

STEBEN COUNTY PUBLIC WORKS COMMITTEE

Monday, April 6, 2020

10:10 a.m.

Via Teleconference

****MINUTES****

COMMITTEE:	Robert V. Nichols, Chair Aaron I. Mullen	Frederick G. Potter, Vice Chair Thomas J. Ryan	Jeffrey P. Horton
STAFF:	Jack K. Wheeler Doug Rapalee Brenda Mori	Christopher Brewer Steve Orcutt Tammy Hurd-Harvey	Vince Spagnoletti Lisa Tracy
LEGISLATORS:	Scott J. Van Etten Kelly H. Fitzpatrick John V. Malter	Robin K. Lattimer Hilda T. Lando Gary D. Swackhamer	Carol A. Ferratella Steven P. Maio
OTHERS:	Media		

I. CALL TO ORDER

Mr. Nichols called the meeting to order at 10:10 a.m.

II. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

MOTION: APPROVING THE MINUTES OF THE MARCH 2, 2020, AND MARCH 23, 2020, MEETINGS MADE BY MR. HORTON. SECONDED BY MR. RYAN. ALL BEING IN FAVOR. MOTION CARRIES 5-0.

III. HIGHWAYS

A. *CR 119 Bridge Over Canisteo River, Cameron* – Mr. Spagnoletti stated the first one is to get your approval for an agreement with C&S Engineers to do the construction inspection and the testing of the materials, plus to do the right-of-way/ eminent domain proceedings. The agreement is for \$498,000. The County's share is 5 percent. Mr. Horton asked is this in the normal project? Mr. Spagnoletti replied this is part of the normal project... (*Secretary's Note: Audio cut out and was garbled*)

MOTION: AUTHORIZING THE COMMISSIONER OF PUBLIC WORKS TO ENTER INTO AN AGREEMENT WITH C&S ENGINEERS TO DO THE CONSTRUCTION INSPECTION, TESTING OF MATERIALS AND THE RIGHT-OF-WAY/EMINENT DOMAIN PROCEEDINGS FOR A TOTAL COST OF \$498,000 WITH THE COUNTY'S SHARE AT 5 PERCENT MADE BY MR. RYAN. SECONDED BY MR. HORTON FOR DISCUSSION.

Mr. Nichols stated so everything is covered for 5 percent and this doesn't go out for bids, right Vince? This is you pick the one you feel is best and you can't look at the price? Mr. Spagnoletti replied this is the engineering firm that you have already, that we have already approved to be the engineer for this project. Now we need an agreement with them. They have already designed it and we approved that. This is for the agreement for them to inspect the job out in the field and to do the materials testing. Mr. Nichols stated all right. Are there any other questions?

Mr. Potter replied yes, I have one. On the agenda there are two amounts listed; \$462,000 and \$36,000 for a total of \$498,000. Can you explain the reason for the two separate amounts? Mr. Spagnoletti replied the \$462,000 is for the construction inspecting and testing and the \$36,000 is for the right-of-way/ eminent domain proceedings. Mr. Potter stated okay, that's what I thought. Mr. Nichols asked is there any other questions?

VOTE ON PREVIOUS MOTION: ALL BEING IN FAVOR. MOTION CARRIES 5-0.

Mr. Spagnoletti stated okay now the numbers two, three and four under the County Route 119 Bridge for the railroad crossing; we are moving the bridge so we have a new railroad crossing built. Number two is for an agreement with DOT to fund \$640,000 of the total cost of moving the railroad crossing. Mr. Nichols asked now we are not doing all three together, this is two, right? Mr. Spagnoletti replied this is just number two to approve an agreement with DOT to fund \$640,000 of the cost.

Mr. Ryan asked if he could ask a question. Mr. Spagnoletti stated yes. Mr. Ryan asked initially, how was it determined to move the bridge in the first place? Why, uh, who determined that it would be best to change the angle? Only because of the additional expense is why I am asking the question. Mr. Spagnoletti explained when we design a bridge like this, the um, we look at different options. The three different options were leave it in the same place, move it, you know, just uh downstream, or, if we left it in the same place to build a detour bridge. If we move the bridge, we have to make a railroad crossing. Those two options are almost the same price. Now we could have instead of, we could have just blocked the traffic; build it in the same place and made the traffic go along these long detours. That option would have been about \$1.3 million lower cost. But we, the State DOT who is funding 95 percent of this, I and Steve Catherman, we made the decision, with the engineering firm, to move the bridge; primarily to get rid of that curvewhere there was a triple fatality. So the decision as to where it goes, which design, is between Steve Catherman, me, State DOT and the engineering design firm. Mr. Ryan asked is the existing bridge going to act as a detour bridge while you are building the new one? Mr. Spagnoletti replied yes. The existing bridge will continue to be used while we build the new bridge right next to it.

