The Board of Huron County Commissioners met this date in Regular Session. Roll being called found the following members present: Terry Boose, Joe Hintz, Bruce Wilde.

19-087

# IN THE MATTER OF THE APPLICATION SUBMITTED FOR A QUALIFIED ENERCY PROJECT BY FIRELANDS WIND, LLC (EMERSON CREEK) AND A PAYMENT IN LIEU OF TAXES (PILOT)

Terry Boose moved the adoption of the following resolution:

**WHEREAS**, the Board of County Commissioners on February 22, 2019, received an application for certification of a qualified energy project related to Firelands Wind, LLC (Emerson Creek) from the Ohio Development Services Agency, for a wind project in Lyme, Norwich, Sherman, Ridgefield and Richmond Townships, Huron County;

**WHEREAS,** per O.R.C. Section 5727.75(E) (1) (b), the Board of County Commissioners shall adopt a resolution approving or rejecting this application within thirty days of receipt of the application from the Ohio Development Services Agency; and

**WHEREAS,** a vote of "yes" will signify approval of the application for certification of a qualified energy project related to Firelands Wind, LLC (Emerson Creek) and a vote of "no" will signify rejecting of the application for certification of a qualified energy project related to Firelands Wind, LLC (Emerson Creek);

now therefore

**BE IT RESOLVED**, *by voting "yes"* this Board hereby approves the qualified energy project application, submitted to the Ohio Development Services Agency by Firelands Wind, LLC, related to the Emerson Creek Wind Farm project in Lyme, Norwich, Sherman, Ridgefield and Richmond Townships, Huron County, Ohio, according to the provisions as outlined in the attached document;

and further

**BE IT RESOLVED**, *by voting "yes"* this Board declares all applications for property tax exemption submitted to and approved by the Director of the Ohio Development Services Agency by Firelands Wind, LLC, related to the Emerson Creek Wind Farm project, pursuant to O.R.C Section 5727.75(E) after the adoption of this resolution, and prior to its repeal, are approved; and further

**BE IT RESOLVED,** *by voting "yes"* the approval provided in this resolution is expressly conditioned upon the payment of an annual service payment required under O.R.C Sections 5727.75 (E) (1) (b) and 5727.75 (G) (2); and further

**BE IT RESOLVED**, *by voting "no"* this Board hereby rejects the qualified energy project application, submitted to the Ohio Development Services Agency by Firelands Wind, LLC, related to the Emerson Creek Wind Farm project in Lyme, Norwich, Sherman, Ridgefield and Richmond Townships, Huron County, Ohio;

**BE IT RESOLVED**, *by voting "no"* this Board declares all applications for property tax exemption submitted to the Director of the Ohio Development Services Agency by Firelands Wind, LLC, related to the Emerson Creek Wind Farm project, pursuant to O.R.C Section 5727.75(E) after the adoption of this resolution, and prior to its repeal, be rejected; and further

**BE IT RESOLVED**, that the foregoing resolution was adopted and all actions and deliberations of the Board of Commissioners of the County of Huron, Ohio relating thereto were conducted in meetings open to the public, in compliance with all applicable legal requirements, including Section 121.22 of the Ohio Revised Code.

Joe Hintz seconded the motion.

#### \*Discussion:

Commissioner Joe Hintz - Mr. Hintz indicated he was really troubled by the fact that initially Apex said they would not proceed with the project if a PILOT was not approved, but now they say they have changed their mind. He is not sure if that was true or not. The big thing they have been pushing lately is the RUMA. Apex has indicated there has to be a PILOT in order to have a RUMA. Mr. Hintz said he doesn't like that – he likes to think this company is going to take care of our roads and bridges regardless of whether there is a PILOT project or not.

Mr. Hintz wanted to state that he has never been in favor of this project, nor was he in favor of Greenwich's when that was proposed. But Mr. Hintz tried to listen to the will of the people, but that came kind of late. He said the Commissioners had tried to do things a lot differently with this project and had tried to hold meetings. The only real opposition Mr. Hintz initially saw was from Greenwich. He did not feel it was fair to the other communities if they wanted the project. He did not feel he could base his decision on just what the community down south wanted.

Mr. Hintz said he had been very straightforward with Apex from the beginning. The Commissioners had voted originally to consider looking at the PILOT, but that created a lot of confusion for the people. He understood this and he apologized because, although that was not the intent, that was what happened.

Mr. Hintz again said he had been straightforward with Apex and had told them that, personally, he was really not for the project, but he was waiting to hear from the residents of this County. He believes the residents have sent us a very, very clear message. Mr. Hintz felt the problem was the fact that there are a lot of people that still have not voiced their opinion, which makes it more difficult for the Commissioners to make a decision.

Mr. Hintz said it was clear to him - he had studied a lot of different things, had looked at a lot of different things, had read a lot of different things, had talked to a lot of people. He believes if you ever see a picture of flicker, it can make you sick. He realizes it probably doesn't affect everyone, but he believes for some it does.

Mr. Hintz thought that, even if all these things are wrong – property values aren't going to be lowered, there won't be any seismic vibrations, there's no infrasound, there's no sickness from it, and it won't kill bats and eagles, regardless the turbines would detract from what he considers to be a beautiful County. He compared it to Florida, which he considers to be rather ugly once you travel outside the resort areas. He said that is not what we have here – we have a very beautiful County and he does not want to see it disrupted.

Mr. Hintz informed the audience that he is the father of 4 daughters and has 14 grandkids, with number 15 on the way. Eight of his grandchildren live in Huron County, so the County is very important him. He clarified that this isn't just a job for him but it is also his home. He too is a resident of this County. Mr. Hintz feels there are too many unknowns, too many variables. He has not received solid answers to his questions, including if the project would really last 30 years. He also didn't know if Emerson Creek would really come to the County regardless of whether they received the PILOT – he said we would have to wait and see. Mr. Hintz reminded the listeners that the Commissioners can't stop them from coming, but he would not be a willing participant to encourage them to come here. He indicated that was where he stands on the issue.

<u>Commissioner Terry Boose</u> – Mr. Boose indicated he had quite a few thoughts on the project.

First, Mr. Boose wanted to start with the conflict the project had created in the community. He indicated it had happened in Greenwich and was now happening in our area. All three of the Commissioners had discussed it and were very disappointed at how it was breaking up the area and causing conflict. For the most part he thought the conflict had always been blamed on Apex, except when it was in Greenwich it had been blamed on that company. Mr. Boose said during his relationship with Apex they had been nothing but straightforward - they had answered any questions he had. Mr. Boose said he was holding those at the meeting partly responsible for how things have moved forward in that area. He did not feel there was any reason for divide. He said that, if they want to divide, want to call people names, want to send ugly emails, if they want to argue with their neighbor and tell them they are wrong just because they want or don't want the project - there is no reason for it. He indicated this is what we have in Washington right now. It is the exact same thing – that division, people calling people names, arguing with each other, and making it ugly.

Mr. Boose pointed out the other thing he sees in Washington is there is no compromise. He said that, when it comes to law making or important decisions in our area, not everybody is going be happy. He said that one of the first things he learned in Columbus was that if you pass a bill and one side is really happy, you probably didn't do your job. This is because every issue has people for it and people against it. He indicated that they need to listen to the people and work through whatever issues there might be. Mr. Boose really felt this was applicable to this area. He feels it is time to cut the divide regardless of whatever decision is made and whatever happens. He said that doesn't mean you can't voice your opinion and be strong about it - there is nothing wrong with that. Mr. Boose meant the true divide that's really happening. He feels it needs to stop, and believes that it can be done, both sides can do it, as well as the people in the middle. He agreed with Mr. Hintz that we have a great County. He said part of the reason the County is great is not just what you see but also the people within. With the right people, when there's an issue when somebody needs help, it will happen – regardless of whether it's Bellevue, Monroeville, Willard, Norwalk, New London. The people come together and make sure they take care of it. Mr. Boose feels part of the great thing about the County is the people.

The second topic Mr. Boose wanted to talk about was today's decision, and what their decision was. He wanted to be very clear for the record what they were voting on so that five or ten years down the road, when things change or something happens with the project, there will be no question what was voted on and how they voted. He feels that, when the Commissioners vote on things, they should be explaining their vote. He said there have been many times over the past two years the Board has questioned "why are we doing that?" or "where did that start?". When they review the minutes it simply says the Commissioners voted to approve it, they voted "yes". Mr. Boose acknowledged that this is an important decision and wanted to be very clear about what they were truly voting on.

Mr. Boose said that a lot of what they had heard from people was that they wanted the Board to vote no on the PILOT. He thought what they were actually saying was that they didn't want the wind turbines. Mr. Boose isn't sure that everybody understands the PILOT, what it does and what happens if there isn't a PILOT.

Mr. Boose indicated that he has been meeting with State Representative Dick Stein just about every week, or at least every other week. Mr. Boose was very disappointed by what Mr. Stein put in the paper. Mr. Boose acknowledged that Mr. Stein can certainly say he isn't for wind energy. However, he felt that Mr. Stein made it sound like the Commissioners decision is whether to like wind energy or not like wind energy. Mr. Boose again said that was not their decision. The decision he was going to make has nothing to do with whether he likes wind energy or doesn't like wind energy. Mr. Boose stated the decision he is supposed to be making today is whether it is in the best interest of the County to have a PILOT project or to not have a PILOT project. That was what they were voting on. They are not voting on wind energy today. They are voting on the PILOT project.

Mr. Boose wanted to explain this further and express his concerns.

Mr. Boose said that he has been told more than once that no wind farm in Ohio has ever moved forward without a PILOT. He has heard it often enough and from enough different sources that he believes that to be true. However, he believes the issue now is that the legislation on how a wind farm can be taxed was done 6, 8, 10 years ago. He believes that wind energy was very different at that time. A lot of people were talking about it, but there wasn't a lot going on. The reason a PILOT was brought up was because the local governments wanted some sort of say in the matter. Mr. Boose reminded the listeners that the State and the Power Siting Board still have the ultimate say, and they didn't want to give that up. But they agreed that if local government wanted to work with the company, they would let them vote on a PILOT. He believes the idea at the time was that the only way everything was going to move forward in a wind project is if the PILOT was passed. So far, that's how it has worked.

Mr. Boose wanted to fast forward to today. Technology has changed immensely in the last 8 to 10 years. Back then he had a flip phone as opposed to today's smart phone. He said technology is totally different, and is totally different in the wind industry. Mr. Boose recognized that everything has changed, even the economy. He said this was outlined by the fact that a PILOT requires 50% Ohio domiciled workers. This is because, at the time it was passed, the unemployment rate in our area sometimes reached as high as 13%. It was a pretty big deal to get local people to do the work.

