THE COUNTY SERVICES COMMITTEE WILL MEET ON TUESDAY, APRIL 8, 2014 AT 6:00 P.M., IN THE PERSONNEL CONFERENCE ROOM (D & E), HUMAN SERVICES BUILDING, 5303 S. CEDAR, LANSING.

Call to Order
Approval of the March 18, 2014 Minutes
Additions to the Agenda
Limited Public Comment

1. **Drain** - Resolution Authorizing the Purchase of a Small **Excavator** from AIS Construction Equipment Corporation for the Drain Commissioner

2. **Treasurer** - Resolution Authorizing Submission of a Joint Application by Ingham County and the Ingham County Land Bank Fast Track Authority for Housing Resource Funding, Consisting of Community Development Block Grant (CDBG) Dollars Made Available Through the Michigan State Housing Development Authority (MSHDA) for Blight Elimination within Non-Entitlement Areas of Ingham County

3. **Michigan State University Extension** - Resolution Amending the 2014 Agreement with Michigan State University for **Extension Services**

4. **Road Department**
   b. Resolution to Execute a **Quit Claim Deed** between Great Lakes Christian Homes Housing Corporation and the Ingham County Board of Commissioners
   c. Resolution to Authorize the Purchase of Reflective Sign Faces and Complete **Signs** from Osburn Associates, Inc.
   d. Resolution Authorizing the Extension of Authorizations to Purchase 2014 Seasonal Requirements of Smooth-Lined Corrugated Polyethylene Pipe & Helically Corrugated Steel **Pipe** for the Road Department
   e. Resolution Authorizing the Extension of a Contract for Gravel Road **Dust Control Service** for the Road Department
   f. Resolution to Approve Proposed 2014 Ingham County **Bridge Funding Applications** for Submission to the Local Bridge Program Manager
   g. Resolution to Approve the Hungerford Street **Stop Sign Installation** at St Joseph Street Traffic Control Order
   h. Resolution to Authorize an As Needed Construction Inspection Professional Engineering Services Contract with **RS Engineering, LLC**
   i. Resolution Authorizing and Endorsing Submission of **Grant Applications** under both the USDOT TIGER FY 2014 and the MDOT TEDF-A Programs for the Reconstruction of Cedar Street from US-127 to Holbrook Drive in Alaiedon and Delhi Townships, Ingham County, Michigan for the Ingham County Road Department
j. Resolution Authorizing and Endorsing Submission of a Grant Application Under the MDOT TEDF-A Program for Various Road Improvements Relating to the Expansion of the Jackson National Life Insurance Office in Alaiedon Township, Ingham County, Michigan for the Ingham County Road Department

k. Resolution to Authorize the Re-designation of Williamston Road between Baseline and Fitchburg Roads, Bunker Hill Township, from Class A to All-Season

l. Resolution to Approve the Special and Routine Permits for the Ingham County Road Department

5. Management Information Systems
   a. Resolution to Approve the Purchase of NetVault Backup Solution from Avalon Technologies
   b. Resolution to Approve the Purchase of New Cisco ASA Firewalls from ISI
   c. Resolution to Approve Entering into an Agreement with Xerox for Managed Print Services

6. Facilities - Resolution Awarding a Contract to Pavement Consultants, Inc. to Provide Professional Asphalt Consulting and Project Management Services for the Parking Lot Replacement Project at the Human Services Building

7. Health Department - Resolution to Amend Resolution #13-486 to Change the Date for the Elimination of a Position

8. Controller’s Office - First Quarter 2014 Budget Adjustments and Contingency Fund Update

9. Board of Commissioners - Resolution in Support of a Cesar E. Chavez National Day of Service

10. Human Resources
    a. Resolution Authorizing and Clarifying Pension Benefits for Teamsters Local 580 Potter Park Zoo Unit
    b. Resolution Approving a Collective Bargaining Agreement with Local 512 Office and Professional Employees International Union - Technical Clerical Unit
    c. Resolution Authorizing the Establishment of a MERS Hybrid Plan for Newly Hired Employees Under Local 512 Office And Professional Employees International Union - Technical Clerical Unit
    d. Resolution Approving a Collective Bargaining Agreement with Ingham County Employees’ Association - Professional Court Employees
    e. Resolution Authorizing the Establishment of a MERS Hybrid Plan for Newly Hired Employees Under Ingham County Employees’ Association - Professional Court Employees
    f. Status of Collective Bargaining (Closed Session)

11. Information - ORV Laws for Southern Michigan

Announcements
Public Comment
Adjournment

PLEASE TURN OFF CELL PHONES OR OTHER ELECTRONIC DEVICES OR SET TO MUTE OR VIBRATE TO AVOID DISRUPTION DURING THE MEETING

The County of Ingham will provide necessary reasonable auxiliary aids and services, such as interpreters for the hearing impaired and audio tapes of printed materials being considered at the meeting for the visually impaired, for individuals with disabilities at the meeting upon five (5) working days notice to the County of Ingham. Individuals with disabilities requiring auxiliary aids or services should contact the County of Ingham in writing or by calling the following: Ingham County Board of Commissioners, P.O. Box 319, Mason, MI 48854 Phone: (517) 676-7200. A quorum of the Board of Commissioners may be in attendance at this meeting. Meeting information is also available on line at www.ingham.org.
COUNTY SERVICES COMMITTEE
March 18, 2014
Draft Minutes

Members Present: Dianne Holman, Penelope Tsernoglou, Bryan Crenshaw, Deb Nolan, Carol Koenig, Victor Celentino and Randy Maiville.

Members Absent: None

Others Present: Tim Dolehanty, Travis Parsons, Nancy Hayward, Barb Mastin, Jared Cypher, Shauna Dunnings, Michael Ashton, Willis Bennett, Michelle Rutkowski, Brian Collins, Sally Auer, Becky Bennett, Rod Villre, Desiree Cook, Toranda Brown, Randy Neff, Matt Moubray, Vicki Watson, Dana Watson, Jennifer Shuster and others.

The meeting was called to order by Chairperson Holman at 6:00 p.m. in the Personnel Conference Room “D & E” of the Human Services Building, 5303 S. Cedar Street, Lansing, Michigan.

Approval of the March 4, 2014 Minutes

MOVED BY COMM. CRENSHAW, SUPPORTED BY COMM. KOENIG, TO APPROVE THE MINUTES OF THE MARCH 4, 2014 MEETING AS PRESENTED.

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

Additions to the Agenda

Agenda item nos. 1 and 11 were removed from the agenda.

Agenda item no. 12c was changed to 12d and the action item for 12c will now read as follows: Authorization of the Board of Commissioners Chairperson to send a letter of support to the Citizens for a National Cesar E. Chavez Day on behalf of the Ingham County Board of Commissioners to establish the National Cesar E. Chavez Day of Service on March 31.

Substitute - 2. Resolution Authorizing the Sale of Office Furniture and Computer Equipment to the Ingham Health Plan

Substitute - 3d. Resolution Authorizing the Submission of a Grant Application to the Michigan Department of Natural Resources Trust Fund for an Accessible Playground at Potter Park

Lates –

13. Resolution Approving the Use of Contingency Funds for a Temporary Hire for Ingham County Probate Court
3e. Resolution Authorizing the Submission of a Grant Application to the Michigan Department of Natural Resources Recreation Passport Grant Program for Repairs and Resurfacing of the Accessible Non-Motorized Trail at Hawk Island County Park

14a. Resolution Honoring James Bibbs

14b. Resolution Honoring Reverend Desirae Kelley-Kato

14c. Resolution Honoring Kendra McFadden

14d. Resolution Honoring Melvin McWilliams

14e. Resolution Honoring Rina Risper

14f. Resolution Honoring Stacia King

Limited Public Comment

Sally Auer, UAW, addressed the Committee and expressed her concern regarding agenda item no. 10. She stated that the process normally followed for reorganization has not been followed. Ms. Auer expressed concern about the power this potential reorganization will give the director of the department and also the potential loss of jobs. She stated that this would adversely affect union members and she urged the Committee not to pass the resolution tonight.

Dana Watson, ICEA, addressed the Committee and also expressed her concern regarding agenda item no. 10. She said she felt that there was no insurance for people affected by this potential reorganization to be placed elsewhere and that is not a good working environment. Ms. Watson asked the Committee to table or not to pass the resolution tonight.

Rod M. Villre, UAW, addressed the Committee and also expressed his concern regarding agenda item no. 10. He said the reorganization was too vague and did not portray a level playing field. Mr. Villre stated that he believes this reorganization would eliminate people for convenience sake. He asked the Committee to not pass the resolution tonight.

Desiree Cook, ICEA, addressed the Committee and also expressed her concern regarding agenda item no. 10. She said her chief concern was that the process was not followed as usual. Ms. Cook stated that it is important to reassure people about their employment.

Toranda Brown, MIS/UAW, addressed the Committee and also expressed her concern regarding agenda item no. 10. She said that her position would be eliminated and that she was not given opportunities for further training. Ms. Brown said she hoped this potential reorganization can be stopped.

Randy Neff, MIS, addressed the Committee and also expressed his concern regarding agenda item no. 10. He said he is concerned about job security even with all of his education, training and experience.
Jeff Vanderscheaf, MIS, addressed the Committee and also expressed his concern regarding agenda item no. 10. He said that he doesn’t feel the plan was thought out. Mr. Vanderscheaf said he is not ready to retire and now feels blindsided.

Matt Moubray, UAW, addressed the Committee and also expressed his concern regarding agenda item no. 10. He said he is nervous about the potential reorganization and doesn’t know where he stands. Mr. Moubray said he is worried about how this will affect his family.

Vicki Watson, MIS, addressed the Committee regarding agenda item no. 10. She stated that the MIS Department is divided, but that she supports the resolution.

MOVED BY COMM. MAIVILLE, SUPPORTED BY COMM. CELENTINO, TO APPROVE A CONSENT AGENDA FOR THE FOLLOWING ITEMS:

2. **Ingham Health Plan** - Resolution Authorizing the Sale of Office Furniture and Computer Equipment to the Ingham Health Plan

3. **Parks Department**
   c. Resolution Authorizing a Contract with Maurer & Parks Well Drilling, Inc. for Materials and Labor to Relocate an Irrigation Well at Lake Lansing Park-South
   d. Resolution Authorizing the Submission of a Grant Application to the Michigan Department of Natural Resources Trust Fund for an Accessible Playground at Potter Park

4. **Facilities Department** - Resolution Authorizing the Purchase of a Replacement Tractor from D&G Equipment for the Human Services Building

5. **Road Department**
   a. Resolution to Amend Resolution #14-067 which Authorized a Bridge Design Professional Engineering Services Contract with Mannik & Smith Group, Inc.
   b. Resolution to Authorize Approval of the Preliminary Plat of Sierra Ridge Estates
   c. Resolution Authorizing a Change of Contractors for Janitorial Services & Supplies for the Road Department
   d. Resolution to Approve the Special and Routine Permits for the Ingham County Road Department

6. **Human Resources**
   a. Resolution Approving the Collective Bargaining Agreement 2014 Wage Reopener with the Fraternal Order of Police, Capitol City Lodge No. 141 – 911 Non-Supervisory Unit
   b. Resolution Approving the Collective Bargaining Agreement 2014 Wage Reopener with the Fraternal Order of Police Capitol City Lodge No. 141 - Corrections Unit

7. **Equalization/Tax Mapping**
a. Resolution Approving Entering into a Grant with the Michigan Department of Licensing and Regulatory Affairs and Appointing Douglas A. Stover as County Grant Administrator for the 2014 Remonumentation Project
b. Resolution to Contract with Ronnie M. Lester as County Representative for the Ingham County Monumentation and Remonumentation Project in 2014

8. Fair - Resolution Authorizing Entering into a Contract with Nielsen Commercial Construction Company, Inc. for General Contractor Services for the Construction of a Tension Fabric Practice Arena at the Ingham County Fairgrounds

12. Board of Commissioners
a. Resolution in Honor of the 2014 State Arbor Day Celebration
b. Resolution Declaring March 31, 2014 as “Cesar E. Chavez Day” in Ingham County
d. Resolution Designating March, 2014 as “Certified Government Financial Manager Month” in Ingham County

14. a. Resolution Honoring James Bibbs
b. Resolution Honoring Reverend Desirae Kelley-Kato
c. Resolution Honoring Kendra McFadden
d. Resolution Honoring Melvin McWilliams
e. Resolution Honoring Rina Risper
f. Resolution Honoring Stacia King

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

MOVED BY COMM. MAIVILLE, SUPPORTED BY COMM CELENTINO, TO APPROVE THE ITEMS ON THE CONSENT AGENDA.

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

3. Parks Department
a. Hawk Island Snow Park Update (Additional Information)

Parks Director Willis Bennett, Deputy Controller Jared Cypher and Park Manager Brian Collins gave a slideshow presentation on an update for the Hawk Island Snow Park. They also distributed a hard copy of the slideshow.

Highlights of the Annual Review included:
-Contract overview with Superparks  
-Visitation/revenue statistics  
-Challenges faced  
-Options for the 2014-15 Season  
-Estimated 2014-15 Ingham County Expenses
Mr. Bennett stated that a decision has to be made now to continue or end the contract with Superparks. He recommended that the County terminates the contract and Mr. Cypher agreed. Mr. Bennett recommended that the County take over the duties that were performed by Superparks. Mr. Bennett stated that the Parks Commission will work on bringing a resolution forward.

b. Resolution Authorizing a Reduction in the Rental Rate at 1621 Lake Lansing Road, Haslett, Michigan

MOVED BY COMM. NOLAN, SUPPORTED BY COMM. CRENSHAW, TO APPROVE THE RESOLUTION AUTHORIZING A REDUCTION IN THE RENTAL RATE AT 1621 LAKE LANSING ROAD, HASLETT, MICHIGAN.

Discussion.

Willis Bennett, Parks Director, addressed the Committee and informed them of the history and exact location of the house. He stated that all of the options for handling the house have been explored and that continuing to rent the house was the best as it is located on park property and that it has been a positive revenue source. Mr. Bennett added that reducing the rental rate amount will make it easier to rent.


e. Resolution Authorizing the Submission of a Grant Application to the Department of Natural Resources Recreation Passport Grant Program for Repairs and Resurfacing of the Accessible Non-Motorized Trail at Hawk Island County Park

MOVED BY COMM. CRENSHAW, SUPPORTED BY COMM. MAIVILLE, TO APPROVE THE RESOLUTION AUTHORIZING THE SUBMISSION OF A GRANT APPLICATION TO THE DEPARTMENT OF NATURAL RESOURCES RECREATION PASSPORT GRANT PROGRAM FOR REPAIRS AND RESURFACING OF THE ACCESSIBLE NON-MOTORIZED TRAIL AT HAWK ISLAND COUNTY PARK.

Discussion.

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

6. Human Resources
   c. Resolution to Adopt an Equal Employment Opportunity Policy
   d. Resolution to Adopt a Policy Against Harassment in the Workplace
   e. Resolution to Adopt a Safe Workplace Policy
MOVED BY COMM. CELENTINO, SUPPORTED BY COMM. KOENIG, TO APPROVE THE RESOLUTION TO ADOPT AN EQUAL EMPLOYMENT OPPORTUNITY POLICY, THE RESOLUTION TO ADOPT A POLICY AGAINST HARASSMENT IN THE WORKPLACE AND THE RESOLUTION TO ADOPT A SAFE WORKPLACE POLICY.

Discussion.

Chairperson Holman inquired about the line in the Equal Employment Opportunity Policy that states: Disabled employees who feel accommodation is needed to perform their job must notify the Civil Rights Representative in writing of the need for reasonable accommodation within 182 days after the date the employee knew or reasonably should have known that an accommodation was needed.

Travis Parsons, Human Resources Director, stated that this time period of 182 days is standard.

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

9. Health Department - Resolution to Authorize the Establishment of an Electronic Health Records Analyst Position Classification

MOVED BY COMM. CELENTINO, SUPPORTED BY COMM. CRENSHAW, TO APPROVE THE RESOLUTION TO AUTHORIZE THE ESTABLISHMENT OF AN ELECTRONIC HEALTH RECORDS ANALYST POSITION CLASSIFICATION.

Commissioner Maivilled asked if this had been fully researched.

Barb Mastin, Deputy Health Officer/Executive Director, stated that it was looked completely and every word has already been picked apart.

Discussion.

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

10. Management Information Systems - Resolution to Authorize Reorganization and Renaming of the Management Information Systems Department

MOVED BY COMM. NOLAN, SUPPORTED BY COMM. CRENSHAW, TO APPROVE THE RESOLUTION TO AUTHORIZE REORGANIZATION AND RENAMING OF THE MANAGEMENT INFORMATION SYSTEMS DEPARTMENT.

Discussion.

Commissioner Nolan stated that she was going to ask to pull this agenda item from the consent agenda before she even heard the public comments. She said even after reading it several times, she could not make sense of the resolution. Commissioner Nolan stated that she had never approved a position without knowing where the funds would be coming from. She said she
understands the changing nature of the Department, but she stated to Michael Ashton, MIS Director, that it is his challenge to work with the unions and Human Resources to make sure the employees feel comfortable. She stated that the County is not “Corporate America” and that the County tries to work with its employees who want to stay employed and put them in another position. Commissioner Nolan said now there is a problem because this staff has lost faith in their leadership. She stated she will be voting “no” on the resolution because it is not well-written and is too broad.

Mr. Ashton addressed the Committee regarding the resolution. He stated that he had discussions with staff members regarding an initial outline of the reorganization and also started talking about it in December with Controller Tim Dolehantry and Human Resources Director Travis Parsons. Mr. Ashton said the two positions that really need to be focused on now are the Deputy Director and Project Manager. He said the next step would be to post those positions and figure out how those would be funded. Mr. Ashton said the other positions would follow the normal human resources process through the ten-step process with the unions. He then listed the ten steps of the process. Mr. Ashton stated that, at this point, none of these jobs are being eliminated and that it cannot happen until there are job postings listed and the complete process has taken place with human resources. He said he held a staff meeting on Monday and that afterwards only six employees have personally approached him with issues and concerns regarding this matter. Mr. Ashton stated that he was hired a year and a half ago to look at how MIS is ran and to determine what works best for this County. He said he wants to be able to provide one of the best, most cost effective county IT departments in the state and that this would be the design for it.

Commissioner Crenshaw asked why this information was released on Thursday when Mr. Ashton was on vacation and who released it. He also asked why this was released without talking to the employees before bringing it to the Board of Commissioners.

Mr. Ashton stated that there had been general discussion on it. He also stated that he was offered a last-minute vacation to attend the Big 10 Tournament over the long weekend in Indiana and chose to go. He said he didn’t realize this information would be released on Thursday and when he found out, Mr. Ashton said he called his office and had an employee meeting scheduled for first thing on Monday morning when he returned to work so he could let the staff know what was going on.

Commissioner Crenshaw stated that he would have preferred that Mr. Ashton make a presentation to the County Services Committee regarding the potential reorganization as just something they were simply thinking about and looking towards instead of an actual resolution. He said he would be voting “no” on the resolution tonight because not enough notice was given to the employees and because of how it was handled.

Commissioner Celentino referred to the memorandum that was attached with the resolution and pointed out that it states specific eliminations. He also pointed out that this proposes to outsource a position that some of the Board of Commissioners may be sensitive about. Commissioner Celentino said we’ve always had the sense that the employees have been a part of the process, they may not be happy about it, but they’ve always been informed and a part of the process. He
suggested to Mr. Ashton that he go back, talk to his employees and come back with a real reorganization. Commissioner Celentino said he is sensitive to the morale in this department and would like to see something more specific and therefore, he said he would be voting “no” on the resolution tonight.

Commissioner Tsernoglou stated that she thinks they need reorganization if the director thinks it is necessary, but she said she doesn’t think the process was handled correctly.

Mr. Ashton stated that he was asking for approval of the structural idea behind the reorganization, but did not articulate that well.

Commissioner Koenig stated that this reorganization should have been brought through as a discussion item and that the language is just too broad. She expressed her gratitude to Mr. Ashton for the work he does and for all of his hard work on the 9-1-1 project. She said she would be voting “no” on the resolution tonight and asked for better communication.

Commissioner Maiville stated that there is little that hasn’t already been said, but he doesn’t agree with the resolution.

Commissioner Nolan stated that she wanted to affirm Mr. Ashton’s work as well. She said this is simply a process issue and that he should come back with more information.

Mr. Ashton stated that he practices an “open door policy.” He also stated that he has accomplished part of what he wants to do by getting the discussion going tonight.

**MOTION NOT CARRIED.** **Yeas:** None. **Nays:** Holman, Tsernoglou, Crenshaw, Nolan, Koenig, Celentino and Maiville. **Absent:** None.

12. **Board of Commissioners**
   c. Authorization of the Board of Commissioners Chairperson to send a letter of support to the Citizens for a National Cesar E. Chavez Day on behalf of the Ingham County Board of Commissioners to establish the National Cesar E. Chavez Day of Service on March 31.

MOVED BY COMM. CRENSHAW, SUPPORTED BY COMM. TSERNOGLOU, TO AUTHORIZE THE BOARD OF COMMISSIONERS CHAIRPERSON TO SEND A LETTER OF SUPPORT TO THE CITIZENS FOR A NATIONAL CESAR E. CHAVEZ DAY ON BEHALF OF THE INGHAM COUNTY BOARD OF COMMISSIONERS TO ESTABLISH THE NATIONAL CESAR E. CHAVEZ DAY OF SERVICE ON MARCH 31 WITH AN OFFICIAL RESOLUTION TO FOLLOW.

Discussion.

Commissioner Crenshaw distributed a printout of an e-mail he received from a representative of the Citizens for a National Cesar E. Chavez Day of Service, asking to add the Ingham County Board of Commissioners to the list of groups who publicly declare their support for a National Cesar E. Chavez Day of Service. Since it was too late to pass a resolution before the requested
date of March 31st, Commissioner Crenshaw requested a letter from the Board of Commissioners Chairperson with a resolution to follow.

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

13. Resolution Approving the Use of Contingency Funds for a Temporary Hire for Ingham County Probate Court

MOVED BY COMM. CELENTINO, SUPPORTED BY COMM. TSERNOGLOU, TO APPROVE THE RESOLUTION APPROVING THE USE OF CONTINGENCY FUNDS FOR A TEMPORARY HIRE FOR INGHAM COUNTY PROBATE COURT WITH THE FOLLOWING CORRECTION:

WHEREAS, the Probate Court General Fund budget does not have the funds to pay for up to 12 months weeks of a temporary replacement judicial assistant; and

Discussion.

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

Announcements

Commissioner Nolan announced an Arbor Day event to be held at Potter Park Zoon on April 25th at 11:30 a.m.

Public Comment

Sally Auer, UAW, expressed her gratitude to the Committee for its action on agenda item no. 10.

The meeting was adjourned at approximately 8:00 p.m.
ACTION ITEMS:
The Controller/Administrator recommends approval of the following resolutions:

1. **Drain Commissioner** - Resolution Authorizing the Purchase of a Small Excavator from AIS Construction Equipment Corporation for the Drain Commissioner

   The Drain Commissioners seeks authorization to purchase an excavator for use on small drain projects. Following review of five quotes received for this purchase, it was determined that AIS Equipment (a local vendor) provided the best price at $43,300. Funds for this purchase were included in the approved CIP which has a balance of $80,000.00.

2. **Treasurer** - Resolution Authorizing Submission of a Joint Application by Ingham County and the Ingham County Land Bank Fast Track Authority for Housing Resource Funding, Consisting of Community Development Block Grant (CDBG) Dollars Made Available Through the Michigan State Housing Development Authority (MSHDA) for Blight Elimination within Non-Entitlement Areas of Ingham County

   The County Treasurer seeks approval to submit an application from both Ingham County and the Ingham County Land Bank Fast Track Authority for a Community Development Block Grant in an amount yet to be determined for blight removal of publicly-owned vacant residential structures located within non-entitlement municipalities.

3. **MSU Extension** - Resolution Amending the 2014 Agreement with Michigan State University for Extension Services

   This resolution authorizes an amendment to the 2014 agreement with Michigan State University for Extension services. Due to a retirement, a Clerk/Typist position in the MSU Extension office is vacant. Currently the MSU Extension assessment provides funds that support 1.5 FTEs of 4-H Program Coordination. There is currently .5 FTE 4-H Program Coordination position vacant. In an effort to provide better service to Ingham county residents, MSU Extension would like to utilize half of the clerical funds towards a full-time Ingham County 4-H Program Coordinator position to replace the half-time 4-H Program Coordinator. This would leave half the funds remaining to hire a part-time Clerk/Typist. This position would remain a County employee. The long term annual cost increase for this change is about $715 for the part-time Clerk/Typist at step 1, and about $4,000 at step 5.


4b. **Road Department** - Resolution to Execute a Quit Claim Deed between Great Lakes Christian Homes Housing Corporation and the Ingham County Board of Commissioners

The Ingham County Road Department, on behalf of Delhi Charter Township, applied for and obtained Congestion Mitigation and Air Quality (CMAQ) funding through the Federal Surface Transportation Program for construction of the township’s RAM Trail Project along Holt Road from Eifert Road to Kahres Road. Following negotiations for purchase of necessary right-of-way, property owner Great Lakes Christian Homes Housing Corporation agreed to issue a quit claim deed to Ingham County for the sum of $1.00. Once approved, lands conveyed to the County will be excluded from property taxes calculations for the parent parcel.

4c. **Road Department** - Resolution to Authorize the Purchase of Reflective Sign Faces and Complete Signs from Osburn Associates, Inc.

Ingham County annually solicits unit prices for a vast array of Road Department sign materials. The Road Department purchases these materials in order to improve and maintain the county road sign system. It was determined through a competitive bidding process that the unit price bid from Osburn Associates, Inc. of Logan, Ohio offered the best option to fully stock the Road Department’s sign materials inventory at an amount not to exceed $37,775.70.

4d. **Road Department** - Resolution Authorizing the Extension of Authorizations to Purchase 2014 Seasonal Requirements of Smooth-Lined Corrugated Polyethylene Pipe & Helically Corrugated Steel Pipe for the Road Department

The Road Department annually purchases approximately 3,500 lineal feet of various sizes of both smooth lined corrugated polyethylene pipe and helically corrugated steel pipe for use as road drainage culverts and piping. After a competitive bidding process, it is recommended that the County extend its current authorization to purchase smooth lined corrugated polyethylene pipe from Advanced Drainage Systems, and helically corrugated steel pipe from Contech Engineered Solutions, LLC, at their respective 2013 unit prices as approved per Resolution 13-204.

4e. **Road Department** - Resolution Authorizing the Extension of a Contract for Gravel Road Dust Control Service for the Road Department

The Road Department annually contracts for delivery and/or application of approximately 230,000 gallons of calcium chloride solution for dust control on the 87 miles of gravel roads. After a competitive bidding process, it is recommended that the County extend its current authorization to secure calcium chloride dust control solution acquisition and/or application with Michigan Mineral Resources of Albion, Michigan at a unit price of 13 cents per gallon consistent with Resolution 13-263.
4f. **Road Department** - *Resolution to Approve Proposed 2014 Ingham County Bridge Funding Applications for Submission to the Local Bridge Program Manager*

The County Road Advisory Board recommends that the County submit five applications for fiscal year 2017 Local Bridge Program funding as follows:

1. Replacement of the Columbia Road Bridge over the Grand River, Aurelius Township
2. Replacement of the Zimmer Road Bridge over Deer Creek, Wheatfield Township
3. Replacement of the Dietz Road Bridge over the Red Cedar River, Locke Township
4. Rehabilitation of the Holt Road Bridge over Doan Creek, Leroy Township
5. Preventative maintenance repairs on:
   - Howell Road Bridge over Doan Creek, Wheatfield and Ingham Townships
   - Olds Road Bridge over the Huntoon Lake Drain, Leslie Township
   - Olds Road Bridge over the Perry Creek, Leslie Township

Major county bridge repair, replacement, and preventative maintenance projects are typically funded by the Local Bridge Program, which is funded by a combination of federal and state transportation revenue. The Local Bridge Program is a rolling three-year program in which applications approved in the first year of the program receive funding in the third year. Local Bridge Program applications for this year are due May 1 for fiscal year 2017 funding. Each agency is limited to five applications per year and if awarded a project, the program funds 95% of construction costs and the County would need to fund the remaining 5%.