Ms. Prossick stated just briefly, when there is a fatality or a severe accident on one of our bridges, we are required by law to do a study and the study showed that there should be changes made. So once we have that information and we know changes need to be made, we have to make those changes to release ourselves from further liability for any further accidents at that site. So I think that's what sparked all of this in the beginning was that road study.

MOTION: AUTHORIZING THE COMMISSIONER OF PUBLIC WORKS TO ENTER INTO AN AGREEMENT WITH NEW YORK STATE DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION TO FUND \$640,000 OF THE TOTAL COST OF MOVING THE RAILROAD CROSSING MADE BY MR. HORTON. SECONDED BY MR. MULLEN. ALL BEING IN FAVOR. MOTION CARRIES 5-0. Resolution Required.

Mr. Spagnoletti stated number three is we need another \$128,000 to pay for the railroad crossing beyond what the State found for funding. To get that \$128,000, we had \$80,000 left over in our County Route 22 Bridge Project and we have \$48,000 in our Future Bridge Projects account. We want to transfer those two amounts which total \$128,000 into this project and that will take care of completing the funding for the new railroad crossing.

MOTION: AUTHORIZING THE COMMISSIONER OF PUBLIC WORKS TO TRANSFER \$80,000 FROM THE COUNTY ROUTE 22 BRIDGE PROJECT ACCOUNT AND \$48,000 FROM THE FUTURE BRIDGE PROJECTS ACCOUNTS INTO THE COUNTY ROUTE 119 BRIDGE PROJECT ACCOUNT MADE BY MR. MULLEN. SECONDED BY MR. HORTON FOR DISCUSSION.

Mr. Nichols stated one question I have with this is we've got to do this, I understand. I've heard talk and I don't know if it will happen or not, but there's talk that Norfolk Southern may add the other track back that they took up or that Conrail or somebody did and uh if they do that, we shouldn't have to pay for another track, for another crossing for that other track should we? Mr. Spagnoletti stated I don't know anything about them adding another track and I don't know that that's in this design. Mr. Nichols stated I just heard; to me it should be their expense, it shouldn't be ours. They're not going to add another track now, but I've heard scuttlebutt that they may in time and a rumor's worth a rumor you know and it may not amount to anything. Mr. Spagnoletti stated I'll check into that Bob (Mr. Nichols), and I'll get back to you. Mr. Nichols stated all I want to know is if they add, if they ever do add another track, I just want a guarantee that we aren't going to have to help pay for the crossing for the other track, do you see what I'm saying? Mr. Spagnoletti stated I see what you're saying and I don't think we would be responsible for paying for that second track. Mr. Nichols stated I don't either, but I had heard that scuttlebutt that they were thinking about maybe down the road doing that. You know they took up what used to.....(*Secretary's Note – Audio cut out*) and my question would be if you add the other track back

someday we aren't going to have to pay on it, that was my only concern. Mr. Spagnoletti stated yeah and I don't think we would. Mr. Nichols stated yeah I agree with you but you never know. Mr. Spagnoletti stated we will keep an eye out for it. Mr. Nichols stated okay.

VOTE ON PREVIOUS MOTION: ALL BEING IN FAVOR. MOTION CARRIES 5-0. Resolution Required.

Mr. Nichols stated okay Vince (Mr. Spagnoletti), number four. Mr. Spagnoletti stated number four, so now we have found the money to move the railroad crossing; \$40,000 from the State and \$128,000 from our other funds. So now we want approval to enter into an agreement with Norfolk Southern to actually build this railroad crossing and the agreement is for \$767,305.

MOTION: AUTHORIZING THE COMMISSIONER OF PUBLIC WORKS TO ENTER INTO AN AGREEMENT WITH NORFOLK SOUTHERN FOR THE CONSTRUCTION OF A NEW RAILROAD CROSSING AT THE COUNTY ROUTE 119 BRIDGE FOR A TOTAL COST OF \$767,305 MADE BY MR. POTTER. SECONDED BY MR. RYAN. ALL BEING IN FAVOR. MOTION CARRIES 5-0.

Mr. Spagnoletti stated Bob (Mr. Nichols), I do want to say one thing about this County Route 119 project. It's been very complicated. The railroad crossing has made it extra more expensive. New York State DOT has done a great job in finding all this funding so that ours is, you know, 5 percent or less of this as these costs have increased. Also, Steve Catherman and Jennifer Prossick have done a lot of work as this project became more and more complicated and they have done, really a great job and there is still more to be done to get this job started on time and finished on time. They are doing a great job on it. Mr. Nichols stated well I say thank you to them and it is a huge project. Any time you deal with the railroad, it becomes nail biting. It's quite an undertaking when you are dealing with the railroad.