#### REGULAR SESSION THURSDAY MARCH 21, 2019

Mr. Boose continued by stating that, also at the time this legislation was passed, there was nothing in the rules that told the Ohio Power Siting Board to include road maintenance and repair guidelines. They decided that on their own. Mr. Boose said he truly still believes there's a difference between the RUMA outlined in a PILOT and what the Power Siting Board will require.

However, Mr. Boose stated that things have changed so much in the industry that Apex has indicated that a PILOT is not that important to them anymore. One of the more drastic changes is that big companies, big organizations, are now investing to buy the output of these wind farms. Recently there was an article in the paper about GM buying power from a wind farm in Michigan.

In addition, Ohio State University has purchased energy coming out of a wind farm in western Ohio. This is because the State of Ohio passed a law that said, by year 2025, if you are generating energy, 25% of that energy has to come from a renewable source. Since that time it has been changed to say that 25% should be the goal. So, despite the fact that OSU has their own electric production facility, they can't reach the goal of 25% unless they buy energy from somewhere else.

Mr. Boose referenced the Super Bowl ad in which Anheuser Busch showed wind turbines in the background and indicated they are investing in wind energy. Mr. Boose said that all the big companies are investing, and that changes the whole scenery for companies like Apex. Now they have an immediate source of income. That makes a difference as to whether they need a PILOT or not. Now that they have a guaranteed source of income, they may not need the PILOT anymore.

Mr. Boose made a guess that Apex has already invested \$5,000,000 to \$10,000,000 on this project. He does not think they would stop the project after investing that much when the PILOT only makes a couple million dollars difference to them. The variables have all changed. He asked - if they have already spent 10 million dollars, are they going to give it up for 1 or 2 million if they don't get a PILOT? Mr. Boose didn't know. What was important to him was that, if Apex moves forward with the wind turbines, they will still be in the same place they were before, everyone will have to see them, but now the schools have the possibility of losing hundreds of thousands of dollars per year. He acknowledged that this is because of the way the funding for schools goes. Mr. Boose said he spoke to a local school superintendent that verified Mr. Boose's thoughts. If the school is receiving tax money, the State will reduce the amount of money they give to the school accordingly. If they are not receiving tax money, but rather payment in lieu of taxes, the state does not hold it against them. Mr. Boose said this could change at any time, but once again was one of the variables, an unknown.

Mr. Boose outlined the results from the meeting held last Tuesday with the local governments:

ADAMS Board/MHAS – neutral; Christie Lane Board of DD – neutral; Senior Center Enrichment – neutral; Bellevue Schools – neutral; Seneca East – no; Monroeville Schools – neutral; Willard Schools – neutral, except on the issue that if the project goes forward, then they are in favor of the PILOT. Mr. Boose indicated he wished we could make that decision, but, as Mr. Strickler pointed out the Ohio Revised Code doesn't allow it. Mr. Boose thought Willard's decision made a lot of sense to him. While they are not out there in support, they know there are a lot of people against this in the area, but they know they have a lot to lose potentially if the project moves forward and they don't have a PILOT.

#### Mr. Boose continued:

Vanguard – no response; Pioneer – neutral and yes, same as Willard; Norwich Township – no; Lyme Township – yes; Sherman Township – no; Richfield Township – no response; Richmond Township – no; Health District – no response; Huron River Fire District – no. Mr. Boose reminded everyone that the Fire District had said at the meeting they weren't sure yet but have come back and said no. Bellevue Library – neutral; Seneca East Library – neutral; Huron County Library District – neutral.

Mr. Boose continued by saying that they have been looking at this project for two years. He knew about it when he was running for County Commissioner. He attended a meeting right next to the Apex office in downtown Bellevue when he was campaigning. He knew that it was happening then and they have been looking at it ever since then. He thought it was interesting to hear, no matter who they were talking to – whether for, against, or in between – everyone tells them to do their homework. But Mr. Boose believes they all want the Commissioners to do the homework about their side of it. They don't want them to necessarily hear what the other side has to say because they believe you can't believe what the other side is saying. He said they have heard that so many times - either way, you can't believe what is being said.

Mr. Boose wanted to make it known that he had been to an anti-wind meeting, had been to a meeting put on by a local group for wind energy, had been to a hearing that Apex had, had attended the Erie County Commissioner's meeting when they had their vote. He said that Huron County has had five hearings and challenged anyone to find another County in the State of Ohio that had a PILOT come before them that has had five open meetings for the public. The only meeting Mr. Boose was aware of in Erie County was the one he attended. He indicated he also attended the meeting in Norwich Township about a year ago. That meeting had a large attendance, the room was fully packed. He believes Huron County has done their due diligence. They have read all the emails, all the attachments, have seen all the movies and videos. He wanted those in attendance to know that the Huron County Commissioners had looked at every possible side of this issue.

Mr. Boose reiterated that the decision today and what this Resolution says is - should we move forward with the PILOT or should we not. It has nothing to do with wind energy, or if they are in favor of wind energy or not. Mr. Boose was concerned where things will go after the vote, and wanted to express those concerns before the vote – he thinks both sides need to hear it.

He said they have made their decision whether to go with the PILOT or whether not to go with the PILOT. However, they are still going to be concerned and will be following the project. He found it ironic that yesterday's newspaper had the visiting viewpoint from Representative Stein telling them what they are supposed to do. Mr. Boose feels they don't really get to do very much at all - they get to vote on one issue that has a great number of variables. He can't even specify the number of variables involved. Mr. Boose feels that the State could do a lot to clear up and eliminate many of the variables. He indicated this is something only the State can do. He said there are things both the Ohio Public Siting Board can do, there are things the State of Ohio can do, more so than can be done at the County level.

Mr. Boose felt that the public had come out and put the pressure on the Commissioners, when really they just have a simple vote on one issue - whether to provide the PILOT.

Mr. Boose encouraged the listeners to contact their State Representative Dick Stein and their State Senator, Nathan Manning. He feels they should be encouraged to change the process so that, if the Power Siting Board approves the project, and if the wind company decides to go forward with the project, then they should have the ability to sit down and negotiate everything that is in the PILOT. He believes this would take away the variable they now have with the schools. This would also allow for the opportunity to sit down and work on a local RUMA. Mr. Boose believes there are all kinds of things the State can do to tweak the process.

Mr. Boose said another thing he learned in Columbus is that it is called the Ohio Revised Code, because it's revised - it gets revised weekly down in Columbus. This is partially because it is not always possible to think of all the consequences of something and it needs to be fixed. This is also partially because, as in this case, everything has changed from the way it was 8 years ago when it was originally passed. The decisions are now different.

Mr. Boose indicated that another major issue that was brought forward to them – is it really a fair way of notifying people by putting it in the newspaper? This was probably the number one concern that they heard. Mr. Hintz heard it with the Greenwich project, they heard it in this project. They thought things were moving pretty smoothly and all of a sudden they started hearing from all these people saying they never knew there was a project going on. Mr. Boose thought he and Mr. Wilde were more surprised by this than Mr. Hintz had been – he had already lived through it. However, Mr. Hintz was still surprised because the Commissioners had held hearings and hadn't heard much opposition.

Mr. Hintz agreed that the Commissioners had tried to be more transparent this time around.

Mr. Boose continued by saying that, 8 years ago just about everybody was receiving the local newspaper. Today, that is not the case. Some of those newspapers aren't even around anymore. This is an area where Mr. Boose feels there needs to be a change – there needs to be a better way of notifying people. He is not sure how to handle this situation. It has been suggested that these things be put on Facebook, but he believes there's probably 25% of the population that doesn't look at Facebook. He thinks it will reach some people, probably more than not. Mr. Boose does not know what the answer is. However, he said that what he does know, at election time, he feels like it is a waste of money every time he does a mailing. Studies show that the average amount of time somebody looks at a mailer is less than 3 seconds. Mostly they just look and

see what it is and throw it away. He feels that, if someone receives something from the project or from Apex, he is not sure they would read it.

Mr. Boose is not sure what the answer is to this dilemma, but feels there has to be some answer. There has to be something better than what we have been doing. He expressed that there have been two projects now and the number one issue for both seemed to be that nobody knew. He said there was nothing they could do as Commissioners about that, but your State Representative and your Senator can. Mr. Boose wanted to express that, just because you tell them what you want does not mean it will automatically happen, but if they don't hear it then it will never get changed.

Mr. Boose believes the citizens of Huron County should ask to have hearings with Mr. Stein and Mr. Manning similar to what they had with the Commissioners. He feels they should be informed of what is wrong with the process, and what people would like to see change in the process. Mr. Boose is convinced we are not done with wind energy in Huron County. He believes there will be other phases and other areas, and it will affect all of Ohio. So, of Huron County doesn't speak to Mr. Stein and Mr. Manning, then nobody else in Columbus is going to hear what Huron County has to say. Or they might hear it but think they are the only ones, so they won't bring it up.

Mr. Boose said that one of the bigger variables they are dealing with is that Apex asked for a PILOT project which would allow for equal payment over 30 years. Then we heard from a lot of people saying the project is never going to make it 30 years. Mr. Boose agrees we have no way of knowing how long the project will last. He said that we could try to use history as a guideline, but things have changed so much in the last 8 years this may not be as reliable as it could be. He said that statistics show that technology has changed more in the last two years than all of the other years in the history of mankind added together. A business can't operate on things from the past. They need to try to figure things out moving forward. Mr. Boose thought that, if the wind project only lasted 10 years, then the anti-wind groups were probably correct and the County would lose money with a PILOT. However, if it lasts 30 years, the County will bring in much more money.

Mr. Boose feels the State needs to change the process - the sooner the better. The Commissioners are making decisions worth hundreds of thousands to the school, millions of dollars to all governments. Mr. Boose indicated he is a numbers guy – he can crank numbers all day long, but he can't do that with this project. He found this very frustrating. He was not able to give either side a good answer on what is going to be – whether the PILOT or regular taxes were the better deal. However, he wanted to stress that, with the current State law, if there isn't a PILOT, the money is going to come in as a tax and there's a very good chance that the schools will lose what they receive now from the State. He compared it to the lottery money, and said that all lottery money does go to education. However, other money was taken away. Mr. Boose is concerned the same thing that will happen here. Instead of that money benefitting the community, it is going to benefit the State. The State will decide their money is no longer needed by the community that is receiving monies from wind turbine taxes. So far, in the communities that have a payment in lieu of taxes, the State has not done that.

