

MINUTES
BOARD OF PUBLIC WORKS MEETING
June 16, 2008
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.

Members Present: Mayor Jack Chiovero, City Engineer J.P. Walker, Alderman Moore, Alderman Seidl & Alderman Ament.

Staff Present: Ron Schildt, Transportation Division Engineer, Tammy Simonson, Transportation Senior Civil Engineer, Greg Kessler, Director of Community Development.

Guest: Sue Barker, Crispell-Snyder, Inc.

Alderman Moore asked three times if there was anyone wishing to speak at the Privilege of the Floor. Seeing none he called the meeting to order at 8:00 AM.

JP Walker: The first item of business is to have a motion and a second to elect the new chairman to the Board pursuant to Municipal Code Chapter 6.1.

Motion by Mayor Chiovero to elect Alderman Moore as Chairman for the Board of Public Works.

JP Walker 2nd the motion.

After voting the motion passed unanimously.

OLD BUSINESS

ITEM 01-08 Approval of the Minutes from the May 19, 2008 meeting

Motion by Alderman Seidl to approve the minutes.

Alderman Ament 2nd the motion.

Upon voting the motion passed unanimously.

NEW BUSINESS

ITEM 11-08 Wall Street Extension to City Center

JP Walker: Recommend to the Common Council the approval of a Jurisdictional Offer of \$326,300 to New Berlin Retail, LLC and the Quit Claim Deed of \$97,100 to U.S. Bank for the purchase of right-of-way for the Wall Street Extension to City Center. Funds to be paid from Wall Street Accounts 04251100 63010 C2004 & 04251100 63010 C2008 and I so move.

Mayor Chiovero 2nd the motion.

JP Walker: In your packets you have Resolution 04-35. That is the Reallocation Order that was approved back in 2004. You have the Appraisal Reports from Single Source and a second Appraisal Report for the Wal-Mart

portion from the Nickelson Group because the representatives of the property owners requested a second appraisal. The amounts of the appraisals are as listed in the motion.

Alderman Ament: If this is approved would New Berlin Retail still have a buildable parcel with all the setbacks and codes and everything, would they be able to meet those?

JP Walker: Back when Wal-Mart came in they were required to make changes in their parking lot, the actual green space that you see out there between the bank and the Wal-Mart parking lot is the area where Wall Street is to be constructed. All the setback requirements are met.

Alderman Ament: So as far as the U.S. Bank that wouldn't create anything like a legal non-conforming or any restrictions on their parcel?

JP Walker: None that I know of.

Alderman Ament: We have a total request here for basically land acquisition of \$423,400 of which \$97,100 would go to U.S. Bank and \$326,300 to New Berlin retail. We are looking at account without getting into great detail; I think we all know the numbers other than the 2004 CIP account. Does this complete that 2004 CIP account or is there more money in there and was this the amount that was designated for this project in 2004?

JP Walker: There are additional funds that are in the 2004 account that will be taken up as part of the 2nd item, the construction contract. This was the original account that was set up for Wall Street; the 2008 account was the account set up for right-of-way acquisition. The appraised purchase prices came in above the 2008 approved amount for the right-of-way acquisition. So therefore, we are using part of the 2004 remaining funds to cover the purchase.

Alderman Ament: The 2004 funds are those funds that were designated for this or are they coming for something else?

JP Walker: They are designated for Wall Street with no specific notation as how to be used on Wall Street.

Alderman Ament: Is there anymore left in that particular part of 2004 or does that clear that out?

JP Walker: There is a little bit left over that will be used to go to pay for the construction project.

Alderman Ament: So when those two are done, that will be completed then?

JP Walker: Yes, that is correct.

Alderman Ament: On page 2 of the Staff Report, it says on October 10, 2007, Single Source submitted a summary appraisal. And that was for the U.S. Bank site. What was the cost of that appraisal, and who paid it?

JP Walker: We paid it out of the Wall Street account.

Alderman Ament: I assume that was approved by either the Board of Public Works and or the Council.

JP Walker: It was part of the approved funds for right-of-way acquisition. There was no specific item that came back to the Board based on the approval of the funds in the budget.

Alderman Ament: It didn't need to.

JP Walker: I'm not aware that it was needed.

Tammy Simonson: As part of the right-of-way acquisition we had hired Bloom Consultants to do the right-of-way acquisition part of it and they hired Single Source to negotiate with the property owners. Our contract with Bloom Consultants was for \$9,100.00. That was for purchasing both the Wal-Mart parcel and the Bank parcel and all the stuff that goes along with it as far as new title searches and acquisition itself.

Alderman Ament: On the second appraisal do you know what the cost of that was? I assume the City paid for that?

JP Walker: Chapter 32 requires that the City pays for the second appraisal also.

Alderman Ament: Do we know the amount on that one?

Tammy Simonson: I don't have that breakdown with me.

Alderman Ament: That came out of the same account, correct?

JP Walker: Yes, that's correct.

Alderman Ament: Did the City Assessor do any analyzing on this?

Tammy Simonson: When we had the information come back for the appraisals the City Assessor was able to review them and signed off on them before we sent them back to Single Source.

Alderman Ament: On page 2 of the Staff Report, it says they are not responsible for ascertaining the existence of any toxic waste or other contamination present on or off the site. The appraiser will, however, report any indications of toxic waste or contaminants. Shouldn't we have that done before we spend the money on this? We did it for the fire station, although we were the purchaser there and it was part of the agreement with them. I'm wondering why we aren't having them do a site analysis for contamination, or why we aren't doing it.

Mayor Chiovarero: I would think that with the title search and everything, this is just a common paragraph that they put in there. But during a title search when they process that, I'm sure that's why they look at. Any chance that there may have been some kind of service station or manufacturing there that would have created some kind of issue. I think that's just normal language.

Alderman Ament: I think that should be done before that goes to Council if this gets approved today.

Alderman Moore: I think you have a point, this is the work of the appraiser and I don't think they have a responsibility in this area.

Alderman Ament: They may not, but I think we do. I think the City should have that done.

Mayor Chiovarero: It's not typical for us in a right-of-way acquisition to do that. I don't recall us ever doing that for any right-of-way acquisition for any property, especially in this case where the road has been dedicated to the City. It's just a matter now of acquiring the right-of-way acquisition and properly compensating the parties that are listed on here.

