarized many advantages of this pavement management
55 system. Mr. Blue asked the committee for approval of a three year contract with an option to extend for
56 five years.
57

58 **MOTION** by Mr. Mitchell to approve; seconded by Mr. McGuire.
59

60 Mr. Alix commented that expectation with the federal mandate would mean more providers. Mr. Blue
61 responded that ARA has the ability to do strength indication and others have systems that take longer
62 and cost more. Mr. Blue stated the federal highway’s number one priority in pavement advantage is
63 located in Champaign, given the County an advantage. He recognized that there will be more players, but
64 it is unknown if there will be anyone regional. Mr. Blue said others would have to come to us, probably at
65 a higher cost. Mr. Alix asked if the contract is the same as the proposal or if there was separate contract
66 language. Mr. Blue said the contract is the proposal and the terms are in the back. Mr. Alix asked that the
67 State’s Attorney to look over the terms.
68

69 Mr. Carter wondered why the vendor isn’t required to have a bond and that it appears as if the County is
70 taking all the risk. Mr. Blue stated that there is no risk to the County because ARA insures and maintains
71 all the equipment. Mr. Vavrik confirmed the County has zero risk. He said that no bond is needed because
72 they don’t actually touch the infrastructure. He said it’s just like any other vehicle being on the road and
73 that all equipment is non-destructive. Mr. Vavrik agreed to remove or change any clause in the terms and
74 conditions if necessary. He summarized the federal regulation requirements that are to take effect by
75 2018 for metro planning organizations. He felt the County was in a unique position to have a provider
76 locally. Mr. Vavrik pointed out that they provide their services all over the country and that all their
77 engineers have either a master’s degree or PhD. He also acknowledged that the mandate will likely create
78 more competition, but companies will have to hire a different level of person than they are used to. Mr.
79 Vavrik indicated that the national recommendation for a pavement management system is 2-4% of
80 construction dollars, and based on the County’s expected funding stream over the next five years ARA’s
81 proposal is at 1-1/2%, mainly because of their location in the County. Mr. Vavrik summarized other
82 advantages of ARA and pavement management systems.
83

84 Mr. Maxwell stated that it’s a matter of choices and being able to justify those choices as resources
85 become more limited. He also voiced concern that the contract is over \$30,000 and wondered if they
86 should have done an RFQ. He noted that there are others who can do this type of work but that it may be
87 done differently. Mr. Maxwell said he would like to see the County adhere to the RFQ policy. Ms. Busey
88 explained that under the QBS process there is no requirement for an RFQ if there is an established
89 positive working relationship. She said services are left to the discretion of the governing body and the
90 RFQ policy is for hard materials. Mr. Maxwell felt they owe it to the community to put out an RFQ.
91

92 Mr. Jay felt the decision should come from Mr. Blue and doesn’t want the committee to micro-manage
93 his job. Mr. McGuire thought it wouldn’t be worth spending money on an RFQ. He stated that if more
94 people get into the field it may become an issue, but that the market isn’t there now. He felt that this has
95 saved money to support other projects.

96 Mr. Alix thinks they should utilize a system like this and felt the cost will return many times over. He
97 stated he is on the fence about an RFQ. He continued by saying if things change they should look at an
98 RFQ. Mr. Blue responded that if the price would have had risen significantly he would have looked at
99 other options. He summarized why ARA is a good choice now.

100
101 Upon vote, the **MOTION CARRIED unanimously.**

102
103 **VIII. Resolution Appropriating \$392,403.00 from County Motor Fuel Tax Funds and Authorizing the County**
104 **Board Chair to Sign an Intergovernmental Agreement with the City of Urbana for the Reconstruction of**
105 **Philo Road – Section #11-00504-01-PV.**

106 Mr. Blue explained that MFT funds can be used for fringe road projects if there is an intergovernmental
107 agreement. He stated the project is complete and that the agreement is for the County's 50% share of
108 the Philo Road project. **MOTION** by Mr. Richards to approve; seconded by Mr. Alix

109
110 Mr. Jay asked how many fringe road agreements remained. Mr. Blue answered Lincoln Avenue, a small
111 part of Prospect Avenue, and Curtis Road. Mr. Jay voiced concern that fringe roads can take a lot of
112 money and would like to get out fringe road agreements. Mr. Alix commented that where they go with
113 agreements is up to the board in the future. He felt the city did a good job controlling costs. Ms. Petrie
114 noted that since the agreement originated, the boundary has been moved south. She asked how much
115 that extension is costing. Mr. Blue thought between \$50,000-\$100,000. Upon vote, the **MOTION**
116 **CARRIED unanimously.**

117
118 **IX. Resolution for Contract Award Authority to County Engineer – Tolono-Champaign Section #12-29988-**
119 **00-BR.**

120 Mr. Blue asked for contract award authority for a township bridge project that is being bid June 18 and
121 needs to be done this summer. He noted that this has been done before as long as the cost is no higher
122 than 10% of the engineer's estimate. **MOTION** by Mr. Jay to approve; seconded by Mr. McGuire. Mr. Alix
123 asked what road was involved. Mr. Blue responded Old Church Road. Upon vote, the **MOTION CARRIED**
124 **unanimously.**

125
126 **X. Designation of Items to be Placed on the Consent Agenda**

127 Items VIII and IX are to be placed on the consent agenda. Mr. Richards asked that VII be put on the
128 regular board agenda.

129
130 **XI. Other Business**

131 Mr. Blue stated that he had no agenda items for July and didn't expect any contracts to come in. He
132 thought the only reason to have a meeting in July would be if the contract for the Tolono-Champaign
133 project came in higher. It was agreed that the July meeting would be cancelled.

134
135 Mr. Blue noted that they currently have a uniform contract for engineers and mechanics, and that the
136 costs have gotten out of control, reaching \$5-6,000/year. He would like to have an allowance instead for
137 the engineers. Ms. Cowart asked Ms. Busey if they hadn't done something a few years ago with this. Ms.
138 Busey said it needed to be talked about because it could have implications on taxes if paid direct to the
139 employees. Mr. Mitchell asked what cost Mr. Blue was thinking per head. Mr. Blue answered \$3-400 per
140 head per year. Mr. McGuire asked Mr. Blue if maintenance would be changed also. Mr. Blue responded
141 that it would not. Mr. McGuire asked if the engineers were covered under a contract. Ms. Busey said it
142 would be the AFSCME contract and didn't think it's addressed.

143
144 **XII. Adjournment**

145 There being no further business, Ms. Cowart adjourned the meeting at 9:55 a.m.