Mr. Boose pointed out another concern - when you receive money from the State, it comes with all kinds of strings attached. Mr. Boose asked - wouldn't it be nice to have \$200,000 to spend on safety in schools? He said there is a lot of money that schools receive, but they can't spend it on resource officers, they can't spend it on cameras, can't spend it on what they really need. The PILOT money has no strings attached. Mr. Boose referenced Willard's Leader in Me program. The Commissioners would be attending the first graduation next week. He said that the Leader in Me teaches kids to make good decisions, teaches them how to respect each other. This is aimed at 4<sup>th</sup> and 5<sup>th</sup> grade students. DARE has told them to say no to drugs, Leader in Me teaches them how to handle situations when drugs are presented to them. Mr. Boose indicated that Willard has scraped by to get money for one class, one grade level for this year. It is all privately funded. Mr. Boose thought it would be great if they had a source of funds so that they could make it available for all grade levels. Mr. Boose said they hear two things from businesses – young people can't pass a drug test and they don't have a good work ethic. No one is teaching work ethic. Mr. Boose said the schools can have some money that has no strings attached that they could use for that purpose.

Mr. Boose believes it is up to everybody to make the community better. He again stated that the decision they are making is not whether wind energy is a good idea or not a good idea. They are saying whether they are going to vote for the PILOT or not. Mr. Boose informed the listeners that there are a lot of things that can be done to make changes. He understood they were all frustrated, and he too would be frustrated

with the process. The current process worked 6 or 8 years ago, but Mr. Boose acknowledged that it doesn't work anymore. Mr. Boose suggested they spend their time going to the Power Siting Board.

Mr. Boose wanted to express that he thinks the Power Siting Board gets a really bad rap. He has heard a lot of people say they believe this should be a local decision. He suggested they be careful what you ask for. If it were a local decision, the County Commissioners would have to try to decide if the turbines were too close to an eagle's nest, or too close to bats, whether you can build them on the type of ground water issues that Bellevue has. Mr. Boose did not think it would be good to have them make those decisions. He believes somebody should be making sound, scientific decisions, and that is what the OPSB is about. That is what they are going to do – they are going to come out and do the studies themselves. They are not going to rely on the studies that they received. The Commissioners couldn't do that. They don't have the money or the expertise. He suggested the citizens give the Power Siting Board a little bit of slack. He clarified that doesn't mean they don't voice their opinion to them. He believes they should tell the OPSB how they feel. He also said to make sure you inform them about the groundwater issues in Bellevue and where there is an eagle's nest is if you know about it.

Mr. Boose said all he is asking is that everybody be a part of the solution.

#### **Bruce Wilde**

Mr. Wilde agreed with what the other two Commissioners discussed. He thought they had touched on all the issues. Mr. Wilde indicated his appreciation for the numerous emails and other communications he received from the community. He indicated that, as a Commissioner, it is his job to listen. Mr. Wilde wanted to again clarify before the vote, that it is the Power Siting Board who makes the decision on the wind farm. The Commissioners are discussing how it is getting funded. He wanted that to be known for one last time. Mr. Wilde then clarified that a "yes" vote is *for* the PILOT, a "no" vote is *to reject* the PILOT. Seeing no more discussion, Mr. Wilde called for the vote.

The roll being called upon its adoption, the vote resulted as follows:

No – Terry Boose No – Joe Hintz No – Bruce Wilde

At 9:49 a.m. the board recessed.

At 10:10 a.m. the board resumed regular session. Public comment – none

19-088

IN THE MATTER OF APPROVING A REQUEST FOR PAYMENT ON LETTER OF CREDIT AND STATUS OF FUNDS REPORT (FORM DS5) FOR HURON COUNTY COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT BLOCK GRANT (B-F-18-1BJ-1) SUBMITTED TO THE BOARD MARCH 21, 2019

Terry Boose moved the adoption of the following resolution:

**WHEREAS**, a request for payment and status of funds report has been prepared and submitted to the Board of Huron County Commissioners as attached herein by WSOS CAC, Inc. & Huron County Development Council for the Board's certification; and

WHEREAS, the Board has reviewed the request for payment and status of funds report; now therefore

**BE IT RESOLVED**, that the Board of Huron County Commissioners hereby approves of the request for payment and status of funds report as attached herein and certifies that the data reported is correct and that the amount of the Request for Payment is not in excess of current needs; and further

**BE IT RESOLVED**, that the foregoing resolution was adopted and all actions and deliberations of the Board of Commissioners of the County of Huron, Ohio relating thereto were conducted in meetings open to the public, in compliance with all applicable legal requirements, including Section 121.22 of the Ohio Revised Code.

Bruce Wilde seconded the motion.

\*Discussion: Ms. Ziemba stated this is the first drawdown for the CDBG grant. It's \$10,000.00 for administration.

The roll being called upon its adoption, the vote resulted as follows:

Aye – Terry Boose Aye – Joe Hintz Aye – Bruce Wilde

Submit To: Name and Address of Grantee: CDBG E.D.RLF Balance:									
Office at P.O.Box	ment Services Agency f Community Development i 1001 us, Ohio 43216-1001	180	on County Commissioner Milan Ave walk, OH 44857	- 1		ousing P.LBat ogram Incom			
	tt Person Information Grant Number: 8-F-18-18J-1 State Use Only Angle McConnell Date:								
Phone N	lumber: (419) 332-2008 mmcconnell@glcap.org	Dra	w Number: 1		Voucher   Warrant #				
Project Nbr	Project Name	Activity Nbr	Activity Name	Housing Site Address(if Applicable)	Site Number	Amount Requested (\$)	Approved Activity/Site Budget(\$)	Balance of Activity/Site Budget** (\$)	
	Administration	2	General Admin			10,000.00	20,500.00	10,500,00	
2		1							
ta Pianhimmon	nount of This Draw :					10,000.00	20,500.00	10,500.00	
Total Am	tion of Itemization of Expen								
Fotal Am Certifica: Certify II		vas drawn wer's depo	in accordance with the ter	rms and conditions of t	he Grant A	Agreement(s)	cited and that II	he amount	
Fotal Arr Certifica Certify II frawn is p ayment Jale:	tion of itemization of Expens hall this request for Payment was proper for payment to the draw is not in eccess of current net 3/2/119	vas drawn wer's depo eds.	in accordance with the ter elizary. I also certify that the	rms and conditions of the data reported above	is correct	Agreement(s)	pited and that the mount of the re	he amount	
Fotal Am Certifical Certify ti frawn is p	tion of itemization of Expen- hall this request for Paymont is proper for paymont to the dra- is not in excess of current need in excess of current	vas drawn wer's depo ids.	in accordance with the teresitary. I also certify that the	tres and conditions of the data reported above	is correct	Agreement(s) o and that the a	pited and that the mount of the re	he amount	

### IN THE MATTER OF TRAVEL

Joe Hintz moved to approve the following travel request this day. Terry Boose seconded the motion. The roll being called upon its adoption, the vote resulted as follows:

Aye – Terry Boose Aye – Joe Hintz Aye – Bruce Wilde

Warren Brown, HR/LP/RE, and Joe Hintz, Commissioner to Columbus, Ohio for CEBCO Annual meeting on April 5, 2019.

Terry Boose, Commissioner, to Columbus, Ohio for CCAO Tax and Finance Committee meeting on March 27, 2019.

#### Administrator/Clerk report

Ms. Ziemba recommends the board amending the January 29, 2019 board minutes of the Stieber-Metro Parks ditch petition public hearing from an adjournment to a continuation.

Terry Boose moved to amend the January 29, 2019 Commissioner board minutes of the Stieber-Metro Parks Ditch first public hearing from adjournment to a continuation. Joe Hintz seconded the motion. The roll being called upon its adoption, the vote resulted as follows:

Aye – Terry Boose Aye – Joe Hintz Aye – Bruce Wilde

Ms. Ziemba asked for a motion to approve signing and sending a letter to the landowners notifying them of the meeting date and sending the legal notice to the Norwalk Reflector.

Terry Boose moved to approve the continuation letter and legal notice and sending to the landowners. Joe Hintz seconded the motion. The roll being called upon its adoption, the vote resulted as follows:

Aye – Terry Boose Aye – Joe Hintz Aye – Bruce Wilde

March 21, 2019

Dear Landowner:

This letter is to notify you that the Huron County Board of Commissioners has decided to continue the public hearing for the Stieber-Metro Parks Ditch petition to allow for additional information from landowners who were unable to attend the public hearing on January 29, 2019.

This notice is given to you and each of you that:

The Board hereby fixes Tuesday, April 9, 2019 at 10:00 a.m. as the continuation date and time for the public hearing for the proposed ditch project at the Huron County Administration Building, 180 Milan Avenue, Meeting Room D, Norwalk, Ohio 44857.

If you have questions regarding the proposed ditch project please contact, Aaron Robinson, Huron County Soil and Water Conservation District, at 419-668-4113.

Sincerely,

THE BOARD OF HURON COUNTY COMMISSIONERS

Terry Boose, Joe Hintz, Bruce Wilde

Enclosures: Legal Notice

### **Commissioner Wilde report**

Mr. Wilde attended the Shooter Training early this morning.

Mr. Boose will be attending the Bellevue Tax Incentive Review committee meeting at 1:00 p.m.

LEPC meeting at 1:00 p.m. Mr. Hintz and Ms. Ziemba will attend.

EMA meeting – Mr. Wilde and Ms. Ziemba will attend.

Banquet tonight at 6:00 p.m.

Men's Recovery at 3:00 p.m. in the Health Department conference room.

Senior Enrichment at 6:00 p.m.

Mr. Wilde will attend CORSA meeting in Columbus tomorrow morning.

<u>Commissioner Hintz report</u>
Mr. Hintz visited the new dispatch center yesterday after the 911 meeting. He thought it was pretty impressive.

At 10:17 a.m. Terry Boose moved to adjourn. Bruce Wilde seconded the motion. The meeting stood adjourned

#### IN THE MATTER OF CERTIFICATION

The Clerk to the Board does hereby attest that the foregoing is a true and correct record of all actions taken by the Board of Huron County Commissioners on March 21, 2019.