Alderman Ament: You mentioned that this roadway has been dedicated, that would tell me that this extension was part of the original PUD in the late 90's. I'm wondering why the City didn't require them to do what all other developers do when they did the PUD, build the road and dedicate it to the City? Why are we paying for it? I know in the late 90's and up till 2001, things weren't planned out very well. If it's already dedicated to the City why are we spending so much money on it, especially the New Berlin retail part of it, I can understand the U.S. Bank part because that was already built, but why we are paying New Berlin Retail for a parcel if they already dedicated it to us.

JP Walker: It wasn't dedicated it to us, all we have is a Relocation Order that was approved by the Common Council. This purchasing of the right-of-way is required because this land is not dedicated to the City. All we have is a Relocation Order saying that we have a public need for the right-of-way and a public necessity for building Wall Street. We went through the appraisal process. We have the appraised values of the land to be purchased and now we are looking at purchasing of that land. We are bring the issue to the Board for approval of that purchase. There is nothing that has been dedicated yet.

Alderman Ament: I guess I'm just wondering why that wasn't done back then.

Mayor Chiovatero: The actual Relocation Order and all the issues were done on the 27th of July in 2004.

Alderman Ament: I'm talking about the original PUD. Why that wasn't included in the PUD?

Mayor Chiovatero: Because they didn't own the property.

Alderman Ament: Who didn't?

Mayor Chiovatero: The PUD did not have any control over that property.

Alderman Ament: So when a developer comes in and develops a parcel, we pay for the roads?

Mayor Chiovatero: We can't demand the developer to develop something that he doesn't own. He doesn't own the Wal-Mart or Bank One property.

Alderman Ament: Then the PUD wasn't planned out very well. Somebody must have owned it.

Mayor Chiovatero: The Bank One and the Wal-Mart owned the parcel.

Alderman Moore: I do agree that the plan would have occurred years ago, that's not something that we are dealing with at this time. We have to deal with what is in front of us currently.

Alderman Seidl: What has been the precedent in the rest of the City Center, were the said developers responsible for building the roadway and right-of-way acquisition?

JP Walker: In the actual area covered by the PUD, that is correct. It is the developer's responsibility to build the infrastructure. The area we are talking about here is outside the PUD, but its part of the overall City Center. This is the interior connection that we have talked about for years. Look at it as a connection from the PUD area to the remaining portion of City Center which is the Wal-Mart and Pick N Save area.

Alderman Seidl: Then the developer doesn't have any responsibility for that at all?

JP Walker: They don't own the land so they don't have any responsibility.

Alderman Moore: In relation to the full amount of money that has been approved in the past, the amount that's part of this motion and the amount that is part of the next motion, have all been approved previously by the Common Council, is that correct?

JP Walker: As part of the budget process, that is correct.

Alderman Moore: These are CIP funds?

JP Walker: That is correct.

Alderman Moore: We are not asking for any more money in either of these motions than what has been approved.

JP Walker: That is correct.

Alderman Moore: In relation to the advantages to the City and to the businesses, I understand there are advantages overall in this, but there are also definitely advantages to the businesses that are going to be served. Have they been at all approached about sharing the cost here?

JP Walker: No.

Alderman Moore: Would it be at all appropriate?

JP Walker: I don't have an answer for that.

Alderman Moore: Do we have any precedent for this kind of construction around businesses as far as the City's paying for this kind of construction?

Greg Kessler: The only other project that is similar where there are multiple property owners and roads were actually constructed, I believe was Westridge, which some of those roads were TIF funded. Other than that I don't recall any. I can tell you from the initial inception of City Center, the connections into City Center have always been critically important to the success of the businesses. The Wall Street connection from all the research that I have done, I believe it's always been a type of public/private investment situation. We certainly wouldn't ask Wade Bolson, the developer to the north to build a road on the Decade parcel. This is the same situation.

Alderman Moore: Is this fully a benefit to the City enough that the City should cover all of these costs or are we specifically benefiting some businesses to the extent that it would be good to ask for a share from them?

Greg Kessler: That's a difficult question to answer. I think there is going to be regional benefit; it helps with the traffic flow and circulation in getting between both developments. The Pick N Save side to the new construction side. I haven't done a cost benefit analysis and I haven't approached each of the individual businesses to talk about special assessments. The City has traditionally never assessed road projects. The only other similar type of situation that I recall would be Honeyager Fields. I think the development agreement we asked for a cost sharing contribution on the street lights.

Alderman Ament: For the traffic signals.

Greg Kessler: If you recall the discussion, it's such a regional issue and it's not solely to benefit Honeyager Fields. My point is that's the only other similar cost sharing arrangement that I can recall in the short term.

Mayor Chiovarero: That was done on the analysis of a TIA and that possibly as that area developed that Honeyager Fields would contribute to the traffic signals and that's why they agreed to it.

Greg Kessler: I believe there is a sunset date on that too. It was not a 50% cost share it was very low.

Alderman Moore: All the streets in City Center were fully funded by the City, correct?

Mayor Chiovarero: No, those were done by the developer. There was an issue with Michelle Wittmer when the developer folded and the street infrastructure wasn't completely done and then it came back to those that own property along that road to help fund the improvements to finish them. The City took part in that because we had the Library. If we didn't have the Library then we wouldn't have taken part in it all.

Greg Kessler: From the original inception of City Center it has always been viewed as a public/private partnership between the City and the developer. When I got here in 1999 the City Council at that time had already borrowed Capital Funds for City Center.

Alderman Moore: Are there any promises that we have made in relation to this to the businesses in relation to constructing Wall Street?

Greg Kessler: I'm not aware of any promises or commitments. The PUD does talk about this connection.

Alderman Moore: Does it talk about it in a way that the City would fund it?

Greg Kessler: I don't recall.

Mayor Chiovarero: I think the City Attorney would say that there is no legal instrument to go back to the businesses and ask them to pay for this because it was never discussed at any point in time. We have twice funded this and the first time we funded it, it was felt that it should be the responsibility of someone other than the City, then we took the funding from this road and put it into Michelle Wittmer when we had to be responsible for that portion of the road. So the funding went to that and then it came back to be re-funded again and it did and went through the budget process again, and those are the funds we are talking about today.

Alderman Moore: So this has been approved twice by City Council?

Alderman Ament: I'm not against the extension of Wall Street; I think it's a good idea. I'm just against the City paying for it. I think it should have been taken care of with the PUD; it should have been part of the agreement except for the US Bank part of it. I think it will also help with some of the traffic flow.

Alderman Moore: My feeling is that there should be a greater percentage of this that should be paid for by the businesses but I think that we are too far into this to go into the businesses. Maybe something for the future for businesses that we deal with.

Mayor Chiovarero: When the Pick N Save was built, I don't think there was a plan for the City Center at that time. When we deal with subdivision roads we always dedicate a certain area for continuation for the project.

