ROADWAYS SUBCOMMITTEE
November 19, 2019
Minutes

Members Present: Sebolt, Maiville, Naeyaert, and Stivers (arrived at 5:36 p.m.)
Members Absent: None
Others Present: Bill Conklin, Liz Noel, and others

The meeting was called to order by Chairperson Sebolt at 5:30 p.m. in Personnel Conference Room “D & E” of the Human Services Building, 5303 S. Cedar Street, Lansing, Michigan.

Approval of the November 5, 2019 Meeting Minutes

WITHOUT OBJECTION, CHAIRPERSON SEBOLT STATED THE NOVEMBER 5, 2019 MEETING MINUTES WERE APPROVED AS PRESENTED. Absent: Commissioner Stivers

Additions to the Agenda

None.

Limited Public Comment

None.

MOVED BY COMM. NAeyaert, SUPPORTED BY COMM. MAIVILLE, TO RECOMMEND THE FOLLOWING RESOLUTIONS FOR THE CONSENT AGENDA AT THE COUNTY SERVICES MEETING:

1. Road Department
   a. Resolution to Authorize an Extension of RFP #49-19 with Yellow Rose Transport for the 2020 Seasonal Requirement of 29A Blast Furnace Slag
   c. Resolution to Approve Stop Sign Traffic Control Orders in Centennial Farms Subdivision Section 26, Delhi Township
   d. Resolution to Approve the Special and Routine Permits for the Ingham County Road Department

THE MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY. Absent: Commissioner Stivers

THE MOTION TO APPROVE THE ITEMS ON THE CONSENT AGENDA CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY. Absent: Commissioner Stivers
1. **Road Department**
   b. Resolution to Authorize Re-Approval of the Preliminary Plat of Sierra Ridge Estates Subdivision

MOVED BY COMM. MAIVILLE, SUPPORTED BY COMM. NAeyaert, TO APPROVE THE RESOLUTION.

Commissioner Maiville stated this resolution had come before the Subcommittee previously. He asked if this version had been sent to stakeholders and had been updated since the Subcommittee saw it last.

Bill Conklin, Road Department Director, stated that the preliminary plats needed to be approved every two years, so it was up for re-approval. He further stated that the plat had not yet been built, so nothing had changed with the status.

**THE MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.** Absent: Commissioner Stivers

1. **Road Department**
   e. Further Information on Potential County Road Millage (*Discussion*)

Chairperson Sebolt asked Mr. Conklin for an update on a potential County Road Millage.

Mr. Conklin presented materials to the Subcommittee and stated he had met with townships in the County the week before. He stated that he expected the state revenue for roads to be about $4.5 million to $5 million.

Commissioner Stivers arrived at 5:36 p.m.

Chairperson Sebolt asked if the $4.25 million portion would be the County share after the cities were paid out.

Mr. Conklin stated the $4.25 million would be what was left after cities and villages were paid out. He further stated that the previous model of road funding would be for the primary road network in the County, because the local jurisdictions did their own repairs.

Mr. Conklin stated that it had been decided by the Subcommittee that local jurisdictions needed funding as well. He further stated he did not recommend requiring matching funds from the local jurisdictions because the ability to match funds would not be consistent across jurisdictions.

Mr. Conklin stated that if a County Road Millage was done, he recommended putting more toward local road programs. He further stated that the figures presented to the Subcommittee was based on 25% going to local roads.
Chairperson Sebolt stated the County could levy the millage and then decide after the fact how to divide it up.

Mr. Conklin stated he had met with the townships in the County last week, and he had collected the township representatives' thoughts on it who were there. He further stated that some of the representatives felt that the funds raised in the community should stay in the community, and others felt that most of the funds should be used to help County primary network.

Mr. Conklin stated the current local match portion of County road funds was $800,000 and those funds were provided based on match. He further stated that there had been a mixed reaction on whether the County should have a road millage, as some townships were trying to do their own or had recently done one.

Commissioner Stivers asked if townships would have the option to opt out of the 25% allocation of a potential road millage if they had sufficient fund on their own.

Mr. Conklin stated townships could opt out of funding.

Commissioner Stivers stated she liked the idea of dividing up funds after the passage of the millage.

Mr. Conklin stated he thought that townships would like some portion of the millage to stay in their own community.

Chairperson Sebolt stated his preference would be if the County did levy a roads millage, he would want to look at the County roads as a whole and figure out what made sense to make sure local roads were not being neglected. He further stated he would lean more toward a regional perspective rather than a set division of funds.

Mr. Conklin stated if County Road Millage funds were going to go right back to the townships, then it would make more sense for the townships to do their own millages.

Chairperson Sebolt asked if Mr. Conklin could explain the projection of road ratings after five years if the County decided to levy 1, 2, or 3 mills.

Mr. Conklin described the projection figures distributed to the Subcommittee.

Discussion.
Chairperson Seb Bolt provided the current millage rates in the County and what was still left to reach the maximum 50 mills. He stated that the current cumulative millage levy was 43.89 mills, which left 6.02 mills.

Mr. Conklin asked if that included the new or increased millages that the Board of Commissioners had just approved.

Chairperson Seb Bolt stated that calculation did not take the millage increases into account, so there was likely about 5.5 mills left before hitting the millage cap. He further stated that if the County Road Millage was levied at 2.5 mills, that would allow for other local or school millages.

Discussion.

Commissioner Stivers stated she would like more information about the Jackson County project where the county had bought their own road equipment. She further stated that she would like to see any data on cost-savings they have had in the long term.

Mr. Conklin stated he did look into the project in Jackson County early-on, but he would revisit it to see if they had any data yet.

Commissioner Maiville stated he thought that Jackson County had bonded a lot of money and made a large commitment for future projects, whereas this County took a more conservative approach with its roads projects.

Announcements
None.

Public Comment
None.

Adjournment
The meeting was adjourned at 5:52 p.m.

BARB BYRUM, CLERK OF THE BOARD