B. *CR 66 Bridge Over Canisteo River, Hornellsville* – Mr. Spagnoletti stated okay the County Route 66 Bridge; the DEC, we already awarded the contract, the DEC came in and said they want a steel sheet wall driven around the old pier for when we remove it so that we don't allow sediment into the water, into the stream. The DEC also said they wanted more soils testing to check to see if there are heavy metals in the soil, in the river, on the streambank. So this is again, this job is zero percent County share. So the first thing to do, to adhere to the DEC's directive, is to approve an agreement with DOT for the additional funding; \$121,000 for the steel cofferdam, \$16,000 for the soils testing for a total of \$138,000, no \$137,000.

MOTION: AUTHORIZING THE COMMISSIONER OF PUBLIC WORKS TO ENTER INTO AN AGREEMENT WITH NEW YORK STATE DOT FOR ADDITIONAL FUNDING TOTALING \$137,000; \$121,000 FOR THE STEEL COFFERDAM AND \$16,000 FOR THE SOILS TESTING, RELATIVE TO THE CR 66 BRIDGE OVER THE CANISTEO RIVER IN HORNELLSVILLE PROJECT MADE BY MR. MULLEN. SECONDED BY MR. HORTON FOR DISCUSSION.

Mr. Nichols asked now this steel that they are going to drive into the ground, does that stay in there permanently Vince (Mr. Spagnoletti)? Mr. Spagnoletti replied no that will come out because they will drive it; it will be a ring around the pier, they will remove the old pier, then they will remove the steel sheeting. The new bridge won't have a pier in the river. Mr. Nichols stated okay.

VOTE ON PREVIOUS MOTION: ALL BEING IN FAVOR. MOTION CARRIES 5-0. Resolution Required.

Mr. Spagnoletti stated okay now we have found the funding for it and we want to issue an order on contract to Twin Tier Construction to adhere to the DEC directive for a steel cofferdam. That change order would be \$121,000.

MOTION: AUTHORIZING A CHANGE ORDER FOR TWIN TIER CONSTRUCTION FOR \$120,000 FOR THE CONSTRUCTION OF A STEEL COFFERDAM RELATIVE TO THE CR 66 BRIDGE OVER THE CANISTEO RIVER PROJECT MADE BY MR. RYAN. SECONDED BY MR. POTTER FOR DISCUSSION.

Mr. Nichols stated now, so this here is paid 100 percent by the State. Is that correct? Mr. Spagnoletti replied that's correct Bob (Mr. Nichols). Mr. Nichols stated okay. Any other questions?

VOTE ON PREVIOUS MOTION: ALL BEING IN FAVOR. MOTION CARRIES 5-0.

Mr. Spagnoletti stated okay the second part of the DEC directive is to do soils testing and we would like approval with an agreement with Popli Engineers to do the soils testing for \$15,403.

MOTION: AUTHORIZING THE COMMISSIONER OF PUBLIC WORKS TO ENTER INTO AN AGREEMENT WITH POPLI ENGINEERS TO DO THE SOILS TESTING RELATIVE TO THE CR 66 BRIDGE OVER THE CANISTEO RIVER PROJECT FOR A TOTAL COST OF \$15,403 MADE BY MR. MULLEN. SECONDED BY MR. RYAN. ALL BEING IN FAVOR. MOTION CARRIES 5-0.

C. *Inter-Municipal Agreements with Cities, Towns and Villages for Hauling and Transporting of Equipment* – Mr. Spagnoletti stated in the past we hauled equipment with our low-boy for the towns and the villages. Very few of them have a low-boy. Apparently the insurance company is now requiring an inter-municipal agreement in place specifically for hauling of equipment. Jennifer (Ms. Prossick), is there something you want to add to this as far as getting approval for this? Ms. Prossick stated it's just real quick; as opposed to it being a shared service, Scott Sprague and I spoke with our new broker and they said they would prefer, because it falls under the auto policy, that we enter into inter-municipal agreements so they can put it on the auto policy and then we come up with a process on who loads it and things of that nature in an inter-municipal agreement so that it's spelled out very clearly who is loading, who is tying it down, things of that nature.

MOTION: AUTHORIZING INTER-MUNICIPAL AGREEMENTS WITH THE CITIES, TOWNS AND VILLAGES FOR HAULING AND TRANSPORTING OF EQUIPMENT MADE BY MR. HORTON. SECONDED BY MR. POTTER. ALL BEING IN FAVOR. MOTION CARRIES 5-0. Resolution Required.