Alderman Moore: If you haven't seen the design there are basically three connections, one to the east and Library Lane, one to the north to National, and one to the south into the shopping center, is that not correct?

Mayor Chiovarero: The one to National is already there. Right now when you come in off of National you pass the bank and you pass Wal-Mart so that portion of the road is there, now you will be able to make a left turn to go into City Center.

Alderman Moore: My point is that all these connections is to National, Library Lane and the shopping center, alongside Wal-Mart.

JP Walker: This public road actually takes the place of the driveway that is now an entrance into that portion of City Center, so it's turning it into a public entrance instead of a driveway into a shopping center.

Upon voting the motion passed 3-2 with Alderman Ament and Alderman Seidl voting no.

ITEM 12-08 Approval of the Contract to Construct Wall Street

JP Walker: Recommend to the Common Council the awarding of a Construction Contract to the lowest responsive, responsible bidder, Capitol Pavers, Inc., for the Wall Street Construction Project in an

amount of \$597,093.41. The accounts are the same as the previous item 04251100 63010 C2008 for \$520,000 and 04251100 63010 C2004 in the amount of \$77,093.41 to cover the contract and I so move.

Mayor Chiovero 2nd the motion.

Alderman Ament: With the land purchase that we just go done with and now this \$597,000 that's \$1,020,500.00 roughly. How long is this road?

JP Walker: Its 500 feet long.

Alderman Ament: That seems like a lot of money for 500 feet of road. Just doesn't seem to work for me, so there is no way that I will support this any more then I did the one before.

Alderman Moore: I agree it does seem to be somewhat excessive when the connection to National is already made. There must be reason why we are paying \$600,000.00 for a fairly short distance.

JP Walker: The items that are included are a retaining wall, street lighting, sidepaths on both sides and street trees. There is nothing extravagant in this design. There is nothing extra, it follows the City Center Design Guidelines. We kept it at bare bones in meeting the City Center Design Guidelines in order to keep it within budget.

Alderman Moore: It is true that we have three bids of which all of them except Capitol Pavers are above \$600,000. They are all very close.

Alderman Seidl: The 5-foot wide concrete sidewalks, who currently clears the snow off the sidewalks in City Center?

Mayor Chiovero: We clear the ones in front of the Library, the rest are taken care of by the businesses.

Alderman Moore: Do you have any further discussion on the cost?

JP Walker: No, I really don't, we have reviewed the cost estimate that Staff had put together in detail, and we cut back the project to stay in budget. We are thankful the bids came in where they did. This was a bare bones approach to meet the criteria that were set up for City Center.

Alderman Moore: Do you have a per lineal foot comparison with other roads that the City has built?

JP Walker: Not on hand, we can provide that.

Tammy Simonson: Like JP said, the cost of the retaining wall, sidewalks, street lightening and street trees are all in keeping with the City Center Design Guidelines. The retaining wall alone was \$46,000.00; the lightning was about \$50,000.00. If we want to keep up with the City Center Design Guidelines, these are the costs associated with it.

Upon voting the motion passes with Alderman Ament and Alderman Seidl voting no.

ITEM 13-08 124TH Street Reconstruction Project Update

JP Walker: We have a communication from Greg Kessler, the Director of Community Development.

Greg Kessler: Attached to the memo that you have from me are the two graphics regarding the latest conceptual design for 24th street. Our department is in the process of working with the project manager to arrange and schedule a public informational meeting and I need to get some input from the Board of Public

Works as to the timing of that. We seem to have a scheduling issue. The last time that we tried to schedule this PIM there was a problem. The rationale for reasons for holding this PIM are as follows:

- 1) Present revised plans showing an on-road sidepath and solicit additional comments from residents.
- 2) Solicit comments and input from the adjacent municipalities of Greenfield and Hales Corners; and
- 3) Discuss the recently obtained STP grant funding and its impact & timeline for use on this project.

With that we are proposing to hold a PIM for June 26th. It's my understanding that in terms of room availability we would hold it here. That is the only date available that week. This room is very difficult to get. I'm looking for input from the Board. Is that adequate time? We have been working with Alderman Harenda on this. But I need Board input on this conceptual design. Also, is this date sufficient notification for this Board?

Alderman Moore: Has Alderman Harenda approved the 26th date?

Greg Kessler: I have asked for time and date suggestions and have not heard back from him.

JP Walker: There is a fundamental question here that needs to be answered. It applies to scheduling of any public informational meeting in the future. Is 10 calendar days sufficient time? The meeting that was scheduled for June 12th notices were mailed on June 2nd, notices were put in the elected officials mailboxes on that date. The question is; would 10 days be sufficient time to send out notices for a Public Informational meeting?

Alderman Moore: What has been the previous standard for notification?

JP Walker: Around that time frame.

Greg Kessler: It varies, based upon the project scope and the size of the project. We do our best to provide adequate notification. It's a difficult when we did put the notices in individual elected official's mailboxes and I did verify that with a couple of the Alderman that they did receive it because I was actually right there when they opened their mailboxes. With our department we are busy enough as it is and it's very difficult to schedule a meeting, schedule a room, get the notices out and then obviously it's hard for us to gauge when the Alderman are available, especially this time of the year. I'm looking for some input from the Board. Is there some standard that you would like to see? I don't want the rules of the game to change based on the project. I think we should be consistent with the scheduling of these notices.

Alderman Ament: Overall looking at the time frame it might be better to ask that at the Council because I think more then likely where you are going to have the question, why didn't I know? In this particular case if we are setting it, if we had 10 days last time and that apparently isn't enough, it would be nice to have a little more direction from the Alderman that canceled that last one.

Greg Kessler: We did notify Alderman Harenda immediately on Friday afternoon after the Mayor and I had the opportunity to discuss the PIM and cancel it. We sent him an e-mail that afternoon asking for suggested dates and I have not heard back from him since that point. I will discuss it with Alderman Poshepny and Alderman Harenda who are the Aldermen of the Districts that this project is located in. It will probably at this point be after the 4th of July. I don't know how that would affect the project schedule.

JP Walker: My direction from you is that we complete the design so that we have adequate time for right-of-way acquisition, although New Berlin doesn't have a lot of right-of-way acquisition. I think there are two parcels that are affected but Greenfield and Hales Corners have more right-of-way acquisition, and when you follow the Chapter 32 requirements, that can take up to a year. With the STP funding that we are getting which we will be talking about later, that's for July of 2009 to July of 2012. It's the State's fiscal year of 2010-2011, that's the time frame we have in which to use the funds.