#### IN THE MATTER OF ADJOURNING

The meeting was called to order at 9:00 a.m. We meeting was adjourned at 10:17 a.m.	ith no further bu	siness to come before the Board, the
		Terry Boose
		Joe Hintz
		Bruce Wilde
ATTEST		
Clerk to the Board	_	

#### **REGULAR SESSION THURSDAY MARCH 21, 2019**

The following bids for the Ferry Road Improvements Phase II were opened on February  $8,2019 \ @ 9:01$ a.m.:

## 2019 Ferry Road Improvement Project Phase II Clarksfield Township BID OPENING: FEBRUARY 8, 2019 9:01 A.M.

						<i>BID OPENING: F</i> 'S ESTIMATE		BLACKTOP	A.J	. RILEY	PRECISIO	N PAVING	OTTE	OTT EXCAVAT			
Ref.	Item	Description	Quantity	Unit	Unit Cost	Total Cost	Unit Cost	Total Cost	Unit Cost	Total Cost	Unit Cost	Total Cost	Unit Cost	Tot	tal Cost		
1	103.5	Premium Contract Bond	1	LS	\$1,000.00	\$1,000.00	\$ 1,000.00	\$ 1,000.00	\$ 3,000.00	\$ 3,000.00	\$ 1,200.00	\$ 1,200.00	\$ 3,700.00	\$	3,700.00		
2	202	Pipe Removed	64	FT	\$5.00	\$320.00	\$ 12.60	\$ 806.40	\$ 3.00	\$ 192.00	\$ 7.00	\$ 448.00	\$ 2.00	\$	128.00		
3	Spec.	Pulvamix existing road & base	2,450	SY	\$2.00	\$4,900.00	\$ 2.25	\$ 5,512.50	\$ 2.00	\$ 4,900.00	\$ 3.25	\$ 7,962.50	\$ 3.59	\$	8,795.50		
4	203	Excavation (including roadway)	510	CY	\$20.00	\$10,200.00	\$ 13.15	\$ 6,706.50	\$ 36.00	\$ 18,360.00	\$ 25.00	\$ 12,750.00	\$ 19.71	\$	10,052.10		
5	203	Embankment	250	CY	\$15.00	\$3,750.00	\$ 10.50	\$ 2,625.00	\$ 15.00	\$ 3,750.00	\$ 17.00	\$ 4,250.00	\$ 32.40	\$	8,100.00		
6	254	Milling (Intersection & Phase 1 Joint)	150	SY	\$5.00	\$750.00	\$ 11.00	\$ 1,650.00	\$ 20.00	\$ 3,000.00	\$ 12.00	\$ 1,800.00	\$ 11.55	\$	1,732.50		
7	301	Asphalt Base, 3"	210	CY	\$150.00	\$31,500.00	\$ 116.00	\$ 24,360.00	\$ 135.00	\$ 28,350.00	\$ 135.00	\$ 28,350.00	\$ 121.80	\$ 7	25,578.00		
8	304	Aggergate Base, limestone add/ blend 4"	300	CY	\$50.00	\$15,000.00	\$ 50.00	\$ 15,000.00	\$ 40.00	\$ 12,000.00	\$ 45.00	\$ 13,500.00	\$ 64.50	\$ :	19,350.00		
9	407	Tack Coat @ 0.1 Gal/SY	342	GAL	\$2.50	\$855.00	\$ 2.40	\$ 820.80	\$ 2.50	\$ 855.00	\$ 2.10	\$ 718.20	\$ 2.52	\$	861.84		
10	407	Tack Coat @ 0.05 Gal/SY	210	GAL	\$2.50	\$525.00	\$ 2.40	\$ 504.00	\$ 2.50	\$ 525.00	\$ 2.10	\$ 441.00	\$ 2.52	\$	529.20		
-11	441	Asphalt Concrete, Intermediate, Type 2, 2" Avg.	140	CY	\$160.00	\$22,400.00	\$ 132.00	\$ 18,480.00	\$ 150.00	\$ 21,000.00	\$ 165.00	\$ 23,100.00	\$ 138.60	\$ :	19,404.00		
12	441	Asphalt Concrete, Scratch Course Type 1, 1"	25	CY	\$180.00	\$4,500.00	\$ 164.00	\$ 4,100.00	\$ 160.00	\$ 4,000.00	\$ 165.00	\$ 4,125.00	\$ 172.20	\$	4,305.00		
13	441	Asphalt Concrete, Surface Overlay, Type 1, 1-1/4"	120	CY	\$180.00	\$21,600.00	\$ 164.00	\$ 19,680.00	\$ 160.00	\$ 19,200.00	\$ 185.00	\$ 22,200.00	\$ 172.20	\$ 7	20,664.00		
14	411	Stabilized Crushed Aggergate (berm)	75	CY	\$80.00	\$4,500.00	\$ 70.00	\$ 5,250.00	\$ 30.00	\$ 2,250.00	\$ 58.00	\$ 4,350.00	\$ 60.60	\$	4,545.00		
15	611	12" Conduit Type C, 707.33 (N-12), As per plan	468	⊏	\$30.00	\$14,040.00	\$ 31.50	\$ 14,742.00	\$ 18.00	\$ 8,424.00	\$ 35.00	\$ 16,380.00	\$ 28.51	\$ :	13,342.68		
16	611	Catch Basin, 2-2B, As per plan	3	Ea.	\$1,000.00	\$3,000.00	\$ 840.00	\$ 2,520.00	\$ 700.00	\$ 2,100.00	\$ 900.00	\$ 2,700.00	\$ 1,273.00	\$	3,819.00		
17	611	Tee Riser With Grate, As per plan	2	Ea.	\$500.00	\$1,000.00	\$ 498.75	\$ 997.50	\$ 500.00	\$ 1,000.00	\$ 600.00	\$ 1,200.00	\$ 270.00	\$	540.00		
18	614	Maintaining Traffic	1	ន	\$2,500.00	\$2,500.00	\$ 5,000.00	\$ 5,000.00	\$ 2,000.00	\$ 2,000.00	\$ 3,200.00	\$ 3,200.00	\$ 3,675.00	\$	3,675.00		
19	624	Mobilization	1	LS	\$3,000.00	\$3,000.00	\$ 4,500.00	\$ 4,500.00	\$ 4,500.00	\$ 4,500.00	\$ 2,000.00	\$ 2,000.00	\$ 6,650.00	\$	6,650.00		
20	642	Center Line	0.32	Mile	\$1,500.00	\$480.00	\$ 2,047.50	\$ 655.20	\$ 2,200.00	\$ 704.00	\$ 2,100.00	\$ 672.00	\$ 2,205.00	\$	705.60		
21	642	Edge Line	0.64	Mile	\$1,000.00	\$840.00	\$ 2,047.50	\$ 1,310.40	\$ 1,100.00	\$ 704.00	\$ 1,050.00	\$ 672.00	\$ 1,102.50	\$	705.60		
22	653	Top Soil Furnished & Placed, 4" Thick	210	CY	\$35.00	\$7,350.00	\$ 42.00	\$ 8,820.00	\$ 35.00	\$ 7,350.00	\$ 44.00	\$ 9,240.00	\$ 35.92	\$	7,543.20		
23	659	Seeding & Mulching, Class 1	2110	SY	\$2.00	\$4,220.00	\$ 1.45	\$ 3,059.50	\$ 1.50	\$ 3,165.00	\$ 1.15	\$ 2,426.50	\$ 2.65	\$	5,591.50		
24	659	Commercial Fertilizer, 19-19-19	0.25	Ton	\$500.00	\$125.00	\$ 630.00	\$ 157.50	\$ 900.00	\$ 225.00	\$ 875.00	\$ 218.75	\$ 2,200.00	\$	550.00		
25	Spec.	Mailbox Support	4	Ea.	\$200.00	\$800.00	\$ 131.25	\$ 525.00	\$ 150.00	\$ 600.00	\$ 200.00	\$ 800.00	\$ 110.00	\$	440.00		
26	Spec.	Traffic Sign Removed & Re-Erect	1	Ea.	\$200.00	\$200.00	\$ 157.50	\$ 157.50	\$ 100.00	\$ 100.00	\$ 100.00	\$ 100.00	\$ 110.00	\$	110.00		
27	Spec.	Contingencies	1	LS	\$5,845.00	\$5,845.00		\$ 5,845.00		\$ 5,845.00		\$ 5,845.00		\$	5,845.00		
						\$165,000.00		\$ 154,784.80		\$ 158,099.00		\$ 170,648.95		\$ 17	.77,262.72		
			SUBCONTRACTOR					DUE & CO LLC	OG	AMERICAN	Correct price based on						
							0	GLESBY			LOGIS	Quantity X Unit Price					

**REGULAR SESSION** THURSDAY MARCH 21, 2019
The following bids for the Cleveland Road Resurfacing project were opened on February 8, 2019 @ 10:01 a.m.:

## 2019 Cleveland Road Resurfacing BID OPENING: FEBRUARY 8, 2019 10:01 A.M.

					ENGINEER	'S ESTIMATE	KOKOSING	CONSTRUCTION	ERIE B	LACKTOP	PRECISION	PAVING	LA	AJ. RILEY		KEN PAVING		
Ref.	Item	Description	Quantity	Unit	Unit Cost	Total Cost	Unit Cost	Total Cost	Unit Cost	Total Cost	Unit Cost	Total Cost	Unit Cost	Total Cost	Unit Cost	Total Cost		
- 1	103.5	Premium Contract Bond	1	S	\$3,000.00	\$3,000.00	\$ 1,500.00	\$ 1,500.00	\$ 2,500.00	\$ 2,500.00	\$ 3,000.00	\$ 3,000.00	\$ 3,000.00	\$ 3,000.00	\$1,700.00	\$ 1,700.00		
2		Full Depth Pavement Repair, 6"	100	SY	\$60.00	\$6,000.00	\$ 66.00	\$ 6,600.00	\$ 78.00	\$ 7,800.00	\$ 72.00	\$ 7,200.00	\$ 50.00	\$ 5,000.00	\$ 86.00	\$ 8,600.00		
3		Pavement Planing, 1"	2,300	SY	\$2.00	\$4,600.00	\$ 0.45	\$ 1,035.00	\$ 1.25	\$ 2,875.00	\$ 1.00	\$ 2,300.00	\$ 1.50	\$ 3,450.00	\$ 2.00	\$ 4,600.00		
4		Pavement Planing, 2.5"	13,200	SY	\$2.50	\$33,000.00	\$ 0.50	\$ 6,600.00	\$ 1.60	\$ 21,120.00	\$ 0.80	\$ 10,560.00	\$ 1.10	\$ 14,520.00	\$ 2.00	\$ 26,400.00		
5	254	Patching of Planed Surface, as per plan	60	TN	\$100.00	\$6,000.00	\$ 40.00	\$ 2,400.00	\$ 85.00	\$ 5,100.00	\$ 100.00	\$ 6,000.00	\$ 100.00	\$ 6,000.00	\$ 55.00	\$ 3,300.00		
6	407	Tack Coat @ 0.1 Gal/SY Non-tracking	1,550	GAL	\$3.00	\$4,650.00	\$ 2.40	\$ 3,720.00	\$ 2.35	\$ 3,642.50	\$ 3.75	\$ 5,812.50	\$ 2.30	\$ 3,565.00	\$ 2.25	\$ 3,487.50		
7	407	Tack Coat @ 0.05 Gal/SY Non-tracking	775	GAL	\$3.00	\$2,325.00	\$ 2.40	\$ 1,860.00	\$ 2.35	\$ 1,821.25	\$ 3.75	\$ 2,906.25	\$ 2.30	\$ 1,782.50	\$ 2.25	\$ 1,743.75		
8	409	Seal Coat Bituminous Material,																
۰	403	CRS-2 @ 0.40 Gal./Sq. Yd. As per plan	7,000	GAL	\$4.00	\$28,000.00	\$ 3.23	\$ 22,610.00	\$ 3.40	\$ 23,800.00	\$ 3.25	\$ 22,750.00	\$ 3.50	\$ 24,500.00	\$ 3.40	\$ 23,800.00		
9	409	Seal Coat Cover Aggregate, Washed	-															
_	403	#8 Limestone @ 22lbs./Sq. Yd. As per plan	175	TN	\$40.00	\$7,000.00	\$ 28.00	\$ 4,900.00	\$ 22.00	\$ 3,850.00	\$ 29.00	\$ 5,075.00	\$ 40.00	\$ 7,000.00	\$ 22.00	\$ 3,850.00		
10	441	Asphalt Concrete, Intermediate, Type 2, 2", As			£430.00													
		per plan, PG64-22	900	CY	\$130.00	\$117,000.00	\$ 118.00	\$ 106,200.00	\$ 126.00	\$ 113,400.00	\$ 135.00	\$ 121,500.00	\$ 130.00	\$ 117,000.00	\$ 142.00	\$ 127,800.00		
11	441	Asphalt Concrete, Surface, Type 1, 1 1/4", As per plan, PG64-22			E450.00	F04 000 00												
12	411	Stabilized Crushed Aggergate (berm)	540 100	CY	\$150.00 \$60.00	\$81,000.00 \$6,000.00	\$ 137.00 \$ 30.00		\$ 158.00 \$ 65.00	\$ 85,320.00	\$ 160.00	\$ 86,400.00	\$ 144.00 \$ 35.00	\$ 77,760.00	\$ 178.00 \$ 68.00	\$ 96,120.00 \$ 6,800.00		
		Maintaining Traffic	100		\$18,000.00	\$18,000.00	*	\$ 3,000.00	\$ 11,500.00	\$ 6,500.00	*	\$ 5,800.00	*	*				
13		Monument Boxes Adjusted to Grade	1	LS EA.	\$500.00	\$1,000.00	\$ 21,335.00	\$ 21,335.00		\$ 11,500.00	\$ 10,800.00	\$ 10,800.00	\$15,000.00	\$ 15,000.00	\$ 6,250.00	\$ 6,250.00		
14		Mobilization	2		·		\$ 828.19	\$ 1,656.38	\$ 1,100.00	\$ 2,200.00	\$ 825.00	\$ 1,650.00	\$ 500.00	\$ 1,000.00	\$ 775.00	\$ 1,550.00		
15			1	LS	\$5,000.00	\$5,000.00	\$ 10,000.00	\$ 10,000.00	\$ 4,000.00	\$ 4,000.00	\$ 2,400.00	\$ 2,400.00	\$ 7,000.00	\$ 7,000.00	\$8,500.00	\$ 8,500.00		
16	630	Signs (OPWC) As Per Plan Ground Mounted Support, Square Posts, with 4ft	2	EA.	\$500.00	\$1,000.00	\$ 425.00	\$ 850.00	\$ 500.00	\$ 1,000.00	\$ 425.00	\$ 850.00	\$ 750.00	\$ 1,500.00	\$ 425.00	\$ 850.00		
17	630	stubs 730.016	200	Ft	\$10.00	\$2,000.00												
40	630	Sign Posts Reflectors (48")		EA	\$40.00	\$120.00	\$ 8.95			\$ 1,880.00	\$ 8.95		\$ 15.00	\$ 3,000.00	\$ 8.95	\$ 1,790.00		
18 19		Sign, Flat Sheet (Warning)	3 27	SF	\$25.00	\$675.00	\$ 35.00 \$ 16.00		\$ 36.75 \$ 16.80		\$ 35.00 \$ 16.00	\$ 105.00 \$ 432.00	\$ 50.00	\$ 240.00 \$ 1,350.00	\$ 35.00 \$ 16.00	\$ 105.00 \$ 432.00		
20		Sign, Flat Sheet (Regulatory)	20	SF	\$25.00	\$500.00	\$ 16.00		\$ 16.80		\$ 16.00	_	\$ 150.00	\$ 3,000.00	\$ 16.00			
21		Sign, Flat Sheet (Road name)	15	SF	\$25.00	\$375.00	\$ 25.00		\$ 26.25		\$ 25.00	_	\$ 200.00	\$ 3,000.00	\$ 25.00			
22		Center Line	10	Mie	\$1,000.00	\$1,000.00	\$ 725.00		\$ 1.185.00		\$ 1,125.00	_	•	\$ 2,000.00	\$ 1,125.00			
		Edge Line	1	Mie	\$700.00	\$1,000.00	_		¥ -	·			_					
23		Temporary Centerline Striping (3 applications)	3	Mie	\$400.00	\$1,400.00	\$ 450.00 \$ 350.00		\$ 555.00 \$ 475.00		\$ 525.00 \$ 1,350.00	\$ 1,050.00	_	\$ 2,200.00	\$ 525.00 \$ 145.00			
25		Thermoolastic Pavement Marking Stop Bar	70	_	\$400.00	\$1,200.00	_					_	_		_			
			//	LF			\$ 13.50		\$ 14.20		\$ 13.50	_	\$ 25.00	\$ 1,750.00	\$ 13.50			
26	Spec.	Contingencies	_	LS	\$8,105.00	\$8,105.00		\$ 8,105.00		\$ 8,105.00		\$ 8,105.00		\$ 8,105.00	_	\$ 8,105.00		
$\vdash$				$\vdash$	TOTAL =	\$340,000.00		\$ 282,993.38		\$ 312,421.35		\$ 313,300.75		\$ 319,222.50		\$ 340,033.25		
$\vdash$		SUBCONTRACTORS: HENRY BERGMAN		AMERICAN ROADWAY LOG AMERICAN ROADWAY LOG			FARU	1115015111 001011111110										
$\vdash$				$\vdash$	SUBCONT	KACTORS:				AMERICAN ROADWAY LOG			OG	LESBY	AMERICAN ROADWAY LOG ROADWAY SERVICES INC			
$\vdash$				$\vdash$				ROADWAY LOG BOCA	В	OCA	WELFL HENRY W							
$\Box$								BUCA			HENRYW	SERGMAN			ERIE	ERIE BLACKTOP		

The following bids for the West River Road Improvements Phase II were opened on February 22, 2019 @ 9:01 a.m.

