June 30, 1982

The Marquette County Board of Commissioners met on June 30, 1982 at 7:00 P.M. in the Commissioners Room of the Courthouse Annex.

Chairperson Racine opened the meeting, roll was called by County Clerk, Henry A. Skewis, and the following roll recorded:

Present: Comm. Carlson, Farrell, Juidici, LaMere, LaPin, Leone, Lowe, May, Steele, Villeneuve and Racine.

Absent: Comm. Cheatham.

Salute to the Flag was given followed by the Pledge of Allegiance.

The minutes of the June 16, 1982 meeting, and the June 23, 1982 meeting of the Marquette County Board of Commissioners and the June 23, 1982 meeting of the Committee of the Whole were accepted by the general concensus of the County Board.

Chairperson Racine opened the meeting for public comment, and asked that any comments in regard to the awarding of the bid for Courthouse Renovation be deferred until later in the meeting when that item would be discussed. All other comments would be heard now.

Peter Embley of Marquette commented on the success of the Elected Officials Conference held in June, 1982 and especially the interest generated in telecommunications. He asked that the County Board recommend that the subject of telecommunications be placed on all Intergovernmental Relations Committee agendas, so that new material can be reviewed as it becomes known, in that way the County Board can be kept aware of the subject.

There being no further comments from the public, Chairperson Racine declared the public comment section closed.

The agenda was approved by the general concensus of the County Board with the addition of an item 7d, request from the Sheriff's Dept. regarding approval of application by Marquette County to the Upper Peninsula Emergency Medical Services Corporation for grant on a 50/50 basis for the purchase and installation of radio crystals in existing radio equipment assigned to the Sheriff's Department Safety Division.

A communication from Joseph I. Maino and a request to submit an application to the Upper Peninsula Emergency Medical Corporation for the purchase and installation of radio crystals in existing radio equipment assigned to the Sheriff's Department Rescue Safety Division were read. It was moved by Comm. Lowe, supported by Comm. Steele and carried unanimously on a roll call vote, that the County Board concur with the request and authorize the filing of the application and authorizing the Board Chairperson Joseph O. Racine to execute the necessary documents, but to defer any budget amendment until such time when the grant will be available.

A communication from John Beerling, Superintendent/Engineer of the County Road Commission and a request for $25,000.00 as part of the local match for a Federal Grant to replace the CR 573 Carp River Bridge, were read. After much discussion, it was moved by Comm. Farrell, supported by Comm. Villeneuve and carried that the request be deferred until the July 7, 1982 meeting of the Marquette County Board of Commissioners.

The awarding of bids for Marquette County Courthouse Renovation was taken under consideration. Controller Duane Beard stated that, as per the County Boards request, he had made the same type of inquiries of the performance of Texak Co. on jobs completed as he had, and presented to the County Board last week, on the low bidder Omega Inc. Construction Co. All comments received from owners of property, on which Texak Co. had worked, were very favorable and showed competence in completion of the jobs on time.
Lincoln Poley, Jr. the architect on the renovation project had also gathered information, from job sources, on the Tezak Co. He stated that all persons he had conversation with had highly complemented Tezak Co. on its job performance and manageability. Mr. Poley stated that in his opinion either firm, Omega or Tezak were capable and qualified to do the work.

Chairperson Racine asked each of the representatives of Omega and Tezak to give their presentations to the County Board.

Chief Civil Counsel Patricia L. Micklow stated that she had talked to EDA administrators and they advised her that they would be concerned with any action which would delay the start of construction. They would ask to be notified of the awarding of the bid and whether or not it was awarded to the lowest bidder. If the low bid is not accepted then the County Board would be acting at its own risk. Circular A101, states that the award should be made to the bidder who is most responsible and most advantageous to the County. Other consideration could be price, discounts, transportation costs and taxes. The bid cannot be awarded on the basis that union or non-union labor be used.

There is some concern with the $500,000.00 grant if the construction on the project is not started on or before July 7, 1982.