4g. **Road Department** - *Resolution to Approve the Hungerford Street Stop Sign Installation at St Joseph Street Traffic Control Order*

The Ingham County Road Department traffic signal at the intersection of Hungerford Street at St Joseph Street, Charter Township of Lansing, was installed in 1988. A recent signal removal study following standards established in the Michigan Manual of Uniform Traffic Control Devices (MMUTCD) recommended removal of the three existing traffic signals and the installation of stop signs to control intersection traffic. Hungerford Street and Clare Street are to stop for the prevailing traffic on St Joseph Street and Main Street. Road Department staff, Lansing Township officials, and the Lansing Township Police Department reviewed the Hungerford Street and St Joseph Street study and concur with the study results. The proposed resolution authorizes the Board Chairperson to sign a traffic control order necessary to implement these changes.

4h. **Road Department** - *Resolution to Authorize an As Needed Construction Inspection Professional Engineering Services Contract with RS Engineering, LLC*

Construction inspection and supervision services are necessary to complete required inspection of federal-aid road and/or bridge construction projects. Four proposals were received and reviewed by the Road Department and Purchasing Department. The departments jointly recommend that RS Engineering, LLC of Lansing be retained to provide the requested inspection and supervision services at a rate not to exceed $57.73 per hour for the Office Technician and $54.54 for inspections.

4i. **Road Department** - *Resolution Authorizing and Endorsing Submission of Grant Applications under both the USDOT TIGER FY 2014 and the MDOT TEDF-A Programs for the Reconstruction of Cedar Street from US-127 to Holbrook Drive in Alaiedon and Delhi Townships, Ingham County, Michigan for the Ingham County Road Department*
Cedar Street from US-127 to Holbrook Drive is in very poor condition and in need of reconstruction to a modern boulevard (divided highway) for improved traffic safety and mobility. The estimated cost of the proposed Cedar Street reconstruction and non-motorized path project is estimated at approximately $15 million. The U.S. Consolidated Appropriations Act appropriated $600 million for national infrastructure investments in a program to be known as the Transportation Investment Generating Economic Recovery Discretionary Grants program for FY 2014 (TIGER FY 2014). The Road Department will also apply for a Transportation Economic Development Fund (TEDF), Category A grant (TEDF-A) from the Michigan Department of Transportation (MDOT) to partially fund the proposed Cedar Street reconstruction project. The recommended resolution cites County endorsement of both grant applications and authorizes the Road Department to submit documents necessary to seek these grant funds.

4j. **Road Department** - Resolution Authorizing and Endorsing Submission of a Grant Application Under the MDOT TEDF-A Program for Various Road Improvements Relating to the Expansion of the Jackson National Life Insurance Office in Alaiedon Township, Ingham County, Michigan for the Ingham County Road Department

Jackson National Life commissioned a traffic engineering study to determine what road improvements would be needed to accommodate the additional traffic expected to be generated by their proposed expansion. Jackson National agreed to fund necessary engineering and right of way acquisition for improvements to Okemos Road south of I-96, and for increasing the vehicle storage on the eastbound I-96 off ramp. Funding of these projects will count toward the required local match on an MDOT TEDF-A grant. The Road Department recommends that the Board of Commissioners approve application for grant funds under MDOT TEDF-A for recommended improvements, with support for Jolly-Okemos Roads improvements contingent upon approval of Meridian Township.

4k. **Road Department** - Resolution to Authorize the Re-designation of Williamston Road between Baseline and Fitchburg Roads, Bunker Hill Township, from Class A to All-Season

Williamston Road is designated as an “all-seasons road” from Fitchburg Road to Haslett Road. Between Fitchburg and Baseline roads Williamston Road is designated as a “Class A road,” leaving this segment subject to seasonal weight restrictions. South of Baseline Road to the Jackson County line, Williamston Road once again achieves “all-seasons” status. Re-designating Williamston Road as an “all-seasons” road over its entire length would allow for establishment of an all-seasons truck route between the cities of Williamston and Jackson. The Road Department seeks approval of a Board resolution to implement this change.

4l. **Road Department** - Resolution to Approve the Special and Routine Permits for the Ingham County Road Department

The Ingham County Board of Commissioners periodically approves special and routine permits submitted by the Road Department as necessary.
5a. **Management Information Systems** - Resolution to Approve the Purchase of NetVault Backup Solution from Avalon Technologies

Ingham County currently lacks capacity to back up all the live data being stored on its information systems network. Existing software used for primary backups is ARCserve 15.0. An upgrade is required to ensure continued support from the vendor and to remedy several other issues. The current condition of the ARCserve configuration has been degraded so much that a complete rebuild of the configuration is required. Correction of this deficiency requires MIS to engage a vendor to rebuild the configuration, or seek a significant investment of labor which would also require a major staff training initiative. MIS recommends approval of a resolution to allow the Chief Information Officer to procure services from AVALON Technologies for replacement of the outdated system as a cost not to exceed $160,727. Funding for this project would be taken from the MIS Network Hardware Maintenance Fund.

5b. **Management Information Systems** - Resolution to Approve the Purchase of New Cisco ASA Firewalls from ISI

Current firewalls protecting the County information technology network are seven years old. The County network could easily be breached by outside sources without proper firewall protection. Firewall replacement costs were included in the 2014 budget for network security enhancements/improvements. New firewalls will allow the County to have more control over who, what, and how users and others have access to County information systems. The total cost of this firewall enhancement proposal includes hardware, software and installation at a cost not to exceed $49,155.78.

5c. **Management Information Systems** - Resolution to Approve Entering into an Agreement with Xerox for Managed Print Services

Xerox recently conducted a 60-day evaluation of County print assets and infrastructure and subsequently proposed a Managed Print Services solution for Ingham County. The Xerox proposal would place all of the desktop printing devices under a complete maintenance agreement that would cover break/fix support, supplies, single invoice billing, data management and single point of contact help desk support for printers. Implementation of the plan will result in significantly reduced printing costs on all 155 desk top devices. The proposal sets goal of 10% reduction in total printer operational cost by reducing print cost by 50%. The proposed resolution would authorize an agreement with Xerox for managed print services at a cost $0.015 per mono (black and white) page and $0.13 per color page for desktop printers.

6. **Facilities** - Resolution Awarding a Contract to Pavement Consultants, Inc. to Provide Professional Asphalt Consulting and Project Management Services for the Parking Lot Replacement Project at the Human Services Building

The Facilities Department seeks Board approval of a resolution to authorize awarding a contract to Pavement Consultants, Inc. to provide professional asphalt consulting and project management services for the parking lot replacement project at the Human Services Building at a cost not to exceed $9,550.00. Pavement Consultants, Inc. was chosen through a competitive bidding process. Funds for this project are available in the approved CIP.
7. **Health Department** - Resolution to Amend Resolution #13-486 to Change the Date for the Elimination of a Position

This resolution amends resolution #13-486 to change the date of elimination for Position #601042. Originally, this position was listed to be eliminated effective April 1, 2014 due to a retirement. The employee in the position will now be retiring effective May 30, 2014.

8. **Controller’s Office** - First Quarter 2014 Budget Adjustments and Contingency Fund Update

The Uniform Budgeting and Accounting Act (Act 621 of 1978) requires that local units of government maintain a balanced budget and periodically adjust the budget to reflect revised revenue and expenditure levels. Recommended adjustments to the Ingham County budget for the first quarter of fiscal year 2014 total $1,161,004. The proposed resolution as recommended satisfies statutory balanced budget requirements.

9. **Board of Commissioners** - Resolution in Support of a Cesar E. Chavez National Day of Service

The proposed resolution supports creation of a Cesar E. Chavez National Day of Service and urges President Obama to declare March 31 as the Cesar E. Chavez National Day of Service.

10a. **Human Resources** - Resolution Authorizing and Clarifying Pension Benefits for Teamsters Local 580 Potter Park Zoo Unit

Results of the collective bargaining process establish need to create a separate MERS Defined Benefit division for four employees. The proposed resolution authorizes execution of a Letter Agreement and MERS Request for Benefit Change form, correcting and clarifying the benefits for the Teamsters Local 580 Potter Park Zoo Unit.

10b. **Human Resources** - Resolution Approving a Collective Bargaining Agreement with Local 512 Office and Professional Employees International Union - Technical Clerical Unit

On Tuesday, March 25, 2014, OPEIU members for voted in favor of a tentative labor agreement through December 31, 2015. A proposed resolution is offered for Board (employer) approval the Agreement.

10c. **Human Resources** - Resolution Authorizing the Establishment of a MERS Hybrid Plan for Newly Hired Employees Under Local 512 Office And Professional Employees International Union - Technical Clerical Unit

In conjunction with approval of the labor agreement with OPEIU, it is necessary to adopt a resolution to establish the MERS Hybrid pension plan for this unit.
10d. **Human Resources** - *Resolution Approving a Collective Bargaining Agreement with Ingham County Employees’ Association – Professional Court Employees*

On Tuesday, April 1, 2014, ICEA notified the County about members’ approval of a tentative labor agreement through December 31, 2015. A proposed resolution is offered for Board (employer) approval the Agreement.

10e. **Human Resources** - *Resolution Authorizing the Establishment of a MERS Hybrid Plan for Newly Hired Employees Under Ingham County Employees’ Association – Professional Court Employees*

In conjunction with approval of the labor agreement with ICEA, it is necessary to adopt a resolution to establish the MERS Hybrid pension plan for this unit.

10f. **Human Resources** - *Status of Collective Bargaining (Closed Session)*

The Human Resources Department requests that the County Services Committee authorize a closed session for strategy and negotiation discussions connected with the negotiation of collective bargaining agreements, as permitted under the Open Meetings Act (MCL 15.268(c)).
MEMORANDUM

TO: County Services and Finance Committees
FROM: Patrick Lindemann, Drain Commissioner
DATE: March 18, 2014
SUBJECT: RESOLUTION AUTHORIZING THE PURCHASE OF A SMALL USED EXCAVATOR

The resolution before you authorizes the purchase of a small used excavator.

The Drain Commissioner will use this excavator on small drain projects that our current excavator would be too large for.

The Drain Commissioner received five quotes for the purchase of this excavator and AIS Equipment, a local vendor, provided the best price for the exact equipment needed by the Drain Commissioner, $43,300.00.

The funds for this equipment are available in the approved CIP Line Item 639-27500-978000 which has a balance of $80,000.00.

I recommend approval of this resolution.
MEMORANDUM

TO: County Services and Finance Committees
FROM: Jim Hudgins, Director of Purchasing
DATE: March 27, 2014
SUBJECT: Mini Excavator - used

Project Description:
Purchase one mini excavator (used) for the Drain Commissioner’s Office.

Quality used equipment was difficult to locate; nonetheless, two local vendors were able to assemble the following:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>VENDOR NAME</th>
<th>Excavator Model</th>
<th>Standard Equipment</th>
<th>Warranty</th>
<th>Total Price</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AIS Construction Equipment</td>
<td>Komatsu PC50MR</td>
<td>Approximately 2450 hours, comes with rubber tracks, an excavator bucket, auxiliary hydraulics, blade, 36&quot; ditching bucket, quick coupler and thumb installed.</td>
<td>30 day Powertrain parts only</td>
<td>$43,300.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AIS Construction Equipment</td>
<td>2004 Hitachi ZX50U</td>
<td>Approximately 3000 hours, comes with rubber tracks, auxiliary hydraulics, blade, bucket and open station.</td>
<td>None listed</td>
<td>$29,900.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AIS Construction Equipment</td>
<td>2007 John Deere 35D</td>
<td>Approximately 1498 hours, comes with auxiliary hydraulics, blade, 24&quot; excavator bucket, 34&quot; ditching bucket and open station.</td>
<td>None listed</td>
<td>$33,700.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AIS Construction Equipment</td>
<td>2010 John Deere 50D</td>
<td>Approximately 1328 hours, comes with 24&quot; coupler bucket, auxiliary hydraulics, mechanical quick attach coupler, 36&quot; ditching bucket and open station.</td>
<td>None listed</td>
<td>$44,055.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michigan Cat</td>
<td>2006 Caterpillar 305CR</td>
<td>Approximately 2604 hours, comes with cab with A/C and heat, rubber tracks, quick coupler and leveling blade.</td>
<td>None listed</td>
<td>$43,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michigan Cat</td>
<td>2008 Caterpillar 305CCR</td>
<td>Approximately 2076 hours, comes with cab with A/C and heat, rubber tracks, auxiliary hydraulics, leveling blade, quick coupler and hydraulic thumb.</td>
<td>None listed</td>
<td>$42,500.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Recommendation:
The recommendation is to award Purchase Order to AIS Construction Equipment in an amount not to exceed $43,300.
Introduced by the County Services and Finance Committees of the:

INGHAM COUNTY BOARD OF COMMISSIONERS

RESOLUTION AUTHORIZING THE PURCHASE OF A SMALL EXCAVATOR FROM
AIS CONSTRUCTION EQUIPMENT CORPORATION FOR THE DRAIN COMMISSIONER

WHEREAS, the Drain Commissioner is constructing more small drain projects; and

WHEREAS, the use of a large excavator or the rental of a small excavator is too costly for Drainage districts; and

WHEREAS, the Drain Commissioner received five quotes for the purchase of a small used excavator from various vendors and AIS Equipment, a local vendor, provided the best quote for the purchase of a small used excavator; and

WHEREAS, funds for this excavator are available in the approved CIP Line Item 639-27500-978000 which has a balance of $80,000.00.

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED, the Ingham County Board of Commissioners hereby authorizes the purchase of a small used excavator, from AIS Equipment, 3600 N. Grand River Ave., Lansing, Michigan 48906, who is a local vendor who provided the lowest price for the exact equipment that the Drain Commissioner needed, for $43,300.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, the Ingham County Board of Commissioners authorizes the Board Chairperson to sign any necessary documents that are consistent with this resolution and approved as to form by the County Attorney.
Agenda Item 2

Introduced by the County Services and Finance Committees of the:

INGHAM COUNTY BOARD OF COMMISSIONERS

RESOLUTION AUTHORIZING SUBMISSION OF A JOINT APPLICATION BY INGHAM COUNTY AND THE INGHAM COUNTY LAND BANK FAST TRACK AUTHORITY FOR HOUSING RESOURCE FUNDING, CONSISTING OF COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT BLOCK GRANT (CDBG) DOLLARS MADE AVAILABLE THROUGH THE MICHIGAN STATE HOUSING DEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY (MSHDA) FOR BLIGHT ELIMINATION WITHIN NON-ENTITLEMENT AREAS OF INGHAM COUNTY

WHEREAS, Ingham County government has long term objectives to foster economic well-being and assist their citizens in meeting basic needs; and

WHEREAS, Ingham County has been invited by the Michigan State Housing Development Authority to apply for a Housing Resource Fund grant designed to provide financial assistance to communities to make physical improvements to residential neighborhoods through blight removal of vacant residential structures that are publicly owned; and

WHEREAS, the blighted sites included in this grant must be located in CDBG low and moderate income census tracts or block groups and each proposed site must be formally considered blighted by the local municipal manager, assessor or code enforcement officer; and

WHEREAS, the required 25% match will be provided by the Ingham County Treasurer through its Delinquent Tax Fund and/or the Ingham County Land Bank Fast Track Authority; and

WHEREAS, the exact location of the properties to be included in this grant is still to be determined and may include eligible properties that are foreclosed on by the County Treasurer on March 31, 2014 and particular properties that were cited in a letter from the City of Mason to the Ingham County Treasurer on behalf of not only Mason, but also the Cities of Leslie and Williamston, depending on the eligibility of these properties; and

WHEREAS, no project costs will be incurred prior to a formal grant award, completion of the environmental review procedures, and formal written authorization to incur costs is received from the Michigan State Housing Development Authority.

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED, that the Ingham County Board of Commissioners authorizes submission of an application from both Ingham County and the Ingham County Land Bank Fast Track Authority for a Community Development Block Grant in an amount yet to be determined for blight removal of vacant residential structures that are publically owned and located within Ingham County’s non-entitlement municipalities.
MEMORANDUM

Date: March 28, 2014

To: Human Services County Services and Finance Committees

From: Jared Cypher, Deputy Controller

Re: Resolution Amending the 2014 Agreement with Michigan State University for Extension Services

This resolution authorizes an amendment to the 2014 agreement with Michigan State University for Extension services. Due to a retirement, a Clerk/Typist position in the MSU Extension office is vacant. Currently the MSU Extension assessment provides funds that support 1.5 FTEs of 4-H Program Coordination. There is currently .5 FTE 4-H Program Coordination position vacant. In an effort to provide better service to Ingham county residents, MSU Extension would like to utilize half of the clerical funds towards a full-time Ingham County 4-H Program Coordinator position to replace the half-time 4-H Program Coordinator. This would leave half the funds remaining to hire a part-time Clerk/Typist. This position would remain a County employee. The long term annual cost increase for this change is about $715 for the part-time Clerk/Typist at step 1, and about $4,000 at step 5. The 2014 agreement will increase by $14,165 to bring the total amount to $202,770.
Introducing the Human Services, County Services and Finance Committees of the:

INGHAM COUNTY BOARD OF COMMISSIONERS

RESOLUTION AMENDING THE 2014 AGREEMENT WITH MICHIGAN STATE UNIVERSITY FOR EXTENSION SERVICES

WHEREAS, due to a retirement effective March 31, 2014 a Clerk/Typist position in the Michigan State University Extension (MSUE) office will become vacant; and

WHEREAS, the current MSUE assessment provides funds that support 1.5 FTE of 4-H Program Coordination; and

WHEREAS, due to a relocation, .5 FTE of a 4-H Program Coordinator position will be vacant; and

WHEREAS, in an effort to provide better service to Ingham County residents, MSUE is proposing to utilize funding that supports the Clerk/Typist position and increase the .5 FTE Program Coordinator position to full time.

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED, that the Clerk/Typist position (Position #731005) is reduced to .5 FTE effective April 1, 2014.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that the 2014 agreement with Michigan State University for Extension services shall be amended and increased to $202,770 to reflect the following change:

1) $14,165 to increase the .5 FTE Program Coordinator position to full time.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that the Controller/Administrator is authorized to make any necessary adjustments to the budget and approved position list consistent with this resolution.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that the Chairperson of the Ingham County Board of Commissioners is authorized to sign any necessary documents consistent with this resolution upon approval as to form by the County Attorney.
Amended
Agreement for Extension Services provided by
Michigan State University to INGHAM County
Annual Work Plan FY 2014 (Exhibit A)

A. Specific Contributions by MSUE:
1. At least 1.0 FTE Extension Educator whose primary office of operation will be the county Extension office included in the assessment.
2. .8 FTE additional extension educators. Areas of Expertise:$73,336
3. 1.5 FTE - 4-H program coordinator(s) included in assessment whose primary office of operation will be the county Extension office.
4. .5 FTE - additional 4-H program coordinators/other paraprofessional, from 7/01/14 – 12/31/14.
5. Administrative oversight included in annual assessment.
6. Access to Extension Educators with expertise in each of the MSUE Institutes included in annual assessment.
7. Supervision of University provided academic and paraprofessional staff. Supervision of county clerical staff and/or county staff upon request. Supervision is included in the annual assessment.
8. Annual reporting of services provided, audiences served, and impact of programs in the county.

B. Specific Contributions by the County:
1. Office space for a County Extension office. The office will include space for at least one Extension educator, one 4-H program coordinator and one clerical staff person, access to space for delivering Extension programs, and utilities, including telephone. Office space will be available for additional MSUE and/or county staff as mutually agreed. The office must be provided high-speed internet sufficient to meet the needs of MSUE Personnel. Minimum standards for internet access can be found in Appendix A. The office space must be at least comparable to the average office space used by County employees.
2. Clerical staff for the Extension office that will perform clerical functions, including assisting county residents in accessing MSUE resources by office visit, telephone, email, internet and media. This can be a county employee or the county can contract with MSU for their services.
3. General operating expenses for the office and non-MSU Personnel.
4. The Assessment Fee and costs for additional personnel, as described above in Section A. If MSUE receives at least a 2% increase in appropriations from the State of Michigan (SOM), the County will be given a 3% credit, thereby leaving the assessment at the 2013 level.
C. **Assessment to County:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MSU Assessment</td>
<td>$125,958</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Credit to county from SOM appropriations</td>
<td>minus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014 TOTAL Assessment</td>
<td>$115,269</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**ADDITIONAL PERSONNEL**

1. Educator (.8 FTE) at $73,336  
   $9,167 per 0.1 FTE  
   $73,336.00

2. 4-H Program Coordinators
   a. 1.0 FTE at $56,650  
   b. 0.5 FTE at $28,325 *(07/01/14 - 12/31/14)*  
   $14,165

3. Other Staff included in MOA
   a. Title and rate ______
   b. ______

TOTAL COUNTY PAYMENT FOR 2014  
$202,770.00

For the period, January 2014 to December 2014, INGHAM County shall pay to MSUE $202,770 which is the cost of the assessment (minus the credit) plus any additional personnel costs. Payment will be made the first month of each quarter of the county fiscal year. (Quarterly payments 1 & 2 will be $47,151.25, and quarterly payments 3 & 4 will be $54,233.75). Payments should be sent to

MSUE Extension Budget Office  
446 W. Circle Dr.  
160 Agriculture Hall  
East Lansing, MI 48824

**MICHIGAN STATE UNIVERSITY**

By:________________________________
Daniel T. Evon, Director,  
Contract & Grant Administration

**INGHAM COUNTY**

By:________________________________
Title:________________________________

Date:______________________________  
Date:______________________________
MEMORANDUM

TO: County Services and Finance Committees

FROM: Robert Peterson, Director of Engineering
       Road Department

DATE: March 10, 2014

SUBJECT: Purchase Authorization Extending 2013 Pavement Marking Contracts for the 2014 Pavement Marking Program

The Ingham County Purchasing Department solicited unit prices, in March 2013, for a vast array of contractor applied pavement markings. Once under contract, the contractor(s) applied waterborne pavement marking paint to refresh the yellow and white longitudinal lines that define road laneage and white cold plastic pavement markings, such as arrows, stop bars and school symbols to guide motorists to their destinations. When finished with the work, the contractor was paid for the quantity of work actually performed using the unit prices contained in their bid.

The Purchasing Department advertised and received three bids for each of the pavement marking items – ITEM 1: Waterborne Pavement Markings and ITEM 2: Cold Plastic Common Text & Symbols.

The 2013 Waterborne Pavement Marking contract was awarded to M&M Pavement Markings, Inc., Grand Blanc, Michigan. They were the low bidder and submitted unit prices that, when applied to the estimated quantities, totaled $402,000.00.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DESCRIPTION</th>
<th>UNIT PRICE</th>
<th>AMOUNT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ITEM #1: 800 miles, more or less, of yellow double line or skip centerline, applied using an estimate of 20.00 gallons of yellow paint per mile.</td>
<td>$ 258.00 / mile</td>
<td>$ 206,400.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ITEM #2: 900 miles, more or less, of white or yellow 4 inch edge line applied, per mile.</td>
<td>$ 204.00 / mile</td>
<td>$ 183,600.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ITEM #3: 125 miles, more or less, of skip white lane line applied, per mile.</td>
<td>$ 80.00 / mile</td>
<td>$10,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ITEM #4: Placing yellow centerline and/or white edge line on bituminous repair pads of varying lengths at varied locations throughout the county. Total approximate length is 50,000 linear feet, more or less.</td>
<td>$0.040 / foot</td>
<td>$2,000.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total: $402,000.00
The 2013 Cold Plastic Common Text & Symbols contract was awarded to **P.K Contracting, Inc., Troy, Michigan.** They were the low bidder and submitted unit prices that, when applied to the estimated quantities, totaled $47,812.60.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DESCRIPTION</th>
<th>UNIT</th>
<th>UNIT PRICE</th>
<th>AMOUNT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>WORK ITEM #1: 5,300 LFT, 12-inch, Crosswalk</td>
<td>LFT</td>
<td>$3.85</td>
<td>$20,405.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WORK ITEM #2: 500 LFT, 12-inch, Cross Hatching, Both White &amp; Yellow</td>
<td>LFT</td>
<td>$3.85</td>
<td>$1,925.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WORK ITEM #3: 1,346 LFT, 18-inch, Stop Bar</td>
<td>LFT</td>
<td>$5.95</td>
<td>$8,008.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WORK ITEM #4: 76 LFT, 24-inch, Stop Bar</td>
<td>LFT</td>
<td>$8.90</td>
<td>$676.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WORK ITEM #5: 0 Each, Directional Arrow Sym</td>
<td>EA</td>
<td>$160.00</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WORK ITEM #6: 28 Each, Lt Turn Arrow Sym</td>
<td>EA</td>
<td>$78.00</td>
<td>$2,184.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WORK ITEM #7: 38 Each, ONLY Sym</td>
<td>EA</td>
<td>$90.00</td>
<td>$3,420.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WORK ITEM #8: 4 Each, Railroad Sym</td>
<td>EA</td>
<td>$310.00</td>
<td>$1,240.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WORK ITEM #9: 7 Each, Rt Turn Arrow Sym</td>
<td>EA</td>
<td>$78.00</td>
<td>$546.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WORK ITEM #10: 19 Each, SCHOOL Sym</td>
<td>EA</td>
<td>$155.00</td>
<td>$2,945.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WORK ITEM #11: 13 Each, Thru and Lt Turn Arrow Sym</td>
<td>EA</td>
<td>$150.00</td>
<td>$1,950.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WORK ITEM #12: 3 Each, Thru and Rt Turn Arrow Sym</td>
<td>EA</td>
<td>$150.00</td>
<td>$450.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WORK ITEM #13: 5 Each, Thru Arrow Sym</td>
<td>EA</td>
<td>$70.00</td>
<td>$350.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WORK ITEM #14: 2,250 SFT, Rem Spec Mrkg</td>
<td>SFT</td>
<td>$1.65</td>
<td>$3,712.50</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Total:** $47,812.60

Both the Road Department’s 2013 waterborne pavement marking contractor and cold plastic pavement marking contractor have indicated in writing that they will honor their 2013 unit prices for the Road Department’s 2014 pavement marking program. A check of MDOT published average unit prices for the end of 2013 and beginning of 2014 pavement marking work revealed that the 2013 costs are in-line, or slightly less, than those expected in 2014. The costs also fit within the 2014 Road Department budget for the program.

This memo contains a recommendation for the Board of Commissioners to extend the two 2013 pavement marking contracts to provide the Road Department’s 2014 annual Countywide Waterborne Pavement Marking & Cold Plastic Common Text & Symbol Pavement Marking Program work.

I respectfully recommend that the Board of Commissioners adopt the attached resolution and extend the 2013 purchase authorization for Waterborne Pavement Markings from M&M Pavement Markings, Inc., Grand Blanc, Michigan and Cold Plastic Common Text & Symbols from P.K Contracting, Inc., Troy, Michigan for the 2014 pavement marking program.
MEMORANDUM

TO: County Services and Finance Committees
FROM: Jim Hudgins, Director of Purchasing
DATE: March 27, 2014
SUBJECT: Extend the contracts for the Countywide Waterborne Pavement Marking & Cold Plastic Common Text & Symbol Pavement Marking Program for the Ingham County Department of Transportation & Roads

Project Description:
Proposals were sought from experienced contractors for the purpose of entering into a contract to provide pavement markings for the 2013 Countywide Waterborne Pavement Marking & Cold Plastic Common Text & Symbol Pavement Marking Program. The contractor will be responsible for providing all necessary machinery, tools, labor, apparatus and other means of construction, do all work and furnish all the materials.

Proposal Summary:
Vendors contacted: 4 Local: 0
Vendors responding: 3 Local: 0

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Company</th>
<th>Waterborn Pavement Marking - Longitudinal Lines</th>
<th>Cold Plastic Pavement Marking - Common Text &amp; Symbols</th>
<th>Local</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>M&amp;M Pavement Markings Inc</td>
<td>$402,000.00</td>
<td>$63,438.00</td>
<td>No, Grand Blanc</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P.K. Contracting</td>
<td>$437,731.25</td>
<td>$47,812.60</td>
<td>No, Troy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R.S. Contracting Inc</td>
<td>$503,750.00</td>
<td>$49,113.00</td>
<td>No, Casco Township</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Recommendation:
It is the recommendation of the Evaluation Committee to extend the one contract to M&M Pavement Marking, Inc. at unit prices quoted in its March 8, 2013 response to RFP #35-13 – Waterborne Pavement Markings; and one contract to P.K Contracting, Inc. at unit prices quoted in its March 18, 2013 response to RFP #35-13 – Cold Plastic Common Text & Symbols.
RESOLUTION EXTENDING PURCHASE AUTHORIZATION OF THE ROAD DEPARTMENT’S 2013 COUNTYWIDE WATERBORNE PAVEMENT MARKING & COLD PLASTIC COMMON TEXT & SYMBOL PAVEMENT MARKING CONTRACTS FOR THE 2014 PAVEMENT MARKING PROGRAM

WHEREAS, during the spring of each year, the Road Department solicits unit prices for a vast array of contractor applied pavement markings; and

WHEREAS, waterborne pavement marking paint is applied to refresh the yellow and white longitudinal lines that define road laneage and white cold plastic material, such as arrows, stop bars and school symbols are applied to guide motorists to their destinations; and

WHEREAS, both the Road Department’s 2013 waterborne pavement marking contractor and cold plastic pavement marking contractor have indicated in writing that they will honor their 2013 unit prices for the Road Department’s 2014 pavement marking program; and

WHEREAS, a check of MDOT published average unit prices for the end of 2013 and beginning of 2014 pavement marking work revealed that the 2013 costs are in-line, or slightly less, than those expected in 2014; and

WHEREAS, both M&M Pavement Markings, Inc., Grand Blanc, Michigan (waterborne pavement marking) and P.K. Contracting, Inc., Troy, Michigan (cold plastic pavement marking) have been selected to provide the Road Department’s annual pavement marking work since 2011; and

WHEREAS, the Road Department adopted 2014 budget includes funds for this purchase; and

WHEREAS, both the Road Department and Purchasing Department recommend approval of an extension of the 2013 purchase authorization.