2019 West River Road Improvements Phase III BID OPENING: FEBRUARY 22, 2019 9:01 A.M.

	BIO OPENING: FEBRUARY 22, 2019 9-01 A.M.  ENGINEER'S ESTIMATE OTT EXCANATING A.J. RILEY INC. SENGHAS CONSTRUCTION ED BURDUE & COMPANY PRECISION PAVING INC BUCKEYE EXCANAT																	
$\rightarrow$	ltem	Description	Quantity	Unit	Unit Cost	Total Cost	Unit Cost	Total Cost	Unit Cost	Total Cost	Unit Cost	Total Cost	Unit Cost	Total Cost	Unit Cost	Total Cost	Unit Cost	Total Cost
1	103.5	Premium Contract Bond	1	LS	\$2,500.00	\$2,500.00	\$ 7,360.00	\$ 7,360.00	\$ 5,000.00	\$ 5,000.00	\$5,000.00	\$ 5,000.00	\$ 4,900.00	\$ 4,900.00	\$2,575.00	\$ 2,575.00	\$3,250.00	\$ 3,250.00
2	201	Clearing and Grubbing	1	S	\$1,000.00	\$1,000.00	\$ 2,400.00	\$ 2,400.00	\$ 2,000.00	\$ 2,000.00	\$1,000.00	\$ 1,000.00	\$ 1,500.00	\$ 1,500.00	\$ 500.00	\$ 500.00	\$3,000.00	\$ 3,000.00
3	202	Existing Structure Removed	- 1	LS	\$4,000.00	\$4,000.00	\$ 7,200.00	\$ 7,200.00	\$ 2,000.00	\$ 2,000.00	\$4,000.00	\$ 4,000.00	\$ 3,700.00	\$ 3,700.00	\$4,000.00	\$ 4,000.00	\$4,500.00	\$ 4,500.00
4	202	Pipe Removed, less than 24"	400	FT	\$2.00	\$800.00	\$ 3.00	\$ 1,200.00	\$ 3.00	\$ 1,200.00	\$ 2.00	\$ 800.00	\$ 6.00	\$ 2,400.00	\$ 2.00	\$ 800.00	\$ 3.50	\$ 1,400.00
5	202	Guardrail Removed	150	FT	\$5.00	\$750.00	\$ 2.10	\$ 315.00	\$ 2.00	\$ 300.00	\$ 2.00	300.00	\$ 2.50	\$ 375.00	\$ 2.00	\$ 300.00	\$ 3.50	\$ 525.00
6	203	Excavation, including pavement, as per plan	400	CY	\$35.00	\$14,000.00	\$ 28.82	\$ 11,528.00	\$ 40.00	\$ 16,000.00	\$ 30.00	\$ 12,000.00	\$ 18.00	\$ 7,200.00	\$ 27.00	\$ 10,800.00	\$ 15.00	\$ 6,000.00
$\rightarrow$	=	Embankment	500	CY	\$10.00	\$5,000.00	\$ 12.90	\$ 6,450.00	\$ 15.00	\$ 7,500.00	\$ 10.00	5,000.00	\$ 17.00	\$ 8,500.00	\$ 15.00	\$ 7,500.00	\$ 18.00	\$ 9,000.00
_		Subgrade Compaction	1,400	SY	\$1.00	\$1,400.00	\$ 0.75	\$ 1,050.00	\$ 1.00	\$ 1,400.00	\$ 1.00	1,400.00	\$ 1.25	\$ 1,750.00	\$ 0.60	\$ 840.00	\$ 0.85	\$ 1,190.00
9	$\overline{}$	Pavement Planing	70	SY	\$20.00	\$1,400.00	\$ 26.25	\$ 1,837.50	\$ 30.00	\$ 2,100.00	\$ 25.00	5 1,750.00	\$ 26.50	\$ 1,855.00	\$ 24.00	\$ 1,680.00	\$ 7.50	\$ 525.00
10		Aggergate Base, limestone, 6"	250	CY	\$50.00	\$12,500.00	\$ 49.68	\$ 12,420.00	\$ 40.00	\$ 10,000.00	\$ 50.00	12,500.00	\$ 40.00	\$ 10,000.00	1	\$ 11,750.00	\$ 45.00	\$ 11,250.00
11	$\overline{}$	Asphalt Base, 4"	150	CY	\$140.00	\$21,000.00	\$ 141.75	\$ 21,262.50	\$ 135.00	\$ 20,250.00	\$ 142.00	\$ 21,300.00	\$ 149.10	\$ 22,365.00	\$ 142.00	\$ 21,300.00	\$ 164.00	\$ 24,600.00
_	$\overline{}$					-	_	\$ 1,052.00	\$ 2.50	\$ 1,000.00	_		\$ 2.60	\$ 1,040.00	_			\$ 1,100.00
12		Tack Coat @ 0.1 Gal/SY	400	GAL	\$4.00	\$1,600.00	\$ 2.63		\$ 2.50		\$ 2.50	1,000.00			\$ 2.00 \$ 2.00	\$ 800.00 \$ 400.00	\$ 2.75	
13	_	Tack Coat @ 0.05 Gal/SY	200	GAL	\$4.00	\$800.00	\$ 2.63	\$ 526.00		\$ 500.00	\$ 2.50	5 500.00	\$ 2.60	\$ 520.00			\$ 2.75	\$ 550.00
14		Asphalt Concrete, Intermediate, Type 2, 2" Avg.	230	CY	\$140.00	\$32,200.00	\$ 145.95	\$ 33,568.50	\$ 139.00	\$ 31,970.00	\$ 134.00	30,820.00	\$ 140.70	\$ 32,361.00	\$ 145.00	\$ 33,350.00	\$ 148.00	\$ 34,040.00
$\rightarrow$	$\overline{}$	Asphalt Concrete, Surface, Type 1, 1 1/4"	140	CY	\$150.00	\$21,000.00	\$ 168.00	\$ 23,520.00	\$ 160.00	\$ 22,400.00	\$ 178.00	24,920.00	\$ 187.00	\$ 26,180.00	\$ 164.00	\$ 22,960.00	\$ 196.00	\$ 27,440.00
_	_	Stabilized Crushed Aggergate (berm & drives)	200	TON	\$50.00	\$10,000.00	\$ 47.51	\$ 9,502.00	\$ 45.00	\$ 9,000.00	\$ 50.00	\$ 10,000.00	\$ 48.00	\$ 9,600.00	\$ 32.00	\$ 6,400.00	\$ 36.00	\$ 7,200.00
17	_	Unclassfied Excavation	1	LS	\$10,000.00	\$10,000.00	\$ 8,850.00	\$ 8,850.00	\$ 5,000.00	\$ 5,000.00	\$8,000.00	\$ 8,000.00	\$15,750.00	\$ 15,750.00	\$6,000.00	\$ 6,000.00	\$4,200.00	\$ 4,200.00
18	509	Expoxy Coated Reinforcing Steel	4,220	LBS	\$1.75	\$7,385.00	\$ 1.68	\$ 7,089.60	\$ 1.80	\$ 7,596.00	\$ 150	6,330.00	\$ 2.00	\$ 8,440.00	\$ 1.70	\$ 7,174.00	\$ 1.75	\$ 7,385.00
19	511	Class QC1 Concrete	53	CY	\$575.00	\$30,475.00	\$ 623.70	\$ 33,056.10	\$ 625.00	\$ 33,125.00	\$ 600.00	\$ 31,800.00	\$ 682.50	\$ 36,172.50	\$ 885.00	\$ 46,905.00	\$ 700.00	\$ 37,100.00
20	512	Sealing Concrete Surface, Epoxy Urethane	40	SY	\$35.00	\$1,400.00	\$ 38.85	\$ 1,554.00	\$ 50.00	\$ 2,000.00	\$ 35.00	1,400.00	\$ 26.25	\$ 1,050.00	\$ 37.00	\$ 1,480.00	\$ 41.00	\$ 1,640.00
$\overline{}$	_	Porous Backfill w/ filter fabric	30	CY	\$60.00	\$1,800.00	\$ 95.39	\$ 2,861.70	\$ 80.00	\$ 2,400.00	\$ 50.00	1,500.00	\$ 63.00	\$ 1,890.00	\$ 80.00	\$ 2,400.00	\$ 61.00	\$ 1,830.00
22		4" PVC Perforated Pipe, 707.41 (SDR 35)	100	FT	\$8.00	\$800.00	\$ 2.81	\$ 281.00	\$ 12.00	\$ 1,200.00	\$ 10.00	1,000.00	\$ 7.00	\$ 700.00	\$ 12.00	\$ 1,200.00	\$ 6.00	\$ 600.00
23		Rock Channel Protection, Type C w/filter, As Per Plan	70	TON	\$50.00	\$3,500.00	\$ 50.90	\$ 3,563.00	\$ 50.00	\$ 3,500.00	\$ 50.00	3,500.00	\$ 31.50	\$ 2,205.00	\$ 48.00	\$ 3,360.00	\$ 71.00	\$ 4,970.00
24	_	Rock Channel Protection, Type A , as per plan	60	TON	\$80.00	\$4,800.00	\$ 52.12	\$ 3,127.20	\$ 50.00	\$ 3,000.00	\$ 70.00	4,200.00	\$ 36.75	\$ 2,205.00	\$ 62.00	\$ 3,720.00	\$ 86.00	\$ 5,160.00
$\rightarrow$			_				_		_		_			\$ 2,205.00	_			
$\rightarrow$	_	Guardrail , Type MGS	112.5	FΤ	\$25.00	\$2,812.50	\$ 21.84	\$ 2,457.00	\$ 25.00	\$ 2,812.50	\$ 20.80	2,340.00	\$ 21.85	* 4	\$ 20.80	\$ 2,340.00	\$ 23.00	\$ 2,587.50
$\overline{}$	_	Guardrail, Type MGS (20' Radius)	50.0	FT	\$30.00	\$1,500.00	\$ 24.78	\$ 1,239.00	\$ 25.00	\$ 1,250.00	\$ 23.60	1,180.00	\$ 24.80	\$ 1,240.00	\$ 23.60	\$ 1,180.00	\$ 26.00	\$ 1,300.00
27		Guardrail, Type MGS (50' Radius)	12.5	FT	\$30.00	\$375.00	\$ 24.78	\$ 309.75	\$ 25.00	\$ 312.50	\$ 23.60	\$ 295.00	\$ 24.80	\$ 310.00	\$ 23.60	\$ 295.00	\$ 26.00	\$ 325.00
28		Guardrail Long Span 18'-9", as per plan	87.5	FT	\$40.00	\$3,500.00	\$ 23.52	\$ 2,058.00	\$ 25.00	\$ 2,187.50	\$ 22.40	1,960.00	\$ 23.50	\$ 2,056.25	\$ 22.40	\$ 1,960.00	\$ 26.00	\$ 2,275.00
29	606	Guardrail, Type T	4	EA	\$900.00	\$3,600.00	\$ 992.25	\$ 3,969.00	\$ 1,000.00	\$ 4,000.00	\$ 945.00	\$ 3,780.00	\$ 992.25	\$ 3,969.00	\$ 945.00	\$ 3,780.00	\$1,040.00	\$ 4,160.00
30	626	Barrier Reflector, Type A-2	20	EA	\$15.00	\$300.00	\$ 7.35	\$ 147.00	\$ 12.00	\$ 240.00	\$ 20.00	\$ 400.00	\$ 7.35	\$ 147.00	\$ 7.00	\$ 140.00	\$ 7.75	\$ 155.00
31	611	60" Conduit Type B, 706.02, Class III Conc., As Per Plan	48	FT	\$600.00	\$28,800.00	\$ 329.00	\$ 15,792.00	\$ 400.00	\$ 19,200.00	\$ 600.00	\$ 28,800.00	\$ 425.00	\$ 20,400.00	\$ 570.00	\$ 27,360.00	\$ 460.00	\$ 22,080.00
32	$\overline{}$	12" Conduit Type C, 707.33 (N-12)	884	FT	\$25.00	\$22,100.00	\$ 20.77	\$ 18,360.68	\$ 16.00	\$ 14,144.00	\$ 25.00	\$ 22,100.00	\$ 25.00	\$ 22,100.00	\$ 28.00	\$ 24,752.00	\$ 32.00	\$ 28,288.00
33		12" Conduit Type B, 707.33 (N-12)	56	FT	\$40.00	\$2,240.00	\$ 36.33	\$ 2,034.48	\$ 70.00	\$ 3,920.00	\$ 40.00	5 2,240.00	\$ 30.00	\$ 1,680.00	\$ 80.00	\$ 4,480.00	\$ 51.00	\$ 2,856.00
_		15" Conduit Type B, 707.33 (N-12)	151	FT	\$50.00	\$7,550.00	\$ 41.00	\$ 6,191.00	\$ 70.00	\$ 10,570.00	\$ 50.00	7,550.00	\$ 40.00	\$ 6,040.00	\$ 45.00	\$ 6,795.00	\$ 36.00	\$ 5,436.00
_	_	8"-12" Conduit, PVC -707.41,	10	FΤ	\$30.00	\$300.00	\$ 14.50	\$ 145.00	\$ 14.00	\$ 140.00	\$ 30.00	300.00	\$ 30.00	\$ 300.00	\$ 25.00	\$ 250.00	\$ 30.00	\$ 300.00
_	611	6" Conduit, PVC -707.41,	20	FΤ	\$20.00	\$400.00	\$ 10.00	\$ 200.00	\$ 12.00	\$ 240.00	\$ 20.00	\$ 400.00	\$ 18.00	\$ 360.00	\$ 12.00	\$ 240.00	\$ 17.00	\$ 340.00
-	_	4" Conduit, PVC -707.41,	40	FT	\$10.00	\$400.00		\$ 260.00	\$ 12.00	\$ 480.00	\$ 10.00	\$ 400.00	\$ 10.00	\$ 400.00	\$ 8.00	\$ 320.00	\$ 14.00	\$ 560.00
_	$\overline{}$		_	_	_		\$ 6.50	,					_	•				
_	_	Catch Basin, 2-2B	7	EA	\$1,000.00	\$7,000.00	\$ 990.00	\$ 6,930.00	\$ 700.00	\$ 4,900.00	\$1,000.00	7,000.00	\$ 950.00	\$ 6,650.00	\$1,000.00	\$ 7,000.00	\$1,375.00	\$ 9,625.00
$\overline{}$	_	Catch Basin, 2-3	3	EA	\$1,200.00	\$3,600.00	\$ 1,335.00	\$ 4,005.00	\$ 900.00	\$ 2,700.00	\$1,200.00	3,600.00	\$ 1,350.00	\$ 4,050.00	\$1,100.00	\$ 3,300.00	\$1,725.00	\$ 5,175.00
40	_	Half Height Headwalls	4	EA	\$500.00	\$2,000.00	\$ 545.00	\$ 2,180.00	\$ 800.00	\$ 3,200.00	\$ 500.00	2,000.00	\$ 500.00	\$ 2,000.00	\$ 500.00	\$ 2,000.00	\$1,085.00	\$ 4,340.00
41	$\overline{}$	Maintaining Traffic	1	LS	\$5,000.00	\$5,000.00	\$ 2,100.00	\$ 2,100.00	\$ 2,000.00	\$ 2,000.00	\$5,800.00	5,800.00	\$ 6,500.00	\$ 6,500.00		\$ 3,000.00	\$9,100.00	\$ 9,100.00
42	624	Mobilization	1	LS	\$5,000.00	\$5,000.00	\$ 4,228.75	\$ 4,228.75	\$12,750.00	\$ 12,750.00	\$7,000.00	7,000.00	\$ 4,500.00	\$ 4,500.00	\$2,700.00	\$ 2,700.00	\$6,800.00	\$ 6,800.00
43	642	Center Line	0.3	MILE	\$2,500.00	\$750.00	\$ 2,100.00	\$ 630.00	\$ 5,000.00	\$ 1,500.00	\$2,000.00	\$ 600.00	\$ 2,100.00	\$ 630.00	\$2,000.00	\$ 600.00	\$3,200.00	\$ 960.00
44	642	Edge Line	0.6	MILE	\$2,000.00	\$1,200.00	\$ 1,050.00	\$ 630.00	\$ 2,000.00	\$ 1,200.00	\$1,000.00	600.00	\$ 1,050.00	\$ 630.00	\$1,000.00	\$ 600.00	\$2,150.00	\$ 1,290.00
45	_	Stop Bar	15	FT	\$20.00	\$300.00	\$ 15.75	\$ 236.25	\$ 25.00	\$ 375.00	\$ 15.00	\$ 225.00	\$ 15.75	\$ 236.25	\$ 15.00	\$ 225.00	\$ 21.00	\$ 315.00
_		Ground Mounted Support, Square Posts, 730.016	24	Ft	\$20.00	\$480.00	\$ 15.75	\$ 378.00	\$ 15.00	\$ 360.00	\$ 15.00	360.00	\$ 15.75		\$ 15.00		\$ 14.00	\$ 336.00
47	$\overline{}$	Sign Posts Reflectors	2	EA	\$40.00	\$80.00	\$ 26.25	\$ 52.50	\$ 55.00	\$ 110.00	\$ 25.00	5 50.00	\$ 26.25	\$ 52.50	\$ 25.00	\$ 50.00	\$ 55.00	\$ 110.00
48	_	Sign, Flat Sheet - 36" R1-1, Stop	1	EA	\$150.00	\$150.00	\$ 131.25	\$ 131.25	\$ 230.00	\$ 230.00	\$ 125.00	125.00	\$ 131.25	\$ 131.25	\$ 125.00	,	\$ 121.00	\$ 121.00
		Sign, Flat Sheet - 36" W3-1, Stop Ahead	+		_	_	_	_	*						\$ 125.00			
_			1	EA	\$150.00	\$150.00	\$ 131.25				\$ 125.00							
		Sign, Flat Sheet- 24"x48" W1-7, Arrow	1	EA	\$175.00	\$175.00	\$ 131.25		\$ 230.00		\$ 125.00				\$ 125.00		\$ 112.00	
$\overline{}$		Top Soil Furnished & Placed, 4" Thick	200	CY	\$40.00	\$8,000.00	\$ 20.00		\$ 35.00	\$ 7,000.00	\$ 30.00	6,000.00	\$ 38.00		\$ 43.00		\$ 15.00	\$ 3,000.00
_		Seeding & Mulching, Class 1	2,000	SY	\$2.00	\$4,000.00	\$ 1.90		\$ 1.75	\$ 3,500.00	\$ 1.00	\$ 2,000.00	\$ 1.50		\$ 1.00		\$ 3.25	\$ 6,500.00
$\overline{}$		Commercial Fertilizer, 19-19-19	0.1	TON	\$500.00	\$50.00	\$ 1,092.50	\$ 109.25	\$ 1,000.00	\$ 100.00	\$1,000.00	\$ 100.00	\$ 900.00		\$ 900.00		\$ 500.00	\$ 50.00
54	Spec.	Sandstone Removed & Reused and/or delivered	1	LS	\$2,000.00	\$2,000.00	\$ 1,500.00	\$ 1,500.00	\$ 9,000.00	\$ 9,000.00	\$2,000.00	\$ 2,000.00	\$ 1,000.00	\$ 1,000.00	\$1,600.00	\$ 1,600.00	\$5,300.00	\$ 5,300.00
55	Spec.	Contingencies	- 1	LS	\$6,077.50	\$6,077.50		\$ 6,077.50		\$ 6,077.50		\$ 6,077.50		\$ 6,077.50		\$ 6,077.50		\$ 6,077.50
$\neg$		-				\$310,000.00		\$ 291,988.01		\$ 305,400.00		\$ 305,552.50		\$ 307,906.88		\$ 310,663.50		\$ 328,450.00
$\dashv$				$\vdash$											т		$\vdash$	
$\dashv$				$\vdash$	SURCONT	RACTORS:	A	J RILEY				ARL .	FRIFR	LACKTOP	AMERIC	AN ROADWAY	FRIF	BLACKTOP
$\rightarrow$				$\vdash$	CCDOOM	vivivite.		KEERIE				E ERIE		N ROADWAY		LFLEINC		RMH
$\rightarrow$	-			$\vdash$							LAN	LINE		BROTHERS		KE ERIE		KEERIE
$\rightarrow$	-			$\vdash$				price based on	<b>—</b>									LESBY
							Yuanut	y X Unit Price					LAKE ERIE		RMH CONCRETE			LE901