Greg Kessler: We recognize that we need more than 10 days notification and more than just putting something in your mailboxes, especially during the summer time. Logistically it's difficult for us to time space in this building.

JP Walker: I think on this project it's important to have more than 10 calendar days when you think that there are three jurisdictions involved in the project. It's difficult just to coordinate everyone's schedule here in New Berlin, but now you add in Greenfield and Hales Corners it does complicate it a little bit more.

Greg Kessler: I don't know what Alderman Harenda and Poshepny schedules are around the 4th of July because obviously you are going to want them there too. We need to talk to them and see what their schedules and availability are and I see this being after the 4th of July at this point.

Mayor Chiovaturo: Have the other jurisdictions had any information to their public yet because it does affect them too, or are we the only ones having these issues?

Sue Barker: Since it's a joint project the first public informational meeting that we had was held here at New Berlin but also attended by Greenfield and Hales Corners. I do believe that Greenfield was going to have some additional small group meetings to discuss some of the sidepath issues in their community, but no other public information meetings have been held because its project related and joint throughout all the communities.

Alderman Moore: Has there been any suggestion of a joint meeting with City officials from all the cities there at the meeting?

Sue Barker: They are certainly all welcome and I would anticipate that at the Public Informational meeting the public officials that are interested would be able to attend that.

Alderman Moore: I'm just wondering if there has been any interest or discussion having one that would be official amongst all three entities as a public information meeting.

Sue Barker: There hasn't been separate discussion about that but they are invited to all of the Public Information meeting.

Greg Kessler: One of the things that Alderman Harenda indicated when I talked to him over the phone was that he was interested in what the Board had to say about the current conceptual designs that we have here. Do you have anything to comment on the concepts that you have before you as well? Obviously we realize the sidepaths were the most contention issue of this project. That would certainly be something we would want to target at the next PIM, are they going to stay or go and if they are going to stay what form are they going to be built in. These were the best graphics available to me that I could get to you.

Alderman Moore: After the last Board of Public Works meeting my understanding was that the next thing was going to happen was that we were going to be presented with two designs and the cost thereof and that nothing was going to occur between now and then.

Alderman Ament: That's how I recall it.

Alderman Moore: So I'm wondering why we are doing this at this time? Why are we having another PIM when the last thing that I understand was that it was going to go to design. We were going to come back with two different designs and we were going to be getting a cost factor and then we would be in a position to have a PIM.

JP Walker: We have two designs and have cost estimates associated with them. That certainly is information that can be presented at the Public Informational meeting, so that those that are in attendance can see it first hand. There isn't a whole lot of difference between the two designs. We have had conversations with, lack of a

better term, professional bikers and they prefer to ride on the road, so one of the designs we have added five feet in width to the roads for the bikers. The lane will be unmarked. There will be room on the pavement for those type of bikers. We have narrowed down the sidepath for the walkers and people with small children that are on bikes. That's the significant differences that you will see on the designs. Crispell-Snyder does have cost estimates for those two different designs.

Alderman Moore: So you are expecting to show those two designs at the PIM?

Sue Barker: Yes.

Alderman Moore: Is it correct that it's normal to have a PIM before they are presented to the Board of Public Works?

JP Walker: The reason why we prefer to do that is so that we can bring public input to the Board.

Greg Kessler: I want to know that the Board of Public Works is comfortable with that approach too. Or do you want us to come back in July with the cost estimates and then we go to PIM? That's what I would like to hear from the Board.

Mayor Chiovarero: I would think we would want some public input on the designs before we brought it back here. That's what caused the issue that we have on hand right now, was public input from the first one. There have been pretty strong discussions on both sides of the issues of sidepaths and on road bike paths. As far as the PIM scheduling, we followed what we normally do to hold PIM's. We find a date and go out about 10 days and that's what happened. I think where the issue came this time, was the fact that none of these designs were shared with anybody to even get a preliminary look at. What would happen is that they wouldn't see it for the first time until they walked in. If you have some of those designs, some of the actual drawings, if they were shared not only with the Board of Public Works but shared with the Alderman of those districts so they would at least have an idea, they could have shared some of those ideas with the people that are more intimate with it and that way when it came to the public meeting it would have been more productive. I think that was the concern of the Alderman. I would suggest Sue, that if you could get some of those drawings to the Aldermen, it would be very helpful. I think 10 days would be sufficient for a Public Informational date if a meeting could be set up that doesn't conflict with other meetings that the Alderman and I have.

JP Walker: What I would suggest is that we will distribute the two designs with the cost estimates to the elected officials. Sue, how quickly could we have in our hands the two designs and cost estimates?

Sue Barker: You can have those this week.

JP Walker: We will then communicate with Alderman Harenda and Alderman Poshepny to let them know that the design packets will be put in their mailboxes this week and then we will look at scheduling a public informational meeting within the next few weeks.

Greg Kessler: I want the Board's opinion of this. Realistically you are looking at a PIM after the 4th of July which would put you within a week of your next Board meeting, so let me ask the Board this. Would you rather discuss this at your next Board meeting or wait and have a PIM meeting before you discuss it at a Board meeting?

Mayor Chiovarero: I think we need the Public Information meeting to get some input.

Greg Kessler: So realistically the earliest you would have it before you for discussion would be August.

JP Walker: Our July meeting is the 21st, so if we were able to have a meeting during the week of July 7th thru 11th, that gives us 10 days before the next Board meeting.

ITEM 14-08 Approved STP Funding for Three Roadway Construction Projects

JP Walker: We have officially received written notice that City of New Berlin will be receiving STP Funding that we applied for on three projects.

- 124th Street from Grange Avenue to Cold Spring Road
- Coffee Road from Calhoun Road to National Avenue
- Lincoln Avenue from Calhoun Road to Moorland Road

In your packets you have the three agreements that the Mayor has signed indicating the amount that applies to each of the three projects. Total federal funding is approximately \$8.9 million dollars. The biggest issue is how do we coordinate the construction projects, how many can we do at one time, how do we spread them out over the given budget years. Those are discussions that will be taking place as we enter into the budget negotiations. We will work it out. What we do know is that we have approximately \$8.9 million dollars in federal funding to assist us on the three listed projects.

Alderman Moore: I assume that this information for us and this is a discussion that's going to take place among staff and you will then bring the information to us, is that correct?

JP Walker: The process that we go through is that we have to bring a formal request to the Board then on to Council that deals with expenses and revenue. We have to enter this as revenue and have to show it as an expense at the time of construction. So there will be a formal motion coming probably closer to 2010 dealing with the expense revenue part of this.