D. *Moore Road Gravel Pit Payments Assigned to New Owner* – Mr. Spagnoletti stated we have a contract with Dennis Gregg of Bath Sand and Gravel to buy gravel for \$3.00 per ton. Since we entered into that contract, it was a bid, Gregg sold the gravel pit to Wilkins. Now, because of their agreement between the two of them, they want us to pay \$0.50 per ton to Gregg and \$2.50 per ton to Wilkins, for the total of \$3.00 per ton. It isn't any more money for us, but it's a legal thing. Jennifer (Ms. Prossick), do you want to finish this one out? Ms. Prossick stated yeah, we are just trying to capture the agreement between the two entities so we can assign the \$2.50 to Wilkins, which was originally to Bath Sand and Gravel, so we can get it paid and vendor ID and have Wilkins assume indemnification clauses so being on his property as opposed to being on Dennis Gregg's and it still covers us.

MOTION: AUTHORIZING THE ASSIGNMENT OF THE MOORE ROAD GRAVEL PIT FROM DENNIS GREGG TO WILKINS AND AUTHORIZING THE COMMISSIONER OF PUBLIC WORKS TO PAY \$0.50 PER TON TO DENNIS GREGG AND \$2.50 PER TON TO WILKINS FOR A TOTAL COST OF \$3.00 PER TON MADE BY MR. MULLEN. SECONDED BY MR. HORTON. ALL BEING IN FAVOR. MOTION CARRIES 5-0.

Mr. Spagnoletti stated Bob (Mr. Nichols) I had one comment on that. Jennifer (Ms. Prossick) is it necessary for us to put in the minutes Scott Wilkins of Wilkins Dairy Farm, d/b/a Roscoe Holdings, or is it okay the way they did it? Ms. Prossick replied it's okay. With the assignment it has it written all ways so that we could identify them, but that is good for the record, Vince. We're good. Mr. Spagnoletti stated okay, thanks.

Mr. Spagnoletti asked, okay Bob (Mr. Nichols) do you want to do the bids now?

Mr. Swackhamer stated I wanted to ask Vince (Mr. Spagnoletti), what happened with that contract for the land next to the Landfill? Mr. Spagnoletti asked the small piece of property down by Route 15? Mr. Swackhamer stated yeah. Mr. Spagnoletti stated they, after the, Jennifer (Ms. Prossick), I don't know what I should be saying here. Mr. Wheeler stated

that's probably Executive Session material. Mr. Swackhamer stated okay, I'll ask him later. Mr. Spagnoletti stated okay. Mr. Swackhamer stated thank you.

IV. BIDS

Mr. Nichols stated now on the bids here we have, before we get into them, there is one bid here, in order to try to save some money because with the circumstances, we are considering not doing the, not washing the bridges this year. What's the committee think? Mr. Malter asked what is the downside? Mr. Nichols stated the downside is we will be on it for a year...(*Secretary's Note – no audio*). Mr. Spagnoletti stated the County Manager has requested us to look for places to save money. In the washing of bridges, we could go a whole year and not wash them. I'll just put together a County crew to wash the surfaces, the decks, the driving surface and not do the beams. Let it go a year; I think we can do that without significant damage. It's not something you want to fall into a routine of doing, because if you let it go, maintenance, then the costs skyrocket in construction. But I think we could do that this year and then we could take \$300,000 off the County DPW expense side.

Mr. Potter stated next year is going to be a tight budget year, we know that. Will it be harder to put that money back in next year than spend it this year? Mr. Wheeler stated so the money, from a budget to budget, the money would be in there. When we carry over and start the budget, your money will still be in there, so you know it would just be a matter of not spending it this year. Mr. Potter stated I see. Mr. Nichols stated it would just give us some extra money for our carry over I assume? Jack, is that what you're saying? Mr. Wheeler stated yeah, obviously what we are looking at is a drop of sales tax, so uh, you know, I've tasked, and Chris (Mr. Brewer) has tasked, departments to look at areas where they could have a savings in this current budget year. So, yeah it would just help plug the gaps in revenue with less expense. Mr. Nichols asked it would still be in the budget for next year? Mr. Wheeler replied yes, right. It would still be in your base budget for next year unless Vince (Mr. Spagnoletti) proposed to take it out, unless I took it out which I wouldn't before we talked with you folks as a committee or Finance, or as a Legislature. So in your base budget it would be in there, yes.

Mr. Potter stated another comment. If we lose sales tax revenue, that's money that's not going to be there in terms of cash forward, if you will, unexpended cash forward. How is this going to help us because we are still going to have to come up with that money next year. Mr. Wheeler stated so the goal is to just address the current problem; so reduce expenses to offset the reduced revenues where we can. Obviously there are some places that we can't. Next year, you know, hopefully this is behind us by the time we are developing our budget and the revenues and sales tax starts bouncing back so that, you know we can go forward. We'll have much better projections of this at that time. This is just the matter of, this is one area that Vince and his crew have identified that they could live without to help us, you know, offset the loss of revenue.