## REGULAR SESSION THURSDAY MARCH 21, 2019

The following bids for New State and Peru Olena Resurfacing were opened on March 15, 2019 @ 9:00 a.m.:

#### 2019 New State and Peru Olena Roads Resurfacing HUR-164-01-18 Bid Opening: March 15, 2019, 9:00 a.m.

								ERIE BLACKTOP GERKEN PAVIN			KO	COSING	A.J. RI	LEY INC.	PRECISION PAVING	
REF. NO.	ITEM NO.	QUANTITY	UNITS	Description	Price	Costs	Unit Cost	Total Cost	Unit Cost	Total Cost	Unit Cost	Total Cost	Unit Cost	Total Cost	Unit Cost	Total Cost
1	103.05	1	ш	Fremlum Contract Bond	\$2,000.00	\$2,000.00	\$ 1,750.00	\$ 1,750.00	\$ 1,990.00	\$ 1,990.00	\$ 900.00	\$ 900.00	\$ 5,000.00	\$ 5,000.00	\$ 3,600.00	\$ 3,600.00
2	254	15450	SY	Pavement Planing 1.5" - 2" Avg.	\$2.00	\$30,900.00	\$ 1.05	\$ 16,222.50	\$ 0.98	\$ 15,141.00	\$ 1.20	\$ 18,540.00	\$ 1.40	\$ 21,630.00	\$ 1.55	\$ 23,947.50
3	407	3925	GAL	Tack Coat @ 0.1 Gal/SY	\$3.00	\$11,77500	\$ 2.30	\$ 9,027.50	\$ 2.00	\$ 7,850.00	\$ 2.40	\$ 9,420.00	\$ 2.30	\$ 9,027.50	\$ 3.75	\$ 14,718.75
4	407	775	GAL	Tack Coat @ 0.05 Gal/SY	\$3.00	\$2,325.00	\$ 2.30	\$ 1,782.50	\$ 2.00	\$ 1,550.00	\$ 2.40	\$ 1,860.00	\$ 2.30	\$ 1,782.50	\$ 3.75	\$ 2,906.25
5	441	860	2	Asphalt Conc., Intermediate, Type 2, 2*, PG66-22	\$130.00	\$111,000.00	\$ 121.00	\$ 104,060.00	\$ 122.00	\$ 104,920.00	\$ 130.00	\$ 111,800.00	\$ 128.00	\$ 110,080.00	\$ 135.00	\$ 116,100.00
6	441	1520	CY	Asphalt Concrete, Surface, Type 1, 1.25° & 1.5°, PGG4-22	\$145.00	\$220,400.00	\$ 138.00	\$ 209,760.00	\$ 135.00	\$ 205,200.00	\$ 135.00	\$ 205,200.00	\$ 150.00	\$ 228,000.00	\$ 148.00	\$ 224,960.00
7	441	17	2	Asphalt Concrete, Surface, Type 1, Drives Peru Olena, PG64-22	\$180.00	\$3,060.00	\$ 138.00	\$ 2,346.00	\$ 500.00	\$ 8,500,00	\$ 135.00	\$ 2,295.00	\$ 250.00	\$ 4,250.00	\$ 148.00	\$ 2,516.00
8	614	1	2	Maintainance of Traffic	\$10,000.00	\$10,000.00	\$ 7,000.00	\$ 7,000.00	\$ 3,400.00	\$ 3,400.00	\$13,500.00	\$ 13,500.00	\$13,000.00	\$ 13,000.00	\$ 9,000.00	\$ 9,000.00
9	614	43	MI	Temp Centerline, Class II 642 Paint	\$400.00	\$1,720.00	\$ 425,00	\$ 1,827.50	\$ 300.00	\$ 1,290.00	\$ 340.00	\$ 1,462.00	\$ 500.00	\$ 2,150.00	\$ 495.00	\$ 2,128.50
10	623	3	EA.	Monument Roses Adjusted to Grade	\$500.00	\$1,500.00	\$ 600,00	\$ 1,000.00	\$ 575.00	\$ 1,725.00	\$ 775.00	\$ 2,325.00	\$ 500.00	\$ 1,500.00	\$ 800.00	\$ 2,400.00
11	624	1	Ľ	Mobilization	\$4,500.00	\$4,500.00	\$ 1,250.00	\$ 1,250.00	\$ 7,500.00	\$ 7,500.00	\$10,000.00	\$ 10,000.00	\$ 5,000.00	\$ 5,000.00	\$ 4,000.00	\$ 4,000.00
12	642	6.4	MI	Edge Une, Type 1	\$500.00	\$3,200.00	\$ 460.00	\$ 2,944.00	\$ 435.00	\$ 2,784.00	\$ 435.00	\$ 2,784.00	\$ 500.00	\$ 3,200.00	\$ 500.00	\$ 3,200.00
13	642	3.2	M	Center Line, Type 1	\$700.00	\$2,240.00	\$ 685.00	\$ 2,192.00	\$ 652.00	\$ 2,086.40	\$ 652.00	\$ 2,086.40	\$ 700.00	\$ 2,240.00	\$ 940.00	\$ 3,000.00
14	Spec	2	ZA.	Butt Joints	\$300.00	\$600.00	\$ 250,00	\$ 500.00	\$ 600.00	\$ 1,200.00	\$ 123.00	\$ 246.00	\$ 400.00	\$ 800.00	\$ 500.00	\$ 1,000.00
15	Spec	1	В	Contingencies	\$8,980.00	\$8,980.00	\$ 8,980.00	\$ 8,980.00	\$ 8,980.00	\$ 8,980,00	\$ 0,900.00	\$ 8,980.00	\$ 0,900.00	\$ 8,980.00	\$ 0,900.00	\$ 8,980.00
				-	Total Base	\$415,000.00		\$ 371,442.00		\$ 374,116.40		\$ 191,198.40		\$ 416,640.00		\$ 422,465.00

