



JOINT MEETING
of the
PAINT CREEK TRAILWAYS COMMISSION
and the
OAKLAND TOWNSHIP PARKS & RECREATION
COMMISSION



Oakland Township Municipal Offices
4393 Collins Rd., Rochester, Michigan 48306

CALL TO ORDER: The Thursday, December 7, 2017 Joint Meeting was called to order by acting Chairperson Becker at 8:03 a.m.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE: All rose and recited the pledge.

ROLL CALL FOR EACH GOVERNMENTAL BODY:

Oakland Township Parks & Recreation Commission (“OTPRC”):

Present: Emily Barkham, Colin Choi, Cathy Rooney, Dan Simon

Absent: Craig Blust, Dan Bukowski, Hank Van Agen

Quorum present

Paint Creek Trailways Commission (“PCTC”):

Voting Members Present: Susan Bowyer, Frank Ferriolo, Jeff Stout

Voting Alternates Present: David Becker, Lynn Loeb (enter 8:49 a.m.) Martha Olijnyk, Donni Steele

Non-Voting Alternates Present: None

Voting Members Absent: Brian Birney, Rock Blanchard, Linda Gamage, Kim Russell, Hank Van Agen

Alternates Absent: Ben Giovanelli, Chris Hagen, Jim Kubicina

Village of Lake Orion Non-Voting Member Absent: Brad Mathisen

Village of Lake Orion Non-Voting Alternate Absent: Shauna Brown

Quorum present

Others Present:

Kristen Myers, Trail Manager, Chris Gray, Assistant Trail Manager, Mindy Milos-Dale, Oakland Township Parks Director, Matt Mikolajczyk, P.E., Chris Zangara, P.E.

APPROVAL OF DECEMBER 7, 2017 AGENDA BY EACH GOVERNMENTAL BODY:

Oakland Township Parks & Recreation Commission:

MOTION by Choi, seconded by Simon, *Moved*, to approve the December 7, 2017 agenda as presented.

Ayes: All Nays: None

MOTION CARRIED.

Paint Creek Trailways Commission:

MOTION by Olijnyk, seconded by Bowyer, *Moved*, to approve the December 7, 2017 agenda as presented.

Ayes: All Nays: None

MOTION CARRIED.

APPROVAL OF NOVEMBER 8, 2017 JOINT MEETING MINUTES BY EACH GOVERNMENTAL BODY

Oakland Township Parks & Recreation Commission:

MOTION by Simon, seconded by Barkham, *Moved*, to approve the November 8, 2017 joint meeting minutes as presented.

Ayes: All Nays: None

MOTION CARRIED.

Paint Creek Trailways Commission:

MOTION by Steele, seconded by Olijnyk, *Moved*, to approve the November 8, 2017 joint meeting minutes as presented.

Ayes: All Nays: None

MOTION CARRIED.

PUBLIC COMMENT FOR ITEMS NOT ON THE AGENDA: No public comment was heard.

DISCUSSION OF TRUSS BRIDGE FINISH OPTIONS AND COST ESTIMATES: Ms.