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED, the Board of Commissioners approves extending the purchase authorization for the 2013 Countywide Waterborne Pavement Marking & Cold Plastic Common Text & Symbol Pavement Marking Program for the Road Department’s 2014 pavement marking program as follows:

- Award the 2014 Waterborne Pavement Marking contract to M&M Pavement Markings, Inc., Grand Blanc, Michigan, for a total estimated price of $402,000.00.

- Award the 2014 Cold Plastic Common Text & Symbols contract to P.K. Contracting, Inc., Troy, Michigan, for a total estimated price of $47,812.60.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that the Purchasing Department is hereby authorized to produce and sign any necessary documents relating to the above authorized purchase, on behalf of the County.
MEMORANDUM

TO: County Services and Finance Committees

FROM: Robert Peterson, Director of Engineering
Road Department

DATE: March 11, 2014

SUBJECT: Delhi Township RAM Trail Quit Claim Deed

The federal government makes available Transportation Alternatives Program (TAP) funding to build transportation facilities through the National Highway Performance Program (NHPP), Surface Transportation Program (STP), Highway Safety Improvement Program (HSIP), and Congestion Mitigation and Air Quality (CMAQ) improvements. Only agencies, as defined within Public Act 51 of 1951, are eligible to make application for, and received funding from the various TAP funded programs. The Michigan Department of Transportation (MDOT), incorporated cities, some villages, and all road commissions are all eligible agencies.

Townships wishing to utilize TAP funding to build eligible projects, such as trails and pathways, must find an eligible agency to sponsor their applications for funding. Ingham County has sponsored numerous such projects in Meridian Township and Delhi Township since 2004. The Ingham County Board of Commissioners resolved to sponsor Delhi Township’s CMAQ application to fund construction of its RAM Trail Project along Holt Road from Eifert Road to Kahres Road in 2013.

The RAM Trail Project received funding and as agreed, the township will pay for all costs associated with the project, including costs for the road department to represent their interests through construction, close-out, and the records audit. Later in the project development process, Road Department staff will provide agreements for Board of Commissioners consideration that outline the MDOT/ICRD and ICRD/TWP construction inspection and payment responsibilities.

At this point, early in the project’s design phase, the township’s consultant is pursuing the right-of-way needed to build the trail and has come to terms with the Great Lakes Christian Homes Housing Corporation, which owns property in the northeast quadrant of Holt Road and Washington Road. Great Lakes Christian Homes wants to quit claim the lands needed for the trail to either the township or county so that the lands are excluded when property taxes are calculated for the parent parcel. Delhi Township requested that the lands be added to the county public road right-of-way, instead of conveyed to the township.

The reason for this memo and resolution is to request execution of the Great Lakes Christian Homes Housing Corporation quit claim deed to the Ingham County Board of Commissioners c/o the Ingham County Road Department.

Approval of the attached resolution is recommended.
WHEREAS, the Ingham County Road Department, on behalf of Delhi Charter Township, had applied for and obtained Congestion Mitigation and Air Quality (CMAQ) funding through the Federal Surface Transportation Program for construction of the township’s RAM Trail Project along Holt Road from Eifert Road to Kahres Road in 2013; and

WHEREAS, the township desires, at its own cost, to acquire necessary right-of-way, design, construct, and maintain the trail for the use of the general public and satisfy all the requirements of the Michigan Department of Transportation (MDOT), the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA), and the Road Department; and

WHEREAS, the township’s design consultant is pursuing the right-of-way needed to build the trail and has come to terms with the Great Lakes Christian Homes Housing Corporation, which owns property in the northeast quadrant of Holt Road and Washington Road; and

WHEREAS, Great Lakes Christian Homes Housing Corporation wants to quit claim the lands needed for the trail to either the township or county, for the sum of $1.00, so that the conveyed lands are excluded when property taxes are calculated for the parent parcel; and

WHEREAS, Delhi Township requested that the lands be added to the county public road right-of-way, instead of conveyed to the township; and

WHEREAS, additional county public road right-of-way is more valuable and desired from the Road Department point of view.

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED, that the Ingham County Board of Commissioners authorizes the Board Chairperson to sign and execute the quit claim deed, consistent with this resolution, after approval as to form by the County Attorney.
QUIT CLAIM DEED

KNOW ALL MEN BY THESE PRESENTS that Great Lakes Christian Homes Housing Corporation, a Michigan nonprofit corporation, whose address is 8300 Maysville Road, Fort Wayne, IN 46815, Quit Claim(s) to the Ingham County Board of Commissioners, c/o the Ingham County Road Department, whose address is 301 Bush St., Mason, MI 48854 the following described parcel of land situated in the Township of Delhi, County of Ingham, and State of Michigan, to wit:

The North 17 feet of the South 50 feet of the West 461.24 feet and the North 37 feet of the South 70 feet of the East 612.3 feet of a parcel of land described as: Beg. at SE Cor Sec 17, thence W along the S Sec. In 612.3 ft, th N Perp to S Sec In 215 ft, th W 250 ft, th S 215 ft to S Sec In, th W along S Sec In 416.24 ft to SW Cor of SE ¼ of SE ¼ of Sec 17, th N00 degrees, 20° 03' E 1323.68 ft alg W In of SE ¼ of SE ¼ to S In of Sup Plat #14, th S89 degrees 43° 09' E 259.69 ft to SE Cor SD Plat, th N00 degrees 29° 10' E alg E In SD Plat 0.66 ft to N In of SE ¼ of SE ¼, th S89 degrees 49° 08' E 1063.28 ft to NE Cor SE ¼ of Se ¼ , th S00 degrees 18° 38' W 1319.71 ft to POB, Sec 17 T3NR2W.

PART OF PARCEL ID NO. 05-17-476-002

Together with all and singular the tenements, hereditaments and appurtenances thereunto belonging or in anywise appertaining, for the sum of One and 00/100 dollar ($1.00).

Dated this ______ day of ____________________, 2014.

By: _______________________________ (L.S.)
    Thomas G. Garman
    Its: Chief Executive Officer

    COUNTY OF ________
    )
    ) SS
    STATE OF MICHIGAN

The foregoing instrument was acknowledged before me this ______ day of _________, 2014, by Thomas G. Garman and being duly sworn, stated that he is the Chief Executive Officer of Great Lakes Christian Homes Housing Corporation, a Michigan nonprofit corporation and with its full authority and as its free act and deed.

Notary Public: ______________________________

__________________________________________

My commission expires: ____________________________

____________ County, Michigan

Acting in the County of _________________
By: ____________________________ (L.S.)

Victor Celentino

Its: Chairperson of the Board

COUNTY OF INGHAM )
STATE OF MICHIGAN )

The foregoing instrument was acknowledged before me this ______ day of __________, 2014, by Victor Celentino and being duly sworn, stated that he is the Chairperson of the Board of the Ingham County Board of Commissioners and with its full authority and as its free act and deed.

Notary Public: ________________________________

______________________________

My commission expires: __________________

______________ County, Michigan

Acting in the County of ________________

Prepared by:
Delhi Charter Township
Assisted By: Gary M. Chalice, P.S.
Hubbell, Roth & Clark, Inc.
555 Hulet Drive
Bloomfield Hills, MI 48303-0824

Recording Fee: _______________ When recorded return to: Ingham County Road Department

Sales Transfer Fee: Exempt per MCL 207.526(a) & (h)(i)

Tax Parcel # 05-17-476-002 Send subsequent tax bills to: Exempt
PARCEL 2

LEGAL DESCRIPTION - 33-25-05-17-476-002 Sidewalk Easement

The North 17 feet of the South 50 feet of a parcel of land described as: Beg at SE Cor Sec 17, th W along S Sec In 612.3 ft, th N Perp to S Sec In 215 ft, th W 250 ft, th S 215 ft to S Sec In, th W along S Sec In 416.24 ft to SW Cor of SE 1/4 of SE 1/4 of Sec 17, th N00°29'10"E 1323.68 ft alg W In of SE 1/4 of SE 1/4 to S In of Sup Plat #14, th S89°49'08"E 1063.28 ft to NE Cor SE 1/4 of SE 1/4, th S00°18'38"W 1319.71 ft to POB, Sec 17 T3NR2W.

LANDOWNER: Great Lakes Christian Homes
ADDRESS: 2050 Washington Road
SE 1/4, Section 17, T3N, R2W
Delhi Twp., Ingham County, Michigan

June 3, 2013
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MEMORANDUM

To: County Services and Finance Committees
From: Robert Peterson, Director of Engineering
       Road Department
Date: March 19, 2014
Subject: Authorization to Purchase Reflective Sign Faces and Completed Signs

This memo contains a recommendation for the Board of Commissioners to accept the unit price bid results for reflective sign faces and completed signs and authorize purchase of an initial order of said materials to fully stock the Road Department’s sign materials inventory.

The Ingham County Purchasing Department solicits unit prices annually for a vast array of sign materials. We use the unit prices and an initial order quantity to determine and recommend a vendor, from which we purchase materials to improve and maintain the county road sign system.

The Invitation for Bids was designed so that later in fiscal year 2014, if we need additional sign materials, we can use the unit prices from the recommended bidder and order materials to replenish our sign materials inventory.

The Purchasing Department advertised and received six bids. This year’s recommended bidder is Osburn Associates, Inc., Logan, Ohio. They were the low bidder and submitted unit prices that, when applied to the initial order quantities, totaled $37,775.70. Their unit prices and initial order costs are in-line with those received last year.

I respectfully recommend that the Board of Commissioners adopt the attached resolution and accept the unit price bid results for reflective sign faces and completed signs from Osburn Associates, Inc. and authorize purchase of the initial order of said materials.
TO: County Services and Finance Committees

FROM: Jim Hudgins, Director of Purchasing

DATE: March 27, 2014

SUBJECT: Reflective Signs Faces, Complete Signs and Sign Blanks

Project Description:
Reflective sign faces, complete signs and aluminum sheet sign panels for the Ingham County Road Department. The County’s request was for unit prices to furnish and deliver to the Ingham County Road Department approximately 2,060 pieces, more or less, of various quantities, shapes and sizes of reflective sign faces, complete signs and aluminum sheet sign panels.

Proposal Summary:
Vendors contacted: 8 Local: 0
Vendors responding: 6 Local: 0

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Company Name</th>
<th>Grand Total</th>
<th>Local</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Osburn Associates</td>
<td>$37,775.70</td>
<td>Logan, Ohio</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dornbos Sign Inc.</td>
<td>$45,400.00</td>
<td>Charlotte Michigan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vulcan Signs</td>
<td>$47,329.60</td>
<td>Foley, Alabama</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rathco Safety Supply</td>
<td>$47,408.70</td>
<td>Portage Michigan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lightle Enterprises of OH</td>
<td>$57,874.92</td>
<td>Frankfort, Ohio</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lowen Corporation</td>
<td>$59,079.06</td>
<td>Hutchinson, Kansas</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Unit Pricing is located on follow pages.

Recommendation:
The Evaluation Committee recommends awarding the contract to Osburn Associates, who submitted the lowest responsive proposal, in an amount not to exceed $37,775.70.

Advertisement:
The RFP was advertised in the Lansing State Journal, New Citizens Press and posted on the Purchasing Department Web Page.
## Sign Face Only

Faces below are to be 3M brand, Series 3930, High Intensity Grade Prismatic Sheeting Material

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Face Size</th>
<th>Quantity</th>
<th>Price Per Face</th>
<th>Total Cost Per Quantity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>12&quot; x 36&quot;</td>
<td>$12.28</td>
<td>$4.83</td>
<td>$4.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24&quot; x 42&quot;</td>
<td>$17.51</td>
<td>$11.27</td>
<td>$10.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30&quot; x 30&quot;</td>
<td>$16.23</td>
<td>$162.30</td>
<td>$10.06 $100.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12&quot; x 18&quot;</td>
<td>$8.93</td>
<td>$2.42</td>
<td>$2.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30&quot; x 36&quot;</td>
<td>$18.32</td>
<td>$12.08</td>
<td>$11.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30&quot; x 18&quot;</td>
<td>$12.49</td>
<td>$6.04</td>
<td>$5.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48&quot; x 24&quot;</td>
<td>$19.07</td>
<td>$12.88</td>
<td>$12.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48&quot; x 30&quot;</td>
<td>$13.05</td>
<td>$3,001.50</td>
<td>$7.24 $1,853.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24&quot; x 24&quot;</td>
<td>$13.77</td>
<td>$550.80</td>
<td>$6.44 $257.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30&quot; x 30&quot;</td>
<td>$16.23</td>
<td>$162.30</td>
<td>$10.06 $100.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12&quot; x 12&quot;</td>
<td>$8.85</td>
<td>$1.61</td>
<td>$1.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12&quot; x 6&quot;</td>
<td>$7.73</td>
<td>$0.81</td>
<td>$0.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48&quot; x 30&quot;</td>
<td>$22.21</td>
<td>$16.10</td>
<td>$15.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36&quot; x 36&quot;</td>
<td>$20.68</td>
<td>$14.49</td>
<td>$13.89</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Sign Face Only

Faces below are to be 3M brand, Series 4081 Cubed, Fluorescent Yellow Diamond Grade Material

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Face Size</th>
<th>Quantity</th>
<th>Price Per Face</th>
<th>Total Cost Per Quantity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>30&quot; x 30&quot;</td>
<td>$33.83</td>
<td>$3,383.00</td>
<td>$28.63 $2,863.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36&quot; x 36&quot;</td>
<td>$45.76</td>
<td>$3,203.06</td>
<td>$37.00 $2,590.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24&quot; x 24&quot;</td>
<td>$24.99</td>
<td>$1,249.50</td>
<td>$16.48 $824.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24&quot; x 30&quot;</td>
<td>$28.37</td>
<td>$1,418.50</td>
<td>$20.50 $824.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12&quot; x 18&quot;</td>
<td>$13.22</td>
<td>$264.40</td>
<td>$14.78 $129.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36&quot; x 36&quot;</td>
<td>$46.71</td>
<td>$3,456.00</td>
<td>$33.75 $2,822.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30&quot; x 18&quot;</td>
<td>$30.40</td>
<td>$17.18</td>
<td>$15.45 $116.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36&quot; x 36&quot;</td>
<td>$53.30</td>
<td>$550.80</td>
<td>$48.00 $432.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36&quot; x 48&quot;</td>
<td>$58.66</td>
<td>$2,848.00</td>
<td>$23.93 $1,774.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48&quot; x 24&quot;</td>
<td>$41.27</td>
<td>$2,746.20</td>
<td>$34.00 $2,040.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48&quot; x 30&quot;</td>
<td>$19.68</td>
<td>$1,180.80</td>
<td>$12.36 $741.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12&quot; x 12&quot;</td>
<td>$13.14</td>
<td>$22.28</td>
<td>$12.75 $972.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12&quot; x 6&quot;</td>
<td>$9.96</td>
<td>$0.59</td>
<td>$1.97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36&quot; x 36&quot;</td>
<td>$49.97</td>
<td>$599.60</td>
<td>$42.50 $339.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30&quot; x 12&quot;</td>
<td>$17.70</td>
<td>$212.40</td>
<td>$10.63 $839.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36&quot; Round</td>
<td>$45.75</td>
<td>$1,626.00</td>
<td>$38.25 $2,634.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36&quot; Yield Ahead</td>
<td>$50.75</td>
<td>$550.80</td>
<td>$48.00 $432.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Sign Face Only

Faces below are to be 3M brand, Series 3924, Fluorescent Orange Diamond Grade Material

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Face Size</th>
<th>Quantity</th>
<th>Lowen Corporation</th>
<th>Price Per Face</th>
<th>Total Cost Per Quantity</th>
<th>Vulcan Signs</th>
<th>Price Per Face</th>
<th>Total Cost Per Quantity</th>
<th>Osburn Associates</th>
<th>Price Per Face</th>
<th>Total Cost Per Quantity</th>
<th>Dornbos Signs</th>
<th>Price Per Face</th>
<th>Total Cost Per Quantity</th>
<th>Rathco Safety Supply</th>
<th>Price Per Face</th>
<th>Total Cost Per Quantity</th>
<th>Lithic Enterprises of Ohio</th>
<th>Price Per Face</th>
<th>Total Cost Per Quantity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>30&quot; Diamond</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>$24.94</td>
<td>$18.88</td>
<td>$23.50</td>
<td>$16.63</td>
<td>$18.44</td>
<td>$24.19</td>
<td>11,647.70</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5,138.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>65.40</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>14,160.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24&quot; x 24&quot;</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>$19.27</td>
<td>$385.40</td>
<td>$12.08</td>
<td>$303.20</td>
<td>$16.63</td>
<td>$23.50</td>
<td>$11,152.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5,138.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>65.40</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>14,160.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48&quot; x 18&quot;</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>$24.10</td>
<td>$18.12</td>
<td>$22.70</td>
<td>$15.96</td>
<td>$17.70</td>
<td>$23.22</td>
<td>11,647.70</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5,138.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>65.40</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>14,160.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36&quot; Diamond</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>$32.97</td>
<td>$27.18</td>
<td>$34.00</td>
<td>$23.94</td>
<td>$26.55</td>
<td>$34.83</td>
<td>11,647.70</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5,138.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>65.40</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>14,160.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30&quot; x 24&quot;</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>$21.25</td>
<td>$15.10</td>
<td>$18.90</td>
<td>$13.30</td>
<td>$14.75</td>
<td>$19.35</td>
<td>11,647.70</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5,138.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>65.40</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>14,160.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Faces below are to be 3M brand, Series 4083 Cubed, Fluorescent Yellow Green Diamond Grade Material

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Face Size</th>
<th>Quantity</th>
<th>Lowen Corporation</th>
<th>Price Per Face</th>
<th>Total Cost Per Quantity</th>
<th>Vulcan Signs</th>
<th>Price Per Face</th>
<th>Total Cost Per Quantity</th>
<th>Osburn Associates</th>
<th>Price Per Face</th>
<th>Total Cost Per Quantity</th>
<th>Dornbos Signs</th>
<th>Price Per Face</th>
<th>Total Cost Per Quantity</th>
<th>Rathco Safety Supply</th>
<th>Price Per Face</th>
<th>Total Cost Per Quantity</th>
<th>Lithic Enterprises of Ohio</th>
<th>Price Per Face</th>
<th>Total Cost Per Quantity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>30&quot; Diamond</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>$31.65</td>
<td>$633.00</td>
<td>$28.63</td>
<td>$572.60</td>
<td>$25.70</td>
<td>$514.00</td>
<td>11,647.70</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5,138.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>65.40</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>14,160.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30&quot; x 12&quot;</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>$17.70</td>
<td>$11.45</td>
<td>$10.25</td>
<td>$9.85</td>
<td>$10.63</td>
<td>$13.50</td>
<td>11,647.70</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5,138.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>65.40</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>14,160.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24&quot; x 8&quot;</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>$12.59</td>
<td>$6.11</td>
<td>$5.49</td>
<td>$5.24</td>
<td>$5.67</td>
<td>$7.24</td>
<td>11,647.70</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5,138.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>65.40</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>14,160.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24&quot; x 12&quot;</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>$15.46</td>
<td>$9.16</td>
<td>$8.29</td>
<td>$7.88</td>
<td>$8.50</td>
<td>$10.80</td>
<td>11,647.70</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5,138.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>65.40</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>14,160.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

## Completed Signs Only

Completed Signs below are to be 3M brand, Series 4000, Diamond Grade Material with 3M Brand Series 1160 Protective Overlay Film Applied

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Legend</th>
<th>Quantity</th>
<th>Lowen Corporation</th>
<th>Unit Price Per Completed Sign</th>
<th>Total Cost Per Completed Sign</th>
<th>Vulcan Signs</th>
<th>Unit Price Per Completed Sign</th>
<th>Total Cost Per Completed Sign</th>
<th>Osburn Associates</th>
<th>Unit Price Per Completed Sign</th>
<th>Total Cost Per Completed Sign</th>
<th>Dornbos Signs</th>
<th>Unit Price Per Completed Sign</th>
<th>Total Cost Per Completed Sign</th>
<th>Rathco Safety Supply</th>
<th>Unit Price Per Completed Sign</th>
<th>Total Cost Per Completed Sign</th>
<th>Lithic Enterprises of Ohio</th>
<th>Unit Price Per Completed Sign</th>
<th>Total Cost Per Completed Sign</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>30&quot; Stop</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>$55.11</td>
<td>$5,511.00</td>
<td>$5,148.00</td>
<td>$36.80</td>
<td>$3,680.00</td>
<td>$4,879.00</td>
<td>$51.38</td>
<td>$5,138.00</td>
<td>$65.40</td>
<td>$6,540.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36&quot; Stop</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>$77.11</td>
<td>$11,566.50</td>
<td>$11,152.50</td>
<td>$53.00</td>
<td>$7,050.00</td>
<td>$10,498.50</td>
<td>$73.98</td>
<td>$11,097.00</td>
<td>$94.40</td>
<td>$14,160.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Completed Signs below are to be 3M Brand, Series 4000, Diamond Grade Material

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Legend</th>
<th>Quantity</th>
<th>Lowen Corporation</th>
<th>Vulcan Signs</th>
<th>Osburn Associates</th>
<th>Dornbos Signs</th>
<th>Rathco Safety Supply</th>
<th>Lighle Enterprises of Ohio</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Unit Price Per Completed Sign</td>
<td>Total Cost Per Quantity</td>
<td>Unit Price Per Completed Sign</td>
<td>Total Cost Per Quantity</td>
<td>Unit Price Per Completed Sign</td>
<td>Total Cost Per Quantity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36&quot; Stop</td>
<td></td>
<td>$32.15</td>
<td>$39.90</td>
<td>$36.15</td>
<td>$54.00</td>
<td>$58.41</td>
<td>$83.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36&quot; Yield</td>
<td></td>
<td>$61.22</td>
<td>$27.74</td>
<td>$18.00</td>
<td>$27.50</td>
<td>$26.85</td>
<td>$42.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12&quot; x 6&quot; 3 - Way</td>
<td></td>
<td>$8.07</td>
<td>$3.60</td>
<td>$2.01</td>
<td>$3.23</td>
<td>$3.97</td>
<td>$4.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12&quot; x 6&quot; 4 - Way</td>
<td></td>
<td>$8.07</td>
<td>$3.60</td>
<td>$2.01</td>
<td>$3.23</td>
<td>$3.97</td>
<td>$4.69</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Completed Signs Only.

### Completed Signs below are to be 3M Brand, Series 4081 Cubed, Fluorescent Yellow Diamond Grade Material

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Legend</th>
<th>Quantity</th>
<th>Lowen Corporation</th>
<th>Vulcan Signs</th>
<th>Osburn Associates</th>
<th>Dornbos Signs</th>
<th>Rathco Safety Supply</th>
<th>Lighle Enterprises of Ohio</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Unit Price Per Completed Sign</td>
<td>Total Cost Per Quantity</td>
<td>Unit Price Per Completed Sign</td>
<td>Total Cost Per Quantity</td>
<td>Unit Price Per Completed Sign</td>
<td>Total Cost Per Quantity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36&quot; x 48&quot; x 48&quot; No Passing Zone</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>$79.15</td>
<td>$3,957.50</td>
<td>$2,129.00</td>
<td>$38.59</td>
<td>$1,929.50</td>
<td>$38.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36&quot; Round Advance Railroad</td>
<td></td>
<td>$78.59</td>
<td>$58.80</td>
<td>$37.00</td>
<td>$53.31</td>
<td>$59.67</td>
<td>$84.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36&quot; x 36&quot; Stop Ahead Symbol</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>$81.30</td>
<td>$8,130.00</td>
<td>$7,515.00</td>
<td>$67.89</td>
<td>$6,789.00</td>
<td>$72.02</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Completed Signs ahead are to be 3M Brand, 4083 Cubed, Fluorescent Yellow Green Diamond Grade Material

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Legend</th>
<th>Quantity</th>
<th>Lowen Corporation</th>
<th>Vulcan Signs</th>
<th>Osburn Associates</th>
<th>Dornbos Signs</th>
<th>Rathco Safety Supply</th>
<th>Lighle Enterprises of Ohio</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Unit Price Per Completed Sign</td>
<td>Total Cost Per Quantity</td>
<td>Unit Price Per Completed Sign</td>
<td>Total Cost Per Quantity</td>
<td>Unit Price Per Completed Sign</td>
<td>Total Cost Per Quantity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30&quot; School</td>
<td></td>
<td>$53.20</td>
<td>$40.54</td>
<td>$25.70</td>
<td>$36.26</td>
<td>$41.31</td>
<td>$58.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30&quot; Diamond</td>
<td></td>
<td>$51.03</td>
<td>$41.77</td>
<td>$25.70</td>
<td>$40.21</td>
<td>$41.44</td>
<td>$58.60</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| sub consign | $29,165.00 $25,944.00 $17,660.00 $24,096.00 $25,422.00 $33,150.50 |
### Aluminum Sheet Sign Panels Only:

#### Aluminum Sheet Sign Panels below are to be 0.080 Type III, Aluminum Sheet Sign Panels

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Panel Size</th>
<th>Quantity</th>
<th>Lowen Corporation</th>
<th>Vulcan Signs</th>
<th>Ostburn Associates</th>
<th>Dornbos Signs</th>
<th>Rathco Safety Supply</th>
<th>Ligthle Enterprises of Ohio</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>12&quot; x 6&quot;</td>
<td></td>
<td>$1.90</td>
<td>$1.91</td>
<td>$1.63</td>
<td>$1.26</td>
<td>$2.15</td>
<td>$1.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12&quot; x 18&quot;</td>
<td></td>
<td>$3.59</td>
<td>$3.09</td>
<td>$3.08</td>
<td>$3.78</td>
<td>$4.02</td>
<td>$3.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36&quot; x 6&quot;</td>
<td></td>
<td>$4.42</td>
<td>$3.33</td>
<td>$3.08</td>
<td>$3.78</td>
<td>$4.10</td>
<td>$3.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48&quot; x 32&quot;</td>
<td></td>
<td>$25.68</td>
<td>$21.59</td>
<td>$21.87</td>
<td>$26.89</td>
<td>$25.92</td>
<td>$2.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36&quot; x 8&quot;</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>$36.12</td>
<td>$6.41</td>
<td>$641.00</td>
<td>$7.56</td>
<td>$714.00</td>
<td>$768.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48&quot; x 18&quot;</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>$71.76</td>
<td>$6.90</td>
<td>$690.00</td>
<td>$7.65</td>
<td>$714.00</td>
<td>$768.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24&quot; x 24&quot;</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>$4.16</td>
<td>$5.38</td>
<td>$5.13</td>
<td>$5.95</td>
<td>$6.40</td>
<td>$30.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36&quot; x 36&quot;</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>$12.66</td>
<td>$13.88</td>
<td>$18.90</td>
<td>$17.85</td>
<td>$19.20</td>
<td>$30.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30&quot; x 30&quot;</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>$12.66</td>
<td>$15.15</td>
<td>$18.09</td>
<td>$17.73</td>
<td>$19.20</td>
<td>$30.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36&quot; x 48&quot;</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>$20.87</td>
<td>$343.50</td>
<td>$20.16</td>
<td>$19.04</td>
<td>$20.48</td>
<td>$1,024.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48&quot; x 48&quot;</td>
<td></td>
<td>$52.76</td>
<td>$33.40</td>
<td>$32.80</td>
<td>$30.56</td>
<td>$31.20</td>
<td>$40.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36&quot; x 36&quot;</td>
<td></td>
<td>$26.41</td>
<td>$18.00</td>
<td>$18.00</td>
<td>$19.20</td>
<td>$23.04</td>
<td>$30.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48&quot; x 48&quot;</td>
<td></td>
<td>$36.63</td>
<td>$43.11</td>
<td>$12.30</td>
<td>$16.12</td>
<td>$23.04</td>
<td>$30.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30&quot; x 12&quot;</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>$31.16</td>
<td>$25.29</td>
<td>$24.50</td>
<td>$29.16</td>
<td>$30.72</td>
<td>$30.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36&quot; x 36&quot;</td>
<td></td>
<td>$221.57</td>
<td>$15.66</td>
<td>$15.38</td>
<td>$19.20</td>
<td>$19.20</td>
<td>$30.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30&quot; x 30&quot;</td>
<td></td>
<td>$10.21</td>
<td>$7.98</td>
<td>$7.69</td>
<td>$8.93</td>
<td>$9.60</td>
<td>$30.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48&quot; x 48&quot;</td>
<td></td>
<td>$33.66</td>
<td>$25.19</td>
<td>$24.50</td>
<td>$28.36</td>
<td>$30.72</td>
<td>$30.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36&quot; x 6&quot;</td>
<td></td>
<td>$3.85</td>
<td>$2.80</td>
<td>$2.56</td>
<td>$3.48</td>
<td>$3.20</td>
<td>$30.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42&quot; x 12&quot;</td>
<td></td>
<td>$10.84</td>
<td>$7.44</td>
<td>$8.82</td>
<td>$8.96</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Aluminum Sheet Sign Panels Only CONT.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Panel Size</th>
<th>Quantity</th>
<th>Lowen Corporation</th>
<th>Vulcan Signs</th>
<th>Ostburn Associates</th>
<th>Dornbos Signs</th>
<th>Rathco Safety Supply</th>
<th>Ligthle Enterprises of Ohio</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>48&quot; x 18&quot;</td>
<td></td>
<td>$17.19</td>
<td>$12.66</td>
<td>$12.30</td>
<td>$15.12</td>
<td>$14.28</td>
<td>$15.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24&quot; x 24&quot;</td>
<td></td>
<td>$24.09</td>
<td>$14.67</td>
<td>$14.35</td>
<td>$17.64</td>
<td>$16.66</td>
<td>$17.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30&quot; x 30&quot;</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>$4.16</td>
<td>$3.67</td>
<td>$373.00</td>
<td>$4.23</td>
<td>$684.00</td>
<td>$4.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60&quot; x 48&quot;</td>
<td></td>
<td>$53.65</td>
<td>$41.75</td>
<td>$48.00</td>
<td>$55.40</td>
<td>$58.00</td>
<td>$51.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36&quot; x 36&quot;</td>
<td></td>
<td>$33.66</td>
<td>$25.19</td>
<td>$24.50</td>
<td>$28.36</td>
<td>$30.72</td>
<td>$30.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30&quot; x 6&quot;</td>
<td></td>
<td>$3.85</td>
<td>$2.80</td>
<td>$2.56</td>
<td>$3.48</td>
<td>$3.20</td>
<td>$30.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48&quot; x 8&quot;</td>
<td></td>
<td>$6.96</td>
<td>$5.73</td>
<td>$5.47</td>
<td>$6.73</td>
<td>$7.41</td>
<td>$6.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50&quot; x 30&quot;</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>$17.52</td>
<td>$13.02</td>
<td>$1953.00</td>
<td>$15.75</td>
<td>$2622.90</td>
<td>$15.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36&quot; Round</td>
<td></td>
<td>$33.69</td>
<td>$16.52</td>
<td>$17.73</td>
<td>$21.52</td>
<td>$22.80</td>
<td>$30.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30&quot; Stop</td>
<td></td>
<td>$12.95</td>
<td>$11.88</td>
<td>$11.70</td>
<td>$13.01</td>
<td>$15.40</td>
<td>$30.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30&quot; Stop</td>
<td></td>
<td>$18.24</td>
<td>$17.12</td>
<td>$16.99</td>
<td>$18.74</td>
<td>$21.15</td>
<td>$22.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30&quot; Pentagon</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>$19.68</td>
<td>$11.63</td>
<td>$581.50</td>
<td>$12.38</td>
<td>$619.00</td>
<td>$14.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36&quot; x 24&quot;</td>
<td></td>
<td>$15.35</td>
<td>$12.60</td>
<td>$15.12</td>
<td>$14.28</td>
<td>$15.36</td>
<td>$30.72</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**GRAND TOTAL FOR INITIAL ORDER**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Lowen Corporation</th>
<th>Vulcan Signs</th>
<th>Ostburn Associates</th>
<th>Dornbos Signs</th>
<th>Rathco Safety Supply</th>
<th>Ligthle Enterprises of Ohio</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$59,079.06</td>
<td>$47,329.60</td>
<td>$37,775.70</td>
<td>$45,400.00</td>
<td>$47,408.70</td>
<td>$57,874.92</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
WHEREAS, the Ingham County Purchasing Department solicits unit prices annually for a vast array of Road Department sign materials; and

WHEREAS, the Road Department uses the unit prices and an initial order quantity to determine a successful bidder, from which materials are purchased to improve and maintain the county road sign system; and

WHEREAS, the Invitation for Bids was designed so that later in fiscal year 2014, if the Road Department needs additional sign materials, it can use the unit prices from the recommended bidder and order materials to replenish its sign materials inventory; and

WHEREAS, the unit prices and initial order costs are in-line with those received last year; and

WHEREAS, the Purchasing Department, Director of Purchasing and the Road Department, Director of Engineering are recommending that the Board of Commissioners accept the unit price bid results for reflective sign faces and completed signs and authorize purchase of sign materials with Osburn Associates, Inc., Logan, Ohio.

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED, that the Ingham County Board of Commissioners accepts the unit price bid results for reflective sign faces and completed signs from Osburn Associates, Inc., Logan, Ohio and authorizes the purchase of an initial order of said materials to fully stock the Road Department’s sign materials inventory.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that the Ingham County Board of Commissioners authorizes the Purchasing Department to issue a Purchase Order in an amount not to exceed $37,775.70 to Osburn Associates, Inc., Logan, Ohio for the purchase of reflective sign faces and completed signs.
TO: County Services and Finance Committees
FROM: Jim Hudgins, Director of Purchasing
DATE: March 27, 2014
SUBJECT: Extend the contracts with Advanced Drainage Systems, Inc. and Contech Engineered Solutions for Smooth-lined Corrugated Polyethylene Pipe and Helically Corrugated Steel Pipe.

Project Description:
Advanced Drainage Systems, Inc. and Contech Engineered Solutions have a contract with the Ingham County Road Department for Smooth-lined Corrugated Polyethylene Pipe and Helically Corrugated Steel Pipe at unit prices quoted in its April 17, 2013 and April 9, 2013 response respectively.

**Item 1: Smooth-lined Corrugated Polyethylene Pipe and Couplers**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pipe Diameter</th>
<th>Jensen Bridge &amp; Supply Company</th>
<th>Sunshine Products of Mid-Michigan LLC</th>
<th>Advanced Drainage Systems</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6 Inch</td>
<td>No Bid</td>
<td>$2.00</td>
<td>$1.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 Inch</td>
<td>No Bid</td>
<td>$2.95</td>
<td>$2.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 Inch</td>
<td>No Bid</td>
<td>$3.65</td>
<td>$3.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 Inch Self Coupling</td>
<td>$6.32</td>
<td>$4.95</td>
<td>$4.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 Inch Self Coupling</td>
<td>$8.85</td>
<td>$6.25</td>
<td>$6.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18 Inch Self Coupling</td>
<td>$13.57</td>
<td>$9.70</td>
<td>$8.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24 Inch Self Coupling</td>
<td>$20.87</td>
<td>$14.90</td>
<td>$14.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30 Inch Self Coupling</td>
<td>No Bid</td>
<td>$22.05</td>
<td>$21.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36 Inch Self Coupling</td>
<td>No Bid</td>
<td>$27.60</td>
<td>$26.64</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Solid Sleeve Couplers**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Solid Sleeve Couplers</th>
<th>Sunshine Products of Mid-Michigan LLC</th>
<th>Advanced Drainage Systems</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6 Inch</td>
<td>$1.95</td>
<td>$2.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 Inch</td>
<td>$4.30</td>
<td>$3.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 Inch</td>
<td>$4.85</td>
<td>$5.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 Inch</td>
<td>$5.30</td>
<td>$5.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 Inch</td>
<td>$7.80</td>
<td>$9.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18 Inch</td>
<td>$10.35</td>
<td>$16.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24 Inch</td>
<td>$16.15</td>
<td>$23.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30 Inch</td>
<td>$42.50</td>
<td>$55.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36 Inch</td>
<td>$113.85</td>
<td>$76.79</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Item 2: Helically Corrugated Galvanized Type 1 Coated Steel Pipe and Couplers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Galvanized Pipe Diameter</th>
<th>Gage</th>
<th>Price per Linear ft.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Contech Engineered Solutions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 Inch Galvanized</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>$6.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 Inch Galvanized</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>$6.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 Inch Galvanized</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>No Bid</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 Inch Galvanized</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>$6.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 Inch Galvanized</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>$7.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 Inch Galvanized</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>$9.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 Inch Galvanized</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>$7.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 Inch Galvanized</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>$9.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 Inch Galvanized</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>$12.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18 Inch Galvanized</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>$9.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18 Inch Galvanized</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>$10.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18 Inch Galvanized</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>$14.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24 Inch Galvanized</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>$11.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24 Inch Galvanized</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>$14.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24 Inch Galvanized</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>$19.97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30 Inch Galvanized</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>$14.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30 Inch Galvanized</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>$18.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30 Inch Galvanized</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>$22.99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36 Inch Galvanized</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>$19.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36 Inch Galvanized</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>$24.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48 Inch Galvanized</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>$29.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48 Inch Galvanized</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>$39.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60 Inch Galvanized</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>$53.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>72 Inch Galvanized</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>$93.80</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Aluminized Type 2 Pipe Diameter

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Aluminized Type 2 Pipe Diameter</th>
<th>Gage</th>
<th>Price per Linear ft.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Contech Engineered Solutions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 Inch Spiral Aluminized Type 2</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>No Bid</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 Inch Spiral Aluminized Type 2</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>$7.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 Inch Spiral Aluminized Type 2</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>$9.98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18 Inch Spiral Aluminized Type 2</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>$11.97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24 Inch Spiral Aluminized Type 2</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>$15.97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30 Inch Spiral Aluminized Type 2</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>$19.97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36 Inch Spiral Aluminized Type 2</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>$21.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48 Inch Spiral Aluminized Type 2</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>$43.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60 Inch Spiral Aluminized Type 2</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>$58.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>72 Inch Spiral Aluminized Type 2</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>$103.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Connecting Bands</td>
<td>Gage</td>
<td>Width</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 Inch Galvanized</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>12”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 Inch Galvanized</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>12”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 Inch Galvanized</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>12”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 Inch Galvanized</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>12”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 Inch Galvanized</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>12”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 Inch Galvanized</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 Inch Galvanized</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>24”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 Inch Galvanized</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>24”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 Inch Galvanized</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>24”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 Inch Galvanized</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>12”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 Inch Galvanized</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>12”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 Inch Galvanized</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 Inch Galvanized</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>24”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 Inch Galvanized</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>24”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 Inch Galvanized</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>24”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18 Inch Galvanized</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>24”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18 Inch Galvanized</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>24”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18 Inch Galvanized</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>24”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24 Inch Galvanized</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>24”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24 Inch Galvanized</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>24”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24 Inch Galvanized</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>24”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30 Inch Galvanized</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>24”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30 Inch Galvanized</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>24”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30 Inch Galvanized</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>24”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36 Inch Galvanized</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>24”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36 Inch Galvanized</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>24”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48 Inch Galvanized</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>24”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48 Inch Galvanized</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>24”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60 Inch Galvanized</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>24”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>72 Inch Galvanized</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>24”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 Inch Aluminized</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>24”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24 Inch Aluminized</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>24”</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Recommendation:**
It is the recommendation of the Evaluation Committee to extend the current contracts with Advanced Drainage Systems, Inc. and Contech Engineered Solutions for another 12 months with the same prices and terms of their respective 2013 proposals, RFP packet #46-13 Steel & Corrugated Pipe.
RESOLUTION AUTHORIZING THE EXTENSION OF AUTHORIZATIONS TO PURCHASE 2014 SEASONAL REQUIREMENTS OF SMOOTH-LINED CORRUGATED POLYETHYLENE PIPE & HELICALLY CORRUGATED STEEL PIPE FOR THE ROAD DEPARTMENT

WHEREAS, the Road Department annually purchases approximately 3,500 lineal feet of various sizes of both smooth lined corrugated polyethylene pipe and helically corrugated steel pipe—both galvanized and aluminized coated, for use as road drainage culverts and piping; and

WHEREAS, the Road Department adopted 2014 budget includes funds for this and other maintenance material purchases in controllable expenditures; and

WHEREAS, per Resolution 13-204, the Board of Commissioners approved bids for both smooth lined corrugated polyethylene pipe and helically corrugated steel pipe—both galvanized and aluminized coated, per Request for Proposals (RFP) #46-13, and authorized awarding this bid and purchase on an as-needed, unit price basis, smooth lined corrugated polyethylene pipe from Advanced Drainage Systems, and helically corrugated steel pipe—both galvanized and aluminized coated, from Contech Engineered Solutions, LLC; and

WHEREAS, both Advanced Drainage Systems and Contech Engineered Solutions, LLC, have offered in writing to extend their 2013 unit prices to 2014 for smooth lined corrugated polyethylene pipe and helically corrugated steel pipe respectively; and

WHEREAS, given inflation in manufacturing and trucking costs, the Road Department expects that bidding these products for 2014 would result in higher unit prices than the price extensions being offered by both Advanced Drainage Systems and Contech Engineered Solutions, LLC, for these pipe products; and

WHEREAS, it is therefore the recommendation of the Road and Purchasing Departments to extend for 2014 the authorization to purchase on an as-needed, unit price basis, smooth lined corrugated polyethylene pipe from Advanced Drainage Systems, and helically corrugated steel pipe—both galvanized and aluminized coated, from Contech Engineered Solutions, LLC, at the unit prices each proposed for their respective products per RFP #46-13.

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED, the Board of Commissioners authorizes extending for 2014 the authorization to purchase on an as-needed, unit price basis smooth lined corrugated polyethylene pipe from Advanced Drainage Systems, and helically corrugated steel pipe—both galvanized and aluminized coated, from Contech Engineered Solutions, LLC, per their respective 2013 unit prices proposed for RFP 46-13 and approved per Resolution 13-204.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that the Purchasing Department is hereby authorized to execute any necessary purchase documents relating to the above, consistent with this resolution, on behalf of the County.
MEMORANDUM

TO:   County Service and Finance Committees
FROM: Jim Hudgins, Director of Purchasing
DATE:  March 27, 2014
SUBJECT: Extend the Contract with Michigan Mineral Resources, LLC for Additional Services for the Gravel Road Dust Control Operations for the Ingham County Department of Transportation & Roads

Project Description:
Michigan Mineral Resources, LLC has a contract with the Ingham County Department of Transportation & Roads for 28% Calcium Chloride Solution both delivered and applied for the price of 13 cents/gallon for the gravel road dust control operations that was bid out in 2012 per the below fees and approved by Resolution #042-12 by the Board of Ingham County Road Commissioners.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Bidder</th>
<th>Delivered to Eastern Prices Per Gallon</th>
<th>Applied at Any Location 38% Price Per Gallon</th>
<th>Option</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>28% 32% 38% 6000&gt; Gallon Load &lt;3000 Gallon Load</td>
<td>Mineral well Brine 28% Delivered Price Per Gallon</td>
<td>Mineral Well Brine 28% Solution Applied Price Per Gallon</td>
<td>Magnesium Chloride Price/Gallon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michigan Mineral Resources LLC (Albion, MI)</td>
<td>0.130 NB NB NB 0.130 NB 0.130 NB</td>
<td>0.130 0.130 NB</td>
<td>NB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michigan Chloride Sales (St. Louis, MI)</td>
<td>0.160 NB NB NB 0.160 0.180 NB</td>
<td>0.160 0.180 NB</td>
<td>NB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Great Lakes Chloride (Shelbyville,MI)</td>
<td>0.375 0.420 0.413 0.458 0.529 NB</td>
<td>NB NB NB</td>
<td>NB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liquid Calcium Chloride Sales (Kawkawlin, MI)</td>
<td>NB 0.512 0.595 0.635 0.720 NB</td>
<td>NB NB NB</td>
<td>NB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MBH Marketing (Webberville, MI)</td>
<td>NB NB NB NB NB 0.139 0.169 NB</td>
<td>0.139 0.169 NB</td>
<td>NB</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

All Prices in dollar/gallon
NB = No Bid

Recommendation:
It is the recommendation of the Evaluation Committee to extend the current contract with Michigan Mineral Resources, LLC to add services for another year at unit prices quoted in their 2012 response to proposal #1635, at 13 cents/gallon. Michigan Mineral Resources, LLC has agreed in writing to hold its prices for another year with no increase in costs.
WHEREAS, the Road Department uses a service to provide, deliver and/or apply approximately 230,000 gallons of calcium chloride solution for dust control each year on the 87 miles of gravel county roads during the dry months of the year; and

WHEREAS, the Road Department adopted 2014 budget includes funds for this expense in controllable expenditures; and

WHEREAS, the 2012 low bid vendor, Michigan Mineral Resources of Albion, Michigan, has offered to extend for 2014 its 2013 and 2012 unit price of 13 cents per gallon for calcium chloride dust control solution delivered to the Road Department for incidental application by Road Department crews and/or applied to all gravel roads by the vendor; and

WHEREAS, Michigan Mineral Resources uses a dust control brine that the Road department has found to be better for dust control than most other materials; and

WHEREAS, Michigan Mineral Resources has been the low bidder on this service for many years; and

WHEREAS, given inflation in fuel and therefore trucking costs, the Road Department expects that bidding this service would result in higher prices than the price extension being offered by Michigan Mineral Resources; and

WHEREAS, it is therefore the recommendation of the Road and Purchasing Departments to extend for 2014 Michigan Mineral Resource’s 2012 and 2013 unit price of 13 cents per gallon for calcium chloride dust control solution delivered and/or applied; and

WHEREAS, per Resolution #13-263, the Board of Commissioners approved continuation of a contract with Michigan Mineral Resources from 2012 to 2013.

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED, the Board of Commissioners authorizes extending for 2014 the contract and unit price of 13 cents per gallon for calcium chloride dust control solution delivered and/or applied with Michigan Mineral Resources of Albion, Michigan.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that the Purchasing Department is hereby authorized to execute any necessary purchase documents relating to the above, consistent with this resolution, on behalf of the County.
TO: County Services and Finance Committees

FROM: Robert Peterson, Director of Engineering
Road Department

DATE: March 26, 2014

SUBJECT: Proposed 2014 Local Bridge Program Funding Applications

Major county bridge repair, replacement, and preventative maintenance projects are typically funded by the Local Bridge Program, which is funded by a combination of federal and state transportation revenue. The Local Bridge Program is a rolling three-year program, in which applications approved in the first year of the program receive funding in the third year of the program. Local Bridge Program applications for this year are due May 1st for fiscal year 2017 funding. Each agency is limited to five applications per year and if awarded a project, the program funds 95% of construction costs and the Road Department would need to fund the remaining 5%.

New since the 2010 call for projects is a provision that allows for “multiple structure applications” - where multiple bridges, that need similar preventative maintenance (PM) work, could be submitted together and only count as one application. The intent was to make PM applications more attractive to applicants, take advantage of construction economies of scale, and streamline MDOT oversight.

The Road Department contracts to have all county bridges inspected, biennially or more frequently, by a state certified bridge inspection consultant as required by federal requirements. Our inspection consultant is required to recommend bridge project candidates for replacement, rehabilitation, or preventative maintenance as part of their contract deliverable.

Ingham County Road Department staff thoroughly evaluated the inspection consultant’s recommendations and presented the recommended list of bridge projects, for which funding applications are to be submitted, at the February 20, 2013, Ingham County Road Advisory Board meeting. During the meeting, the Ingham County Road Advisory Board passed a motion recommending approval of submitting the following 2013 funding applications:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Bridge</th>
<th>Comments</th>
<th>Priority</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Columbia Road bridge over the Grand River,</td>
<td>Primary road bridge replacement, 4,900 ADT, posted for 42 tons, 54 tons,</td>
<td>Repl-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aurelius Twp. $1,600,000 (estimated)</td>
<td>and 63 tons due to rehabilitation work performed by ICRC crews in 2009.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zimmer Road bridge over Deer Creek, Wheatfield</td>
<td>Local road bridge replacement, 360 ADT, posted for 22 tons, 30 tons, and</td>
<td>Repl-2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Twp. $450,000 (estimated)</td>
<td>57 tons.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Dietz Road bridge over Red Cedar River, Locke Twp. $800,000 (estimated)  \hspace{1cm} \text{Primary road bridge replacement}, 700 ADT, posted for 34 tons, 41 tons, and 54 tons.  \hspace{1cm} \text{Repl-3}

Holt Road bridge over Doan Creek, Leroy Twp. $360,000 (estimated)  \hspace{1cm} \text{Local road bridge rehabilitation}, consisting of a superstructure replacement, 900 ADT, posted for 42 tons, 60 tons, and 70 tons.  \hspace{1cm} \text{Rehab-1}

Howell Road bridge over Doan Creek, Wheatfield & Ingham Twps. Olds Road bridge over Huntoon Lake Drain, Leslie Twp. Olds Road bridge over Perry Creek, Leslie Twp. $571,000 total (estimated)  \hspace{1cm} \text{Three local road bridges needing preventative maintenance (PM) consisting of Timber pile and back-wall sheeting repairs, railing replacement, deck overlays, guardrail retrofit, and full cleaning and coating of structural steel.}  \hspace{1cm} \text{PM-1}

Based on the Ingham County Road Advisory Board’s motion, we solicited similar support from the Board of Commissioners because the Local Bridge Program requires each road agency’s governing body to pass a resolution in support of the bridge funding applications.

Although our 2013 applications were competitive and scored well, we did not receive any Local Bridge Program funding last year. I have thoroughly evaluated our 67 bridges again and propose that we re-submit applications for the same bridges, in 2014, that did not receive funding last year.

Lastly, staff presented the recommended list of 2014 bridge applications at the March 26, 2014, Ingham County Road Advisory Board meeting. During the meeting, the Ingham County Road Advisory Board passed a motion recommending approval of the bridge applications listed above.

Road department staff respectfully recommends approval of the attached resolution in support of the 2014 bridge applications for fiscal year 2017 Local Bridge Program funding.
Introduced by the County Services and Finance Committees of the:

INGHAM COUNTY BOARD OF COMMISSIONERS

RESOLUTION TO APPROVE
PROPOSED 2014 INGHAM COUNTY BRIDGE FUNDING APPLICATIONS
FOR SUBMISSION TO THE LOCAL BRIDGE PROGRAM MANAGER

WHEREAS, federal and state funding is made available for major bridge reconstruction, rehabilitation, and preventative maintenance projects through the Local Bridge Program; and

WHEREAS, the Local Bridge Program requires an application process where “… a current resolution, signed and dated, from the governing board supporting the project” must be submitted for bridge projects to be considered for funding under this program; and

WHEREAS, the Ingham County Road Department has all Ingham County road bridges inspected by a state certified bridge inspection consultant biennially, or more, as required by federal requirements; and

WHEREAS, the state certified bridge inspection consultant recommends bridge projects for replacement, rehabilitation, and preventative maintenance, which is provided to and evaluated by Road Department staff; and

WHEREAS, Road Department staff concurs with the bridge inspection consultant’s bridge project recommendations and priorities; and

WHEREAS, the Ingham County Road Advisory Board was convened for a meeting on March 26, 2014, among other issues, to consider and advise the Board of Commissioners on projects to be submitted for federal and state Local Bridge Program funding; and

WHEREAS, upon reviewing the county bridge needs and input from Road Department staff, the County Road Advisory Board passed a motion recommending approval for submitting 2014 funding applications to address replacement, rehabilitation, and preventative maintenance needs for the following bridges:

1. Replacement of the Columbia Road Bridge over the Grand River, Aurelius Township
2. Replacement of the Zimmer Road Bridge over Deer Creek, Wheatfield Township
3. Replacement of the Dietz Road Bridge over the Red Cedar River, Locke Township
4. Rehabilitation of the Holt Road Bridge over Doan Creek, Leroy Township
5. Preventative maintenance repairs on:
   - Howell Road Bridge over Doan Creek, Wheatfield and Ingham Townships
   - Olds Road Bridge over the Huntoon Lake Drain, Leslie Township
   - Olds Road Bridge over the Perry Creek, Leslie Township

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED, that the Ingham County Board of Commissioners authorizes Road Department staff to submit five applications for the bridges listed above for fiscal year 2017 Local Bridge Program funding.
MEMORANDUM

TO: County Services Committee

FROM: Robert Peterson, Director of Engineering
Road Department

DATE: March 26, 2014

SUBJECT: Hungerford Street at St Joseph Street Stop Sign Traffic Control Order

The Ingham County Road Department traffic signal at the intersection of Hungerford Street at St Joseph Street, Charter Township of Lansing, was installed in 1988. At that time, it was decided that the new signal was to be controlled by the City of Lansing’s signal controller operating the city’s signal at the nearby intersection of Clare Street and St Joseph Street. The two signals have been operating as a coordinated pair for the last 26 years.

Since the GM plants have closed and traffic has diminished, the City of Lansing performed Traffic Signal Removal Studies for the following intersections:

- Clare Street and St Joseph Street (City)
- Clare Street and Main Street (City)
- Hungerford Street and St Joseph Street (County)

Signal installation and removal studies follow a rigorous warrant analysis process, as described within the Michigan Manual of Uniform Traffic Control Devices (MMUTCD). The study results recommend removal of the three existing traffic signals and the installation of stop signs to control intersection traffic. Hungerford Street and Clare Street are to stop for the prevailing traffic on St Joseph Street and Main Street. Road Department staff, Lansing Township officials, and the Lansing Township Police Department reviewed the Hungerford Street and St Joseph Street study and concur with the study results.

Removal of the county signal and the two city signals will be performed by each jurisdiction, but must be coordinated with the installation of replacement traffic control. Installation of stop signs to control intersection traffic requires issuance of a Traffic Control Order, pursuant to MCL 257.71, which states:

“Traffic control order” means an order officially establishing the location of traffic control devices and traffic control signals on the highways of this state by the authority having jurisdiction over such highway and filed with the county clerk of the county traversed by such highway. A certified copy thereof shall be prima facie evidence in all courts of the issuance of such order.”

The reason for this memo is to recommend issuance of a traffic control order directing northbound and southbound traffic on Hungerford Street to stop for westbound traffic on St Joseph Street and request authorization for the Board Chairperson to sign and date said traffic control order. After a proper traffic control order is filed with the County Clerk, Road Department staff will remove the existing signal equipment and install the stop signs at the intersection.

Approval of the attached resolution is recommended.
Agenda Item 4g

Introduced by the County Services Committee of the:

INGHAM COUNTY BOARD OF COMMISSIONERS

RESOLUTION TO APPROVE THE
HUNGERFORD STREET STOP SIGN INSTALLATION AT ST JOSEPH STREET
TRAFFIC CONTROL ORDER

WHEREAS, the existing Ingham County Road Department traffic signal at the intersection of Hungerford Street at St Joseph Street was installed in 1988; and

WHEREAS, the Hungerford Street at St Joseph Street signal has been controlled by the City of Lansing’s signal controller, which also operates the city’s signal at the intersection of Clare Street and St Joseph Street; and

WHEREAS, since the GM plants in the vicinity of the intersection have closed and traffic has diminished, a Traffic Signal Removal Study was performed that recommends the signal’s removal and installation of stop signs to control the Hungerford Street and St Joseph Street intersection; and

WHEREAS, Road Department staff, Lansing Township officials, and the Lansing Township Police Department reviewed the Hungerford Street and St Joseph Street study and concur with the study results; and

WHEREAS, installation of stop signs to control intersection traffic requires issuance of a Traffic Control Order, pursuant to MCL 257.71.