Alderman Ament: Isn't Lincoln Avenue design work basically done?

JP Walker: It's pretty much done but there might be right-of-way acquisition associated with the bio-retention swales. We have that whole issue in order to install bio-retention swales to the width that we need encroaching on private property. Do we offer the opportunity for the businesses to be able to count the green space all the way out to the edge of the pavement within the right-of way in exchange for being able to install the bio-retention swales on their property at the front or is it an out-right permanent easement purchase. We have to work our way through that and if there is right-of-way acquisition you have to account for a year for the Chapter 32 processes to go through. We don't have the funding right now. We have the formal notice that we are getting the funding.

Ron Schildt: The actual funding for the cycle is the State's fiscal year 2010 through 11 or 12. It's actually a two-year cycle that you apply for but they have funds available for three years. So the earliest that we can get it is their fiscal year 2010 which begins in July 2009. We would probably start the construction in 2010. With the scheduling the funds are in there but as long as we have them slotted in they can carry those funds over a little bit as long as WisDOT knows the project is moving forward. We need to discuss with WisDOT as to how we get those different projects slotted with other projects that might be under construction at the same time making sure we don't overlap construction on two streets that are in the same area.

JP Walker: That is the key issue, especially for Lincoln Avenue. Obviously Lincoln Avenue, Coffee Road and Cleveland Avenue all connect with Calhoun Road. So we have potentially four major projects occurring in relatively same area. How do we sequence them. That's the issue that we have to work our way through.

Mayor Chiovatero: In the case of 124th Street, we are saying that we won't be able to do anything until 2010 on that. If right now we are in the middle of design and it's only the middle of 2008 why can't we be ready to start construction in July of 2009 when the funds are available?

JP Walker: Because you have right-of-way acquisition that has to be completed before you start construction. Three communities have different schedules for their right-of-way acquisitions and each community handles them separately. New Berlin is relatively easy because we only have two parcels and they are on Grange Avenue. For Greenfield and Hales Corners it's more of a complicated issue for them.

Mayor Chiovatero: How long do they plan that project to take construction wise?

Sue Barker: It should last a full summer. Somewhere between May and October would be a typical timeframe. We also have some utility relocation that have to happen before the actual construction begins. That's one of the reasons why we have been saying 2010.

Mayor Chiovatero: It makes more sense now.

ITEM 15-08 Approval of the Contract for the 2008 Roadway Maintenance Project

JP Walker: Request the Board of Public Works to recommend approval to the Common Council of Design Alternative 2008-A for the reconstruction of Calhoun Road and I so move.

Mayor Chiovatero 2nd the motion.

Alderman Seidl: The frontage road on the west side that meets up with Elmwood, is that remaining with this plan on Calhoun Road?

JP Walker: No.

Alderman Seidl: It is going away?

JP Walker: It's going away. It may be reconfigured as a shared driveway for the residents that are located on the west side of it to be either connected to Elmwood Road or to Roosevelt Avenue, but it's not going to be a public access area. I believe that is an area where we can actually vacate some of the right-of-way that exceeds the ultimate right-of-way is for Calhoun Road. I believe the ultimate width is 130' and obviously that area greatly exceeds 65' at least from the center of the right-of-way to the western edge. The reason why we would want to take it out is because the angles that it meets Calhoun Road are very unsafe and with some reconfiguring, right now we show the driveways coming right out to Calhoun Road. The question is do they have to or can it be a shared driveway that comes to either Roosevelt or Elmwood.

Alderman Seidl: I'm looking at the drainage easement on the west side of Calhoun that runs behind 1505, 1515 and 1525. With the stormwater improvements that are being proposed would that drainage easement still needed?

JP Walker: Yes, the area that was constructed is part of WisDOT's Greenfield Avenue project darin to that easement. There are major cross culverts that cross under Calhoun Road between 1480 and 1470 that drain directly to that easement area. The cross culverts are staying.

Alderman Seidl: With the medians that are in this plan, looks like they pick up right after the railroad tracks we are looking at two businesses for sure that would be impacted by the size of those medians. They would be Calhoun Station and Senor Luna's and they would be unable to more than unlikely get their beer trucks into their parking lot or any of their delivery trucks in, so I'm kind of curious, as well as the residents in that area, with the medians being where they are it looks quite a few of them are going to have to travel south to come back north. In specific 2185, 2135, 2021, 2017, 1961. With the medians being where they are we are inconveniencing not only the residents but also a lot of the businesses. I guess my question is the medians in general do they need to be there?

JP Walker: We had talked with many of the business owners at the May 8th Public Informational meeting and these issues were brought to our attention. We are showing the medians right now because when you look at safety the medians are the safest alternative. There are other alternatives; I'm not enamored by a TWLTL. It is an option but there are also other ways that the median areas can be replaced with striping. So there are alternatives, we have to really look at the access issues to the businesses and come up with the proper approach for allowing the maneuvering that they need as well as the residents in that area. The medians are proposed for safety issues and for controlling traffic maneuvering. If you have the ability to go across and turn left from your given driveway, there are safety concerns and that's why we are showing medians but we are also very much aware of the access requirements that are needed for the property owners on Calhoun Road.

Alderman Moore: Do you have a specific recommendation in relation to the medians?

Alderman Seidl: I understand what JP is saying; unfortunately I believe I have to disagree with this one. I don't see a reason in having the medians, if we are doing away with them north of the railroad tracks but we are picking them up right after Roosevelt Avenue and they are pretty sizeable. Obviously you said there are other alternatives, in the first plan they looked like they were green and apparently and it made people think that it was grass. Is that the case, are these grassy medians? The City will have to maintain those medians as well then?

JP Walker: Yes, that's correct. The reason for the medians is if you look at all the left turn lanes that are required, that's why you need the physical features out there to create the turning lanes, yet provide sufficient separation and a visual separation for the traffic to be able to maneuver safely. As I say there are other alternatives to a grass median and we certainly have to take a look at that.