The following bids for the Butler Road Bridge replacement were opened March 15, 2019 @ 10:01 a.m.:

2019 Butler Road Bridge Replacement HUR-063-04.95

BID OPENING: MARCH 15, 2019 10:01 A.M. GREAT LAKES DEMOLITION ADENA CORPORATION DENES CONCRETE INC. Ref. Item Description Price Costs Unit Cost Total Cost Unit Cost Total Cost Unit Cost Total Cost 1 103.5 Premium Contract Bond 1 LS \$2,500,00 \$2,500,00 \$ 7,000.00 \$ 7,000.00 \$ 2,973.01 \$ 2.973.01 \$ 3,500.00 \$ 3,500.00 201 Clearing and Grubbing LS \$2,000.00 \$2,000.00 2,000.00 \$ 3,654.41 \$ 5,000.00 1 3,654.4 \$ 5,000.0 3,755.14 202 Existing Structure Removed, as per plan 1 LS \$5,000.00 \$5,000.00 \$ 5,000,00 \$ 5,000.00 \$ 3,755.14 \$ \$ 7,500.00 7,500.0 202 Sandstone Removed, and stockpiled LS \$2,000.00 \$2,000.00 2,500.00 1,500.00 1,500.0 \$ 2,153.14 2,153.1 \$ 2,500.00 5 202 Pipe Removed, 12" and under 80 FT \$5.00 \$400.00 6.00 480.00 16.96 \$ 1,356.80 10.00 800.00 203 Excavation, including pavement 60 CY \$35.00 \$2,100.00 7 203 Embankment 200 CY \$25.00 17.50 3,500.00 14.89 \$ 2,978.00 20.00 4,000.00 204 Subgrade Compaction \$840.00 420 SY \$2.00 1.28 630.00 \$1,400.00 28.58 \$ 9 254 Pavement Planning 70 SY 25.00 1,750.00 2,000.60 50.00 \$ 3,500.00 10 304 Aggergate Base, limestone, 6' 75 \$60.00 \$4,500.00 54.00 CY 4,050.00 66.68 50.00 \$ 3,750.00 5,001.00 11 301 Asphalt Base, 6' 70 CY \$160.00 \$11,200.00 195.00 13,650.00 222.97 15,607.90 350.00 \$ 24,500.00 12 407 Tack Coat @ 0.1 Gal/S\ 50 \$4.00 \$200.00 105.00 500.00 GAL 2.10 5.71 285.50 10.00 13 407 Tack Coat @ 0.05 Gal/SY 25 GAL \$4.00 \$100.00 52.50 6.86 171.50 10.00 \$ 250.00 14 441 Asphalt Concrete, Intermediate, Type 2, 1 3/4 25 \$7,500.00 CY \$300.00 300.00 7,500.00 228.69 5,717.25 375.00 \$ 9,375.00 15 441 Asphalt Concrete, Surface, Type 1, 1 1/4" 20 CY \$320.00 \$6,400.00 300.00 \$ 6.000.00 245.84 \$ 4.916.80 400.00 \$ 8.000.00 18 441 Asphalt Concrete, Surface, Type 1, 3" (Driveway) CY \$400.00 \$800.00 460.00 920.00 251.56 503.12 500.00 \$ 1.000.00 17 411 Stabilized Crushed Aggergate (berm) 60 TON \$50.00 \$3,000.00 38.00 \$ 2.280.00 50.52 \$ 3.031.20 50.00 \$ 3.000.00 18 503 Unclassfied Excavation 1 LS \$35,000.00 \$35,000.00 \$ 5,000,00 5.000.00 \$ 50.838.49 \$ 50.838.49 \$ 25,000.00 \$ 25,000.00 19 509 Expoxy Coated Reinforcing Steel 8 630 LBS \$1.50 \$12,945,00 1 50 \$ 12 945 00 1.41 12.168.30 1.50 \$ 12.945.00 20 511 Class QC1, Concrete (Headwall & Footing) 92 CY \$600.00 \$55,200,00 580.00 \$ 53.360.00 \$ 449.12 \$ 41.319.04 \$ 450.00 \$ 41,400.00 511 Class QC1, Concrete Pad В CY \$400.00 \$2,400.00 800.00 4,800.00 520.46 3,122.76 400.00 \$ 2,400.00 22 512 Type 2 Waterproofing 200 SY \$15.00 \$3,000.00 20.00 4,000.00 12.16 35.00 \$ 7,000.00 23 512 Type 3 Waterproofing 150 SY \$25.00 \$3,750.00 30.00 4,500.00 27.65 4,147.50 35.00 5,250.00 24 512 Sealing Concrete Surface, Epoxy Urethane 60 SY \$30.00 \$1,800.00 21.00 1,260.00 30.00 \$ 1,800.00 20.27 518 Porous Backfill w/ filter fabric 20 CY \$70.00 \$1,400.00 100.00 99.82 1,996.40 75.00 1,500.00 2,000.00 26 518 4" PVC Perforated Pipe, 707.41 (SDR 35) 170 FT \$10.00 \$1,700.00 1,179.80 601 Rock Channel Protection, Type C w/filter, as per plan 300 TN \$45.00 \$13,500.00 45.00 46.34 60.00 \$ 18,000.00 13,500.00 13,902.00 28 602 Half Height Headwall EA \$400.00 600.00 475.68 475.68 29 606 Guardrail, Type MGS (Remove Re-install) \$20.00 \$6,800.00 19.00 6,460.00 16.86 20.00 \$ 6,800.00 5,732.40 30 611 12" Conduit, Type C - 707.33 \$6,000.00 6,000.00 200 FT \$30.00 26.01 \$ 5,202.00 7,000.00 31 611 2-2B Catch Bas EA \$1,200.00 \$2,400.00 1,200.00 2,400.00 784.98 1,569.96 750.00 \$ 1,500.00 32 614 Maintaining Traffic LS \$5,000.00 \$5,000.00 8,000.00 8,000.00 \$ 6,506.32 6,506.32 \$ 3,500.00 \$ 3,500.00 33 624 Mobilization LS \$5,000.00 \$5,000.00 8,000.00 8,000.00 \$ 4,996.94 4,996.94 \$ 2,000.00 \$ 2,000.00 34 642 Center Line \$300.00 0.05 MILE \$6,000.00 11,500.00 575.00 \$ 12,463.77 \$ 623.19 \$ 20,000.00 \$ 1,000.00 35 642 Edge Line 0.1 MILE \$3,000.00 \$300.00 6,000.00 600.00 \$ 6,231.88 \$ 623.19 \$10,000.00 \$ 1,000.00 38 653 Top Soil, Furnished and Placed 30 TN \$50.00 \$1,500.00 60.00 1,800.00 36.05 \$ 1,081.50 40.00 \$ 1,200.00 37 671 Straw Blanket, Double Netting 800 SY \$5.00 \$4,000.00 3.75 3,000.00 1.28 \$ 1,024.00 3.50 \$ 2,800.00 38 659 Seeding & Mulching, Class 1 2.000 SY \$2.00 \$4,000.00 1.55 3.100.00 1.16 \$ 2.320.00 2.000.00 39 659 Commercial Fertilizer, 19-19-19 0.8 TON \$500.00 \$400.00 250.00 200.00 \$ 880.46 \$ 704.37 \$ 1,000.00 \$ 800.00 Spec. 12'x8' PreCast Reinforced Conc. Box Sections 84 FT \$850.00 \$71,400.00 840.00 70.560.00 768.50 \$ 64,554.00 \$ 850.00 \$ 71,400.00 Spec. No. 10 Screening 5 CY \$60.00 \$300.00 150.00 72.26 361.30 100.00 500.00 750.00 Spec. Sandstone Placement for Erosion Control LS \$3,000.00 \$3,000.00 2,000.00 2,000.00 \$ 1,887.86 1,887.86 \$ 5,000.00 5.000.00 43 Spec. Contingencies LS \$8,565.00 \$8,565.00 \$ 8,565.00 8,565.00 8,565.00 \$ 8,565.00 \$ 8,565.00 \$ 8,565.00 VECTOR SURVEYING; AMBRY SUBCONTRACTORS: CUYAHOGA FENCE ASPHALT: BARNHART ARI CRANE; CUYAHOGA FENCE JL REICHERT

PRECISION PAVING

Correct price based on Quantity X Unit Price

Quantity X Unit Price