

November 12, 2009

McKean County Commissioners in regular session assembled on Thursday, November 12, 2009 at 10:00 AM in the Commissioners meeting room. Present were Commissioners Joseph DeMott, Al Pingie, and Judy Church, Chief Clerk, Audrey Irons, County Solicitor, Dan Hartle. Also present was Martha Knight.

The meeting was called to order by Mr. DeMott, followed by the Pledge of Allegiance and a moment of silence.

Moved by Mr. Pingie, seconded by Mrs. Church, to approve the minutes of the October 27, 2009 meeting.

Vote on the above resolution, DeMott – yes. Pingie – yes. Church – yes. Three – yeas. No – nays. Carried.

Mr. DeMott – Opened the meeting for public comment.

No public comment.

Moved by Mr. Pingie, seconded by Mrs. Church, to approve payment to approve payment to A. L. Blades & Sons, Inc. in the amount of \$16,363.91 representing payment for the Boyer Crossing Bridge Replacement Project for the period ending October 30, 2009. This money is to be taken from the McKean Boyer Bridge Project Fund.

Mr. DeMott – Commented that he went out a couple of days ago and looked at the bridge and it is essentially complete – it looks very nice – they are just waiting for some guard rail and some seeding work to do, but it is essentially complete and we hope to have it open soon.

Vote on the above resolution, DeMott – yes. Pingie – yes. Church – yes. Three – yeas. No – nays. Carried.

Moved by Mr. Pingie, seconded by Mrs. Church, to approve a county aid application for Otto Township in the amount of \$4,475.00 for the year 2009.

Vote on the above resolution, DeMott – yes. Pingie – yes. Church – yes. Three – yeas. No – nays. Carried.

Moved by Mr. Pingie, seconded by Mrs. Church, to issue real estate tax refunds to the following corporation and individuals for the year 2009.

1. Hawley Development Corporation - \$500.37 – their property was adjusted due to a formal appeal.
2. Thomas & Brenda Fitch - \$37.04 – their property was adjusted due to a formal appeal.

Vote on the above resolution, DeMott – yes. Pingie – yes. Church – yes. Three – yeas. No – nays. Carried.

Moved by Mr. Pingie, seconded by Mrs. Church, rescind the resolution that was adopted at the October 27, 2009 meeting to award the bid to Falk Construction for the window replacement project for one of the old county home buildings.

Vote on the above resolution, DeMott – yes. Pingie – yes. Church – yes. Three – yeas. No – nays. Carried.

Moved by Mr. Pingie, seconded by Mrs. Church, to reject the other two bids that were received for the above mentioned window replacement project and to re-bid the project.

Mr. Pingie – The one bid was more than twice what the low bid was and the second bid appeared to be quite high also, so we are looking to re-bid the project.

Vote on the above resolution, DeMott – yes. Pingie – yes. Church – yes. Three – yeas. No – nays. Carried.

Moved by Mr. Pingie, seconded by Mrs. Church, to deny the request from E & M Engineers & Surveyors, PC for receiving a complimentary copy of Foster Township GIS data layer.

Mr. Pingie – We are finding out that a lot of the engineering firms are requesting GIS data information from the municipalities for different projects they are working on and I think they are going to be using something that we are paying for and then they are going to turn around and use it and sell it to the municipalities or their customers – I think we need to recoup some of our funding for that – Angie has a fee schedule already in place per parcel layer. If they want to pay for the information, then they are entitled to receive the information. We have had numerous other requests for different parcel layers and everyone has paid a specific fee for that and being an engineering firm you know they are going to charge their customer whether it be the municipality or an individual they are going to allow something in their pricing for using this data that would be less costly for them or maybe no cost to them and I feel we should receive something for our GIS data.

Mr. DeMott – This project would cost them \$695.00.

Mrs. Church – Angie has the request forms in her office – there is a schedule of how much each individual parcel costs.

Martha Knight – What did the GIS data system cost the county?

Mrs. Church – Ask Angie – she has the figures. If they wanted to purchase the entire GIS Data Layer for McKean County the cost is \$7,575.00 plus processing fees, etc.

Ms. Knight – How recent is this information? Is it updated on a regular basis?

Mrs. Church – They update it all the time.

Vote on the above resolution, DeMott – yes. Pingie – yes. Church – yes. Three – yeas. No – nays. Carried.

Moved by Mr. Pingie, seconded by Mrs. Church, to enter into a leasing agreement with the Charles Cole Memorial Hospital for renting office space in one of the old county home buildings.

Mr. DeMott – Mentioned that the lease only runs through the end of next month – this formalizes the take over of their acquisition of Dr. Bowman’s practice.

Ms. Knight – Will they be renewing it after that?

Mr. DeMott – I don’t believe so, but I don’t want to speak for the hospital. The lease only runs through December 31, 2009.

Vote on the above resolution, DeMott – yes. Pingie – yes. Church – yes. Three – yeas. No – nays. Carried.

Moved by Mr. Pingie, seconded by Mrs. Church, to participate in PennDot’s Bridge Inspection Consultant Selection Process for McKean County.