Mr. Nichols stated this would be a project that next year would have to be done. We need to skip something next year and it would have to be something different than this because we will have to wash the bridges next year. Mr. Potter stated agreed. Mr. Spagnoletti stated yeah, this is something that it would be important to do next year. We will do part of it this year with our crews, but it is very important to do it next year.

Mr. Nichols asked didn't we buy a fire truck a few years ago to wash the upper deck or something? Didn't we? I thought we bought an old fire truck or something to power wash. Mr. Spagnoletti stated Bob (Mr. Nichols) as best as I can remember, it seems as if years ago we bought an old fire truck, but it really didn't work out to do the job right. Now maybe, I'm just not sure of that, but I don't think we have that anymore. If we did have it, it would be all right to wash off the driving surface, but not to get underneath for the beams. Mr. Nichols stated I think we are going back a long ways Vince (Mr. Spagnoletti) on that one. Mr. Spagnoletti stated yeah I'm pretty sure that was bought and maybe put in the auction. Mr. Nichols stated it probably went to the scrap pile. Mr. Malter stated it was bought in the 80's. Mr. Nichols stated or it was put in the auction. All right, so is there a motion to do that and not award that bid for power washing the bridges? Do you want to do that and then we'll go down through the bids, but this is one we want to take out.

Mr. Mullen stated I was wondering if we have several bridges that are on salt heavier roads maybe we should still do. I know that maybe like County Route 70A; I think a lot of our roads we put a lot more sand on don't we? But where we have bridges that get a lot of salt, maybe we should consider just doing those ones. Mr. Nichols stated I don't know.

Vince (Mr. Spagnoletti)? Mr. Spagnoletti stated yeah Aaron (Mr. Mullen), I think we will be all right to go one year. To ask the contractor now to come in and just do a few bridges, it would be changing the contract so much that it would make a different bid and I think it would be cleaner to just to reject it. The point is good. Some roads we use a lot of salt and others not so much, but I think we'll be all right to let it go this year. Mr. Mullen stated okay.

MOTION: REJECTING THE BIDS FOR THE CLEANING, WASHING AND SEALING OF STEUBEN COUNTY BRIDGES MADE BY MR. POTTER. SECONDED BY MR. RYAN. ALL BEING IN FAVOR. MOTION CARRIES 5-0.

Mr. Nichols stated okay Vince (Mr. Spagnoletti), we'll go back to the, start with Bid A. Mr. Mullen asked can I interrupt for a second? Are we going to need an Executive Session, because Brenda (Ms. Mori) will need to get a code out and I know Gary (Mr. Swackhamer) sounded like maybe we would need one. Mr. Nichols stated I don't know. Mr. Wheeler stated that's up to you. If there are no more questions, I would say probably not. Vince (Mr. Spagnoletti) sent an email, or I believe Jen (Ms. Prossick) sent an email to everyone about that issue. If that's your only, I mean you certainly can, but if that's the only issue, I think we can handle it other ways. Ms. Prossick stated yeah if anybody wants to email me in response to the email I sent, or give me a call, I'm here, so we can talk about that off the record if anyone had any follow-up questions. Mr. Nichols stated okay. Mr. Nichols stated with that then, if everybody is okay with it, let's proceed with the bids then Vince (Mr. Spagnoletti).

Mr. Spagnoletti stated Bob (Mr. Nichols) if it's all right with you, I'll just go right through from one bid to the next and you can vote on all of them. Mr. Nichols stated we will have a motion on all of them at the end, yes. We'll go one to the other.

A. *Chip Spreader* – Mr. Spagnoletti stated this is the same price that we received last time. This is a rebid. It's a good machine. The \$317,010 to Tracy Road Equipment. I want to say that Doug Rapalee, Jerry Miller and Scott Sprague got \$59,250 on insurance from our damaged machine to help pay for this. So I would recommend this one to Tracy Road Equipment.

Mr. Mullen asked wasn't that the one that we thought we were going to get a better bid on? Mr. Spagnoletti replied yes. We did reject it I think last month or the month before. Primarily to see if we could get, if there was another machine out there, another make, even a much better machine than we had. As it turned out, we got the same price and the same machine. It didn't turn out exactly the way I wanted, but it is a good machine and I would recommend awarding it. It's the same price as last time.

MOTION: AWARDING THE BID FOR CHIP SPREADER TO THE LOW BIDDER, TRACEY ROAD EQUIPMENT, INC. FOR A TOTAL OF \$317,010.00 MADE BY MR. RYAN. SECONDED BY MR. MULLEN. ALL BEING IN FAVOR. MOTION CARRIES 5-0.