Mr. Harold DeYoung of Omega Inc. made a short presentation on his company. He stated that Omega Inc. was low bidder and had met all of the requirements, at the time the job was bid. He stated that he understood that the county's concern was Omega's ability to do the paper work necessary and to employ local labor. He stated that he would consider the "local market" a tri-county area, he would try to use local help as much as possible, and would use 60% local help. He declined to put this in writing when asked if he would do so. He did say he would use the 80% as a goal but not as contract language. When asked if Omega had any troubles in regard to the Bacon/Davis Act, Mr. DeYoung replied that "you don't get the final payment until the job is finished satisfactorily. He stated he would be using about a dozen of his own people on the job. In regard to payroll affidavits, he stated that they are submitted to the owner and final payment is not given until this is considered O.K. He stated upon questioning that he uses very few apprentices. He stated that on other jobs he has filed labor and payroll bonds and that should speak for itself.

Frank Tezak of Tezak Co. made a short presentation and introduced Jack Erickson. He gave two hand-outs that showed jobs finished and letters of recommendation from seven or eight persons or companies which described his work as excellent. He stated he had no objections of the "labor market" being defined as Marquette County. He will be bringing only two persons to the job, a superintendent and possibly a foreman. Sub-contractors are responsible for the language of their contracts that provide for the hiring of local labor and they will have to comply with the contract. The sub-contractors are pretty much from Marquette County. His firm had done a renovation of the courthouse in Grand Traverse County. Mr. Tezak presented letters from the sub-contractors which made commitments to local labor. He suggested that Marquette County check with the owners of his firm has completed and did provide a list of the names of these owners.

Chairperson asked for public comment.

Don Bressette of 2305 Wilkinson, Marquette stated that he had worked for Omega Construction and had no problems as a laborer in any way. He felt they had been a fine employer.

Various questions were asked by all of the commissioners and answers were given by either Mr. DeYoung, Mr. Tezak, Chief Civil Counsel Patricia L. Micklow and Controller Duane Beard.

Comm. May asked if it was absolutely necessary that the County Board accept the lowest bidder in order to participate fully in the grant, or if it was not, would we have to add approximately $47,000.00 to the cost of the project, if the second lowest bidder was chosen? Will the EDA only participate to the extent of the lowest bid?
Chief Civil Counsel stated that EDA obviously does not want to spend more than they have to, but that there is no requirement that they would only participate to the extent of the lowest bidder. The requirement would be that we provide in writing the reasons we did not accept the low bidder and that we assure them that we are not jeopardizing the project.

It was moved by Comm. Juidici, supported by Comm. Farrell that the bid for Courthouse Renovation be awarded to Omega Inc. the lowest bidder with alternates 1-2-4 and M2 included, as recommended by the architect.

Comm. Carlson stated that he would vote against the motion because although we have two companies here who have good records, it seemed to him that in listening to the summaries, the Tezak Co. reputation was from good to excellent and he is a little more impressed with the Tezak Co. than he is with the Omega Co., although the Omega Co. does good work. He felt that Tezak Company's commitment to local labor was a little bit stronger than Omega's.

Comm. Juidici stated that she was glad that the union people were here last meeting and showed an interest in the project, however, it was disconcerting to her to have the union people mention one of the bidders as though they were lobbying for the bidder. She felt that by awarding a bid to Tezak she is possibly going to be seen as a person who bow's to pressure by unions and then possible putting into union members hands, a club to use with Tezak Co. because of the unions pressure that Tezak got the bid.

Comm. Lowe felt much the same as Comm. Juidici but commended the unions for going to bat for their people.

Comm. LaPin stated that he didn't want anybody to think they pull his chain and he wished to make that clear. He votes the dictates of his own conscience.

Comm. Farrell stated that after listening to the two contractors and also being on the Environment, Lands and Buildings Committee that dealt with these plans in more detail, he doesn't see much of a difference between the two contractors, Omega and Tezak, in terms of what they had said this night. "I hope they would hire 80% or more local people but not as the one they would agree in writing that they would hire up to 80% or over local labor." That is a very difficult thing to do but he hoped it would be possible. It seemed to him that if you add the local sub-contractors, one has all but four and one has all but three from Marquette County, supposedly. He stated he didn't know how many people were hired by these local contractors, but realized that special items like copper work may need to hire more specialized people. He felt with unemployment as it is in the county that local labor should be speaking up. Basically, it comes down to spending the additional $20,000.00 to $40,000.00, if this is spent for wages to people, it seems to me that the $20,000.00 to $40,000.00 is an item we should not overlook, one way or the other.