Milos-Dale handed out a copy of an email from OTPRC Commissioner Blust with his comments in regards to the Truss Bridge Finish Options and Cost Estimates. All Commissioners were given a few minutes to read his comments. Mr. Blust requested clarification on the true minimum steel thickness with respect to the recommended corrosion allowance on options 3 and 3a. Mr. Mikolajczyk clarified that the steel thickness and corrosion allowance amounts are not added together, and that the corrosion allowance as part of option 3 helps increase the longevity of the steel, to reach the 75 year estimated lifespan, whereas option 3a without corrosion allowance, is only guaranteed for 35 years, but could potentially last 50 years or longer. Mr. Blust also requested clarification of the \$425,000 in "all other items approximate cost" line item associated with all four bridge designs. Mr. Mikolajczyk explained that all bridge truss options are similar in geometry and weight, and all items listed are where they need to be for the span. The cost will not change unless the approach is reduced or the bridge length is reduced. In terms of the tubular (closed) pedestrian bridge versus the open vehicular bridge style, the closed style is less expensive, and holes can be drilled to prevent water build up. However, it is more difficult to make repairs to the closed style, and the aesthetics are different with the bolted connections of the open style. Chairman Becker reminded everyone that the cost overages are a worst case scenario, and the groups should not panic yet. Mr. Ferriolo disagreed with Chairman Becker, and feels the potential overages could be a reality. He expressed concerns that there are only two options to be considered with the dollars that are available. Prices will increase, not decrease. He felt any overages are the responsibility of Oakland Township, not the Paint Creek Trailways Commission. Oakland Township is responsible for maintenance. The OTPRC needs to find the money, and the township board needs to back it up. He agreed with Mr. Blust and felt there should be a closer look at the \$425,000 to find potential savings. In terms of the PCTC reallocating the \$20,000 that will not be needed for easement acquisition, he felt it was only appropriate to use it for easement purposes, and not any potential bridge overages. Mr. Mikolajczyk proceeded to review the weathered steel finish versus galvanized steel finish renderings that were in the packet. Weathering steel requires less maintenance than galvanized steel. He continued to provide an overview of the Engineers Opinion of Costs. The estimate includes mobilizing, structure removal, coffer dams, substructure construction, abutments, and live staking. The preliminary plans have been submitted to the Road Commission for Oakland County, and he is awaiting comment. They are tentatively scheduled to be submitted to MDOT on Monday, with the anticipated bid letting planned for May 2018. Mr. Mikolajczyk continued his overview of the cost estimates. The truss fabricator provided conservative preliminary estimates, with a built-in contingency up to 10%, in anticipation of rising costs. He used recent unit prices from local

projects to build the cost estimate. The bids may come in higher or lower, based on unknowns such as steel prices and contractor availability. Mr. Ferriolo requested clarification on the span size. In what order of importance do we consider items that can be eliminated or reduced to save costs? Is reducing the span to 65' the answer? Mr. Mikolajczyk explained that the existing span is 62'. If we reduce the span from 75' to 62', we will have new issues with the 100 year floodplain, and there is more involved. More hydraulic studies would be required and we potentially could still have to use a larger span. He still recommends the 75' span to allow for gentler slopes, reduce exposed abutment heights, and rip rap. If we want them to reduce the size, there will need to be more time, effort, and analyzation of the creek including a hydraulic study. Mr. Choi asked if the additional engineering costs were included in the cost savings estimate. Mr. Mikolajczyk said yes. Ms. Milos-Dale asked if the MDEQ would approve the project if the span was less than 62'. Mr. Mikolajczyk indicated that the MDEQ would have concerns, and may not accept it. Mr. Simon asked if the current proposed span would affect the slope and the velocity of the river, by slowing the water down. Mr. Mikolajczyk indicated the longer length reduces scour, while a shorter span length increases scour. Mr. Stout asked Mr. Mikolajczyk if, in his opinion, the 75' span length is the best course of action. Mr. Mikolajczyk said yes. Ms. Olijnyk asked if we can save money by reducing the load rating from H-20 to H-10. Mr. Mikolajczyk explained that AASHTO sets the minimum load rating to H-10. The current bridge can carry 77 tons. H-10 bridges can't take the larger maintenance vehicles such as gravel haulers, which could impact future maintenance costs when surfacing material needs to be moved. H-10 can handle large trucks, and ambulances, but not a large gravel hauler. Ms. Milos-Dale added that based on her past project experience along the trail repairing erosion areas, reduced access can drive up the price. Bridge 33.7 is a middle bridge with no place to turn around. Savings up front may not equal savings over the long term. Chairman Becker stated that he agreed with Mr. Stout, and trusts the engineers. Mannik & Smith has taken into account future estimated costs and has used recent unit prices. Previous projects did come in 10% higher because of unexpected access issues. In Mr. Mikolajczyk's opinion, if we choose weathering steel, it will need a corrosion allowance. If we choose galvanized steel, no corrosion allowance is necessary. Option 3a would still give us a decent lifespan of 35 years plus. Ms. Steele asked if there would be a cost savings by reducing the span from 75' to 62', and Mr. Mikolajczyk said yes.