B. *Asphalt Concrete; Specified In-Place Projects* – Mr. Spagnoletti stated the next one is our asphalt concrete. These are our blacktop projects. The 39 miles of road that we are going to blacktop; the price is up 6 percent from last year. What we are hoping for is, there is a price adjustment if the oil price goes up or goes down. There are reports that crude oil could go down to \$20 to \$30 per gallon. If that does, we will spend less than what is shown here. As the price is shown, Dolomite is a good contractor. Yes it's up 6 percent, but he would award it to Dolomite for \$3,640,998.35.

MOTION: AWARDING THE BID FOR ASPHALT CONCRETE; SPECIFIED IN-PLACE PROJECTS TO THE LOW BIDDER, DOLOMITE PRODUCTS CO., INC., D/B/A A.L. BLADES FOR A TOTAL PRICE OF \$3,640,998.35 MADE BY MR. RYAN. SECONDED BY MR. MULLEN. ALL BEING IN FAVOR. MOTION CARRIES 5-0.

C. *Cold In-Place Recycling Project(s)* – Mr. Spagnoletti stated this is where the machine goes down and takes the existing blacktop, which has some cracking; **grinds** it, adds oil and aggregate, rolls it and it's like new blacktop. This bid is becoming a problem. The price is up 40 percent in two years. Now again, we are looking to see if in the end

we will pay a lot less because of the crude oil prices going down. We are also looking into some other way to substitute for this process. Maybe blacktop for more jobs or use our grinder. As of now, this is the best we can do on the recycling and I would recommend awarding it to Suit-Kote for \$1,639,344.73. This has been a problem throughout the State; the recycling bids have been going up quite rapidly and quite high.

D. *Cutting Edges* – Mr. Spagnoletti stated we would like to postpone until next month.

E. *Crushed Limestone* – Mr. Spagnoletti stated the Crushed Limestone, this is for when we chip-seal the roads. The price is about the same as last year. I would like to award it to Dolomite.

MOTION: AWARDING THE BID FOR CRUSHED LIMESTONE TO THE LOW BIDDER, DOLOMITE PRODUCTS COMPANY, INC., D/B/A A.L. BLADES FOR A TOTAL PRICE OF \$147,557.50 MADE BY MR. RYAN. SECONDED BY MR. MULLEN. ALL BEING IN FAVOR. MOTION CARRIES 5-0.

F. *Cleaning, Washing and Sealing of Steuben County Bridges* – Mr. Spagnoletti stated you rejected the bridge washing.

G. *Geotextile Materials and Waterproofing Membrane* – Mr. Spagnoletti stated geotextile primarily we use it behind the bridge abutments to drain water. There was about a 14 percent increase from last year but I think this is the best we can do. I would recommend awarding it to Chemung Supply.

MOTION: AWARDING THE BID FOR GEOTEXTILE MATERIALS AND WATERPROOFING MEMBRANE TO THE SOLE BIDDER, CHEMUNG SUPPLY MADE BY MR. RYAN. SECONDED BY MR. MULLEN. ALL BEING IN FAVOR. MOTION CARRIES 5-0.

H. *Stone Fill Trucking Services* – Mr. Spagnoletti stated the top part of it, of the bid is to haul with tri-axes and recommend awarding to all bidders except Sick Brothers. They are rejected because they didn't put the proper bid bond in. The bottom part of it, only one bidder and award that to Dgien. This is the bid that Jeff Parker requested because we were having trouble finding trucks.

MOTION: DECLARING SICK BROTHERS A NON-RESPONSIVER BIDDER AS THEY DID NOT PUT THE PROPER BID BOND IN, AND AWARDING THE BID FOR STONE FILL TRUCKING SERVICES – TRI-AXLE DUMP TO THE FOLLOWING BIDDERS ON A LINE ITEM BASIS: DGIEN TRUCKING, INC.; GOODRICH TRUCKING AND LEON LACY, INC.; AWARDING THE BID FOR STONE FILL TRUCKING SERVICES – TRAILER DUMP, TO THE SOLE BIDDER, DGIEN TRUCKING MADE BY MR. RYAN. SECONDED BY MR. MULLEN. ALL BEING IN FAVOR. MOTION CARRIES 5-0.

I. *Grinder Teeth, Tooth Holders & Hardware* – Mr. Spagnoletti this is for our big grinder. The big item there is the grinder teeth, \$4.65 each and that is up about \$0.30 in two years. I would recommend awarding that to Monroe Tractor.

MOTION: AWARDING THE BID FOR GRINDER TEETH, TOOTH HOLDERS & HARDWARE TO THE SOLE BIDDER, MONROE TRACTOR, INC. MADE BY MR. RYAN. SECONDED BY MR. MULLEN. ALL BEING IN FAVOR. MOTION CARRIES 5-0.

J. *Asphalt Milling* – Mr. Spagnoletti stated asphalt milling is a special milling machine that will grind the blacktop, put it in the conveyor belt and drop it right in our trucks. We only use about five days a year. This price has actually dropped \$100 per day since 2019. So I would recommend awarding to all bidders.

