

MINUTES
BOARD OF PUBLIC WORKS MEETING
May 18, 2009 (Special)
New Berlin City Hall Common Council Chambers
3805 S Casper Drive

Please note: Minutes are unofficial until approved by the Board of Public Works at their next regular scheduled meeting.

The meeting was called to order at 6:24 PM.

Members Present: Mayor Jack Chiovatero, John Graber, Alderman Wysocki, Alderman Ament and Alderman Seidl.

Staff Present: J. P. Walker, City Engineer, Mel Corley, Division Engineer, Tammy Simonson, Transportation Senior Civil Engineer, Alderman Ted Wysocki

Privilege of the Floor:

Rhoda Flagg – 3180 Thornapple Lane felt that we should save as much money as possible on Calhoun Road because the schools have things going on that are going to hit us in the pocketbook. She thinks we should do this road as good as possible with as little money as is necessary to do it.

JP Walker asked three times if anyone else wanted to speak to the Board, after hearing none he called the meeting to order.

Election of Board Chairman pursuant to Municipal Code Chapter 6.1

Alderman Seidl nominated Alderman Ament for Chairman of the Board
Alderman Wysocki 2nd the nomination
The nomination passed unanimously.

Alderman Wysocki moved to close the nominations.
John Graber 2nd the motion
The motion passed unanimously.

The nomination for Alderman Ament passed unanimously.

OLD BUSINESS

ITEM 12-09 Calhoun Road Design Alternative 2009-A

Alderman Ament: I don't know that we need a formal presentation on 2009-A, we had the presentation at a previous meeting.

Alderman Wysocki made the motion to adopt the Calhoun Road Design Alternative 2009-A
Alderman Seidl 2nd the motion.

Alderman Wysocki asked if the Gatewood-type storm sewer will collect any drainage that comes off the properties flooding Calhoun?

JP Walker responded yes, the technique is one that we used in the Gatewood Subdivision where we were able to shallow up the swales that have a field inlet between each of the driveways to collect water flowing from private properties. The driveways become high points and allow the riddance of the driveway culverts.

Alderman Wysocki asked will the bio-swale system satisfy the Industrial Park needs?

JP Walker responded yes, it would be considered to be part of the storm water management system for the entire Industrial Park. We have always said that getting control of the storm water at Calhoun was a high priority on the impact to the rest of the Industrial Park.

Alderman Ament asked was that bio-swale included in 2009-B?

JP Walker responded yes, it was.

John Graber asked at the last meeting didn't we make a recommendation to the Council for 2009-B? Now we are discussing 2009-A. The next item on the agenda is rescinding of 2009-B. Is it the thought of the Board to take both of them forward to the Council or just present one alternative?

Alderman Ament responded that we didn't make a formal recommendation on 2009-A to the Council and they asked us to do this for the next meeting. 2009-B was sent but A was not with any recommendation.

Mayor Chiovarero stated that 2009-B had a motion on it, but it hasn't gone to Council yet because the last meeting was 1 day before the Council meeting. The Council has never seen 2009- B.

Alderman Wysocki asked would the motion include the estimated costs for construction of \$4,883,771.00 assuming that we all believe in the feasibility of the bio-retention swale along the east side. He believes there still is land acquisition needed in 2009-A.

JP Walker responded that is correct.

Alderman Ament stated that the other thing that JP might want to explain is the whether we want to include the \$5,500 for the public informational meeting. He didn't know that 2009-A was at a public informational meeting at all.

JP Walker replied no, it did not have a PIM.

Alderman Wysocki asked with the options that were discussed how public informational meetings have we had?

JP Walker replied that we have had 3 public informational meetings and at least one public hearing.

Alderman Wysocki made the motion to recommend to Council adoption of the Calhoun Road design 2009-A in the amount not to exceed \$4,883,771.00 and in the event it is determined to be needed to provide a public informational meeting with handouts explaining Alternative 2009-A at a cost not to exceed \$5,500.00.

Alderman Seidl seconded the motion.

Alderman Ament asked is there anything in the policy that requires a public informational meeting?

JP Walker responded that he has always considered public informational meetings to be a courtesy to the public to allow them to be as informed as they can with the information we have on hand. Public hearings are not required for road projects, only upon request.

John Graber asked if this motion enough for the consultant to move forward?

JP Walker responded that it gives general guidance. He believes that we have a pretty good understanding as to what is being brought forth by this Requested Action Statement. There are some open ended things in the RAS, as for example, it says “plan to include all storm water improvements”. We have never had an alternative that has gotten to the point where we have gotten into the details of the storm water improvements, so this is going to be new ground. Staff has done a lot of work trying to understand the drainage issues on Calhoun Road, so we have a real good feel as to what is going to be needed, just that we haven’t seen the design details because the consultant has never progressed to that point. It’s things like that that are a little bit open ended but I think this gives the necessary guidance as a starting point. There may be something that could come up that may require a little bit more research but at this point I don’t see any.