Mr. DeMott – Read the following letter that the Commissioners received by George Uhl from PennDot. “The local bridge inspection contract for McKean County will expire in March of 2010. Since the last inspection contract, the rules concerning how local bridge inspection is handled when Federal money is involved has changed. Now, the bridge inspection consultant has to be selected based on merit. The selection criteria has to be a standard set of values. The County can no longer just appoint an engineer when Federal money is involved. The selection reasons have to be documented to show why the one firm was chosen over another firm. The District has been helping out the other Counties by advertising the bridge inspection contract through the Engineering and Construction Management System. This internet based system allows all consultants to view the advertisement and submit a Statement of Interest for consideration of being selected for the project. The Statements of Interest are then reviewed by a Selection Committee and the Consultant firm is selected. The selection committee usually consists of a member of the County. Copies of all Statement of Interests submitted would be mailed to the county representative for their review. The selection committee meeting could be conducted by a conference phone call. The County can have more than one representative if they so choose. The Department would handle all of the administrative aspects of the contract and pay the invoices. The county share, 20 % , would be deducted from the yearly liquid fuel allocation. This method has been used on all of the new local bridge inspection contracts. Elk County and Clearfield County recently just completed

their local inspection contracts this way. McKean County's current consultant for the bridge inspection program is Northwest Engineers."

Mr. Pingie – Asked how long Northwest Engineering has been doing the county's bridge inspection program?

Mrs. Irons – As far as I know they have been doing it for thirty some years. They usually subcontract with E & M Engineers for doing some of the bridge inspections.

Mr. Pingie – I think they have done a nice job of providing a lot of information on each of the bridges in McKean County such as weight limit, signage, costs of repairs, pictures of the bridges including the abutments and underneath the bridge, the steel construction of the bridge, etc. so I think they have done a nice job.

Ms. Knight – And they could bid on doing the bridge inspection through PennDot?

Mr. Pingie – Yes and I hope with them doing this for the county for so many years that PennDot takes that into consideration and how familiar they are with our bridges .

Ms. Knight – Has there been a bid process before?

Mr. Pingie – For the most part the Commissioners have decided on who they wanted to appoint as the engineers for the bridge inspection program.

Mr. DeMott – My take on the letter is that we could do this our selves if we wanted to, but we would be responsible for all the reporting and justifying to the federal government why we chose this firm instead of that firm.

Ms. Knight – When they say 20% would be deducted from the liquid fuels – is that 20% of the liquid fuel money you receive or 20% of the cost of this program?

Mr. DeMott – It is an 80-20 program, so we pay 20% of the cost of the bridge inspections. Instead of us paying the contractor and them paying us 80% they would pay the contractor and deduct our 20% share from other payments the county receives for Liquid Fuel funds.

Ms. Knight – So it doesn't sound to you like much of a change in your costs for the program?

Mr. DeMott – No.

Ms. Knight – But you wouldn't have any control over that or would you?

Mrs. Church – We can serve on the selection committee.

Mr. Pingie – We can have more than one person on the committee and I would think we would want to have at least 2 people on the committee. I just hope that this isn't going to turn into a process where they are hiring people out of Pittsburgh or farther away to look at our bridges when we have someone local that is familiar with our bridges.

Mrs. Church – And we would have a say in that by serving on the selection committee.

Ms. Knight – How many bridges are we talking about?

Mr. Pingie – All the bridges in the county over 20 feet.

Mrs. Irons – I think there are over 60 bridges in the county – we only have six county bridges.

Mr. DeMott – We don't own all the bridges, but we are responsible for the inspection program.

Vote on the above resolution, DeMott – yes. Pingie – yes. Church – yes. Three – yeas. No – nays. Carried.

Mr. DeMott – Opened the meeting for public comment.

Ms. Knight – Asked why they rejected Falk Construction's bid for the window project?

Mr. Pingie – The window that Falk Construction bid did not meet the bid specifications and the second and third bids were extremely higher than what we thought the project should go for so we are re-bidding the project.

Ms. Knight – Were the windows specifications by brand name or by equal to a certain brand?

Mr. Pingie – No. They were specified for low E Argon Gas and we are re-bidding the same specifications so we expect everyone to stay within those limits. I don't think you can bid anything specific as to name brand.

Ms. Knight – And the Falk bid did not include that type of window?

Mr. Pingie – After review by Skip Linnan, our director for the project, he did not feel that the windows Falk bid were going to give us the best results – we knew roughly what it was going to cost per window and the rest was just installation and we felt it was best to re-bid the project.

Ms. Knight – So when do you plan on re-bidding the project and awarding the bid?

Mr. DeMott – We are going to re-bid the project and open the bids at our November 24th meeting. We could award the bid subject to review at that meeting.

Ms. Knight – So you are hoping you will be able to complete this project before the end of the year?

Mr. Pingie – Yes, we were hoping to get at least the upstairs done by the first part of December as we have carpet to install, etc. We were hoping to get the offices moved by the end of the year or by the first part of January.

Continued discussion on the window project.

Moved by Mr. Pingie, seconded by Mrs. Church, to adjourn the meeting.

Vote on the above resolution, DeMott – yes. Pingie – yes. Church – yes. Three – yeas. No – nays. Carried.

Chief Clerk