MOTION: AWARDING THE BID FOR ASPHALT MILLING TO THE FOLLOWING BIDDERS: BOTHAR CONSTRUCTION, LLC; DONEGAL CONSTRUCTION CORP.; KILLIAN CONSTRUCTION LLC; SUIT-KOTE CORPORATION; AND VILLAGE CONSTRUCTION, INC. MADE BY MR. RYAN. SECONDED BY MR. MULLEN. ALL BEING IN FAVOR. MOTION CARRIES 5-0.

K. *Oxygen & Acetylene* – Mr. Spagnoletti stated oxygen and acetylene; one bidder. The price was \$2,400 four years ago. This one \$3,471.79 and I recommend awarding to Bradley Supply.

MOTION: AWARDING THE BID FOR OXYGEN & ACETYLENE TO THE SOLE BIDDER, BRADLEY SUPPLY, INC. FOR A TOTAL PRICE OF \$3,471.79 MADE BY MR. RYAN. SECONDED BY MR. MULLEN. ALL BEING IN FAVOR. MOTION CARRIES 5-0.

L. *Removal & Recycling/Disposal of Waste Oil & Antifreeze* – Mr. Spagnoletti stated when we drain the oil out of the equipment, we call people to come in and take it to recycle it. I would recommend awarding to both Safety Kleen and Environmental Service. We used Environmental Service; they're the ones that are usually available. Their price has gone up from \$8,400 to a total of \$11,550 in four years, so that's a good price. I would recommend awarding to both of them.

MOTION: AWARDING THE BID FOR REMOVAL & RECYCLING/DISPOSAL OF WASTE OIL AND ANTIFREEZE TO THE FOLLOWING BIDDERS: SAFETY-KLEEN SYSTEMS, INC. AND THE ENVIRONMENTAL SERVICE GROUP NY, INC. MADE BY MR. RYAN. SECONDED BY MR. MULLEN. ALL BEING IN FAVOR. MOTION CARRIES 5-0

M. *Asphalt Concrete: FOB Plant Site* – Mr. Spagnoletti stated this is where we send our trucks to the blacktop plants just to buy the material. Now on this one there has been a 4 percent drop over a year. Again, that doesn't correlate with what happened with the asphalt projects and the recycling, but I would recommend awarding to all bidders on the FOB.

MOTION: AWARDING THE BID FOR ASPHALT CONCRETE: FOB PLANT SITE TO THE FOLLOWING BIDDERS: DALRYMPLE GRAVEL & CONTRACTING CO., INC.; DOLOMITE PRODUCTS CO., INC., D/B/A A.L. BLADES; ELMIRA ROAD MATERIALS, LLC; AND SPALLINA MATERIALS, INC. MADE BY MR. RYAN. SECONDED BY MR. MULLEN. ALL BEING IN FAVOR. MOTIO CARRIES 5-0.

N. *Crane Rental Services – Precast Concrete Box Culverts* – Mr. Spagnoletti stated we make box culverts in the winter in our bridge shop. This is for the cranes to set them in place. On our 165 ton crane, it has gone up from what, \$715 to \$725. These bids are good. Multiple award. Very little price increase.

MOTION: AWARDING THE BID FOR CRANE RENTAL SERVICES TO THE FOLLOWING BIDDERS: CLARK RIGGING AND RENTAL; C.P. WARD, INC.; MANSFIELD CRANE SERVICES; AND SILVERLINE CONSTRUCTION, INC. MADE BY MR. RYAN. SECONDED BY MR. MULLEN. ALL BEING IN FAVOR. MOTION CARRIES 5-0.

O. *Crane Rental Services – General Bridge Services* – Mr. Spagnoletti stated again, when we build the five or six bridges a year with our crews, we set the beams with these cranes. These prices have only gone up from about \$715 to \$725 an hour for the cranes that we use most of the time. So I would recommend awarding to all of those bidders.

MOTION: AWARDING THE BID FOR CRANE RENTAL SERVICES – GENERAL BRIDGE SERVICES TO THE FOLLOWING BIDDERS: CLARKING RIGGING AND RENTAL; C.P. WARD, INC.; MANSFIELD CRANE SERVICES; AND SILVERLINE CONSTRUCTION, INC. MADE BY MR. RYAN. SECONDED BY MR. MULLEN. ALL BEING IN FAVOR. MOTION CARRIES 5-0.

P. *Vegetation Control – Application of Herbicides* – Mr. Spagnoletti stated they spray along the guiderail and at the stop signs to keep the brush and grass from growing. Chase Enterprises is willing to extend; this is a price they gave us in 2019 and they are willing to hold it for 2020; the \$50,400. I would recommend extending it to them.