Mayor Chiovaturo asked will this get us to 90% or 100% design?

JP Walker replied that this gets us to the point where we are able to have a public informational meeting that would probably be about 90%.

Mayor Chiovaturo asked if we come across any issues we would be able to correct them at that time?

JP Walker replied that is correct.

Mayor Chiovaturo stated my objection to the plan has been mostly for the storm water issues. He asked with this drainage option, do you feel it would work in this situation on a road such as Calhoun?

JP Walker responded that he believes it will. Staff has looked at the entire area that contributes potential storm water to any storm water management system. Outside of the right-of-way for Calhoun Road there is not a whole lot of area that contributes flow to Calhoun Road. We are aware of a drainage channel up at the northern end that comes from the east that has to be accounted for, and that certainly will be. We are also aware that there are drainage divides in different locations on Calhoun Road where water flows in different directions. Once you have those understandings it’s fairly simple to design a storm water management system to handle that and we are at the point where we have that understanding and will be working with the consultant to make sure that the concepts that they are or will be thinking about jive with what our analysis tells us.

Mayor Chiovaturo stated that he wants to make sure that the issues we have with the road bed are taken into account and taken care of.

JP Walker responded that one of the things that we have to be looking at is the drainage within the sub-grade. If that means we might have to add some cross drains that are connected to the storm water management system that’s what we have to do. We know that there are areas along Calhoun Road where the sub-grade has been impacted and it probably has been impacted because of lack of drainage. Gaining control of that drainage and tying it into a storm water management system will be key to improving the base of the road.

Mayor Chiovaturo asked does the \$4.8 million cover the stormwater cost also?

JP Walker responded that there is no cost component included for sub-drains. There are cost estimates in there based on a concept that the consultant had considered back when we were looking at Alternative 1-A. That’s the same cost that was brought forth into 2009-A, because we had nothing else to base that cost for storm water control on. So it made sense to me to use that amount. If we go with the Gatewood technique that certainly is not something that the consultant would have looked at because that is something that we created. We have numbers that apply to a concept that was never presented to the City, because the design never progressed to the point where it could be presented to the City. Do those numbers apply to what is going to be needed on Calhoun Road? I can’t say yes or no, because I don’t know until we get into it. My suspect is that when you

look at the costs that are associated with grading, and the costs that are associated with storm sewer that it may be a wash. They may have accounted for the grading of the ditches, as part of the grading and not part of any storm water management costs. They may have only looked at the piping that would be necessary for the storm sewer. Until we get into that detail I don't have an answer for that.

John Graber asked would it be appropriate then to delete the \$4.8 million from the motion, because what if we come in over?

Alderman Ament responded that's true but at this point in any of these projects those type of things are guestimations.

Alderman Wysocki stated that we need a number to work with that can be adjusted. This would be a Capitol Improvements budgeted item that the Mayor would have to put into the Capitol budget system. This is an opportunity for a good ball park idea of where the costs are.

JP Walker stated that there are two components that would apply to the CIP budget process. One is the right-of-way acquisition which has to be in 2010. Based on the Chapter 32 requirements you can not start construction until that land acquisition phase is completed. Land acquisition may not be completed in 2010 soon enough for construction to start in 2010, so consideration has to be given to construction being budgeted in 2011. Until we get into how long it takes to complete the design and bring it forth for a public informational meeting and then move on to finalize that design, we are just guessing on what year the phases will occur.

Alderman Ament stated that is going to be part of the issue that we are going to have with the public informational meeting. The longer we drag this out the further out its going to be before we get started on the land acquisition.

Alderman Wysocki stated that JP is right about the Chapter 32 requirements, but it also allows for the property owners to accelerate the process. The primary purchases that we are looking at are actually from people that will benefit from this improvement. I would like to believe that they would be as anxious as any of us here to get this project going. So it may not take the year.

Alderman Wysocki asked how much is left in the budget?

JP Walker replied about \$293,000, which we need for the final design.

Alderman Wysocki asked if we can use some of the left over money to get the right-of-way acquisition started?

JP Walker replied no, that does not include a land acquisition service, that's a separate budget item. The \$550,000 number that we have estimated would include those services. To move along we need to expedite the design. You have about \$90,000 difference between the amount of the contract and the total available funds that were approved by Council back in 2003.