Comm. May stated that she had hoped that the information presented here tonight would have made it crystal clear to her, how she would vote. She was sorry to say that had not happened, and because of that she felt she had not received information sufficient to her to vote against the lowest bidder.

Comm. Steele asked if the county was talking about a difference between low and second low bidder of $20,000.00 or $40,000.00. Chief Civil Counsel explained the difference was $47,000.00 on the base bid but that the alternates recommended by the architect were included, so it would be reduced to approximately $22,000.00.

Comm. Leone stated that his chief concern was that the majority of the labor force came from this area and he was sure it would.

Roll call was held on the motion to award the Courthouse Renovation Contract to Omega Co. with alternates 1-2-4 and M-2 included; these alternates were recommended by the architect.


Nays: Comm. Carlson, LaMore, LaPin, Steele, Villeneuve and Racine.


The motion was defeated 5 to 6.
It was moved by Comm. Carlson, supported by Comm. LaMere and carried on a roll call vote that the County Board award the bid for Courthouse Renovation to the Tezak Co. with the alternates recommended by the project architect. (alternates 1-2-4 & M-2) and that the reasons for awarding the bid to the Tezak Co. are on the basis of material submitted by and presentations made, that the Tezak Co. appears to have something of an outstanding record in craftsmanship and workmanship in terms of completion of its projects on time and even though it is felt that Omega has a good reputation in terms of material submitted, that the information we received in relation to the Tezak Co. and second that there is a stronger commitment on behalf of the Tezak Co., to have local labor to the extent that was slightly greater than that of the Omega Co.

Comm. Lowe stated he would vote for the motion but he is concerned about the jeopardy of the grant money and also he feels the County Board may have set a dangerous precedent for future actions regarding bidding. If in the future when the county requests bids on a project, will they be getting all of the best bids that could be submitted or would company's say that the County Board will not accept the lowest bid so why give them the best bid possible?

Comm. Farrell stated that he would like to reiterate what Comm. Lowe said. He stated he doesn't believe in the reasons stated in the motion for awarding the bid. Possibly neither he or Comm. Lowe will be here next year, but thank God we have some people who think about things down the road.

A roll call vote was taken on awarding the Courthouse Renovation Contract to Tezak Co. with alternates 1-2-4- and M-2 recommended by the architect. And the motion carried 8 to 3.

Ayes: Comm. Carlson, Farrell, LaMere, LaPin, Lowe, Steele, Villeneuve and Racine.
Absent: Comm. Cheatham.

The tapes of this meeting will be placed on file for future use if necessary.

RECESS

Chairperson Racine reconvened the meeting after a ten minute recess.

The establishing of the 1983 Capital Improvement Priorities were discussed. It was moved by Comm. Lowe, supported by Comm. Judici and carried that the County Board of Commissioners rate the 1983 Capital Improvement Projects as High, Medium, and Low priorities and that the County Commissioners then rate all of those projects that receive a high priority on a basis of first to last and turn in the ratings to the County Controller by July 6, 1982.