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED, that the Ingham County Board of Commissioners approves issuance of a traffic control order directing northbound and southbound traffic on Hungerford Street to stop for westbound traffic on St Joseph Street and request authorization for the Board Chairperson to execute and date the traffic control order.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that the Ingham County Board of Commissioners authorizes removal of the existing Hungerford Street and St Joseph Street traffic signal and installation of stop signs, per the approved traffic control order.
The Transportation and Non-Motorized Section of the Engineering Division is performed a traffic signal removal study at the intersection of Hungerford Street and St. Joseph Street to determine if the traffic volumes currently meet the Michigan Manual of Uniform on Traffic Control Devices (MMUTCD) Traffic Signal Warrants. This study was conducted due to the reduction in traffic volumes at the intersection and to minimize delay and improve traffic flow on St. Joseph Street. At the same time, studies were carried out at the nearby intersections of Olds Avenue/Clare Street and Main Street and at Clare Street and St. Joseph Street. (See Figure1: Signal Removal Study Intersection Locations)

The intersection of Hungerford Street and St Joseph Street is under the jurisdiction of Ingham County Road Commission. This intersection is signalized and is controlled by the traffic signal controller at the intersection of Clare Street and St. Joseph Street. The Transportation Section of the Engineering Division does not have any records regarding the date of installation of the traffic signal.

St. Joseph Street extended from Pennsylvania Avenue to the west city limits and operated as a two-way road prior to the construction of Interstate I-496. When Interstate I-496 was constructed in the latter part of the 1960’s, St. Joseph Street and Main Street, which run parallel, were converted to a one-way pair. St Joseph Street currently operates as a one-way westbound from just west of Grand Avenue past the west city limits into Lansing Township. Main Street is currently a one-way eastbound roadway from west city limits to Pennsylvania Avenue. St. Joseph Street and Main Street act as service drives to I-496 between Pennsylvania Avenue and Lansing Road.

Hungerford Street operated as one-way southbound roadway prior to being converted to two-way operation. Currently, Hungerford Street operates as a two lane two-way street from Michigan Avenue to St Joseph Street. Hungerford Street is one way southbound between St Joseph Street and Main Street. South of Main Street, Hungerford Street becomes Main Street and is a four-lane two-way street that accesses Lansing Road.

**Intersection of Hungerford Street & St. Joseph Street**

St. Joseph Street is a westbound, one-way major arterial on the southern fringe of the city of Lansing’s Central Business District extending from the I-496 westbound off ramp to Grand Avenue past Lansing’s western city limits and into Lansing Township and Eaton County. St. Joseph Street is a one-way three–lane roadway as it approaches Hungerford Street. There is one thru/left turn lane (leading to the access ramp to Lansing Road, one thru lane, and one thru–right turn lane. Hungerford Street has one southbound approach lane at St. Joseph Street and has two one-way south bound lanes as it approaches Main Street.
The intersection of Hungerford Street & St. Joseph Street is approximately 375 feet north of the intersection of Hungerford Street and Main Street. The intersection of Hungerford Street and Main Street is currently controlled by all-way stops. The signalized intersection of Hungerford Street & St. Joseph Street is approximately 275 feet west of the Clare Street & St. Joseph Street intersection.

The Traffic Signal Warrants found in the Michigan Manual of Uniform Traffic Control Devices (MMUTCD) were used to evaluate the need for a traffic signal at the intersection of Hungerford Street and St. Joseph Street.

Section 4B of the MMUTCD outlines the advantages and disadvantages of traffic control signals and requires a traffic engineering study as the basis for installation or removal of traffic control signals. There are eight (8) traffic signals warrants that evaluate the need for a traffic control signal. These warrants were used to verify that traffic conditions at the intersection of Clare Street and Main Street continue to satisfy the requirements for traffic signal control. If changes in traffic patterns eliminate the need for a traffic control signal, consideration should be given to removing it and replacing it with appropriate alternative traffic control devices.

**Warrant 1, Eight-Hour Vehicular Volume**

The Minimum Vehicular Volumes, Condition A, is intended for application at locations where a large volume of intersecting traffic is the principal reason to consider installing a traffic control signal.

The Interruption of Continuous Traffic, Condition B, is intended for applications at locations where Condition A is not satisfied and where the traffic volume on a major street is so heavy that traffic on a minor intersecting street suffers excessive delay or conflict in entering or crossing the major street.

It is intended that Warrant 1 be treated as a single warrant. If Condition A is satisfied then the criteria for Warrant 1 is satisfied and Condition B and the combination of Condition A and Condition B are not needed. Similarly, if Condition B is satisfied, then the criteria for Warrant 1 is satisfied and Condition A and the combination of Condition A and Condition B are not needed.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Condition A – Minimum Vehicular Volume</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number of lanes for moving traffic on each approach</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Major Street</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 or more…</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 or more…</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 or more…</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 or more…</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Condition B – Minimum Vehicular Volume

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of lanes for moving traffic on each approach</th>
<th>Vehicular Volume (total of both approaches)</th>
<th>Vehicular Volume on higher-volume minor-street approach (one direction only)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Major Street</td>
<td>Minor Street</td>
<td>100%&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt; 80%&lt;sup&gt;b&lt;/sup&gt; 70%&lt;sup&gt;c&lt;/sup&gt; 56%&lt;sup&gt;d&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 or more...</td>
<td>1 or more...</td>
<td>750 600 525 420</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 or more...</td>
<td>1 or more...</td>
<td>900 720 630 504</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 or more...</td>
<td>2 or more...</td>
<td>900 720 630 504</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 or more...</td>
<td>2 or more...</td>
<td>750 600 525 420</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<sup>a</sup> Basic minimum hourly volume
<sup>b</sup> Used for combination of Condition A and B after adequate trial of other remedial measures
<sup>c</sup> May be used when major-street speed exceeds 40 mph or in an isolated community with a population less than 10,000
<sup>d</sup> May be used for a combination of Condition A and B after adequate trial of other remedial measures when major-street speed exceeds 40 mph or in an isolated community with a population less than 10,000

The following table summarizes the traffic volumes collected on the approaches to the intersections under study for traffic signal removal:

Intersection of Hungerford Street and St. Joseph Street Avenue:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hour</th>
<th>St. Joseph (WB)</th>
<th>Hungerford (SB)</th>
<th>Satisfies Condition A or B</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>01:00</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02:00</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>03:00</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>04:00</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>05:00</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>06:00</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>07:00</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>08:00</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>09:00</td>
<td>206</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10:00</td>
<td>208</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11:00</td>
<td>191</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12:00</td>
<td>204</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13:00</td>
<td>296</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14:00</td>
<td>276</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15:00</td>
<td>265</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16:00</td>
<td>281</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17:00</td>
<td>317</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18:00</td>
<td>337</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19:00</td>
<td>378</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20:00</td>
<td>202</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21:00</td>
<td>172</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22:00</td>
<td>144</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23:00</td>
<td>116</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24:00</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The existing traffic volumes at the intersection of Hungerford Street and St. Joseph Street do not satisfy Condition A or Condition B of Warrant for any hour of the average day. Additionally, the existing traffic volumes do not meet the combination of Condition A and Condition B, which allows 80% of the existing volumes to be used to determine if Warrant 1 is satisfied when neither Condition A or Condition B is met using 100% of the existing traffic volume.

**Warrant 2, Four-Hour Vehicular Volume**

The need for traffic signal control shall be considered if an engineering study finds that, for each of any four hours of an average day, the plotted points representing the vehicles per hour on the major street (total of both approaches) and the corresponding vehicles per hour on the higher volume minor-street approach (one direction only) all fall above the applicable curve in Figure 4C-1 of the MMUTCD for the existing combinations of approach lanes. On the minor street, the higher volume shall not be required to be on the same approach during each of these four hours.

The traffic volumes collected at this intersection do not meet Warrant 2, Four-Hour Vehicular Volume criteria for any hour of an average day at the intersection of Hungerford Street and St. Joseph Avenue. (See Appendix 1-2A)

**Warrant 3, Peak Hour Volume**

The Peak Hour Warrant is intended for use at a location where traffic conditions are such that for a minimum of one hour of an average day, the minor street suffers undue delay when entering or crossing the major street.

The need for traffic signal control shall be considered if an engineering study finds that the criteria in either of the following two categories are met:

A. If all three of the following conditions exist for the same 1 hour of an average day:

1. The total stopped time delay experienced by the traffic on one minor-street approach (one direction only) controlled by a Stop sign equals or exceeds : 4 vehicle-hours for a one-lane approach; or 5 vehicle-hours for a two-lane approach, and

2. The volume on the same minor-street approach (one direction only) equals or exceeds 100 vehicles per hour for one moving lane of traffic or 150 vehicles per hour for two moving lanes, and

3. The total entering volume serviced during the hour equals or exceeds 650 vehicles per hour for intersections with three approaches or 800 vehicles per hour for intersections with four or more approaches
B. The plotted point representing the vehicles per hour on the major street (total of both approaches) and the corresponding vehicles per hour on the higher-volume minor-street approach (one direction only) for 1 hour of an average day falls above the applicable curve in Figure 4C-3 of the MMUTCD for the existing combination of approach lanes.

A review of existing plotted traffic volumes at this intersection revealed that no plotted point fell above the graphed line for any hour of the average day. (See Appendix 1-3A)

The existing traffic volumes at the intersection of Hungerford Street and St. Joseph Street do not meet the criteria of the Warrant 3, Peak Hour Warrant.

**Warrant 4, Pedestrian Volume**

The pedestrian activity at the intersection of the Hungerford Street and St. Joseph Street intersection was reviewed and was almost non-existent due to the lack of a contiguous pedestrian network.

Based on the lack of pedestrian activity at the intersection of Hungerford Street and St. Joseph Street Warrant 4, Pedestrian Volume has not been satisfied.

**Warrant 5, School Crossing**

The School Crossing Warrant does not apply because the intersection of Hungerford Street and St. Joseph Street does not serve as a school crossing nor has it been identified as a school pedestrian walking route.

**Warrant 6, Coordinated Signal System**

The Coordinated Signal System Warrant would not be applicable if the traffic signals at all three intersections, Hungerford Street and St. Joseph Street, Clare Street and St Joseph Street, and Clare Street/Olds Avenue & Main Street are approved for removal.

**Warrant 7, Crash Experience**

The need for a Traffic Control Signal shall be considered if an engineering study finds that all of the following criteria are met:

A. Adequate trial of alternatives with satisfactory observance and enforcement has failed to reduce the crash frequency; and

B. Five or more reported crashes, of types susceptible to correction by a traffic control signal, have occurred within a 12-month period, each crash
involving personal injury or property damage apparently exceeding the applicable requirements for a reportable crash; and

C. For each of any 8 hours of an average day, the vehicles per hour (vph) given in both the 80 percent columns of condition A in Table 4C-1 (see MMUTCD Section 4C.02), or the vph in both of the 80 percent columns of Condition B in Table 4C-1 exists on the major-street and the high-volume minor street approach, respectively, to the intersection, or the volume of pedestrian traffic is not less than 80 percent of the requirements in the Pedestrian Volume warrant. These major-street and minor-street volumes shall be on the same approach for during each of the 8 hours.

A review of reported traffic crash data for last five years (2006 – 2010) at the intersection of Clare Street/Old Avenue & Main Street does not indicate significant crash experience. These data are summarized in the following table:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Crash Totals</th>
<th>Correctable Crashes*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0 (0 injury)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0 (0 injury)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1 (0 injury)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0 (0 injury)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0 (0 injury)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1 (0 injury)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Potentially Correctable Accidents by Traffic Signal Installation

There has been no 12 month period within this five year period where there have been 5 or more reported accidents at this intersection.

Warrant 8, Roadway Network

This warrant applies to an intersection of two major routes. The intersection of Hungerford Street and St. Joseph Street does not satisfy this designation.

Field Evaluation:

Since none of the warrants for traffic signal control are met at this intersection, the existing traffic signal at the intersection Hungerford Street and St. Joseph Street was switched from the current stop and go operation to flashing operations for a trial period of 60 to 90 days to determine if traffic operations at the intersection are affected. During the evaluation period, the signals flashed yellow on St. Joseph Street and red on Hungerford Street. Stop signs were installed on Hungerford Street for southbound traffic.
During the trial period, staff reviewed traffic operations to determine the effect of the change in intersection operations and at the end of the trial period, traffic volumes and speeds were collected.

City staff observed traffic operations at the signalized intersections of Malcolm X Street/Clare Street, St. Joseph Street/Clare Street and St. Joseph Street/Hungerford Street. Observations were conducted while the signals at the intersections mentioned above were in full operation and while they were in flash mode. During flash mode the signals were flashing all-way red at Malcolm X Street/Clare Street and flashing amber along St. Joseph Street at Clare Street and at Hungerford Street. The side streets along St. Joseph Street, Clare Street and Hungerford Street, were flashing red. Below is summary of the findings.

**Observations during full signal operation (Red, Amber, Green):**
- Side street traffic encountered excessive delay when traffic on St. Joseph Street and Malcolm X Street was minimal or not present.
- Significant backup for westbound St. Joseph Street occurred during the peak hour when little side street traffic was present.
- Line of sight between side-street and main street traffic is not required since the intersection is signalized.

**Observations during when signal operating in flash mode:**
- Traffic queues along St. Joseph Street were eliminated
- Westbound traffic is virtually unimpeded.
- Adequate gaps in vehicle traffic exist to accommodate entry across and onto St Joseph Street from the side streets.
- Sight distance is adequate for side street traffic.
- There is minimal delay to side street traffic.
- Traffic at the all-way stop at Malcolm X Street/Clare Street/Olds was organized and flowed very well.

**Recommendations:**
The City of Lansing’s Transportation and Non-Motorized Section received one concern regarding line-of-sight. This concern was that it is difficult for a southbound motorist in a passenger vehicle to see westbound traffic when stopped at the stop bar on Clare Street at St. Joseph Street. Staff conducted a site investigation and determined that the sight obstruction was due to the railroad cabinet in the northeast quadrant of the intersection and could be resolved by relocating the stop bar closer to the intersection.

Based on the observations and little to no public concern, the Transportation and Non-Motorized Section recommends the removal of the traffic signals at Malcolm X Street/Clare Street, St. Joseph Street/Clare Street and St Joseph Street/ Hungerford Street. Stop signs shall be permanently placed on the Clare Street
Traffic Signal Removal Study: Hungerford Street and St. Joseph Street

and on the Hungerford Street approaches to St Joseph Street. The intersection of Malcolm X Street/Clare Street/Olds should be permanently signed as an all-way stop.

This report will be sent to the Ingham County Department of Transportation and Roads and Lansing Township for their review and action.
Figure 1: Signal Removal Study Intersection Locations
Warrant 2 - Four-Hour Vehicular Volumes

The Four Hour Volume Warrant is satisfied when each of any four hours of an average day plotted on a chart for the major street (both directions) and the higher volume of one direction of the minor street all fall above the curve in Figure 4C-1 of MMUTCD.

The charts below are for the major street and the minor street.

Figure 4C-2 may be used if the 85th percentile speed of the major street exceeds 40 mph or when the intersection lies within the built-up area of an isolated community having a population less than 10,000.

Can the Four Hour Volume Warrant be used?  Yes
Is Four Hour Volume Warrant met?  No
Appendix 1-3A: Hungerford Street and St. Joseph Street

Michigan Manual of Uniform Traffic Control Devices
Worksheet for Signal Warrants (Section 4C)
Prepared by Parsons Brinckerhoff for the 2005 Edition of the MMUTCD

Intersection: ST JOSEPH ST AND HUNGERFORD ST
City: LANSING

Warrant 3B - Peak Hour

The peak hour volume warrant is also intended for application when traffic conditions are such that for one hour of the day minor street traffic suffers undue traffic delay in entering or crossing the main street.

The peak hour volume warrant is satisfied when the plotted point representing vehicles per hour on the higher volume minor street for one hour falls above the curve in Figure 4C-3.

Figure 4C-4 may be used if the 85th percentile speed of the major street exceeds 40 mph or when the intersection lies within a built-up area of an isolated community having a population less than 10,000.

Warrant 3 cannot be used because of Peak Hour Delay requirements.

(see Warrant 3A for more details).

Can the Peak Hour Volume Warrant be used? Yes
Is Peak Hour Volume Warrant Met? No
Agenda Item 4h

MEMORANDUM

TO: County Services and Finance Committees

FROM: Robert Peterson, Director of Engineering
       Road Department

DATE: March 27, 2014

SUBJECT: 2014 – 2015 As-Needed Construction Inspection and Supervision Services

The Ingham County Purchasing Department solicited proposals from Michigan Department of Transportation (MDOT) prequalified and experienced engineering firms to provide inspection and supervision services for construction on an as-needed basis.

Generally, the inspection and supervision services are to include as-needed full-time or part-time staffing to perform field or office construction technician services normally associated with the inspection and supervision of Ingham County Road Department (ICRD) federal-aid road and/or bridge construction projects within the public road rights-of-way in Ingham County, Michigan.

The Purchasing Department advertised for the inspection and supervision services and received four (4) proposals. ICRD and Purchasing Department staff reviewed the proposals for adherence to county purchasing requirements, proposed scope of work, similar project experience, and overall value to the county. Both ICRD and Purchasing Department staff agree to recommend that RS Engineering, LLC of Lansing, Michigan, be retained to provide the requested inspection and supervision services. Their hourly rate for the as-needed, MDOT prequalified, services was lower than the other respondents.

I respectfully recommend that the Board of Commissioners adopt the attached resolution and accept the inspection and supervision services proposal from RS Engineering, LLC.
MEMORANDUM

TO: County Service and Finance Committees
FROM: Jim Hudgins, Director, Purchasing Department
DATE: March 27, 2014
SUBJECT: Proposal Summary for 2014 and 2015 As-Needed Construction Inspection and Supervision Services

Project Description:
Inspection and supervision services including as-needed, full-time or part-time staffing to perform field or office construction technician services normally associated with the inspection and supervision of Ingham County Road Department (ICRD) federal-aid road and/or bridge construction projects within the public road rights-of-way in Ingham County, Michigan.

Proposal Summary:
Vendors contacted: 18 Local: 3
Vendors responding: 4 Local: 2

Other vendors not responding:
Tetra Tech, Inc., 123 Brighton Lake Road, Suite 203, Brighton, MI 48116
Reason: Current workload and lack of capacity to provide the services as requested.

Parsons Brinckerhoff, 6011 W. St. Joseph Highway, Suite 400, Lansing, MI 48917
Reason: Our work load is such that all of our staff is currently working on full consulting engineer contracts limiting our flexibility and availability for on-call contracts at this time.

Recommendation:
The Evaluation Committee recommends awarding the contract to RS Engineering, a DBE (Disadvantaged Business Enterprises, which includes Minority Business Enterprises, Women Business Enterprises, and other entities defined as socially and/or economically disadvantaged) who submitted the lowest responsive proposal. Their costs are outlined in the grid on the following page.

In addition to submitting a responsive proposal RS Engineering is a prequalified Michigan Department of Transportation vendor for this type of work, and has other relevant experience working on projects of similar size and scope.

Advertisement:
The RFP was advertised in the Lansing State Journal, the Michigan Infrastructure and Transportation Association (MI-ITA) & MI-ITA DBE websites and posted on the Purchasing Department Web Page.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Vendor Name</th>
<th>Office Technician ($/Hr.)</th>
<th>Inspection Technician ($/Hr.)</th>
<th>Transportation Cost</th>
<th>Local</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DLZ Michigan, Inc</td>
<td>$70.00</td>
<td>$78.00</td>
<td>These rates include all transportation and normal inspection equipment expenses, computer expenses and overhead.</td>
<td>Yes, Lansing MI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RS Engineering, LLC</td>
<td>$53.60 ($57.73)</td>
<td>$50.41 ($54.54)</td>
<td>.66/mile - Transportation costs will be billed from our office (915 Centennial Way, Suite 380, Lansing, MI) to the assigned job site, unless the assigned staff member lives closer to the job-site. If that is the case, transportation costs will be billed from the worker's home to the job-site.</td>
<td>No, Eaton County (Lansing)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spalding DeDecker Associates</td>
<td>$80.00</td>
<td>$75.00</td>
<td>These rates include all expenses and overhead, including transportation and normal inspection equipment expenses and computer expenses.</td>
<td>No, Rochester Hills MI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Mannik Smith Group</td>
<td>$58.00 ($60.81)</td>
<td>$63.00 ($65.81)</td>
<td>.45/mile - Mileage will be billed from our Lansing office or the Field inspectors home. It will be determined by the location closer to the project site.</td>
<td>Yes, Lansing MI</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Mileage Note:** If we assume that the $0.66/mile charge for RS Engineering is applied to an average of 50 miles traveled per 8 hour day, the billing rate would work out to be $57.73 per hour for the Office Technician and $54.54 for the Inspection Technician (shown above in parentheses). If we assume that the $0.45/mile charge for Mannik Smith is applied to an average of 50 miles traveled per 8 hour day, the billing rate would work out to be $57.73 per hour for the Office Technician and
WHEREAS, the Ingham County Purchasing Department solicited proposals from Michigan Department of Transportation (MDOT) prequalified and experienced engineering firms to provide inspection and supervision services for construction on an as-needed basis; and

WHEREAS, the Purchasing Department advertised for the inspection and supervision services and received four (4) proposals; and

WHEREAS, Road Department and Purchasing Department staff reviewed the proposals for adherence to county purchasing requirements, proposed scope of work, similar project experience, and overall value to the county; and

WHEREAS, the Road Department and Purchasing Department staff jointly recommend that the Board of Commissioners authorize an inspection and supervision services contract with RS Engineering, LLC because their hourly rate for the as-needed services were lower than the other respondents.

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED, that the Ingham County Board of Commissioners authorizes entering into a contract with RS Engineering, LLC, 915 Centennial Way, Suite 380, Lansing, Michigan, based on its proposal dated March 5, 2014, for 2014 – 2015 As-Needed Construction Inspection and Supervision Services for the unit prices illustrated below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Vendor Name</th>
<th>Office Technician ($/Hr.)</th>
<th>Inspection Technician ($/Hr.)</th>
<th>Transportation Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>RS Engineering, LLC</td>
<td>$53.60 ($57.73)</td>
<td>$50.41 ($54.54)</td>
<td>$0.66/mile - transportation costs will be billed from their office to the assigned job site, unless the assigned staff member lives closer to the job site. If that is the case, transportation costs will be billed from the worker's home to the job site.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Mileage Note: If we assume that the $0.66/mile charge for RS Engineering is applied to an average of 50 miles traveled per 8 hour day, the billing rate would work out to be $57.73 per hour for the Office Technician and $54.54 for the Inspection (shown above in parentheses).

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that the Chairperson of the Ingham County Board of Commissioners is hereby authorized to sign any necessary contract documents, on behalf of the County, after approved as to form by the County Attorney.
MEMORANDUM

To: County Services & Finance Committees

From: William Conklin, Managing Director
Road Department

Date: March 27, 2014

RE: PROPOSED RESOLUTION AUTHORIZING AND ENDORSING SUBMISSION OF GRANT APPLICATIONS UNDER BOTH THE USDOT TIGER FY 2014 AND THE MDOT TEDF-A PROGRAMS FOR THE RECONSTRUCTION OF CEDAR STREET FROM US-127 TO HOLBROOK DRIVE IN ALAIEDON AND DELHI TOWNSHIPS

Cedar Street, from US-127 to Holbrook Drive in Alaiedon and Delhi Townships, is in very poor condition, as you probably have experienced, and needs to be reconstructed to a modern boulevard or divided highway having a wider median with uni-directional channelized turn-arounds and other geometric improvements for improved traffic safety and mobility.

Dart Container Company, on Cedar Street just northwest of US-127, is currently expanding its container manufacturing plant and operations including the planned addition of at least 300 permanent jobs currently and possibly additional jobs in the future. It also the desire of Delhi and Alaiedon Townships for additional business and job growth to occur along the Cedar Street business corridor.

It also the desire of Delhi and Alaiedon Townships, City of Manson and other communities to construct a currently non-existent link in the area’s non-motorized, multi-use path system between Mason and Delhi Township.

The Road Department therefore recommends to reconstruct Cedar Street from U.S.-127 to Holbrook Drive in Alaiedon and Delhi Townships, a distance of approximately 3.5 miles, as a modern boulevard or divided highway having a wider median with uni-directional channelized turn-arounds, other geometric improvements, and a non-motorized, multi-use path throughout one side of the Cedar Street road corridor.

The estimated cost of the proposed Cedar Street reconstruction and non-motorized path project is estimated at approximately $15 million total. The road department does not have sufficient funding to undertake such a large project without additional funding in the form of various, available, special state and federal grants.

The U.S. Consolidated Appropriations Act, 2014 (pub. L. 113-76, January 17, 2014) appropriated $600 million to be awarded by the U.S. Department of Transportation (USDOT) in FY 2014 for National Infrastructure Investments in a program to be known as the Transportation Investment Generating Economic Recovery Discretionary Grants program for FY 2014 (TIGER FY 2014).
The Road department is also applying for a Transportation Economic Development Fund (TEDF), Category A (transportation projects supporting new job growth in Michigan) grant (TEDF-A) from the Michigan Department of Transportation (MDOT) to partially fund the proposed Cedar Street reconstruction project in conjunction with the Dart job expansion, and to provide the required minimum 20% match funding for the aforementioned federal TIGER FY 2014 grant.

Delhi Township had previously applied for a TIGER grant for a portion of the Cedar Street project in 2009, but this previous TIGER grant was not awarded to Cedar Street.

Both Alaiedon and Delhi Townships support current applications for both USDOT TIGER FY 2014 and MDOT TEDF-A grants for the currently proposed Cedar Street project, and County Road Advisory Board, per a motion unanimously passed at its March 26, 2014 meeting also supports current applications under both programs for reconstructing Cedar Street and building an adjacent non-motorized path.

Therefore, Board of Commissioners approval of the attached resolution to this effect is recommended.
RESOLUTION AUTHORIZING AND ENDORSING SUBMISSION OF GRANT APPLICATIONS UNDER BOTH THE USDOT TIGER FY 2014 AND THE MDOT TEDF-A PROGRAMS FOR THE RECONSTRUCTION OF CEDAR STREET FROM US-127 TO HOLBROOK DRIVE IN ALAIEDON AND DELHI TOWNSHIPS, INGHAM COUNTY, MICHIGAN FOR THE INGHAM COUNTY ROAD DEPARTMENT

WHEREAS, Cedar Street from US-127 to Holbrook Drive in Alaiedon and Delhi Townships, Ingham County, Michigan, is in very poor condition and needs to be reconstructed to a modern boulevard or divided highway having a wider median with uni-directional channelized turn-arounds and other geometric improvements for improved traffic safety and mobility; and

WHEREAS, the aforementioned Cedar Street corridor supports Dart Container Manufacturing Company located on Cedar Street, Mason, Michigan, approximately one half mile northwest of US-127, and many other small businesses located through-out its approximately 3.5 mile length between the City of Mason and Delhi Township; and

WHEREAS, Dart Container Company is currently expanding its aforementioned container manufacturing plant and operations including the planned addition of at least 300 permanent jobs currently and possibly additional jobs in the future; and

WHEREAS, it also the desire of Delhi and Alaiedon Townships, and Ingham County for additional business and job growth to occur along the aforementioned Cedar Street corridor; and

WHEREAS, it also the desire of Delhi and Alaiedon Townships, City of Manson, Ingham County, and other included communities to construct a currently non-existent link in the area’s non-motorized, multi-use path system between the City of Mason and Delhi Township; and

WHEREAS, the Ingham County Road Department (ICRD) therefore recommends to reconstruct Cedar Street from US-127 to Holbrook Drive in Alaiedon and Delhi Townships, Ingham County, MI, a distance of approximately 3.5 miles, as a modern boulevard or divided highway having a wider median with uni-directional channelized turn-arounds, other geometric improvements, and a non-motorized, multi-use path throughout one side of the Cedar Street road corridor; and

WHEREAS, the estimated cost of the aforementioned Cedar Street reconstruction and non-motorized path project is estimated at approximately $15 million total; and

WHEREAS, ICRD does not have sufficient funding to undertake such a large project without additional funding in the form of various, available, special state and federal grants; and

WHEREAS, the U.S. Consolidated Appropriations Act, 2014 (pub. L. 113-76, January 17, 2014) appropriated $600 million to be awarded by the U.S. Department of Transportation (USDOT) in FY 2014 for National Infrastructure Investments in a program to be known as the Transportation Investment Generating Economic Recovery Discretionary Grants program for FY 2014 (TIGER FY 2014); and
WHEREAS, ICRD is also applying for a Transportation Economic Development Fund (TEDF), Category A (transportation projects supporting new job growth in Michigan) grant (TEDF-A) from the Michigan Department of Transportation (MDOT) to partially fund the aforementioned Cedar Street reconstruction project in conjunction with the aforementioned Dart Container Company job expansion, and to provide the required minimum 20% match funding for the aforementioned federal TIGER FY 2014 grant; and

WHEREAS, Delhi Township had previously applied for a TIGER grant for a portion of the Cedar Street project in 2009, but said previous TIGER grant was not awarded to this project; and

WHEREAS, both Alaiedon and Delhi Townships support a current application for both USDOT TIGER FY 2014 and MDOT TEDF-A grants for the aforementioned, currently proposed Cedar Street project; and

WHEREAS, the Ingham County Road Advisory Board, per a motion unanimously passed at its March 26, 2014 meeting also supports current applications for both USDOT TIGER and MDOT TEDF-A grants for the aforementioned, currently proposed Cedar Street project.