Mayor Chiovarero: I know that when this was drawn up it was done for purposes of the PIM and we have had some comments that came to us from the businesses from Senor Luna's and Calhoun Station. I have also talked to Alderman Seidl about a couple of residents that it affects too. It was always my impression that we can make some modifications to take care of those areas. As far as the medians being grass or whatever we decide to put in there I think those are a minor detail and it can be worked out when we get further down the road. Again, this was put together to take care of all the concerns of the comments that we received. I'm a little bit concerned that this has come out, saying this is how it's going to be. Again, we put this together for the PIM, the majority of the comments that we received, most of the people have been pretty receptive to this, they have some concerns, and I think there's some tweaking that has to be done. If it can be we will. The biggest one that I keep coming back to is the medians. Is there a need for a median? What are they there for? With all the left turn lanes it's a safety issue there. We have to take a look at it and make sure if we put the medians in we want to make sure we want to try not to impact the fewest number of people. Some people will be impacted and we have to take that into account. This is brought before you with the comments we received at the public meeting and some of the information we are just trying to get the Board of Public Works to chime in on it this time. I know when I talked to Alderman Seidl he brought up these concerns. I relayed them to JP. The plans don't reflect any changes, I don't know if we took the step to make any changes yet. I know there are some comments about this little frontage road down by Elmwood Road. I know that the discussion there went back and forth, do we just make it a common driveway, can we make a driveway out to Calhoun Road? I know the residents do like that little road, they are used to it. Would they be in-line to have a common driveway at least and push a couple towards Roosevelt and a couple towards Elmwood? That's something that I personally haven't talked to those residents on. I asked several times, why do we have to take that road out of there? I don't know if that road could be configured so it could have some different angles or if the road will become part of the common driveway?

Alderman Seidl: In response to the common driveway. Who would be responsible for clearing the snow there?

Mayor Chiovarero: Probably the residents.

Alderman Seidl: They would just have to work it out among themselves?

Mayor Chiovatero: Yes, I think so.

Alderman Moore: Taking a look at the comments I was impressed with many of them and their thoughtfulness. One of them said, right now there are only two lanes entering the Lincoln Avenue intersection east/west, this person suggests adding a third straight ahead lane and I see where that might be advisable. Is there any reason why we are not planning that at this point?

Ron Schildt: The geometrics from all the intersections were done basically from the traffic study that was done at the beginning part of this project. There are some areas that we have added additional lanes because of other things that weren't taken into account possibly or just the ease of access, so yes you could look at something there. But if you are trying to look at a straight thru lane the amount of traffic that is usually there doesn't warrant it and with the signal there, the people can get through. Because it's a shared left and thru those people that would be waiting at the signal wouldn't be able to go thru the intersection anyway as opposed to a right turn lane. Those are the ones that we have added in a couple areas just for convenience so the right turn people could bypass the people that are waiting at a signal or waiting to turn off of Calhoun Road. At least for this area to do that you would have to widen the intersection another 12 feet and add that third lane.

Alderman Moore: Is that a problem?

Ron Schildt: We have the bio-retention swale there; we have more property acquisition and probably would not help them that much because you have a left turn lane where we most likely aren't going to have a left turn arrow.

Alderman Moore: We do not have right-of-way already acquired so it would increase the cost?

Ron Schildt: No, if you look at that intersection for Lincoln Avenue, except for at the little corner triangles where we are trying to purchase those corner triangles for radius to get back to Calhoun their isn't any right-of-way acquisition along Lincoln. We are trying to fit the cross section at the intersection pretty much within the existing right-of-way.

Alderman Moore: Could we add a lane on the east side without additional costs right?

Ron Schildt: You already have a shared left and thru, so you would be basically adding a left turn bay which then pushes the east bound thru lane another 12 feet which also makes it not line up with the west side or the east bound approach.

Alderman Moore: You could go two ways on that, go a little bit each way and still maintain the alignment right?

Ron Schildt: Based on the traffic report, it's really not needed.

Alderman Moore: We are going to be reconstructing Lincoln the whole road right? My understanding is that the master plan shows additional businesses and construction along Lincoln to the west, is that correct?

Ron Schildt: Part of the projections with the traffic study looked at future traffic volumes and that's again based on a certain percentage a standard increase of what it would be but also other future developments in the area and based off of those these are the recommended geometrics.

Alderman Moore: This particular person says that "the four lane undivided roadway section at the north end would be a mistake, and there are safety concerns there and it would be actually better to do a "road diet", which would be one lane in each direction with a TWLTL in the center, which would be better and safer then a four lane undivided roadway section." I would like to hear from our staff in relation to that suggestion.

Ron Schildt: Usually when you look at the “road diet” it’s usually when you are going from a four lane section to something different, that’s when you are taking an existing width of 40 – 44’ on a four lane roadway and because of the different maneuvers of turning left into driveways and other cross streets and everything, you take that four lane cross section and reduce it down hence the road diet and go down to a single lane in each direction with then that center left turn lane so you can get the traffic that’s turning out of those lanes. Some of those do work better and usually you are looking at those in the commercial areas where you have a lot busier driveways. Here we are talking about residential driveways which don’t get the same amount of use as a commercial driveway and then you have some cross streets. Those might be the area where it would be beneficial to have a wider section and actually have a dedicated turn lane for those. But for the length of the segment as a whole actually having a three lane cross section probably isn’t that, you have to look at the analysis as to how much turning traffic do you have as a percentage of what is the thru traffic? For that area the majority of the traffic is thru traffic. You do have the occasional person turning into a driveway or cross street, the type of thing. But those are not high volume streets; those are all very low volume residential streets and driveways. That’s where the differentiation comes in. There is a place for the road diet to work, I don’t know necessarily for this one because you are going from a two lane section to a four lane section and yet still fitting that within the existing right-of-way and not increasing what people would define as their usable front yard because the new roadway will end up being about where the existing ditch line is.

JP Walker: If you think back to the traffic counts that were taken, we had a traffic count location right about Fullerton Avenue. That had the highest volume of traffic. That was the one that exceeded 13,000 all the time in any of the counts that we had. That is dictating why there still is that need for two traffic lanes in both directions north of the railroad tracks also. To narrow it down to one traffic lane with a TWLT you aren’t meeting the traffic capacity requirements.

Alderman Moore: Does that mean that this person is wrong when he states “road diets do not displace traffic unless they have exotically high numbers. Road diets ranges typically start at 8,000 vehicles and climb to 19,000 at 20,000 vehicles per day the diet is called a super road diet. These diet’s range from 19,000 on up to 23,000 vehicles per day, they are undertaken by replacing signals with roundabouts and other means to keep traffic moving smoothly and uniformly.” This person believes, I think, that the numbers you are talking about can be handled up to 19,000 by this system.

JP Walker: I disagree with it. That is his opinion and staff has their opinion and we believe 13,000 is the threshold that we need to go to four lanes. Where this data is coming from, I’m not sure.