COMPARISON OF POTENTIAL PROJECT COST USING MDOT LETTING PROCESS VS ORIGINAL ESTIMATED PROJECT COST (\$756,200) IN OTPRC BUDGET, AND CALCULATION OF FUNDED AND UNFUNDED OBLIGATIONS:

Ms. Milos-Dale reviewed the MDOT bid letting process. If the lowest qualified bid comes in up to 10% over the engineers cost estimate, MDOT will accept the bid on our behalf. Because of this, in the joint agreement, it states that both agencies need to approve the estimated project cost. If the proposed project cost is not more than 90% of the Estimated Project Cost, then both agencies shall approve the proposed project cost. If the proposed project cost is more than 90% of the Estimated Project Cost, then both agencies would need to evaluate the scope, design, and additional funding sources and jointly determine how to proceed with the project. When reviewing the grant budget utilizing the original estimated project cost of \$756,200, the project is potentially over budget. For example, with Option 2, weathered steel with corrosion allowance, Oakland Township would be responsible for \$192,000, after the grants are used. They budgeted \$156,200, leaving a potential unfunded liability of \$35,817, if MDOT accepts a bid up to 10% over our engineer's estimate. The unfunded liability would potentially be \$7,304 for Option 2a, \$43,077 for Option 3, and \$11,528 for Option 3a. Chairman Becker asked the engineers what the probability would be for MDOT to accept a bid up to 10% over. Mr. Mikolajczyk said it often happens, that's why he has captured higher estimated costs for our project. Ms. Steele expressed concern that the higher you budget, the higher it would come in. The engineers are aware of that concern and they try to get ahead of it before it happens. The worst case scenario would be that only 2 or 3 bids would come

in. If we hold a good pre-bid meeting, the numbers are more accurate. We would hope to have 6-8 qualified bidders. Generally, 1-2 would be lower cost proposals, 1-2 at our estimate, 1-2 higher than estimated, and 1 very much higher than our estimate. Mr. Stout expressed that the longer we wait, the higher the potential costs might be. We might experience a post-hurricane demand/supply effect. Ms. Myers asked Mr. Mikolajczyk to review the project construction timeline, and the effect of delays, especially on the October 1 deadline to be working in the creek when trout spawning season starts. He indicated that the abutments will need to be done by October 1. When asked if we could move the MDOT bid letting to April 1 instead of May 1, he indicated that we could possibly encourage MDOT to meet that deadline. Ms. Olijnyk wanted clarification on the 10% contingency. Ms. Milos-Dale explained that when the original project estimate was done by a different engineering company, we purposely picked the most expensive option to help ensure the project could be done within the budget consisting of grant money and the OTPRC match. The 10% has been taken into account on the budget we are reviewing today. Ms. Olijnyk wanted to know if the bids could be higher. Yes, but they might also be lower. It would be best to look at ways to reduce costs now.

EVALUATION OF PROJECT SCOPE, DESIGN, AND POTENTIAL ADDITIONAL FUNDING SOURCES:

Ms. Myers reiterated that since the Estimated Project Cost is higher than anticipated, the clause in our joint agreement has been triggered. We need to discuss the project scope, bridge design, and potential additional funding sources. Mr. Mikolajczyk has prepared a spreadsheet with costs reducing options for consideration. We could reduce the bridge approach length from 75' and 50' to 25' on each side, saving approximately \$15,496. Mr. Choi asked what the pros and cons would be if we reduce the approach. Mr. Mikolajczyk wanted a more gradual change from the trail to the deck of the bridge, but originally thought the deck would have to be raised. With the current design, the deck will be at the appropriate elevation. He feels reducing the approach length would not negatively impact the project, and would be the easiest place to save money. The bridge approach length will be bid by unit price, so we can still decide later if we want to extend it. There is also additional cost savings with the project because Mannik & Smith Group have not had to perform a couple of items that we had budgeted for that will not be required. This is a savings of \$3,860. The groups then discussed the pros and cons of reducing the design loads from H-20 to H-10. AASHTO standards are that the bridge needs to be a minimum H-10 loading. However, at that load rate, large gravel haulers will not be able to cross the bridge during future resurfacing. The bridges to the north and south can both handle large gravel haulers, so it is not recommended that we reduce the loading from H-20 to H-10. Both groups agreed, by consensus. The groups proceeded to discuss changing the truss style from open (vehicular) to closed (pedestrian), which could potentially save \$18,594 with Option 2. We chose the open style because it's easier to repair. The closed style would make it more difficult to see internal erosion, and more difficult to repair when sections need to be removed. Mr. Mikolajczyk suggested that if we decide to change to a closed style, he would recommend a galvanized finish, drilling drain holes, and adding bee and insect screens to prevent pest infestation. Galvanized steel would still get us a minimum of 35 years to maybe 50 years, but if we added corrosion allowance, it could extend the life to 75 years. Chairman Becker doesn't want to eliminate the aesthetic advantages of weathering steel, as both agencies indicated they would like the bridge to look more historical and compatible with the trail. Mr. Ferriolo expressed that the open truss design is important for the township in the long run, and he likes the idea of saving money with reducing the length of the bridge approach. He agrees with Dr. Becker that the bridge will not be subjected to corrosive elements such as salt water. Lastly, the group discussed the pros and cons of reducing the span length to 65'. Using Option 2 as an example, we could potentially save an additional \$13,105.34. If the span length was reduced, it would affect the abutments and riprap. Mannik & Smith Group's recommendation is to keep the span at

75'. It was the consensus of both groups to follow the engineer's recommendation and not reduce the span length.

FOR DISCUSSION & CONSIDERATION BY PAINT CREEK TRAILWAYS COMMISSION: COMMITMENT OF FUNDS FROM PCTC FUND BALANCE FOR POTENTIAL UNFUNDED LIABILITIES:

Ms. Myers gave an overview of the memo in the packet. If MDOT accepts a bid that is within 10% higher than estimated, we will potentially be over budget. Considering the PCTC had budgeted \$20,000 from fund balance to cover the cost of a construction access easement, and the easement will not be necessary, she recommended that if the PCTC agrees, the \$20,000 in fund balance be reallocated to help offset any potential construction overage with this project. By reducing the bridge approach, and factoring in money not spent on Mannik & Smith Group services, we can reduce the potential overage on Option 2 from \$35,817 to \$16,461. The potential overage on Option 3 drops from \$43,077 to \$23,721. Mr. Ferriolo felt that the bridge is solely the responsibility of the OTPRC, since they are responsible for maintenance of the Oakland Township section of the trail. He felt it was appropriate to set aside money in the PCTC fund balance for easement acquisition, because it was a property issue. He feels the \$20,000 should go back into PCTC fund balance. If the PCTC votes to reallocate the \$20,000 from easement acquisition to the potential overage of the construction project, he will vote against it because it will set a precedent. Dr. Bowyer indicated she understood Mr. Ferriolo's concerns, but as long as we go with Option 2, the PCTC could reallocate the \$20,000 that was set aside for the easement to offset the potential overage of \$16,461 for the project. Discussion continued about the PCTC budget, and the allocation of funds for a deck project in Rochester, and whether that set a precedent. Mr. Ferriolo felt that the deck in Rochester is for the enhancement of the entire trail, and is beneficial to all communities. The easement was our responsibility. If it wasn't he would have voted against it at the time. He would like to have a special PCTC meeting to discuss the reallocation further, and doesn't appreciate the pressure to make a decision right now. Chairman Becker indicated that he did not mean to pressure a decision, but that we have to worry about delaying the project which could jeopardize getting the project done in the 2018 construction season.

MOTION by Bowyer, seconded by Olijnyk, *Moved*, to commit up to \$20,000 from the PCTC fund balance that was set aside for easement acquisition to cover the potential overage for the bridge project.

Ayes: Becker, Bowyer, Loeb, Olijnyk, Stout

Nays: Steele, Ferriolo

MOTION CARRIED.