CIP Project Worksheet
FY 1983

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Number</th>
<th>Project Name</th>
<th>Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>107</td>
<td>Sheriffs Vehicles</td>
<td>$51,718.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>108</td>
<td>Rental Vehicle</td>
<td>4,400.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>035</td>
<td>Micrographics</td>
<td>115,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>106</td>
<td>New Vehicles-Narcotics Division</td>
<td>6,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>109</td>
<td>Computer Terminal</td>
<td>4,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>095</td>
<td>Computer Hardware Upgrade No. 1</td>
<td>89,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>096</td>
<td>Software Acquisition No. 2</td>
<td>48,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>016</td>
<td>Communication System Addition</td>
<td>140,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>081</td>
<td>Jail Freezer</td>
<td>6,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>034</td>
<td>Courthouse Renovation</td>
<td>575,000.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
012 Glass Replacement 9,400.00 L
021 Storm Windows - Acocks 200,000.00 H
049 Boiler Fuel Modification 5,700.00 H
113 Solid Waste Management Eng. Study 15,000.00 H
044 Air Handling Unit #5 - Jail 4,500.00 M
014 Key Conversion 6,000.00 H
087 Training Center 8,000.00 M
110 Office Rental 5,000.00 L
036 Carpet Replacement 110,000.00 L
038 Rescue Services Facility 88,463.00 H
024 Vault Probate Court 40,760.00 L
067 Sheltered Workshop 800,000.00 L
086 Brookridge 550,000.00 L
054 Jail Locker Room 7,000.00 L
072 Replace Tandem Axle Trucks 174,000.00 H
073 Replace Single Axle Trucks 170,000.00 H
092 Spreaders 42,000.00 H
074 Repower Grader 12,000.00 H
089 Repower Sno-Go Unit 14,000.00 H
093 Graders 116,000.00 M
091 Pick-Up Truck 19,500.00 L
090 Rubber Tire Dozer (used) 50,000.00 L
029 Gravel Plant 545,000.00 L
052 Radio Equipment 5,000.00 L
046 Sewerline Replacement 14,000.00 H
057 Equipment - Pickup 5,000.00 L
112 Replace Zone Valves - Old Terminal 2,500.00 H
048 Skandia Maintenance Garage 425,000.00 L
050 Access Road/Storm Drainage 10,000.00 H
076 Update Master Plan 15,000.00 M
058 1983 ADAP (Terminal Expansion, Additional Apron and Taxiways 80,000.00 M
041 Garage Site 22,000.00 L
042 Satellite Salt Storage Facility 58,000.00 H
028 Maintenance Garage 324,000.00 L
062 Acocks-Renovation or Replacement (approx) 50,000.00 L
069 Third Floor Jail Study 3,000.00 L
County Road 573 Bridge 25,000.00 H

TOTAL COST - INFORMATION ONLY $5,069,941.00

Comm. Carlson asked what is being done about the proposed recording system for the Commissioners Room. He was advised by Duane Beard, Controller, that he has contacted Lincoln Poley for specifications to be bid, with hopes that bids could be let within two weeks.

It was moved by Comm. Juidici, supported by Comm. LaMere that all telecommunication questions and materials be referred to the Inter-governmental Relations Committee so that they may be aware of all new developments.

There being no further business to come before the County Board, it was moved by Comm. LaPin, supported by Comm. LaMere and carried that the meeting be adjourned.

Respectfully Submitted,

Henry A. Skewis
County Clerk
MARQUETTE COUNTY BOARD OF COMMISSIONERS

Wednesday, June 23, 1982, 7:00 p.m.
(Recessed from June 16, 1982)

Commissioners Room, Courthouse Annex
Marquette, Michigan

1. CALLING OF ROLL BY THE COUNTY CLERK.
2. SALUTE TO THE FLAG AND PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE.
4. PUBLIC COMMENT (time limit of 20 minutes total).
5. APPROVAL OF THE AGENDA.
6. PUBLIC HEARINGS:
   a.
   b.

7. PRESENTATION OF CLAIMS, PETITIONS AND COMMUNICATIONS:
   b. Memo from the Controller on capital improvements program - 1983. Deferred from June 16, 1982 meeting.
   c. Communication from John Beerling, Supt./Engineer, Road Commission, requesting financial assistance to provide local match for federal funds for replacement of Carp River Bridge, Ishpeming Township.
   d. of
   e. f. g.

8. REPORTS OF STANDING COMMITTEES:
   a.
   b.

9. REPORTS OF SPECIAL COMMITTEES:
   a.
   b.

10. REPORTS OF COUNTY OFFICERS:
    a.
    b.

11. LATE ADDITIONS:
    a.
    b.

12. UNFINISHED BUSINESS:
    a.
    b.

13. NEW BUSINESS:
    a.
    b.

14. PUBLIC COMMENT.
15. ANNOUNCEMENTS.
16. ADJOURNMENT.