Ron Schildt: If you are looking at a commercial area that has a lot of other turns that are going into commercial driveways and that type of thing, a road diet can sometimes work because you are now providing that two way left turn lane that gets full use. The problem we are having on Calhoun Road is that we have much more thru traffic then we have turning traffic. We have to be able to handle that so you don’t have a steady stream of cars just going through one lane and the people that are on the side street don’t even have a chance to get out and yet you will have that two way left turn lane that will be pretty much free and nobody will be using half the time.

Alderman Moore: What if a round-about were put at Calhoun and Greenfield?

Ron Schildt: I don’t think that would help the road diet any more then right now, the good thing about a signal is, in fact the WisDOT now requires that the first thing you look at when you have a signal that’s going to be replaced or a new one that’s going in, the first thing you have to look at is a round about. So that is something that is coming up more and more often. The thing with a round-about is that you have a steady stream of traffic going thru there, which means you don’t maybe have the breaks in traffic, you would have further south on Calhoun. With the signal there you do have some gaps there to actually turn out of the side streets. Having the signals there would be more beneficial then anything else you would do.

Alderman Moore: With a round-about then the TWLTL would work for turning traffic because of the steady stream.

Ron Schildt: That's not the way I would see it.

JP Walker: A round-about on Greenfield Avenue would eliminate both of those gas stations. There just isn't the room that has to be taken into consideration. Again, that is State jurisdiction, not City jurisdiction. You also have the City of Brookfield into the equation also. There would be significant land purchase required for that plus relocation.

Alderman Moore: Let's talk about differences of 2008-A compared to other proposals. Can I assume that 2008-A, except for the east side sidepath is fairly similar to 3A south of the tracks.

JP Walker: It's fairly similar yes.

Alderman Moore: Are there any differences?

JP Walker: You mentioned the sidepath issue. That has been eliminated on most of the east side in 2008-A. I think everything else is as it was in 3A south of the tracks.

Mayor Chiovatero: There is some redefining of the medians on the far south end, by Cleveland. It has the extra width for the bike lane. We try to take all the comments that were coming in and try incorporating them and obviously reducing the width of the road, reducing the impact to property owners but maintain the design standards that we are trying to follow as well as stormwater and frontage road issues. It's hard to get everything to fit into this design but we tried.

Alderman Moore: So north of Glendale have you added a bike lane or just added width?

Mayor Chiovatero: If I understand its added width for bikes.

Ron Schildt: It would not be marked but it would actually be the right width.

Alderman Moore: Why wouldn't it be marked?

JP Walker: You can look at the cost factor. Bike lanes do not have to be marked.

Mayor Chiovatero: In that area the frontage road is there too.

Alderman Moore: North of the railroad tracks basically you have taken away the bicycle lanes?

JP Walker: The bicycle lanes turn off of Calhoun Road at Roosevelt and the bike trails will be marked accordingly through the subdivisions. You may recall that at the Public Information meeting we provided that information where we showed a route that I think was going up 171st on the east side and a street on the west side.

Alderman Moore: So no sidepaths and bike lanes north of Roosevelt.

JP Walker: There were comments received looking at the area between Roosevelt and Elmwood on the west side on whether or not the sidepaths should be connected to Elmwood to allow pedestrians walking on Elmwood to get down to the county trail. It's not shown on these plans and it wasn't shown on the PIM and it isn't shown on the plans but we did receive comments about that.

Alderman Moore: I was impressed by the number of comments that said, to return the sidepaths and bike lanes, one or the other or both. One of the reasons was because we have paths along Greenfield, we've got the New Berlin bike path and we aren't connecting them sufficiently. Personally I have a significant problem with the loss of the sidepaths along the street plus from my discussion with staff and taking a look at this there is in fact right-of-way and there wouldn't need to be any additional purchase of right-of-way if sidepaths were put back in except a very small corner between Fullerton and Greenfield and one there and another section probably to the north of that and a little section by the service station on the west side. So I do have a problem with this plan without those sidepaths. I think the comments were very thoughtful and I do agree with them. Although I'm wondering also if we move ahead with 2008-A disregarding the sidepaths for a moment that the staff is comfortable with lack of separation of traffic north and south in the four-lane section between the tracks and Greenfield. One of the comments was that there should be at least 3 or more feet at least in between.

JP Walker: The area north of the railroad tracks is a very difficult area to first recognize all of the concerns, be aware of all the concerns, and then try to accommodate those concerns into the design. Meeting all the professional criteria's, ect. ect. Is this design as safe as 3-A in that area? No it isn't. Is it acceptable to me as a City Engineer? Yes, it is and meets the minimum requirements. By the end of this year we are going to have four-lanes to the north of our border and when the County redoes Cleveland Avenue according to my understanding there are going to be four lanes going from Calhoun to the east. Four lanes are needed, traffic volume dictates it. It meets minimum requirements.

Ron Schildt: It's better than what's out there right now. Is it as good as the alternatives we looked at before that had a divided section in there? No, but this will take care of the traffic that is projected to be there and is out there now and will work.

Alderman Moore: What about the comment about adding a couple of feet?

Ron Schildt: Any extra distance between them is always better, it's going to provide a little more separation, and again that affects the size of the roadway. The purpose of this is what can we do to minimize the impact to the residents that live along there, recognizing that yes, we do have right-of-way out there that we could put a wider roadway cross section in there but we are trying to do what we can and provide a safe roadway that will fit with what's out there and will handle the traffic now and in the future.

JP Walker: We have had many conversations with the property owners in that stretch and their major concern is the encroachment of the road into their perceived front yards. We all recognize that it is within our right-of-way. Adding two feet is going to change the dynamics in their minds, maybe. We gave actual measurements to the back of curb as proposed. I have met with a couple of the residents out there and physically showed them in the field where the back of curb would be. Encroaching one more foot closer to them is going to open a can of worms. Is it safer? Adding some type of dimension in between the lines obviously would add some safety. But this meets the minimum requirements and from the people that I have talked with they appear to be accepting this alternative.

Alderman Moore: What about the big trucks?

JP Walker: The lane widths right now are 11' which can accommodate trucks.

Alderman Moore: If we are talking about long term planning, is this plan the best for the long term, 20 years down the road?

JP Walker: Is this design best? No. Alternative 3-A was.

Alderman Moore: What do you anticipate the next step after action today would be?

JP Walker: I would anticipate that this goes to the Common Council and we have a vote at the Common Council on Alternative 2008-A. Either vote to go forth and complete the design or defeat it and then we are back to step 1.

Alderman Moore: I would like to make an amendment to the motion to return sidepaths to the plan except where there are frontage roads.