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED, that the Ingham County Board of Commissioners authorizes ICRD to apply for both USDOT TIGER FY 2014 and MDOT TEDF-A grants for the aforementioned, currently proposed Cedar Street project.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that the Ingham County Board of Commissioners hereby endorses both above authorized grant applications.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that the ICRD Managing Director is hereby authorized to execute, sign and submit any necessary, related grant application documents consistent with this resolution on behalf of Ingham County.
MEMORANDUM

To: County Services & Finance Committees
From: William Conklin, Managing Director
        Road Department
Date: March 31, 2014

RE: PROPOSED RESOLUTION AUTHORIZING AND ENDORSING SUBMISSION OF A GRANT APPLICATION UNDER THE MDOT TEDF-A PROGRAM FOR VARIOUS ROAD IMPROVEMENTS RELATING TO THE EXPANSION OF THE JACKSON NATIONAL LIFE INSURANCE OFFICE IN ALAIEDON TOWNSHIP, INGHAM COUNTY, MICHIGAN FOR THE INGHAM COUNTY ROAD DEPARTMENT

Jackson National Life Insurance Company (JNL) has announced that it is expanding its office complex in Alaiedon Township, and adding up to 1000 new permanent jobs at this location over the next several years. JNL commissioned a traffic engineering study that was done to determine what road improvements would be recommended to accommodate the additional traffic expected to be generated by the additional employment at the JNL office. The traffic study was completed and the recommendation is to construct the various road improvements shown on the attached map.

The estimated costs of the recommended improvements with necessary engineering and right of way acquisition are as follows:

- All work south of I-96: $3,986,450
- Jolly-Okemos Roads intersection widening: $1,142,700

To fund the recommended improvements, Ingham County Road Department (ICRD) staff submitted a letter of interest for, and the Michigan Department of Transportation (MDOT) has offered, a Transportation Economic Development Fund (TEDF), Category A (transportation projects supporting new job growth in Michigan) grant (TEDF-A). A TEDF-A grant typically provides up to 20% of an approved project’s cost. Engineering and any necessary right of way (ROW) acquisition are counted as “soft” match towards these grants such that the grant typically provides most, if not all, of the construction funding.

JNL has agreed to fund the necessary engineering and right of way acquisition for the portion of the improvements south of I-96 except for the local match on proposed project item 5, increasing the vehicle storage on the EB I-96 off ramp. This funding will count as the required local match on the MDOT TEDF-A grant for the improvements south of I-96, except for project item 5. MDOT will provide the local match on project item 5.

Other federal road funding, which would be allocated to Ingham County per the Tri-County Regional Planning Commission (TCRPC) process, could fund the local match on the recommended improvements at the Jolly-Okemos Roads intersection, subject to the TCRPC process, with engineering to be provided by ICRD.
To share information about this possible project, and to obtain their input, ICRD invited all business and/or property owners within the limits of the recommended improvements at the Jolly-Okemos Roads intersection, and officials from both Meridian and Alaiedon Townships to attend an informational meeting held on February 24, 2014, to see the concept plans for all of the recommended improvements.

Alaiedon Township through its Supervisor Steven Lott has indicated Alaiedon Township supports all of the recommended improvements.

The Meridian Township Board of Trustees plans to discuss whether or not they will support the recommended improvements at the Jolly-Okemos Roads intersection, or a portion thereof, at their regular meeting of April 15, 2014, for which they also plan to again invite all business and/or property owners within the limits of the recommended improvements at the Jolly-Okemos Roads intersection to attend and share whether these owners support all or part of the proposed project, or whether it is felt the impacts of widening are not worth the traffic improvement benefits the project would offer. If Meridian Township and/or the involved business owners do not support all or any of the Jolly-Okemos improvements, this portion of the project and grant application would be truncated accordingly.

Also, the Ingham County Road Advisory Board, per a motion unanimously passed at its March 26, 2014, meeting supports application for a MDOT TEDF-A grant for the aforementioned, recommended improvements.

ICRD staff therefore recommends Ingham County Board of Commissioners approval of the attached proposed resolution to this effect.
Introduced by the County Services and Finance Committees of the:

INGHAM COUNTY BOARD OF COMMISSIONERS

RESOLUTION AUTHORIZING AND ENDORSING SUBMISSION OF A GRANT APPLICATION UNDER THE MDOT TEDF-A PROGRAM FOR VARIOUS ROAD IMPROVEMENTS RELATING TO THE EXPANSION OF THE JACKSON NATIONAL LIFE INSURANCE OFFICE IN ALAIEDON TOWNSHIP, INGHAM COUNTY, MICHIGAN FOR THE INGHAM COUNTY ROAD DEPARTMENT

WHEREAS, Jackson National Life Insurance Company (JNL) has announced that it is expanding its office complex in Alaiedon Township, and adding up to 1000 new permanent jobs at this location over the next several years; and

WHEREAS, JNL commissioned a traffic engineering study that was done to determine what road improvements would be recommended to accommodate the additional traffic expected to be generated by the additional employment at the JNL office; and

WHEREAS, the aforementioned traffic study was completed and the recommendation is to construct the various road improvements shown on the attached map; and

WHEREAS, the estimated costs of the recommended improvements with necessary engineering and right of way acquisition are as follows:

- All work south of I-96: $3,986,450
- Jolly-Okemos Roads intersection widening: $1,142,700

WHEREAS, Ingham County Road Department (ICRD) staff has submitted a letter of interest for, and the Michigan Department of Transportation (MDOT) has offered, a Transportation Economic Development Fund (TEDF), Category A (transportation projects supporting new job growth in Michigan) grant (TEDF-A) to partially fund the recommended road improvements; and

WHEREAS, JNL has agreed to fund necessary engineering and right of way acquisition for the portion of the aforementioned improvements south of I-96 except for the local match on proposed project item 5, increasing the vehicle storage on the EB I-96 off ramp, which funding will count as the required local match on the MDOT TEDF-A grant for the improvements south of I-96 except for project item 5; and

WHEREAS MDOT will provide the local match on project item 5, increasing the vehicle storage on the EB I-96 off ramp; and

WHEREAS, the aforementioned MDOT TEDF-A grant and other federal road funding, which would be allocated to Ingham County per the Tri-County Regional Planning Commission (TCRPC) process, could fund the recommended improvements at the Jolly-Okemos Roads intersection, subject to the TCRPC process, with engineering to be provided by ICRD; and

WHEREAS, all business and/or property owners within the limits of the recommended improvements at the Jolly-Okemos Roads intersection, and officials from both Meridian and Alaiedon Townships were invited to attend an informational meeting held on February 24, 2014, to see the concept plans for all of the recommended improvements; and
WHEREAS, Alaiedon Township through its Supervisor Steven Lott has indicated Alaiedon Township supports all of the recommended improvements; and

WHEREAS, the Meridian Township Board of Trustees plans to discuss whether or not they will support the recommended improvements at the Jolly-Okemos Roads intersection, or a portion thereof, at their regular meeting of April 15, 2014, for which they also plan to again invite all business and/or property owners within the limits of the recommended improvements at the Jolly-Okemos Roads intersection to attend and share whether these owners support the proposed project; and

WHEREAS, the Ingham County Road Advisory Board, per a motion unanimously passed at its March 26, 2014, meeting supports application for a MDOT TEDF-A grant for the aforementioned, recommended improvements; and

WHEREAS, ICRD staff therefore recommends Ingham County Board of Commissioners approval of applying for the MDOT TEDF-A grants for all of the recommended improvements, except ICRD recommends support for the Jolly-Okemos Roads recommended improvements, or a portion thereof, subject to Meridian Township’s passage of a resolution of support for the same.

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED, that the Ingham County Board of Commissioners authorizes ICRD to apply for MDOT TEDF-A grants for the aforementioned, recommended improvements.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that the Ingham County Board of Commissioners hereby endorses the above authorized grant applications.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that the ICRD Managing Director is hereby authorized to execute, sign and submit any necessary, related grant application documents consistent with this resolution on behalf of Ingham County.
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MEMORANDUM

To: County Services Committee

From: William Conklin, Managing Director
      Road Department

Date: March 27, 2014

RE: Recommendation to Change Vehicle Weight Class of Williamston Road, Baseline to Fitchburg Roads, Bunker Hill Township.

Under section 722 of the Michigan Vehicle Code, MCL 257.722, truck weights are regulated by limiting the weight per axle imposed on the roadway for various axle configurations. This section of law also allows road agencies to reduce the normal legal axle weights in the spring months when thaw is occurring and road beds are more susceptible to vehicle weight damage. This is known as spring weight restrictions. It is due to the road base being saturated and thus weakened by thawed moisture being trapped in the base by underlying and/or adjacent frost in the process of thawing.

Having been built to withstand varying vehicle loadings based on expected usage, roads are divided into three classes for spring weight restrictions—Class B, 35% legal axle weight reduction; Class A, 25% reduction; and All-season, no legal axle weight reduction. MCL 257.722 also allows local road authorities to designate roads in the above classifications as deemed appropriate. It is desirable to have truck routes be consistently all-season through-out the route if possible in order to avoid disrupting trucking activity during the spring months.

Currently Williamston Road is designated All-season nearly through-out Ingham County, from Fitchburg Road to Haslett Road including through Dansville, an interchange with I-96, and the City of Williamston. Between Fitchburg and Baseline roads Williamston Road is currently designated Class A, and thus has 25% spring weight restrictions. South of Baseline Road, the county line with Jackson County, Williamston Road connects with Jackson County’s Bunker Hill Road which is also All-season, and in turn connects with state highway M-106 leading to the City of Jackson. Thus re-designating Williamston Road, Baseline to Fitchburg Roads as All-season would complete an otherwise complete all-season truck route between the cities of Williamston and Jackson.

Re-designating Williamston Road, Baseline to Fitchburg Roads as All-season to complete this unrestricted truck route has been requested by Gene Ulrey, Supervisor of Bunker Hill Township, and has been recommended for approval by a motion of the County Road Advisory Board at its March 26, 2014, meeting. Thus approval of the attached resolution to this effect is recommended to the Board of Commissioners.
Introduced by the County Services Committee of the:

INGHAM COUNTY BOARD OF COMMISSIONERS

RESOLUTION TO AUTHORIZE THE REDESIGNATION OF WILLIAMSTON ROAD BETWEEN BASELINE AND FITCHBURG ROADS, BUNKER HILL TOWNSHIP, FROM CLASS A TO ALL-SEASON

WHEREAS, section 722 of the Michigan Vehicle Code, MCL 257.722, regulates truck weights by limiting the weight per axle imposed on the roadway for various axle configurations, and allows road agencies to reduce the normal legal axle weights in the spring months when thaw is occurring and road beds are more susceptible to vehicle weight damage; and

WHEREAS, having been built to withstand varying vehicle loadings based on expected usage, roads are divided into three classes for spring weight restrictions—Class B, 35% legal axle weight reduction; Class A, 25% reduction; and All-season, no legal axle weight reduction; and

WHEREAS, MCL 257.722 also allows local road authorities to designate roads in the above classifications as deemed appropriate; and

WHEREAS, to avoid disrupting trucking activity on higher truck volume roads during the spring months, it is desirable to have truck routes be consistently All-season through-out the route; and

WHEREAS, currently Williamston Road is designated All-season through-out Ingham County, from Fitchburg Road to Haslett Road including through the Village of Dansville, an interchange with I-96, and the City of Williamston, but between Fitchburg and Baseline Roads, in Bunker Hill Township, Williamston Road is currently designated Class A, and thus has 25% spring weight restrictions; and

WHEREAS, south of Baseline Road, the county line with Jackson County, Williamston Road connects with Jackson County’s Bunker Hill Road which is also All-season, which in turn connects with state highway M-106 leading to the City of Jackson; and

WHEREAS, thus re-designating Williamston Road, Baseline to Fitchburg Roads, as All-season would complete an otherwise complete All-season truck route between the cities of Williamston and Jackson; and

WHEREAS, re-designating Williamston Road, Baseline to Fitchburg Roads as All-season to complete this unrestricted truck route has been requested by Gene Ulrey, Supervisor of Bunker Hill Township; and

WHEREAS, re-designating Williamston Road, Baseline to Fitchburg Roads, as All-season has been recommended for approval by a motion of the County Road Advisory Board at its March 26, 2014, meeting.

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED, that the Ingham County Board of Commissioners authorizes re-designating Williamston Road, Baseline to Fitchburg Roads as All-season.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, the Road Department is authorized to show Williamston Road, Baseline to Fitchburg Roads, as All-season on the next printing of the Ingham County Truck Operator’s Map.
Introduce by the County Services Committee of the:

INGHAM COUNTY BOARD OF COMMISSIONERS

RESOLUTION TO APPROVE THE SPECIAL AND ROUTINE PERMITS FOR THE INGHAM COUNTY ROAD DEPARTMENT

WHEREAS, as of July 23, 2013, the Ingham County Department of Transportation and Roads became the Ingham County Road Department per Resolution #13-289; and

WHEREAS, the Ingham County Road Commission periodically approved Special and Routine permits as part of their roles and responsibilities; and

WHEREAS, this is now the responsibility of the Board of Commissioners to approve these permits as necessary.

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED, that the Ingham County Board of Commissioners approves the attached list of Special and Routine Permits dated March 27, 2014 as submitted.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>R/W PERMIT#</th>
<th>R/W APPLICANT/CONTRACTOR</th>
<th>R/W WORK</th>
<th>R/W LOCATION</th>
<th>R/W CITY/TWP.</th>
<th>R/W SECTION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2014-081</td>
<td>WOLVERINE PIPE LINE CO</td>
<td>ANNUAL BLANKET</td>
<td>VARIOUS</td>
<td>VARIOUS</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014-082</td>
<td>NORMAN &amp; JOYCE RECTOR</td>
<td>LAND DIVISION</td>
<td>FROST RD BET MERIDIAN RD AND BURKLEY RD</td>
<td>WHEATFIELD</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014-084</td>
<td>ENBRIDGE ENERGY CORP</td>
<td>COMMERCIAL DR</td>
<td>MT PLEASANT RD BET DEXTER TR &amp; SWAN RD</td>
<td>STOCKBRIDGE</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014-085</td>
<td>FERRIS &amp; SONS MILK HAULING</td>
<td>HAUL ROUTE/MILK</td>
<td>VARIOUS</td>
<td>VARIOUS</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014-089</td>
<td>COMCAST</td>
<td>CABLE / UG</td>
<td>PINE TREE RD BET DEVELOPMENT DR &amp; ENGLISH OAK DR</td>
<td>DELHI</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014-090</td>
<td>COMCAST</td>
<td>CABLE / UG</td>
<td>ST JOSEPH HWY BET WAVERLY RD &amp; CLEMENT RD</td>
<td>LANSING</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014-091</td>
<td>COMCAST</td>
<td>CABLE / UG</td>
<td>PINE TREE RD &amp; DEVELOPMENT DR</td>
<td>DELHI</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014-092</td>
<td>KEISER TRUCKING LLC</td>
<td>AGRICULTURAL MULTIPLE MOVE</td>
<td>VARIOUS</td>
<td>VARIOUS</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014-093</td>
<td>MDOT</td>
<td>DETOUR</td>
<td>VARIOUS</td>
<td>VARIOUS</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014-094</td>
<td>ROBERT COOLEY TRUCKING LLC</td>
<td>HAUL ROUTE/MILK</td>
<td>VARIOUS</td>
<td>VARIOUS</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014-095</td>
<td>LANSING BOARD OF WATER &amp; LIGHT</td>
<td>WATERMAIN/DETOUR</td>
<td>WAVERLY RD BET WILLOW ST &amp; GRAND RIVER AVE</td>
<td>LANSING</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014-096</td>
<td>MERIDIAN CHARTER TOWNSHIP</td>
<td>ROAD CLOSURE / SPECIAL EVENT</td>
<td>VARIOUS</td>
<td>MERIDIAN</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014-097</td>
<td>ENBRIDGE ENERGY</td>
<td>MISCELLANEOUS</td>
<td>VARIOUS</td>
<td>VARIOUS</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014-098</td>
<td>SMALLEY FARMS</td>
<td>AGRICULTURAL MULTIPLE MOVE</td>
<td>BRAY RD</td>
<td>WHEATFIELD</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014-100</td>
<td>MERIDIAN CHARTER TOWNSHIP</td>
<td>MISCELLANEOUS</td>
<td>VARIOUS</td>
<td>MERIDIAN</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014-101</td>
<td>AT &amp; T</td>
<td>CABLE / UG</td>
<td>HAGADORN RD &amp; HOWELL RD</td>
<td>ALAIEDON</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014-102</td>
<td>FRONTIER</td>
<td>CABLE / UG</td>
<td>ZIMMER RD BET GERMANY RD &amp; SHERWOOD RD</td>
<td>WILLIAMSTOWN</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014-103</td>
<td>CONSUMERS ENERGY</td>
<td>GAS</td>
<td>CATHERINE ST &amp; MICHIGAN AVE</td>
<td>LANSING</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014-104</td>
<td>CONSUMERS ENERGY</td>
<td>GAS</td>
<td>SNOWGLEN LN &amp; RAVENSWOOD DR</td>
<td>LANSING</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014-105</td>
<td>CONSUMERS ENERGY</td>
<td>GAS</td>
<td>CHARLES ST &amp; KALAMAZOO ST</td>
<td>LANSING</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014-106</td>
<td>CONSUMERS ENERGY</td>
<td>GAS</td>
<td>DEERFIELDAVE &amp; GENSEE ST</td>
<td>LANSING</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014-107</td>
<td>CONSUMERS ENERGY</td>
<td>GAS</td>
<td>DEERFIELD AVE &amp; GENSEE ST</td>
<td>LANSING</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014-108</td>
<td>AYLES TREE &amp; LANDSCAPE</td>
<td>TREE REMOVAL</td>
<td>LINDEN DR BET TIMBER DR &amp; AMBER DR</td>
<td>MERIDIAN</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014-109</td>
<td>LANSING CHARTER TOWNSHIP</td>
<td>WATERMAIN</td>
<td>MICHIGAN AVE BET BRYNFORD AVE &amp; CATHERINE ST</td>
<td>LANSING</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014-110</td>
<td>FRONTIER</td>
<td>CABLE / UG</td>
<td>MOECHEL RD BET BASE LINE RD &amp; HEENEY RD</td>
<td>STOCKBRIDGE</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014-111</td>
<td>DELHI CHARTER TOWNSHIP</td>
<td>SPECIAL EVENT</td>
<td>VARIOUS</td>
<td>DELHI</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014-112</td>
<td>DELHI CHARTER TOWNSHIP</td>
<td>SPECIAL EVENT</td>
<td>VARIOUS</td>
<td>DELHI</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
To:        Board of Commissioners  
From:      Michael E. Ashton, CIO  
Date:      March 5th, 2014  
Re:        AVALON Backup Solution

Dear Commissioners,

As a result of the data loss in 2012 an evaluation of the County’s file backup systems was initiated. The following areas were discovered to have problems that needed addressing:

- Storage Capacity
- Backup Software Configuration and Training
- Redundancy

**Storage Capacity**

It was discovered the County lacked capacity to back up all the live data being stored. As a result the focus switch from archiving data for long periods so that a particular version of a file could be restored to a disaster recovery model where data could be restored for a shorter period of time should it be lost as it was in 2012. To expand the current system back up capacity a hardware investment in excess of $50,000 was required.

**Backup Software Configuration and Training**

The current software being used for primary backups is ARCserve 15.0 and the current version of ARCserve is 16.5 update 3. An upgrade would be required ensure continued support from the vendor and to remedy several other issues. Also the current condition of the ARCserve configuration has been degraded so much that a complete rebuild of the configuration would be required. This would require either MIS to engage a vendor to rebuild the configuration or require a significant investment of labor. A significant investment would also be required to train staff on how to use the existing software.

**Redundancy**

Data redundancy is important to any back up system. It’s important to store the backup data at a separate geographical location from where the live data is stored. The current system relies on two ExaGrid appliances which are located at the Hilliard Building and Sheriff’s Office Complex. In several cases the data that is being backed up is currently being stored in the same location as the live data. If a fire or natural disaster were to take out one of these locations it’s likely that both the live data and back up data would be lost.

**Interim Changes**

As a result of this evaluation it became apparent the costs required to fix the current system made it necessary for the MIS department to evaluate implementing a completely new system. While this evaluation was occurring several changes were made to the existing back up system to mitigate the risk of data loss while evaluating a new system. Those changes included switching from an archived focused back up method to a disaster recovery method, and buying inexpensive storage to leverage already purchased Veeam back up software to back up more virtual servers than previously possible.
Evaluation and Selection of Backup System
Several systems were evaluated including AppAssure, ARCserve, Veeam and NetVault. After evaluating the different software packages the MIS department selected NetVault software. NetVault was selected for the following reasons:

- Will back up all the different types of data the County uses
- Ease of use
- Direct integration with storage
- One Support Number for Hardware and Software

Different Types of Data
The county stores data of varying types in several different ways and the NetVault backup software allows for backing up all types of data currently in use

Ease of use
Currently, the MIS department leverage different backup software packages to backup different types of data. By using NetVault all types of data will now be backed up using the same software and interface. Using a single management interface allows for streamlined management and less time spent on training.

Hardware/Software integration and Support
The current backup system in use uses ARCserve and Veeam software and ExaGrid and HP storage arrays (hardware). The software and hardware are manufactured by different companies and are configured to work with one another. It works but there are concerns and we have had a few hiccups in the configuration to get them to work. NetVault and the DR4100 are both manufactured by Dell and thus integrate very well together. This integration should make the configuration of the system easier and should allow for simplified support.

COST
AVALON Technologies is the vendor of choice for this solution. AVALON installed and configured our current redundant SAN. The MIS department was very pleased with the configuration, migration of data, and training provided. AVALON won the SAN FRP bid process and provided an option DR component. The solution provided by AVALON is on a competitive contract with Midwestern Higher Education Commission (MHEC) Contract NO. MHEC-09C701.02.

The total cost of solution recommended is $160,727.00. The breakdown of the cost is $62,361.00 for Software, $83,877.00 for the R4100 Backup/deduplication device, $9,589.00 for the Backup Server, and $4,900 for installation and configuration.

The funds for this solution would come from the MIS Network Maintenance Hardware account. The account had $243,000 added for in FY 2014. In FY 2014 MIS currently spent or committed about $62,000. The account has carried a reserve of $542,000 from the previous Fiscal years for future upgrades such as backup solutions. The fund account is 63625810-932032.

Thank you for your consideration and feel free to contact me if you have any questions at 676-7371 or Mashton@ingham.org.
WHEREAS, it was discovered the County lacked capacity to back up all the live data being stored; and

WHEREAS, the current software being used for primary backups is ARCserve 15.0 and the current version of ARCserve is 16.5 update 3; and

WHEREAS, data redundancy is important to any back up system; and

WHEREAS, it is important to store the backup data at a separate geographical location from where the live data is stored; and

WHEREAS, it became apparent the costs required to fix the current system made it necessary for the MIS Department to evaluate implementing a completely new system; and

WHEREAS, after evaluating the different software packages the MIS department selected NetVault software from AVALON Technologies; and

WHEREAS, it is the recommendation of the Chief Information Officer that a complete Disaster Recovery solution called NetVault from AVALON Technologies be procured to replace the outdated system.

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED, that the Board of Commissioners authorizes the purchase of the NetVault solution from AVALON Technologies at a cost not to exceed of $160,727.00.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, the total cost of $160,727 will be paid from the MIS Network Hardware Maintenance Fund (636-25810-932032).
To: Board of Commissioners  
From: Michael E. Ashton, CIO  
Date: March 23rd, 2014  
Re: Firewall Upgrade  

Dear Commissioners,

The current firewalls the county owns are 7 years old. The firewalls are what protect the county network. Without proper firewalls in place the county network could be breached from outside resources.

The replacements of the firewalls are part of our 2014 budget for network security enhancements/improvements. The new firewalls will allow the county to have more control over who, what, and how users and others have access to the county’s systems.

This will also ensure that we can meet the new requirements for Criminal Justice Systems set by the FBI. It will also ensure we stay in compliance with HIPPA and Personal Credit Information data as well.

The current firewalls of the county go end of life the end of 2016. We covered this project in our 2014’s budget due to new security requirements and allow for more efficient use of the county’s network and resources along with better security monitoring and protection of the county network.

ISI is the reseller authorized by CISCO for Ingham County and part of cooperative contract agreement and is currently the vendor we use for our advanced network designs and configurations.

The total cost of solution which includes hardware, software and installation recommended is not to exceed $49,155.78.

The funds for this solution would come from the MIS Network Maintenance Hardware account. The fund account is 63625810-932032.

Thank you for your consideration and feel free to contact me if you have any questions at 676-7371 or Mashton@ingham.org.
RESOLUTION TO APPROVE THE PURCHASE OF NEW CISCO ASA FIREWALLS FROM ISI

WHEREAS, it has been determined the County’s current firewalls lacked capacity to meet today’s IT security needs; and

WHEREAS, the current firewalls are 7 years old; and

WHEREAS, to ensure the County continues to meet HIPPA and Criminal Justice System requirements MIS needs to replace the current firewalls in use; and

WHEREAS, it is a priority to ensure the county information systems are properly secured; and

WHEREAS, the costs required to upgrade the firewalls outweighs the cost of a security breach; and

WHEREAS, the County’s network is currently a CISCO environment and the new CISCO ASA firewalls will meet all of the concerns listed and ensure the ability to maintain the security of the County’s infrastructure; and

WHEREAS, it is the recommendation of the Chief Information Officer that new ASA 5500 firewalls, configuration, and installation be purchased from ISI, a CISCO preferred vendor.

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED, that the Board of Commissioners authorizes the purchase of hardware, installation, and configuration of a new ASA 5500 firewall system from ISI at a cost not to exceed $49,155.78.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, the total cost, not to exceed $49,155.78, will be paid from the MIS Network Hardware Maintenance Fund (636-25810-932032).
Recently, Xerox conducted a 60 day evaluation of the Counties print assets and infrastructure. Xerox has proposed a Managed Print Services solution for Ingham County. Xerox’s proposal would place all of the desktop printing devices under a complete maintenance agreement that would cover break fix support, supplies, single invoice billing, data management and single point of contact help desk support for printers. The results of this would be to significantly reduce the cost of printing on all desk top devices, 155 total devices. The proposal is for the county to reach a goal of a 10% reduction in cost by reducing print cost by 50%.

Currently the county has a total of 205 print devices, which 155 are desktop network printers. The county also has just over 55 Multifunction devices.

The current volume of print from these devices is 2,617,500 black/white (mono) pages and 159,384 color pages yearly.

Based on current averages for cost of toner/ink and maintenance the cost per page is around $0.0293 per mono page cost and $0.235 per color page. For the 155 desktop printers (155 devices) we spend around $114,267 per year. Fax machines and scanners were not included in the analysis from vendors.

Over the last 3 months, Jim Hudgins (purchasing) and myself have met with vendors to seek improvements to this environment and accomplish the following goals. Provide pro-Active break fix maintenance and supplies on all printers by monitoring them actively across our network. Leverage a single point of contact for all help desk related calls. Currently each department has ordered their own toner/ink from various vendors and either call MIS or a vendor to repair their printers or have MIS replace their printer.

After a thorough review of all proposals Xerox was chosen as the vendor of choice. Their proposal will save the County around $60,000/year by leveraging a GSA contract, actively monitor our network printers and move us from a reactive support model to a proactive one, and further provide us with detailed quarterly reporting on success metrics.

Xerox will take control of the monitoring of the networked printers and pro-actively send out maintenance personnel when errors occur. Also, Xerox will take over the ordering and delivery of supplies for all the included devices on a pro-active basis (excluding paper).
Xerox has been ranked the number 1 vendor in the managed print services space by Gartner Group 3 years in a row and has strong local references

Under the Xerox managed print services program we can achieve the following:

- Reduce the total spend per page for all 155 desk top devices, cost would be $.015 per mono page and $0.13 per color page.
- Pro-Active break fix maintenance on all devices
- Pro-Active Supplies delivery for all devices
- Single Invoice statements for all devices
- Single point of contact for all help desk calls
- Quarterly reviews of Xerox solution
- Cost savings of 50% / $60,000 per year.