MOTION: EXTENDING THE BID FOR VEGETATION CONTROL – APPLICATION OF HERBICIDES, OPTION A, WITH ALLEN CHASE ENTERPRISES, INC FOR ONE YEAR AT THE YEARLY RATE OF \$15,800 MADE BY MR. RYAN. SECONDED BY MR. MULLEN. ALL BEING IN FAVOR. MOTION CARRIES 5-0.

Q. *Bottled Water* – Mr. Spagnoletti stated this is an extension on the bottled water. We use this in the shops; drinking water. This was a 2018 price and they are willing to extend it to 2020. Let's see who was it; B&B Water. So I would recommend extending to them.

MOTION: EXTENDING THE BID FOR BOTTLED WATER WITH B & B WATER CONDITIONING, INC. FOR ONE YEAR MADE BY MR. RYAN. SECONDED BY MR. MULLEN. ALL BEING IN FAVOR. MOTION CARRIES 5-0.

Mr. Spagnoletti stated that's it unless you have any questions.

Mr. Nichols asked are there any questions on any of the bids? Mr. Horton stated Vince (Mr. Spagnoletti) I have one question. On the vegetation control, where they are willing to extend it for a year; so is it one year at the \$16,800 or are they actually extending it for another three years? Mr. Spagnoletti replied this is just a one year extension. Mr. Horton stated okay. Mr. Spagnoletti stated that's a good point, I see now. It's the Option A, perform roadside treatment to guiderail and stop signs, plus our two lots. So it would be Option A, extend the 2019 price of \$15,800. Mr. Horton stated okay, thank you. Mr. Nichols asked if there were any other questions.

MOTION: AWARDING THE BIDS AS PRESENTED BY THE COMMISSIONER OF PUBLIC WORKS MADE BY MR. RYAN. SECONDED BY MR. MULLEN FOR DISCUSSION.

Mr. Mullen stated I had a question too Bob (Mr. Nichols). Mr. Nichols stated sure, go ahead. Mr. Mullen asked are we, and it might be more for Jennifer (Mr. Prossick), but are we, I just was kind of curious on our liability on some of these bigger jobs, like where we; asphalt in-place with Dolomite. If we can't have equipment in place or the roads lined up due to slowdowns, if we are not able to pay them to do all those jobs, is there going to be language in these contracts that's per job or something like that? Mr. Spagnoletti stated Jen (Ms. Prossick) let me, excuse me, the contracts include a clause that all projects are not guaranteed. The quantity is not guaranteed. There's been a few years in the past where we didn't have enough, ended up we didn't not have enough money and we deleted certain projects. That's within the contract language that we have. Mr. Prossick stated yeah we incorporate the bid terms and the proposals into the contract so we don't lose those on these. We also have the termination clause and we can cancel any contract with thirty days' notice. So I think we have a backup to that plan as well. Mr. Mullen stated thanks. Mr. Nichols stated that's a good question because sometimes you run out of money, a project costs more or whatever happens, and we may not get to all of our projects this year. That's a real possibility. Mr. Spagnoletti stated Bob (Mr. Nichols), I would like to say one more thing on that. These projects are all within a schedule that I have prepared based on receiving some extra that we hadn't had in our original budget. Like Extreme Winter Recovery money for example. Now, we have been told that that money will be, and this is as recently as last week, however, we are going to have to keep a close watch on it. If we don't, if we see that we are not getting that money, then I'm going to have to stop some of these projects. It's something that we're just going to have to watch day by day, week by week as far as what funding we are actually getting from the State, and then make adjustments to the contracts and the work we are going to do. Mr. Nichols stated that's very true. We don't know what this budget is going to come out at the State. If we don't have the money we can't spend it. Mr. Spagnoletti stated yep.

Mr. Nichols asked is there anything else for this meeting? Have we voted on the bids? We have a motion and a second. Did we vote? Mr. Mullen replied no. Mr. Nichols stated okay.

VOTE ON PREVIOUS MOTION: ALL BEING IN FAVOR. MOTION CARRIES 5-0.

Mr. Nichols asked is there anything else for the Public Works meeting Vince (Mr. Spagnoletti)? Mr. Spagnoletti replied I don't have anything. Mr. Nichols asked does anybody else have anything?

MOTION: TO ADJOURN MADE BY MR. MULLEN. SECONDED BY MR. POTTER. ALL BEING IN FAVOR. MOTION CARRIES 5-0.

Respectfully Submitted by

Amanda L. Chapman
Deputy Clerk
Steuben County Legislature

****NEXT MEETING SCHEDULED FOR****

**May 4, 2020
Legislative Committee Room
10:00 a.m.**

**Please send agenda items to the Clerk of the Legislature's Office
NO LATER THAN NOON
Monday, April 27, 2020**