Alderman Wysocki asked why can't we initiate part of the contract for negotiating for the purchase of the property, right, but not the actual purchase?

JP Walker responded that you can't do that until you have the Relocation Order approved, and you can't have the Relocation Order approved until you have the design pretty well completed.

Alderman Wysocki asked what do we have to do to get this expedited?

JP Walker replied that we have to expedite getting the design completed.

John Graber asked would the GlasGrid be included in the service road or would it include only the main line?

JP Walker replied that the service road is going to be resurfaced.

John Graber stated on the service road that is the application that you would normally see the GlasGrid used on, but on the main road I don't know if that's necessary to justify that added cost.

JP Walker replied that based on our experience with GlasGrid on Lincoln Avenue that was installed back in 2003 it has tremendously slowed down cracks propagating from the base up. Normally when you reconstruct a road it's going to take a few years before you see a crack. GlasGrid doubles that time before you can expect to see a crack. One way to look at it is you can consider GlasGrid in a reconstruction to be an insurance policy? We are looking at an item that is going to cost about \$132,000. It may keep cracks from occurring on Calhoun Road to year 5 instead of year 3.

Alderman Ament & Alderman Wysocki both agreed that it worked well on Lincoln Avenue.

John Graber stated that the RAS calls for a 5' shoulder path on both sides of Calhoun Road from the match line at the south end to the north end. He didn't see a plan that showed how far the sidepaths extended towards Greenfield Avenue. He wanted to make sure it goes to the existing sidepath or pedestrian facility on Greenfield Avenue.

JP Walker responded that the match line at the north end is where the curb and gutter starts. That was part of the State's reconstruction of Greenfield Avenue that included a portion on Calhoun Road. When you have curb and gutter you don't normally have a shoulder path, that's why it's called a shoulder path. The road widens out at that match line because it actually becomes four lanes with a median just south of Greenfield Avenue. I don't see a need where there is an actual matching up to existing pedestrian ways which are at Greenfield Avenue. You have a shoulder path; you don't have a defined area for pedestrians. If they chose to walk on the shoulder path, it's their choice, it's not being created as a pedestrian way, per say. It's a shoulder path for alternative transportation, yes; walking is an alternative type of transportation. I stand on record, I do not recommend pedestrians use shoulder paths, they don't have the physical separation from traffic.

John Graber stated that there should be an adequate facility to get from the end of Greenfield Avenue to the beginning of our construction on Calhoun Road, and we don't want a gap in between. There should be something there.

Alderman Ament stated that at the time he was looking at match line to match line, which was the extent of the project initially so he didn't look anything beyond there. He didn't know where that would fall in or if it would be a separate item.

JP Walker provided a suggestion. We know that there is a transition area down at the south end; we can consider that northern end to be a transition area as it relates to the shoulder path and its connection to the existing sidepath up on Greenfield Avenue if the Board is willing to consider that.

Alderman Ament stated that he didn't have any problem looking at it. He didn't want that little piece to hold up the roadway project. He thinks that is something that should be looked at separately.

JP Walker stated that as we progress along in the design and we see stumbling potential blocks, it is our duty to report back to the Board, and have the Board weigh in on what those issues are.

Mayor Chiovarero stated that he has a concern about the safety issues we discussed and that the traffic issues are being address. I think there are going to be more issues because of Highway 59 being used. I think we need to be prepared; this is feeding our Industrial Park. I think between Cleveland and Greenfield we need to take care of the Industrial Park, take care of traffic and make sure it's done safely. That road is heavily used. A lot of people are avoiding it now because of it's physical condition, but I feel when the road is improved the

traffic volume will pick up and I'm worried about pedestrians, bicyclists, car traffic verses semi-traffic, the same issues I had before.

JP Walker stated that he still has concerns when you consider capacity. We are improving capacity by improving the Lincoln Avenue intersection, the County will improve the capacity issues down at Cleveland; where I have concerns is in between those intersections, between Greenfield Avenue and Lincoln Avenue, and then between Lincoln Avenue and Cleveland Avenue. Picture a vehicle sitting on a side street or driveway trying to turn left onto Calhoun Road. There are times now during the day you are taking your life in your own hands if you try that maneuver. Traffic volumes are projected to increase on Calhoun Road. I think you are going to see fewer gaps available for these people sitting on the side trying to get onto Calhoun Road, especially if they are trying to turn left. You are going to continue to have problems out there on that maneuver, maybe not so much on right hand turns but you will have problems with left hand turns whether you are trying to get onto Calhoun Road or are traveling on Calhoun and want to turn left off of the road.