There is no additional funding required for this resolution as the cost of the contract charged back to the departments based on usage. The departments are already spending the funds in their supply budgets and this will reduce the amount they need to spend.

Thank you for your consideration and feel free to contact me if you have any questions at 676-7371 or Mashton@ingham.org.
Introduced by the County Services and Finance Committees of the:

INGHAM COUNTY BOARD OF COMMISSIONERS

RESOLUTION TO APPROVE ENTERING INTO AN AGREEMENT WITH XEROX FOR MANAGED PRINT SERVICES

WHEREAS, Ingham County currently has over 155 desktop style printing devices; and

WHEREAS, the county prints an average of over 2.5 million mono and 115,000 color prints per year; and

WHEREAS, the cost of printing and maintenance is currently around $114,267 per year; and

WHEREAS, managed print services will reduce the total spend per page for all 155 desktop device to $.015 per mono page and $0.13 per color page; and

WHEREAS, cost savings to move to a managed print service is expected to be 50% or around $60,000 per year; and

WHEREAS, there is no additional funding required for this resolution as the cost of the contract charged back to the departments based on usage; and

WHEREAS, after a thorough review of all proposals, Xerox was chosen as the vendor of choice leveraging a GSA contract; and

WHEREAS, it is the recommendation of the MIS Chief Information Officer and Purchasing Director that the County enter into agreement with Xerox for managed print services.

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED, that the Board of Commissioners authorizes the County to enter into an agreement with Xerox for managed print services at a cost $.015 per mono page and $.13 per color page for desktop printers.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, the total cost of this agreement will not exceed the current cost of printing.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that the Controller is authorized to make any necessary budget adjustments related to this agreement.
MEMORANDUM

TO: County Services and Finance Committees
FROM: Rick Terrill, Facilities Director
DATE: March 26, 2014
SUBJECT: RESOLUTION AWARDING A CONTRACT TO PAVEMENT CONSULTANTS, INC. TO PROVIDE PROFESSIONAL ASPHALT CONSULTING AND PROJECT MANAGEMENT SERVICES FOR THE PARKING LOT REPLACEMENT PROJECT AT THE HUMAN SERVICES BUILDING

The resolution before you authorizes awarding a contract to Pavement Consultants, Inc. to provide professional asphalt consulting and project management services for the parking lot replacement project at the Human Services Building, for an amount not to exceed $9,550.00.

Pavement Consultants, Inc., who submitted the lowest responsive and responsible bid, were chosen after going through a competitive bidding process, and have the recommendation of both the Purchasing and Facilities Departments. We are confident that Pavement Consultants Inc. will provide the quality of service needed to complete this project successfully.

The funds for this project are available in the approved CIP Line Item 631-23304-931000-2FC16 which has a balance of $61,055.55.

I recommend approval of this resolution.
MEMORANDUM

TO: County Service and Finance Committees
FROM: Jim Hudgins, Director, Purchasing Department
DATE: March 27, 2014
SUBJECT: Proposal Summary for Professional Asphalt Consulting Services

Project Description:
Proposals were sought from experienced and qualified professional consulting firms for the purpose of entering into an agreement to provide asphalt consulting and management services for the rehabilitation of the North and South parking lots of the Human Service Facility.

Services will include, but are not limited to, the following:

1. Develop and prepare specifications and construction documents;
2. Prepare an estimated construction cost/budget;
3. Access ADA compliance;
4. Attend pre-bid and pre-construction meetings;
5. Conduct post bid analysis and evaluate bids;
6. Conduct project management and oversight of the entire project; and,
7. Create a punch list and perform final inspection.

Proposal Summary:
Vendors contacted: 3 Local: 1
Vendors responding: 3 Local: 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Company Name</th>
<th>Total Cost</th>
<th>Local</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pavement Consultants, Inc. (PCI)</td>
<td>$9,550</td>
<td>No – Eaton Rapids</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C2AE</td>
<td>$17,000</td>
<td>Yes – Lansing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Structure Tec</td>
<td>$22,900</td>
<td>No – Kalamazoo</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Recommendation:
The Evaluation Committee recommends awarding a contract to Pavement Consultants, Inc. (PCI) in an amount not to exceed $9,550.

In addition to submitting the lowest responsive proposal, PCI is licensed and insured, has other relevant experience working on projects of similar size and scope, and has previous experience working with the County.

This project was not formally advertised as the project costs were not expected to exceed $25,000.
Introduction by the County Services and Finance Committees of the:

INGHAM COUNTY BOARD OF COMMISSIONERS

RESOLUTION AWARDING A CONTRACT TO PAVEMENT CONSULTANTS, INC. TO PROVIDE PROFESSIONAL ASPHALT CONSULTING AND PROJECT MANAGEMENT SERVICES FOR THE PARKING LOT REPLACEMENT PROJECT AT THE HUMAN SERVICES BUILDING

WHEREAS, the Human Services Building parking lot is in need of replacement due to deterioration over the years; and

WHEREAS, after careful review of the bids, the Purchasing and Facilities Departments both agree that a contract be awarded to Pavement Consultants, Inc. who submitted the lowest responsive and responsible bid in the amount of $9,550.00; and

WHEREAS, funds for this project are available within the approved CIP Line Item 631-23304-931000-2FC16 which has a balance of $61,055.55.

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED, the Ingham County Board of Commissioners hereby authorizes entering into a contract with Pavement Consultants, Inc., 840 South Smith Road, Eaton Rapids, MI 48827, to provide professional asphalt consulting and project management services for the parking lot replacement project at the Human Services Building, for an amount not to exceed $9,550.00.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, the Ingham County Board of Commissioners authorizes the Board Chairperson to sign any necessary documents that are consistent with this resolution and approved as to form by the County Attorney.
MEMORANDUM

TO: Human Services Committee
   County Services Committee
   Finance Committee

FROM: Nancy Hayward, Acting Health Officer

DATE: March 27, 2014

RE: Resolution to Amend Resolution #13-486 to Change the Date for the Elimination of a Position

In Resolution #13-486, the Board of Commissioners authorized a reorganization to adjust Health Department Capacity in response to Federal Requirements.

In this resolution, Position #601042 was listed to be eliminated effective April 1, 2014 due a retirement. The employee in this position will be retiring effective May 30, 2014.

I am requesting that the Board authorize an amendment to Resolution #13-486 to change the effective date to eliminate Position #601042 to May 30, 2014.
INTRODUCED BY THE HUMAN SERVICES, COUNTY SERVICES, AND FINANCE COMMITTEES OF THE:

INGHAM COUNTY BOARD OF COMMISSIONERS

RESOLUTION TO AMEND RESOLUTION #13-486 TO CHANGE THE DATE FOR THE ELIMINATION OF A POSITION

WHEREAS, in Resolution #13-486 the Board of Commissioners authorized a resolution for reorganization to adjust Health Department capacity in response to federal requirements; and

WHEREAS, in this resolution Position #601042 was approved to be eliminated effective April 1, 2014 due to a retirement; and

WHEREAS, the employee in this position will retire effective May 30, 2014; and

WHEREAS, the Acting Health Officer recommends that Resolution #13-486 be amended to change the effective date to eliminate Position #601042 to May 30, 2014.

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED, that the Board of Commissioners authorizes an amendment to Resolution #13-486 to change the effective date to eliminate Position #601042 to May 30, 2014.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that the Controller/Administrator is authorized to make any necessary adjustments to the budget and approved position list consistent with this resolution.
MEMORANDUM

March 28, 2014

TO: Finance and Liaison Committees

FROM: Teri Morton, Budget Director

RE: First Quarter 2014 Budget Adjustments and Contingency Fund Update

Enclosed please find the recommended adjustments to the Ingham County budget for the first quarter of fiscal year 2014. The total increase to the General Fund is $1,161,004.

The quarterly budget amendment process as authorized by the Board of Commissioners is necessary to make adjustments to the adopted budget. Usually, adjustments are made as a result of updated revenue and expenditure projections, grant revenues, reappropriations, accounting and contractual changes, and general housekeeping issues.

The majority of adjustments this quarter are reappropriations of funds budgeted but not spent in 2013. Some of the larger projects carried over from the 2013 budget include $100,000 for the new 9-1-1 phone system, $96,425 for pavilion roof repair at the Potter Park Zoo, and two major imaging/scanning projects, $191,953 for Probate Court and $228,702 for Circuit Court. There is also $85,000 carried over for roof replacement at Animal Control. Although Animal Control is planning on the construction of a new facility, the old building will likely be used as a county storage facility, so the roof will still need to be replaced. All of these capital budget carryover funds are reserved within the funds where the projects are budgeted.

The largest adjustment this quarter is the transfer of the Minimum Security Facility Fund (F103) budget into the General Fund. This merger was approved in 2013, but the 2014 budget also needs to be adjusted. This will transfer $915,690 to the Sheriff’s General Fund budget.

The use of fund balance in the general fund is increased $221,448 to purchase Sheriff vehicles budgeted but not purchased in 2013 and to reappropriate funds for participation in the U.S. Geological Survey Enhanced Flood Warning System approved by Resolution 13-412, and for the remaining portion a Veterans Awareness grant approved by Resolution 13-416. Also reappropriated is the balance of funds approved by Resolution 13-438 for the one-time wage supplement. Some employees were not eligible for payment in 2013 because their collective bargaining agreements had not yet been ratified.

The Road Department budget will be increased $825,000 by increasing the use of unrestricted fund balance for primary and local road maintenance. This is an annual adjustment done after analysis of the prior year’s fund balance that will bring the road maintenance budget up to the amount that is traditionally spent. The Road Department budget is will also be increased by $795,000 to recognize additional Motor Vehicle Highway Fund revenue from the State of Michigan.

This resolution will also amend the 2014 Approved Position List to increase a part-time position in Facilities to full-time and decrease a full-time position to part-time.
There are also some increases for replacement computer equipment where costs are recouped through chargebacks to user departments.

Also included is an update of contingency fund spending so far this year. The current contingency amount is $313,953. If this resolution is passed as recommended, the contingency amount will be reduced to $305,231.

The attached document details how the Board has allocated the contingency funds throughout the year, beginning with a balance of $350,000.

Should you require any additional information or have questions regarding this process, please don’t hesitate to contact me.
INTRODUCED BY THE FINANCE COMMITTEE OF THE:

INGHAM COUNTY BOARD OF COMMISSIONERS

RESOLUTION AUTHORIZING ADJUSTMENTS TO THE 2014 INGHAM COUNTY BUDGET

WHEREAS, the Board of Commissioners adopted the 2014 Budget on October 22, 2013 and has authorized certain amendments since that time, and it is now necessary to make some adjustments as a result of updated revenue and expenditure projections, fund transfers, reappropriations, accounting and contractual changes, errors and omissions, and additional appropriation needs; and

WHEREAS, the Liaison Committees and the Finance Committee have reviewed the proposed budget adjustments prepared by the Controller’s staff and have made adjustments where necessary; and

WHEREAS, Public Act 621 of 1978 requires that local units of government maintain a balanced budget and periodically adjust the budget to reflect revised revenue and expenditure levels; and

WHEREAS, a vacancy within the Facilities Department has allowed for the evaluation of the department’s current staffing needs, and it has been determined that there is a need for additional administrative support.

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED, that the Ingham County Board of Commissioners hereby directs the Controller to make the necessary transfers to adjust revenues and expenditures in the following funds, according to the attached schedules:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FUND</th>
<th>DESCRIPTION</th>
<th>2014 BUDGET</th>
<th>PROPOSED CHANGES</th>
<th>PROPOSED BUDGET</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>101</td>
<td>General Fund</td>
<td>$74,576,934</td>
<td>$1,161,004</td>
<td>$75,737,938</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>201</td>
<td>Road Department</td>
<td>21,236,316</td>
<td>1,620,000</td>
<td>22,856,316</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>208</td>
<td>Parks</td>
<td>1,803,733</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1,803,733</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>211</td>
<td>9-1-1 Center</td>
<td>5,428,734</td>
<td>131,396</td>
<td>5,560,130</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>215</td>
<td>Friend of the Court</td>
<td>4,925,923</td>
<td>17,647</td>
<td>4,943,570</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>230</td>
<td>Hotel/Motel Tax</td>
<td>2,397,200</td>
<td>473</td>
<td>2,397,673</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>245</td>
<td>Public Improvements</td>
<td>1,066,178</td>
<td>326,679</td>
<td>1,392,857</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>258</td>
<td>Potter Park/Zoo</td>
<td>3,697,956</td>
<td>242,017</td>
<td>3,939,973</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>264</td>
<td>Juvenile Justice Millage</td>
<td>5,074,777</td>
<td>34,550</td>
<td>5,109,327</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>292</td>
<td>Family Division Child Care</td>
<td>12,727,085</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>12,727,085</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>561</td>
<td>Fair</td>
<td>1,093,220</td>
<td>473</td>
<td>1,093,693</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>631</td>
<td>Building Authority Operating</td>
<td>3,854,699</td>
<td>98,985</td>
<td>3,953,684</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>636</td>
<td>MIS</td>
<td>4,014,850</td>
<td>213,175</td>
<td>4,228,025</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>664</td>
<td>Mach. &amp; Equip. Revolving</td>
<td>493,783</td>
<td>333,993</td>
<td>827,776</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that the Facilities Department’s 2014 Approved Position List is amended to decrease a Maintenance Repair Person position (#233030) from full-time to part-time and to increase the Secretary/Facilities position (#233014) from part-time to full-time, at no additional cost.
### GENERAL FUND REVENUES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Tax Revenues</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>County Property Tax</td>
<td>40,965,476</td>
<td></td>
<td>40,965,476</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Property Tax Adjustments</td>
<td>(450,000)</td>
<td></td>
<td>(450,000)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delinquent Real Property Tax</td>
<td>15,000</td>
<td></td>
<td>15,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unpaid Personal Property Tax</td>
<td>(10,000)</td>
<td></td>
<td>(10,000)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Industrial Facility Tax</td>
<td>350,000</td>
<td></td>
<td>350,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trailer Fee Tax</td>
<td>15,000</td>
<td></td>
<td>15,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Intergovernmental Transfers</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State Revenue Sharing</td>
<td>4,867,967</td>
<td></td>
<td>4,867,967</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Convention/Tourism Tax - Liquor</td>
<td>2,199,176</td>
<td></td>
<td>2,199,176</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Court Equity Fund</td>
<td>1,485,000</td>
<td></td>
<td>1,485,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use of Fund Balance</td>
<td>3,253,997</td>
<td>221,448</td>
<td>3,475,445</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Department Generated Revenue</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Animal Control</td>
<td>747,066</td>
<td></td>
<td>747,066</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Circuit Court - Family Division</td>
<td>734,235</td>
<td></td>
<td>734,235</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Circuit Court - Friend of the Court</td>
<td>462,000</td>
<td></td>
<td>462,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Circuit Crt - General Trial</td>
<td>2,134,032</td>
<td></td>
<td>2,134,032</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Controller</td>
<td>3,170</td>
<td></td>
<td>3,170</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cooperative Extension</td>
<td>2,500</td>
<td></td>
<td>2,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>County Clerk</td>
<td>631,110</td>
<td></td>
<td>631,110</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>District Court</td>
<td>2,702,571</td>
<td></td>
<td>2,702,571</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drain Commissioner/Drain Tax</td>
<td>352,058</td>
<td></td>
<td>352,058</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economic Development</td>
<td>52,184</td>
<td></td>
<td>52,184</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elections</td>
<td>65,550</td>
<td></td>
<td>65,550</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emergency Operations</td>
<td>115,582</td>
<td></td>
<td>115,582</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equalization /Tax Mapping</td>
<td>10,100</td>
<td></td>
<td>10,100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department</td>
<td>2014 Budget - 4/1/14</td>
<td>Proposed Changes</td>
<td>2014 Proposed Budget</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facilities</td>
<td>182,180</td>
<td></td>
<td>182,180</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Financial Services</td>
<td>48,052</td>
<td></td>
<td>48,052</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health Department</td>
<td>327,662</td>
<td></td>
<td>327,662</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Human Resources</td>
<td>80,822</td>
<td></td>
<td>80,822</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Probate Court</td>
<td>277,178</td>
<td></td>
<td>277,178</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prosecuting Attorney</td>
<td>577,701</td>
<td></td>
<td>577,701</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Register of Deeds</td>
<td>2,036,729</td>
<td></td>
<td>2,036,729</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Remonumentation Grant</td>
<td>85,000</td>
<td></td>
<td>85,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sheriff</td>
<td>5,453,295</td>
<td>939,556</td>
<td>6,392,851</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Treasurer</td>
<td>4,377,465</td>
<td></td>
<td>4,377,465</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tri-County Regional Planning</td>
<td>62,976</td>
<td></td>
<td>62,976</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Veteran Affairs</td>
<td>364,100</td>
<td></td>
<td>364,100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total General Fund Revenues</strong></td>
<td><strong>74,576,934</strong></td>
<td><strong>1,161,004</strong></td>
<td><strong>75,737,938</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**GENERAL FUND EXPENDITURES**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Department</th>
<th>2014 Budget - 4/1/14</th>
<th>Proposed Changes</th>
<th>2014 Proposed Budget</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Board of Commissioners</td>
<td>559,761</td>
<td></td>
<td>559,761</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One-time Wage Supplement</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>83,950</td>
<td>83,950</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Circuit Court - General Trial</td>
<td>8,028,832</td>
<td></td>
<td>8,028,832</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>District Court</td>
<td>2,848,814</td>
<td></td>
<td>2,848,814</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Circuit Court - Friend of the Court</td>
<td>1,209,772</td>
<td></td>
<td>1,209,772</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jury Board</td>
<td>1,146</td>
<td></td>
<td>1,146</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Probate Court</td>
<td>1,480,476</td>
<td></td>
<td>1,480,476</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Circuit Court - Family Division</td>
<td>4,583,957</td>
<td></td>
<td>4,583,957</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jury Selection</td>
<td>101,191</td>
<td></td>
<td>101,191</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elections</td>
<td>360,915</td>
<td></td>
<td>360,915</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Financial Services</td>
<td>707,874</td>
<td></td>
<td>707,874</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>County Attorney</td>
<td>416,352</td>
<td></td>
<td>416,352</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>County Clerk</td>
<td>615,681</td>
<td></td>
<td>615,681</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Controller</td>
<td>811,056</td>
<td></td>
<td>811,056</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department</td>
<td>2019 Budget</td>
<td>2020 Budget</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equalization/Tax Services</td>
<td>681,655</td>
<td>681,655</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Human Resources</td>
<td>629,901</td>
<td>629,901</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prosecuting Attorney</td>
<td>6,035,375</td>
<td>6,035,375</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Purchasing</td>
<td>207,307</td>
<td>207,307</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facilities</td>
<td>1,941,685</td>
<td>1,941,685</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Register of Deeds</td>
<td>505,548</td>
<td>505,548</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Remonumentation Grant</td>
<td>85,000</td>
<td>85,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Treasurer</td>
<td>548,408</td>
<td>548,408</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drain Commissioner</td>
<td>907,336</td>
<td>907,336</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economic Development</td>
<td>122,031</td>
<td>122,031</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Agencies</td>
<td>200,000</td>
<td>200,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ingham Conservation District</td>
<td>7,895</td>
<td>7,895</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equal Opportunity Committee</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>500</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Women’s Commission</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>500</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Historical Commission</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>500</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tri-County Regional Planning</td>
<td>104,960</td>
<td>8,722</td>
<td>113,682</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jail Maintenance</td>
<td>217,750</td>
<td>217,750</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sheriff</td>
<td>18,277,702</td>
<td>1,056,341</td>
<td>19,334,043</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tri-County Metro Squad</td>
<td>25,000</td>
<td>25,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Corrections</td>
<td>97,215</td>
<td>97,215</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Animal Control</td>
<td>1,455,995</td>
<td>1,455,995</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Homeland Sec./Emergency Ops.</td>
<td>239,002</td>
<td>10,000</td>
<td>249,003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Board of Public Works</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>300</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drain Tax at Large</td>
<td>432,000</td>
<td>432,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health Department</td>
<td>4,409,972</td>
<td>4,409,972</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Health Centers</td>
<td>4,266,868</td>
<td>4,266,868</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jail Medical</td>
<td>1,893,587</td>
<td>1,893,587</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medical Examiner</td>
<td>336,155</td>
<td>336,155</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Substance Abuse</td>
<td>1,103,903</td>
<td>1,103,903</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Mental Health</td>
<td>1,751,631</td>
<td>1,751,631</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department</td>
<td>1,774,863</td>
<td>1,774,863</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tri-County Aging</td>
<td>76,225</td>
<td>76,225</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Veterans Affairs</td>
<td>488,841</td>
<td>10,713</td>
<td>499,554</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cooperative Extension</td>
<td>474,127</td>
<td>474,127</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Library Legacy Costs</td>
<td>80,148</td>
<td>80,148</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parks and Recreation</td>
<td>1,445,577</td>
<td>1,445,577</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contingency Reserves</td>
<td>313,953</td>
<td>(8,722)</td>
<td>305,231</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legal Aid</td>
<td>20,000</td>
<td>20,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2-1-1 Project</td>
<td>45,750</td>
<td>45,750</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Coalition for Youth</td>
<td>27,000</td>
<td>27,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capital Improvements</td>
<td>1,618,941</td>
<td>1,618,941</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Total General Fund Expenditures**

|                                                   | 74,576,934 | 1,161,004 | 75,737,938 |

**General Fund Revenues**

**Sheriff**

Increase insurance proceeds revenue $20,366 to replace damaged Sheriff vehicle. Increase jail bed rental $915,690 due to merger of Minimum Security Facility Fund into Sheriff General Fund budget. Increase federal revenue from U.S. Marshals Service $3,500 for overtime reimbursement for participation with the Michigan State Police Fugitive Task Force.

**Use of Fund Balance**

Reappropriate funds for the following items: $10,713 in remaining funds for Veterans Awareness grant authorized by Resolution 13-416, $10,000 to participate in the U.S. Geological Survey Enhanced Flood Warning System authorized by Resolution 13-412, $83,950 in remaining funds for one-time wage supplement as authorized by Resolution 13-438, and $116,785 for Sheriff vehicles budgeted but not purchased in 2013.

**General Fund Expenditures**

**One-time Wage Supplement**

Reappropriate $83,950 in remaining funds for one-time wage supplement as authorized by Resolution 13-438. Some collective bargaining agreements were not ratified in 2013, delaying payment until 2014.

**Drain Office**

Transfer $10,160 from personnel services to contractual services/services fees to pay for contract accountant position while permanent position was vacant.
Stormwater Management

Increase budget $8,722 for 2013 and 2014 general fund membership payments to Greater Lansing Regional Committee (GLRC) for Stormwater Management per Resolution 14-013.

Sheriff

Reappropriate $116,785 for vehicles budgeted but not purchased in 2013. Increase budget $20,366 to replace damaged Sheriff vehicle, to be reimbursed from insurance proceeds. Transfer Minimum Security Facility Fund budget into Sheriff General Fund budget. Minimum Security Facility Fund was merged into the General Fund in 2013. $915,690 in expenses will be transferred to the General Fund. Increase overtime budget $3,500 for participation with the Michigan State Police Fugitive Task Force, to be reimbursed by federal revenue from U.S. Marshals Service.

Homeland Scty/Em. Ops.

Reappropriate $10,000 to participate in the U.S. Geological Survey Enhanced Flood Warning System authorized by Resolution 13-412. (Contract was not finalized in 2013.)

Veterans Affairs

Reappropriate $10,713 in remaining funds for Veterans Awareness grant authorized by Resolution 13-416.

Contingency

Decrease contingency account $8,722 for 2013 and 2014 general fund membership payments to GLRC for Stormwater Management.

Non-General Fund Adjustments

Road Department (F201)

Increase use of unrestricted fund balance ($825,000) to be used for road equipment ($70,000) and asphalt and tack ($755,000). This adjustment will bring the road maintenance budget up to the amount that is traditionally spent. This is an annual adjustment that is done once the prior year’s final fund balance has been analyzed. Increase Motor Vehicle Highway Fund revenue ($795,000) to recognize new revenue from the State of Michigan. Increase asphalt and tack by same amount.

Parks (F208)

Transfer funds for Jail Alternative Sentencing Program (JASP) from Parks temporary salaries line item to Friend of the Court to allow funds to be matched by Cooperative Reimbursement grant. ($6,000)

911 Center (F211)

Reappropriate funds for new phone system authorized by Resolution 13-419 ($100,000) and microwave project authorized by Resolution 13-192 ($31,396).

Friend of the Court (F215)

Transfer funds for Jail Alternative Sentencing Program (JASP) from Parks temporary salaries line items ($6,000) to Friend of the Court to allow funds to be matched by Cooperative Reimbursement grant ($11,647) for a total JASP budget of $17,647.

Hotel/Motel (F230)

Reappropriate and transfer remaining funds for Fair computer upgrades per the 2013 capital budget ($473).
Public Improvements
(F245)
Reappropriate funds for the following capital improvement projects:
District Court power transfer switch ($20,500), replace concrete in Lansing and Mason ($15,000), Animal Control roof replacement ($85,000), Sheriff roof replacement ($32,715) and Mason Courthouse mold redemption ($28,500) per 2012 capital budget, ADA Compliant Doors ($12,000), replace Jail cooling tower ($77,399), kennel doors and frames at Animal Control ($13,322) per 2013 capital budget, and building assessment for a new Animal Shelter ($42,243) approved by Resolution 13-403.

Potter Park/Zoo
(F258)
Reappropriate funds for the following capital projects not completed in previous years: garden program ($4,284) approved in 2010 capital budget, admissions system ($30,000) and security cameras/wireless internet ($25,000) approved in 2011 capital budget, zoo and park graphics ($10,000), zoo and park landscaping ($8,753), pavilion #2 roof repair ($96,425), and moose & bison exhibit ($25,518) approved in 2012 capital budget, and glass block birdhouse ($2,680), replace bongo door ($8,000), tiger training chute ($2,000), storage building holding cages ($6,000), raven exhibit ($10,000) fencing between yak and clinic ($1,800) and fencing exhibit upgrade ($11,557) approved in 2013 capital budget.

Juv. Justice Millage
(F264)
Reappropriate funds for the following projects at the Ingham County Family Center; tuckpointing ($28,198) per the 2012 capital budget, and door replacement ($4,752) and gym drinking fountain ($1,600) per the 2013 capital budget.

Fam.Div. Child Care
(F292)
Transfer funds from contractual services to pay for Family Division’s portion of Americorps position assigned to the Ingham County Family Center ($7,916).

Fair
(F561)
Reappropriate remaining funds for computer upgrades per the 2013 capital budget ($473). Funds will be transferred from hotel/motel fund balance.

Bldg Authority Operating
(F631)
Reappropriate funds for the following capital improvement projects at the Human Services Building: signage ($10,725) per the 2009 capital budget, garage tuckpointing ($14,804) and parking lot replacement ($61,056) per the 2012 capital budget, and vestibule heaters ($8,100) per the 2013 capital budget. Reappropriate funds for a metal detector at the Veterans Memorial Courthouse/Grady Porter Building per the 2012 capital budget ($4,300).

MIS
(F636)
Reappropriate remaining funds for the following projects: Probate Court scanning project ($191,953) approved by Resolution 11-120, Prosecuting Attorney imaging project ($10,554) approved in 2012 capital budget and Clerk imaging project ($10,668) approved by Resolution 13-199.