Alderman Chiovero: I'm struggling a real lot with that because talking with these residents that are living north of the tracks; they are really concerned about the amount of property that is going to be taken up by the road and the auxiliaries which would be the sidepaths. If we had not come up with the idea or the plan to reroute the bike trails and find a way around it I think I would support that, but right now I'm trying to keep my promise to those residents as to the amount of roadway that is going to encroach on their property. When I talked to them and before we got this design, the questions I was asking if we can keep it within the current ditch lines would that help and they said "yes". I have had a couple of people say "well, as long as your doing it let's put the sidewalks in too". I don't know if I have the full consensus to those sidewalks. I'm really struggling with this and I understand your reason for wanting the sidepaths, but in this case we had to make a lot of concessions, narrower lanes, get rid of the medians, everything to make this work and I think one of the concessions that I kind of hesitatingly support was the fact the least amount of property intrusion past the ditch line. That's why I'm having trouble with this Alderman Moore. I want to say yes, put them in but at the same time I don't know if I would continue to get the support of these people. This is the area of the road where the worst support was at because it does affect these property owners. If we go ahead with the added pavement in the middle and then the sidepaths all the way down, I don't think we would get as much support from those residents there. We aren't actually talking about 3' we are talking about 8' because of the terrace so we are actually talking about 16 feet

Alderman Moore: The motion fails for lack of a second.

Alderman Moore: Hearing that you are suggesting you would like some more input, is that what you are saying?

Mayor Chiovero: I would have to see where it goes into. As JP said a few of these residents have called us, we have gone out there and showed them where the back of the curb would be in relationship to their house and I would like to see where that point would be and try to get some feed back from those residents. We need the support of those residents and the aldermen in this area to get this pushed through.

Alderman Moore: I do encourage everybody to understand that this road is just not for the residents it is yes for the residents, but it is also for the rest of the City and we need to consider what the whole City needs and we need to consider what this area needs beyond when these residents might actually be living there.

Alderman Ament: On sheet #7 of the design scenario. Realizing that this could be a serious blow to the businesses on the west side of Calhoun where it would widen out I am looking at the area that you have for the Glass Block property. If I'm not mistaken, all or most of their parking for customers is on Calhoun Road. If we eliminate that which it looks like we would, are we going to allow parking on Roosevelt or Calhoun for them, or are we just going to put them out?

JP Walker: There is a need to purchase five feet.

Mayor Chiovero: So he is currently parking his vehicles in the right-of-way?

Alderman Ament: Maybe we should purchase that if we go to four lanes.

JP Walker: I question whether or not there is the possibility of creating parking elsewhere on that parcel for customers. Certainly something we can look at.

Alderman Ament: I think we should, at least talk to them about it. On the front page of the Staff Report the very last bullet point is: Estimated construction cost of approximately \$8.25 Million, does that include the right-of-way acquisition?

JP Walker: No, we have a current rough estimate of about \$500,000 with this alternative.

Alderman Ament: The cost of this redesign, do we know what that cost was?

Mayor Chiovatero: It was around \$5,400 that was up to the PIM.

Alderman Ament: So it's \$5,400 plus the PIM? On page 2 of the Staff report it shows that under #2 on that page over 1,000 notifications for the May 8, 2008 meeting were mailed in the City of New Berlin. I didn't get one. Also on comprehensive plan on the third page. It says that the 2004 Transportation Plan which is an element of the Master Plan states and it goes on to several other bullet points encouraging the four lanes. I just want to point out that also part of that 2004 Transportation Plan does not call for sidewalks; it calls for on road or should facilities. I would think if we are going to follow it one way we should follow it the other way. Going back to the discussion quickly on the sidepaths where the service roads are. You are talking about eliminating any kind of sidepath on the west side of Calhoun in that area.

JP Walker: No, the east side.

Alderman Ament: In favor of using the service road?

JP Walker: Yes, with reservations.

Alderman Ament: What would that be?

JP Walker: I stated my reservations at previous meetings, that mixing pedestrians with traffic my opinion is not the way to go. It was pointed out that there isn't that much traffic on the frontage road. But you are still mixing pedestrians with traffic especially down by the day care, and I know currently they are using the frontage road.

Alderman Ament: So the assumption would be that if there was a sidewalk on Calhoun Road that the day care people would go up to that sidewalk rather than using the frontage road, or should we propose sidewalks on both sides of the frontage road?

JP Walker: My encouragement would be that they would use the sidepath if it was developed for them.

Alderman Ament: We were talking about the grid system for four lanes, looking at Moorland and Cleveland and Greenfield and then adding Calhoun Road and we look at the same type of thing for the sidewalks, would it not then make sense to add sidewalks to both sides of Rogers, Lincoln, Glendale, Ryerson, Victor?

JP Walker: We have had feedback from the property owners and tenants in the Industrial Park as part of the redevelopment plan and it came across very clear that they were not interested in having sidepaths go internally into the Industrial Park. My response to your question Dave would be that it would not make sense. First of all Calhoun Road is an arterial the other streets you mentioned are not arterial. We are following the Bicycle and Pedestrian Facilities Plan in its requirement that we make arterials bicycle and pedestrian friendly when they are reconstructed.

Alderman Ament: I guess I could follow that logic through to the service road as well. If Rogers, Lincoln, Ryerson, Glendale and Victor are not arterials then neither is the service road. What I'm trying to point out is that it would be really nice to have a sidewalk, a bike trail, maybe several other different facilities along side the roads but it is just doesn't make sense fiscally. I will say that I am very glad to see that there is at least that

much common sense coming into this and consider what we are doing to the businesses and residents in the area. I'm really happy to see that we are making some progress.

Alderman Moore made the motion to table this for now until further investigation.

Mayor Chiovatero 2nd the motion.

Mayor Chiovatero: On tabling this I would like to say the conversations that we had today were good and I'm glad that we are at least moving this forward a little bit. I don't think the plan is perfect but there have been a lot of compromises made, trying to work with the residents and business owners. Of course I would like to see this move forward but I think we have to take a look at a couple of those buildings that we talked about and find tune this. Remember this is not a design construction set. It's a design for consideration. I think a lot of the questions that we heard today will crop up with more questions as we move ahead into the final design stages, and then we will know exactly where this will go. Alderman Seidl brought up some information about the residents on the west side of the road. It's just very hard to make sure that this fits everybody's needs. We have to look at it. I'm glad that we got some discussion on this.

Upon voting the motion passed with Alderman Seidl and Alderman Ament voting no.

Alderman Seidl made the motion to adjourn.

Mayor Chiovatero 2nd the motion.

Meeting was adjourned at 10:00 AM.

-