Alderman Wysocki stated that Calhoun does not lead to access to I-94 or I-43, let's make that very clear. This recommendation is a safe one otherwise we would not be recommending it. If an engineering firm would have given us the option of 1-A I certainly would not have found it a safe option. With the approved SEWRPC Plan, County Plan and the Plan that our Council approved back in December it will become a county road. If the County decides at that time that there is going to be some kind of access to the freeway, that's another whole issue. I find it interesting that there is concern about pedestrian traffic on Calhoun when there's none on Moorland. If you want to try a left turn, try turning left across four lanes. When we were doing our major study for the Industrial Park there was a lot of concern with four lanes with a truck coming out of an uncontrolled intersection trying to make a left turn on Calhoun. We are going to have to count on people to obey transportation situations. I think this will work and I approve of it. It's the best cost option we have available.

Alderman Ament stated that he agrees with that and with what we are looking at doing for the service roads will impact the traffic, especially the semi turning on Calhoun Road. Most of the semis are still using Moorland because of access to and from I-94 and I-43. The original design was to come into the Industrial Park, use the service road, now what they have to do is, other than at Glendale which is not the best turning situation for semi's, is they have to go out onto Calhoun Road to get onto the service road and then they have to turn out onto Calhoun Road to get back out. So if they are going east on Rogers or Lincoln they have to go out onto Calhoun Road to turn in and then they have turn around and come back out and go around onto Calhoun Road for a block or two and then turn back into the Industrial Park. This way they don't have to go down Calhoun Road, they can access those roads the way they are. I think that will have a big improvement on safety, especially for the semis.

John Graber stated that he has some questions on safety. The best alternative in the ideal world is the four-lane road. We have cost constraints to look and those are going to obviously impact what we do. Alderman Wysocki mentioned that the County will be taking the road over. I'm not aware of what their time table or anything else is but I know on every other road that they have taken over the original maintainer got it up to a situation to transfer. Before the County turned Calhoun over to the City in the 70's down by National Avenue they did some work to improve it. Similar with Moorland Road, it was only under the condition that it would become a County Highway if it was reconstructed. If that's their current policy today I would expect the same thing to happen.

Mayor Chiovaturo stated that in relation to some of the comments that Alderman Wysocki made about SEWRPC, SEWRPC also shows Calhoun Road as becoming four-lanes. In a letter from last July, it says that the County will not be taking over Calhoun Road until there is access to I-94 from Calhoun Road. We did ask them to take it over but they said they didn't want to at this time.

Alderman Ament referred to the shoulder paths per the RAS. Maybe this is something we can look at assuming it comes back here. I think in 2009-B we discussed using the service drive as the eastern part, I'm not sure if

we talking about using that as a shoulder path, as far as using the service road and the fact that they could save some construction costs on the stretch from Glendale to Rogers Drive, did we look at that at all?

JP Walker replied that we looked at it in relationship to 2009-B's sidepaths. We said where the frontage road is, that would serve as the walking path for pedestrians. I do recall making a statement, I think Alderman Seidl, had brought up the question, in my opinion what I was seeing was that a shoulder path in 2009-A would continue along Calhoun Road even along the frontage road area.

Upon voting the motion passed 3 -2 with Mayor Chiovatero & John Graber voting no.

NEW BUSINESS

Item 19-09 – Discussion and Possible Action to Rescind the Board Recommendation for Approval of Agenda Item 12-09 Calhoun Road Alternative 2009-B

Alderman Wysocki made the motion to rescind the Board recommendation for approval of Agenda Item 12-09 Calhoun Road Alternative 2009-B

Alderman Seidl 2nd the motion.

Alderman Wysocki asked to rescind the 2009-B because of the adoption of 2009-A which was the original intent of the Council for the Board of the Public Works to review and add any comments or options that were a concern to the Board. He thought what the Board did was to conjure up a different type of two lanes that had some additional features that 2009-A did not have (larger lanes and sidepaths, etc). He thought the intention of the Council was to work with 2009-A and talk about the options available, not to send to Council a whole new version.

Mayor Chiovatero replied that 2009-B was a compromise on the 4-lane plan; it took into consideration the storm water management, alternative transportation and capacity. Alternative 2009-A is no compromise from the original plan that was presented last year. Because of that he will not support it.

John Graber stated that 2009-B does provide a safer compromise. This was a major compromise that included a lot of the considerations that he would be willing to live with as being part of the negotiation process. He didn't think that 2009-A is the best alternative and therefore will not support it.

Upon voting the motions passed 3-2 with Mayor Chiovatero and John Graber voting no.

Motion by Alderman Wysocki to adjourn.

Alderman Ament 2nd the motion.

Upon voting the motion passed unanimously.

Meeting was adjourned at 7:27PM.