FOR APPROVAL BY OAKLAND TOWNSHIP PARKS AND RECREATION COMMISSION: TRUSS BRIDGE STYLE AND FINISH FOR PAINT CREEK TRAIL BRIDGE 33.7 RENOVATION:

Mr. Simon felt the galvanized finish offered the longevity that was desired by both agencies. Ms. Rooney wants to respect the aesthetics and the neighbors of the trail with the design. Mr. Choi likes both the Weathering Steel and Galvanized Steel finishes, but would like Mr. McClure, neighbor along the trail, to provide his comment on preferred finish. Discussion continued regarding the longevity estimates of both finishes, and both will depend on how well the bridge is maintained and cleaned. Option 3 has the most potential to last more than 75 years, if maintained properly, but it is more expensive. Ms. Steele originally felt the weathering steel was the way to go, but feels that the galvanized finish is the best option for longevity, even if it isn't as aesthetic as the weathering steel. We would be doing a disservice to our communities by building something that won't last as long. Mr. Ferriolo understands Mr. Simon's point, but the steel on the current bridge has lasted almost 100 years. Aesthetics are a concern for him, and he believes the weathering steel fits in with the trail, and the railroad history. He walked the site with Mr. McClure and agrees that the posts are the issue, not the bridge, and

the weathering steel is a good choice. Mr. McClure, 5660 N. Livernois, Rochester, Michigan, spoke up regarding the finish options. He prefers the weathering steel, but feels the current bridge has not been maintained properly. He asked for clarification on the different forms of galvanization. Mr. Mikolajczyk explained that for this bridge, if galvanized was chosen, it would be hot dipped, and bonded. It would not be a coating. Chairman Becker felt that the proper aesthetics are paramount for this bridge.

MOTION by Barkham, seconded by Rooney, *Moved*, to approve Option 2, Weathered Steel with Corrosion allowance, utilizing the cost savings by reducing the bridge approach to 25’.

Ayes: Barkham, Choi, Rooney

Nays: Simon

MOTION CARRIED.

FOR APPROVAL BY PAINT CREEK TRAILWAYS COMMISSION: TRUSS BRIDGE STYLE AND FINISH FOR PAINT CREEK TRAIL BRIDGE 33.7 RENOVATION:

MOTION by Ferriolo, seconded by Bowyer, *Moved*, to approve Option 2, Weathered Steel with Corrosion allowance, utilizing the cost savings by reducing the bridge approach to 25’.

Ayes: Becker, Bowyer, Ferriolo, Loeb, Olijnyk, Stout

Nays: Steele

MOTION CARRIED.

PHASE II: FINAL DESIGN PHASE SCHEDULE FROM MANNIK SMITH GROUP: Mr. Mikolajczyk reviewed the final schedule. The preliminary plans have been submitted to the Road Commission for review, and both Ms. Myers and Ms. Milos-Dale have copies of all documents if the groups would like them distributed. Once the Road Commission provides comment, the GI plans will be submitted to MDOT. After MDOT’s review, they will hold a GI meeting in the area to provide their comments to the Road Commission, Mannik & Smith Group, OTPRC, and PCTC. After the GI Review meeting, Mannik & Smith Group will finalize the plans, and MDOT will assemble the bid documents in preparation for the May letting date. There may be an opportunity to move up the letting date.

ADJOURNMENT BY EACH GOVERNMENTAL BODY:

Oakland Township Parks & Recreation Commission:

MOTION by Simon seconded Barkham, *Moved*, to adjourn the meeting at 9:53 a.m.

Ayes: All Nays: None

MOTION CARRIED.

Paint Creek Trailways Commission:

MOTION by Bowyer, supported by Stout, *Moved*, to adjourn the meeting at 9:53 a.m.

Ayes: All Nays: None

MOTION CARRIED.

NEXT MEETING DATE – DECEMBER 19, 2017 AT 6:00 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

EMILY BARKHAM, Secretary
Oakland Township Parks & Recreation Commission

HANK VAN AGEN, Secretary
Paint Creek Trailways Commission