Mach./Equip. Revolving
(F664)
Increase CIP upgrade funds to purchase the following replacement equipment: one PC and monitor for Facilities ($1,189), one PC and monitor for Community Corrections ($853), two PCs and monitors for Financial Services ($1,710), one PC and monitor for Animal Control ($873), and a copier ($742) and 2 printers ($1,261) at Probate Court. Reappropriate funds for the following projects: Circuit Court imaging/scanning project ($228,702), backscanning for Circuit Court ($50,000), video surveillance for District Court ($4,200), and Sheriff in-car camera project ($16,500) per 2012 capital budget, phones and headsets for Parks ($4,184), Sheriff training rifles ($325), video surveillance for District Court
($15,400), and portable recording equipment for Circuit Court ($7,266) per 2013 capital budget. Increase budget for Drain Office copier ($681) and Family Division van security screen ($107). (Costs were more than budgeted.)
### 2014 CONTINGENCY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Proposed Contingency Amount</th>
<th>$305,231</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Adopted Contingency Amount</td>
<td>$350,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R14-039: District Court Enforcement/Court Officer Pilot Project</td>
<td>(25,407)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R14-135: Probate Court Temporary Employee</td>
<td>(10,640)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposed 1st Quarter Adjustment</td>
<td>(8,722)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
WHEREAS, Cesar E. Chavez, the late founder and president of the United Farm Workers of America, had deep confidence in the ability of people to take on the injustices; and

WHEREAS, Cesar E. Chavez unselfishly gave of himself to the cause of farm workers, and all workers, as he strived for fair working conditions and equality for Latinos while providing each of us a unique example to live our lives by; and

WHEREAS, his courage in the face of some of our nation’s most powerful industries inspired generations of all races and nationalities to fight for fair working conditions and equality; and

WHEREAS, under his leadership, farm workers were able to win the first union contracts for agricultural workers in the grape fields; and

WHEREAS, Cesar E. Chavez had millions of followers on his journey which won monumental gains for farm workers, for civil rights, political representation for racial minorities and environmental justice; and

WHEREAS, these achievements place him as one of the most outstanding leaders of the twentieth century, the accomplishments of this extraordinary man deserve to be recognized and celebrated; and

WHEREAS, declaring March 31 a National Day of Service will insure that his legacy will live on and that future generations will be inspired by the remarkable achievements he attained during his lifetime.

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED, that the Ingham County Board of Commissioners hereby supports the creation of a Cesar E. Chavez National Day of Service and urges President Obama to declare March 31 as the Cesar E. Chavez National Day of Service.
Intended by the County Services and Finance Committees of the:

INGHAM COUNTY BOARD OF COMMISSIONERS

RESOLUTION AUTHORIZING AND CLARIFYING PENSION BENEFITS FOR TEAMSTERS LOCAL 580 POTTER PARK ZOO UNIT

WHEREAS, on February 28, 2012, the Ingham County Board of Commissioners approved Resolution 12-47, authorizing the correction and clarification of pension benefits under the Municipal Employees’ Retirement System (MERS); and

WHEREAS, pursuant to the Resolution, in an effort to address the misplacement of employees under Teamsters Local 580 Potter Park Zoo Employees that were placed in MERS Division 94, which also contains United Automobile, Aerospace and Agricultural Workers of America (UAW) Local 2256 Potter Park Zoo employees; and

WHEREAS, through the collective bargaining process there is a need to establish a separate MERS Defined Benefit division for four employees, hired prior to April 1, 2013 for service credit beginning July 1, 2007; and

WHEREAS, the County Attorney and the Human Resources Department have discussed with MERS the changes that are needed to correct and clarify the issue and have prepared the attached Letter Agreement between Ingham County and Teamsters Local 580, Potter Park Zoo Unit; and

WHEREAS, the County Attorney and the Human Resources Department have discussed with MERS the changes that are needed to correct and clarify the issue and have prepared the attached MERS Request for Benefit Change.

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED, that the Ingham County Board of Commissioner authorizes the attached Letter Agreement and MERS Request for Benefit Change form, correcting and clarifying the benefits for the Teamsters Local 580 Potter Park Zoo Unit.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that Travis Parsons, Director of Human Resources is authorized on behalf of the County’s retirement system to sign and execute all documents to effectuate and finalize this transaction, subject to prior approval as to form, by legal counsel.
LETTER AGREEMENT
BETWEEN
INGHAM COUNTY (Employer)
AND
TEAMSTERS LOCAL 580 (Union)
POTTER PARK ZOO UNIT

WHEREAS, on or about May 1, 2007, the City of Lansing and Ingham County entered into an Agreement for the Lease and Operation of Potter Park and Potter Park Zoo (the “Agreement”). The Agreement provided and it was the intent of the Parties that Former City Employees who worked at the Potter Park Zoo would be provided the opportunity to continue employment as Ingham County employees, would be placed in Municipal Employees' Retirement System, of Michigan (MERS) plans equating to City of Lansing retirement pension benefits.

WHEREAS, to effectuate this intent, the County and the Union entered into letters defining the benefit levels for Former City Employees while employed by the City. Thereafter, appropriate resolutions where passed by the County to establish with MERS three new divisions.

WHEREAS, the Parties discovered later that Division 94, established for United Automobile, Aerospace and Agricultural Workers of America (UAW) Local 2256 Potter Park Zoo employees contained four employees of the Teamsters Local 580 Potter Park Zoo.

WHEREAS, during the negotiations for the Teamsters 580 Zoo unit collective bargaining agreement, the Parties clarified and agreed to the correct plan which accurately reflected the retirement plan for Teamsters 580 Zoo employees hired prior to April 1, 2013.

WHEREAS, Representatives of MERS stated that to correct these discrepancies, the affected Union would need to provide a letter agreement explaining the discrepancies and agreeing to the changes/clarifications.

NOW THEREFORE, IT IS AGREED THAT:

The proper pension benefit level, for Teamster’s Local 580 Potter Park Zoo employees, hired prior to April 1, 2013, is accurately reflected in the Resolution of the Ingham County Board of Commissioners dated ________________________ and a set forth in this Letter Agreement, and the County and Union agree to the establishment and placement of such employees as set forth in the Resolution.
1. MERS B-2 Plan: 2% multiplier
2. Service Credit: July 1, 2007 – Present
3. The maximum annual pension may not exceed 80% of the FAC.
4. Normal Retirement Age: 60
5. FAC 5: highest consecutive 5 years of compensation
6. 8 year vesting.
7. Effective April 1, 2014, the employee contribution equals 1.2% of wages

IT IS AGREED

COUNTY OF INGHAM

Victor Celentino, Chairperson
Ingham County Board of Commissioners

Mike Parker, Secretary-Treasurer
Teamsters Local 580

Barb Byrum, County Clerk

APPROVED AS TO FORM:
COHL, STOKER & TOSKEY, P.C.

Rich McNulty
On Tuesday, March 25, 2014, OPEIU put before their members for vote a proposed tentative agreement. The OPEIU members ratified the agreement. Highlights of the agreement include the following:

- **Contract Duration (Article 31):** through December 31, 2015
- **Salary Schedule (Appendix A):**
  - 2014 - No wage increase from the 2013 wage scales.
  - 2015 – Wage Re-opener
- **Retirement (Article 27):**
  - Eligible employees hired before January 1, 2014: 1.2% increase in the employee pension contribution.
  - Eligible employees hired on or after January 1, 2014 shall receive a MERS Hybrid pension plan: DB - 1.25% multiplier and DC - 1% employee minimum contribution with a 1% employer match. Retirement Age - 60
- **Retiree Health (Article 24):**
  - Employees hired on or after January 1, 2014 – single subscriber retiree health per sliding scale based on years of service. Eligible at age 60.
- **Retiree Life Insurance** – eliminated for employees that retire after January 1, 2014
- **Longevity (Article 23)**
  - Employees hired on or after January 1, 2014 are not eligible to receive longevity bonus for service with the Employer.
- **Health Insurance (Article 24)**
  - 2014 Plan Year - Employees shall maintain their current Base Plan and Buy-up Plan option in addition to the current County High Deductible Plan.
  - 2015 Plan Year – Employees shall receive plan options as recommended by the Health Care Coalition and approved by the Board of Commissioners.
- **Long Term Disability Insurance (Article 26)**
  - Benefit at 50% of base salary, capped at $2500 per month
- **Leave Time (Article 17):**
  - Vacation Bonus at twenty-eight (28) hours for each calendar year

Also included in the packet is a resolution establishing the MERS Hybrid pension plan.
Agenda Item 10b

Introduced by the County Services Committee and Finance Committee of the:

INGHAM COUNTY BOARD OF COMMISSIONERS

RESOLUTION APPROVING A COLLECTIVE BARGAINING AGREEMENT WITH LOCAL 512 OFFICE AND PROFESSIONAL EMPLOYEES INTERNATIONAL UNION - TECHNICAL CLERICAL UNIT

WHEREAS, an agreement has been reached between representatives of Ingham County and Local 512 Office and Professional Employees International Union for the period January 1, 2014 through December 31, 2015; and

WHEREAS, the agreement has been ratified by the employees within the bargaining unit; and

WHEREAS, the provisions of the agreement have been approved by the County Services and Finance Committees.

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED, that the Ingham County Board of Commissioners hereby approves the contract between Ingham County and Local 512 Office and Professional Employees International Union for the period January 1, 2014 through December 31, 2015.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that the Chairperson of the Board of Commissioners and the County Clerk are authorized to sign the contract on behalf of the County, subject to the approval as to form by the County Attorney.
Introduced by the County Services and Finance Committees of the:

INGHAM COUNTY BOARD OF COMMISSIONERS

RESOLUTION AUTHORIZING THE ESTABLISHMENT OF A MERS HYBRID PLAN FOR NEWLY HIRED EMPLOYEES UNDER LOCAL 512 OFFICE AND PROFESSIONAL EMPLOYEES INTERNATIONAL UNION - TECHNICAL CLERICAL UNIT

WHEREAS, the Ingham County Board of Commissioners has recognized the escalating cost of the current MERS Defined Benefit Plan; and

WHEREAS, Local 512 Office and Professional Employees International Union – Technical Clerical Unit approved a new collective bargaining agreement that includes the establishment of a Hybrid pension plan for new hires.

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED, the Board of Commissioners authorizes the attached MERS Hybrid Plan Adoption Agreement and the MERS Defined Benefit Plan Adoption Agreement establishing the MERS Hybrid Pension Plan for new employees under Local 512 Office and Professional Employees International Union – Technical Clerical Unit hired on or after January 1, 2014.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that the Ingham County Board of Commissioners authorizes the Board Chair to sign and execute all documents on behalf of the County to effectuate and finalize this transaction, subject to the approval as to form by the County Attorney.
Defined Benefit Plan Adoption Agreement

The Employer, a participating municipality or participating court within the state of Michigan, hereby agrees to adopt and administer the MERS Defined Benefit Plan provided by the Municipal Employees' Retirement System of Michigan, as authorized by 1996 PA 220, in accordance with the MERS Plan Document, as both may be amended, subject to the terms and conditions herein.

I. Employer Name County of Ingham Municipality #: 3303
If new to MERS, please provide your municipality's fiscal year: ___________ through ___________.

II. Effective Date

Check one:

A. ☐ If this is the initial Adoption Agreement for this group, the effective date shall be the first day of ___________, 20__.

☐ This municipality or division is new to MERS, so vesting credit prior to the initial MERS effective date by each eligible participant shall be credited as follows (choose one):

☐ All prior service from date of hire
☐ Prior service proportional to assets transferred; all service used for vesting
☐ Prior service and vesting service proportional to assets transferred
☐ No prior service but grant vesting credit
☐ No prior service or vesting credit

☐ Link this new division to division number ______ for purposes of determining contributions (Unless otherwise specified, the standard transfer/rehire rules apply)

B. ☐ If this is an amendment of an existing Adoption Agreement (Defined Benefit division number 71), the effective date shall be the first day of January, 2014. Please note: You only need to mark changes to your plan throughout the remainder of this Agreement.

C. ☐ If this is a temporary benefit that lasts 2-6 months, the effective dates of this temporary benefit are from __/__/__ through __/__/__ for Defined Benefit division number ______.

Last day of month

Please note: You only need to mark changes to your plan throughout the remainder of this Agreement.

D. ☐ If this is to separate employees from an existing Defined Benefit division (existing division number(s) ____________________________) into a new division, the effective date shall be the first day of ___________, 20__.

E. ☐ If this is to merge division(s) __________________ into division(s) __________________, the effective date shall be the first of ___________, 20__.
Defined Benefit Plan Adoption Agreement

III. Eligible Employees

Only those Employees eligible for MERS membership may participate in the MERS Defined Benefit Plan. A copy of ALL employee enrollment forms must be submitted to MERS. The following groups of employees are eligible to participate:

Admin/Union/OPEIU
(Name of Defined Benefit division – e.g. All Full Time Employees, or General after 7/01/13)

☐ Only retirees will be in this division.

These employees are (check one or both):

☐ In a collective bargaining unit (attach cover page, retirement section, signature page)

☐ Subject to the same personnel policy

To receive one month of service credit (check one):

☐ An employee shall work 10 ______ hour days.

☐ An employee shall work ______ hours in a month.

All employees as classified under eligible employees, whether full or part time, who meet this criteria must be reported to MERS. If you change your current day of work definition to be more restrictive, the new definition only applies to employees hired after the effective date.

To further define eligibility, check all that apply:

☐ Probationary Periods are allowed in one-month increments, no longer than 12 months. During this introductory period, the Employer will not report or provide service time for this period, including retroactively. Service will begin after the probationary period has been satisfied.

The probationary period will be ______ month(s).

☐ Temporary employees in a position normally requiring less than a total of 12 whole months of work in the position may be excluded from membership. These employees must be notified in writing by the participating municipality that they are excluded from membership within 10 business days of date of hire or execution of this Agreement.

The temporary exclusion period will be ______ month(s).

IV. Provisions

Valuation Date: ______________________, 20___

1. This Adoption Agreement will be implemented in conjunction with a current actuarial valuation certified by a MERS actuary that sets contribution rates.

2. Annually, the MERS actuary will conduct an actuarial valuation to determine the employers’ contribution rates. Employers are responsible for payment of said contributions at the rate, in the form and at the time that MERS determines.
Defined Benefit Plan Adoption Agreement

3. Benefit Multiplier (1%-2.5%, increments of 0.05%) ________ % (max 80% for multipliers over 2.25%)
   □ Check here if multiplier will be effective for existing active members' future service only
     (Bridged Benefit as of effective date on page 1)
     If checked, select one below:
     □ Termination Final Average Compensation (calculated over the members entire wage history)
     □ Frozen Final Average Compensation (FAC is calculated twice, once for the timeframe that matches the original multiplier, and once for the new multiplier)

4. Final Average Compensation (Min 3 yr, increments of 1 yr) ________ years

5. Vesting (5-10 yrs, increments of 1 yr) ________ years

6. Required employee contribution (Max 10%, increments of 0.1%) ________ %

7. Compensation, for retirement purposes, is defined as base wages and all of the following. Check applicable boxes to exclude these types from your MERS reported wages:
   □ Longevity pay
   □ Overtime pay
   □ Shift differentials
   □ Pay for periods of absence from work by reason of vacation, holiday, and sickness
   □ Workers' compensation weekly benefits (if reported and are higher than regular earnings)
   □ A member’s pre-tax contributions to a plan established under Section 125 of the IRC
   □ Transcript fees paid to a court reporter
   □ A taxable car allowance
   □ Short term or long term disability payments
   □ Payments for achievement of established annual (or similar period) performance goals
   □ Payment for attainment of educational degrees from accredited colleges, universities, or for acquisition of job-related certifications
   □ Lump sum payments attributable to the member's personal service rendered during the FAC period
   □ Other: ____________________________________________
   □ Other 2: ____________________________________________
Defined Benefit Plan Adoption Agreement

8. Early Normal Retirement with unreduced benefits
   - Age 50 with 25 years of service
   - Age 50 with 30 years of service
   - Age 55 with 15 years of service
   - Age 55 with 20 years of service
   - Age 55 with 25 years of service
   - Age 55 with 30 years of service
   - Any age with (20-30 yrs, in 1 yr increments) _____ years of service

9. Other
   - Surviving Spouse will receive _____% of Straight Life benefit without a reduction to the participant’s benefit
   - Duty death or disability enhancement (add up to additional 10 years of service credit not to exceed 30 years of service)
   - DROP + with __________ %

10. Cost-of-Living Adjustment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>All current retirees as of effective date</th>
<th>Future retirees who retire after effective date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Retirees who retire <strong>between</strong> _<strong><strong>/01/</strong></strong> and _<strong><strong>/01/</strong></strong> (one time increase only)</td>
<td>Increase of <em><strong><strong>% or $</strong></strong></em> per month</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increase of <em><strong><strong>% or $</strong></strong></em> per month</td>
<td>Increase of <em><strong><strong>% or $</strong></strong></em> per month</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Select one:</td>
<td>Select one:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Annual automatic increase</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>One-time increase</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Select one:</td>
<td>Select one:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Compounding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Non-compounding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employees must be retired _____ months (6-12 months, increments of 1 month)</td>
<td>Employees must be retired _____ months (6-12 months, increments of 1 month)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

V. Appointing MERS as the Plan Administrator

The Employer hereby agrees to the provisions of this MERS Defined Benefit Plan Adoption Agreement and appoints MERS as the Plan Administrator pursuant to the terms and conditions of the Plan. The Employer also agrees that in the event any conflict between MERS Plan Document and the MERS Defined Benefit Plan, the provisions of the Plan Document control.
VI. Modification Of The Terms Of The Adoption Agreement

If the Employer desires to amend any of its elections contained in this Adoption Agreement, including attachments, the Governing Body or Chief Judge, by resolution or official action accepted by MERS, must adopt a new Adoption Agreement. The amendment of the new Agreement is not effective until approved by MERS.

VII. Enforcement

1. The Employer acknowledges that the Michigan Constitution of 1963, Article 9, Section 24, provides that accrued financial benefits arising under a public Employer's retirement plan are a contractual obligation of the Employer that may not be diminished or impaired, and prohibits the use of the Employer’s required current service funding to finance unfunded accrued liabilities.

2. The Employer agrees that, pursuant to the Michigan Constitution, its obligations to pay required contributions are contractual obligations to its employees and to MERS and may be enforced in a court of competent jurisdiction;

3. In accordance with the Constitution and this Agreement, if at any time the balance standing to the Employer’s credit in the reserve for employer contributions and benefit payments is insufficient to pay all service benefits due and payable to the entity’s retirees and beneficiaries, the Employer agrees and covenants to promptly remit to MERS the amount of such deficiency as determined by the Retirement Board within thirty (30) days notice of such deficiency.

4. The Employer acknowledges that wage and service reports are due monthly, and the employee contributions (if any) and Employer contributions are due and payable monthly, and must be submitted in accordance with the MERS Enforcement Procedure for Prompt Reporting and Payment, the terms of which are incorporated herein by reference.

5. Should the Employer fail to make its required contribution(s) when due, the retirement benefits due and payable by MERS on behalf of the entity to its retirees and beneficiaries may be suspended until the delinquent payment is received by MERS. MERS may implement any applicable interest charges and penalties pursuant to the MERS Enforcement Procedure for Prompt Reporting and Payment and Plan Document Section 45A(3), and take any appropriate legal action, including but not limited to filing a lawsuit and reporting the entity to the Treasurer of the State of Michigan in accordance with MCL 141.1544(d), Section 44 of PA 436 of 2012, as may be amended.

6. The Employer acknowledges that changes to the Employer’s MERS Defined Benefit Plan must be made in accordance with the MERS Plan Document and applicable law, and agrees that MERS will not administer any such changes unless the MERS Plan Document and applicable law permit same, and MERS is capable of administering same.
VIII. Execution

Authorized Designee of Governing Body of Municipality or Chief Judge of Court

The foregoing Adoption Agreement is hereby approved by Ingham County Board of Commissioners on the ____ day of ____________________, 20____.

(Name of Approving Employer)

Authorized signature: ____________________________________________________________

Title: ________________

Witness signature: _____________________________________________________________

Received and Approved by the Municipal Employees' Retirement System of Michigan

Dated: ____________________, 20____ Signature: _________________________________

(Authorized MERS Signatory)
Agenda Item 10d and 10e

April 1, 2014

To: County Services and Finance Committee

From: Travis Parsons, Human Resources Director

Subject: ICEA Professional Court Employees - Collective Bargaining Agreement

On Tuesday, April 1, 2014, ICEA notified us the membership ratified tentative agreement reached on March 14, 2014. Highlights of the agreement include the following:

- **Contract Duration (Article 40):** through December 31, 2015
- **Salary Schedule (Article 30):**
  - 2014 – 1% wage reduction from the 2013 wage scales.
  - 2015 – 1% wage increase
  - Step progression for 2014 resumes to the step the employee would have progressed to in 2014 on the later of the employee’s anniversary date or date of ratification.
- **Retirement (Article 26):**
  - Eligible employees hired after April 15, 2014 shall receive a MERS Hybrid pension plan: DB - 1.25% multiplier and DC - 1% employee minimum contribution with a 1% employer match.
  - Retirement Age - 60
- **Retiree Health (Article 26):**
  - Employees hired after April 15, 2014 – single subscriber retiree health per sliding scale based on years of service. Eligible at age 60.
- **Longevity (Article 25):**
  - Employees hired after April 15, 2014 are not eligible to receive longevity bonus for service with the Employer.
- **Vacation (Article 22):**
  - Employees hired after April 15, 2014 shall accrue vacation according to the reduced schedule.
- **Leaves of Absence (Article 23):**
  - Employees hired after April 15, 2014 shall receive payout for death or retirement at the rate of 25% of accrued hours up to a max accrual of 1,280 hours.
  - Employees hired after April 15, 2014 shall earn sick leave credit based on the ratio of 3.69 hours for each fully compensated payroll period. Upon reaching a 10 year anniversary shall be restored to the ratio of 4.5 hours for each fully compensated payroll period.

Also included in the packet is a resolution establishing the MERS Hybrid pension plan.
Agenda Item 10d

Introduced by the County Services Committee and Finance Committee of the:

INGHAM COUNTY BOARD OF COMMISSIONERS

RESOLUTION APPROVING A COLLECTIVE BARGAINING AGREEMENT
WITH INGHAM COUNTY EMPLOYEES’ ASSOCIATION –
PROFESSIONAL COURT EMPLOYEES

WHEREAS, an agreement has been reached between representatives of Ingham County, the 30th Judicial
Circuit Court, 55th District Court and Ingham County Employees’ Association (ICEA) – Professional Court
Employees for the period January 1, 2012 through December 31, 2015; and

WHEREAS, the agreement has been ratified by the employees within the bargaining unit; and

WHEREAS, the provisions of the agreement have been approved by the County Services and Finance
Committees.

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED, that the Ingham County Board of Commissioners hereby approves the
contract between Ingham County and ICEA Professional Court Employees for the period January 1, 2012
through December 31, 2015.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that the Chairperson of the Board of Commissioners and the County Clerk are
authorized to sign the contract on behalf of the County, subject to the approval as to form by the County
Attorney.
Introduced by the County Services and Finance Committees of the:

INGHAM COUNTY BOARD OF COMMISSIONERS

RESOLUTION AUTHORIZING THE ESTABLISHMENT OF A MERS HYBRID PLAN FOR NEWLY HIRED EMPLOYEES UNDER INGHAM COUNTY EMPLOYEES’ ASSOCIATION – PROFESSIONAL COURT EMPLOYEES

WHEREAS, the Ingham County Board of Commissioners has recognized the escalating cost of the current MERS Defined Benefit Plan; and

WHEREAS, Ingham County Employees’ Association (ICEA) – Professional Court Employees approved a new collective bargaining agreement that includes the establishment of a Hybrid pension plan for new hires.

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED, the Board of Commissioners authorizes the MERS Hybrid Plan Adoption Agreement establishing the MERS Hybrid Pension Plan for new employees under Ingham County Employees’ Association (ICEA) – Professional Court Employees after April 15, 2014.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that the Ingham County Board of Commissioners authorizes the Board Chair to sign and execute all documents on behalf of the County to effectuate and finalize this transaction, subject to the approval as to form by the County Attorney.
GUEST ARTICLE
ON THE ROAD WITH OFF-ROAD VEHICLES

By Peter A. Cohl and Timothy M. Perrone, Cohl, Stoker & Toskey, P.C.

The Michigan Legislature has once again expanded the list of counties that are eligible to adopt an ordinance permitting Off-Road Vehicles (ORV's) on county roads, now authorizing such local ordinances throughout the state. Since 2008, certain counties have been statutorily authorized to adopt an ordinance allowing ORV's to be operated with the flow of traffic on the far right side of the maintained portion of designated county roads, with other statutorily-required restrictions and conditions. Statutory authorization for an ORV ordinance was historically limited to counties in the Upper Peninsula and northern Lower Michigan. However, the applicable statute was recently amended by 2013 PA 119 (eff. 9/25/13) to make "southern counties" also eligible to adopt an ORV ordinance.

"ORV" means a motor-driven off-road recreation vehicle capable of cross-country travel without benefit of a road or trail, on or immediately over land, snow, ice, marsh, swamp, or other natural terrain. ORV includes, but is not limited to, a multitrack or multiwheel drive vehicle, an ATV, a motorcycle or related 2-wheel vehicle, a vehicle with 3 or more wheels, an amphibious machine, a ground effect air cushion vehicle, or other means of transportation. ORV does not include a registered snowmobile.

Statutory Authority

ORV's in Michigan are governed by Part 811 of the Natural Resources and Environmental Protection Act (NREPA), as amended, MCL 324.81101 et seq. This statute regulates the use and operation of ORV's, and provides penalties for violation of the law. All violations of Part 811 may be enforced by a law enforcement officer, e.g., county sheriff's deputy. MCL 324.81146.

ORV ordinances are governed by MCL 324.81131. Under MCL 324.81131(2), a county is authorized to adopt an ordinance authorizing the operation of ORV's on the maintained portion of one or more roads located within the county. Townships, cities and villages may also adopt ordinances allowing the operation of ORV's on roads or streets within the municipality, but only beginning one year after the effective date of the amendatory act that first authorized the county to adopt an ORV ordinance. MCL 324.81131(3), (5).

Designation of County Roads

County and township ordinances are subject to the right of the county road commission to close a road to ORV operation to protect the environment, or where the operation of ORV's poses a particular and demonstrable threat to public safety. MCL 324.81131(4). The county road commission shall not close more than 30% of the linear miles of county roads located within the county to the operation of ORV's otherwise authorized by ordinance. The legislative body of a township or municipality may adopt an ordinance to close a county road located in the township or municipality to the operation of ORV's that are otherwise authorized under a county ORV ordinance, but only to protect the environment or if the operation of ORV's poses a particular and demonstrable threat to public safety. Id.

The county may maintain a master map of all roads under the jurisdiction of the county road commission upon which shall be indicated those roads and parts or sections thereof upon which the operation of ORVs is permitted and prohibited under an ordinance. The county may make such master map available for interested groups or organizations to make copies for distribution to the general public, but would have no obligation to incur any expense associated with the making of such copies.

State Highways

The county may also request that the Michigan Department of Transportation (MDOT) authorize the county to adopt an ordinance authorizing the operation of ORV's on a highway within the county, other than an interstate highway. MCL 324.81131(6). According to MCL 324.81131(7), MDOT shall authorize operation of an ORV only on a highway that is not an interstate highway and that meets one or more of the following requirements:

(a) Serves as a connector between ORV areas, routes, or trails designated by the MDRE or an ORV user group.

(b) Provides access to tourist attractions, food service establishments, fuel, motels, or other services.

(c) Serves as a connector between two segments of the same county road that run along discontinuous town lines and on which ORV use is authorized by ordinance.

Continued on page 8
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Proposed Ordinance

If a county decides to adopt an ORV ordinance, the violations of the county ordinance potentially punishable as municipal civil infractions are limited to those specific violations set forth in MCL 324.81131 regarding (a) designated roads, (b) flow of traffic, (c) operation on the far right side of the road, (d) basic speed, (e) non-interference with traffic, (f) unlicensed driving of a registered motor vehicle over 65 inches in width or having three wheels, (g) single file travel, (h) operation without a lighted headlight and taillight, (i) operation by a person under 12 years of age, and (j) operation by a person under 18 years of age unless in possession of a driver’s license or under direct supervision with possession of an ORV safety certificate.

The ordinance could either simply list the county roads designated for ORV operation under the ordinance, or may make reference to a separate list of county roads designated for ORV operation under the ordinance. To the extent that the list of designated county roads may need to be changed, the changes must be accomplished by an ordinance amendment. It would be insufficient to simply provide in the ordinance that the list of roads or master map may be updated periodically.

Procedure for Adoption of Ordinance

Adoption of an ORV ordinance by a county board of commissioners requires a public hearing. MCL 324.81131(2). Not less than 45 days before a public hearing on the ordinance, the county clerk shall send notice of the public hearing, by certified mail, to (a) the county road commission, (b) the legislative body of each township and municipality located within the county, (c) the Michigan Department of Transportation if the road intersects a highway, and (d) if state forestland is located within the county, to the Michigan Department of Natural Resources and Environment.

In “southern counties,” the law requires the county board of commissioners to “consult” with the board of county road commissioners before adopting an ORV ordinance. MCL 324.81131(2). The ordinance becomes effective when notice of its adoption is published in a newspaper of general circulation in the county. MCL 46.11(1).

By: Peter A. Cohl
Timothy M. Perrone
Cohl, Stoker & Toskey, P.C.
601 N. Capitol Ave.
Lansing, MI 48933
(517) 372-9000