

MINUTES
BOARD OF PUBLIC WORKS MEETING
June 11, 2007
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 Chiovatero, City Engineer J.P. Walker, Alderman Ament, Alderman Moore. & Alderman Augustine.

Staff Present: Tammy Simonson, Civil Engineer, Ron Schildt, Transportation Engineer, Eric Nitschke, Stormwater Engineer; Greg Kessler, Director of Community Development.

PRIVILEGE OF THE FLOOR

Alderman Augustine asked if there was anyone wishing to speak at the Privilege of the floor and the following people spoke:

Mr. Ken Matheson – 17025 w Rogers Drive – Read the following letter:



NEW BERLIN INDUSTRIAL ASSOCIATION ♦ P.O. BOX 510715 ♦ NEW BERLIN, WI 53151-0715

Telephone: (262) 786-8615 ♦ Fax: (262) 786-3235 ♦ Email: nbia@excpc.com

June 11, 2007

New Berlin Common Council
Public Meeting, May 22, 2007

Re: Calhoun Road Improvements

From: The New Berlin Industrial Association

The NBIA, representing almost 400 businesses and more than 12,000 employees, has actively been involved in this issue since the Park Modernization project launched. Our members are firmly behind improvements to Calhoun Road and the frontage road. Most New Berlin citizens also feel that the road is not up to standard, from previous meeting comments. So we all agree that the City needs to move forward immediately.

This is not a short term project, nor does it have a short term affect. As the projected cost will be substantial, it is important to do it with forward thinking and secure improvements in each concern: traffic flow, safety and storm water control. The County will continue to develop its east/west arteries (Cleveland and Greenfield) as four lane roads, to handle the traffic loads. As Calhoun is a major traffic route between the two, as Brookfield moves Calhoun to a completed four lane road north of Greenfield in 2008, and as the current SEWRPC planning projects steady traffic increases on it, it's logical to build Calhoun with four lanes now.

Doing nothing is completely unacceptable. A quick repave addresses only one aspect of the current problem – the asphalt condition, and essentially eliminates the possibility of any county funding in the Cleveland intersection. Encouraging that \$2.2M forfeiture and ignoring the other concerns of an overused road is irresponsible. We do not believe that intersection improvements at Lincoln and Cleveland can be achieved without triggering State required Storm Water management implementation. It is certainly not cost effective to do this project twice in 10 years.

The attached page indicates a majority of the Park owners with industrial-sized buildings on Calhoun Road support moving forward with 3A. On the benefit grading grid used in assessing each design option, 3A is the top choice, so the professional traffic engineers and the City staff support 3A. Quite frankly, the City schools benefit immensely from the property tax dollars the Park businesses pay. These businesses support using their tax dollars for an immediate widening of Calhoun Road using option 3A. To this point, the NBIA members feel that it is only equitable that some of our taxes at this time be spent on 3A and strongly encourage its adoption.

Thank you for your time and consideration.

The NBIA Board

The following business on Calhoun Road Support the Four-Lane Configuration of Calhoun Road:

- Jim O'Rourke, A & A Manufacturing
- William Shier, ABL Controls
- Tom Brown, Custom Wireless, Inc.
- Arlen Meidenbauer, Denali Ingredients
- William Luterbach, James Luterbach Construction Company
- Andrew J. Fleming, Metal Masters, Inc.
- Todd Scheel, Muzic IN Motion
- Rochelle Barton, New Generation Learning Center
- John Secora, Jr., Pomp's Tire
- Dennis Murphy, Southwest Metal & Finishing
- Mary Wehrheim, Stanek Tool
- Jim Wurster, Super Products
- Steve Podjaski, Tape Machining Corp.
- Jeff Porter, Velvac
- Chris Weichman, Wisconsin Glacier Springs

Donna Goodrich – 3783 Shady Lane – I'm here to say that I'm very disappointed that you gentlemen changed this meeting last week towards the end of the week and people were not given the opportunity to even read about it even on your website until over the weekend. That isn't giving the taxpayers proper voice. I looked this morning and your website has changed the date on your agenda for today and not on your calendar, so it isn't even consistent within your website. I don't think this was exactly fair play and it's another example of what I term as "New Berlin Politics"

Steve Podjasky — I'm one of the owners of Tape Machining at 2222 So Calhoun. I too am somewhat confused. I went to the website on May 29th I could not find the current agenda for this meeting and then reading the minutes of the Common Council and other things on the website 3A was there and now some other plans have come up and I have questions because my two concerns are stormwater runoff and the safety that goes with that, because with the current 5th year storms that you have you are going to have some kids getting killed. I'm here to hear what is going on with this current proposal. I too have a business on Calhoun Road, not only do I own the business but I also own the business property, so I'm here to find out what's going on.

Bill Luterbach – 2880 South 171st – Over the recent past I have read different accounts of the Calhoun Road project and most of what I hear is how much money we are going to save the taxpayers by scaling this project down. I'm here to tell you that we in the Industrial Park are not the only people using this road and we also are taxpayers. By the end of 2008 public common knowledge is that Brookfield will be through residential areas bringing four lanes to Greenfield Avenue right at our doorsteps. Some people say the traffic will or has dropped off. First off with four lanes coming to our front door, I hardly believe that traffic is going to slow down and go away. I also have heard people talk about the independent consultants and I would like to see the reports be fair and consistent. For example road counts, when you talked throughout this community and they are done for over years wherever we are expanding road counts are done on weekdays, not seven days. I'm here many Saturdays, some Sundays and I know what the traffic counts are on those days and that's not showing something fair to the community. I would also like to say the independent engineers that are hired based on designs from the state, from the county; from the local people here we have standards. If we are over the requirement there are certain rules that should apply. All I'm here to say is that we would like to see that it's fair and consistent and applied. I also look at some of the things that have gone on recently; there has not been one referendum. With residential reconstruction of roads going on us as a community have spent \$60 million in schools. We are here talking about a few million. In over thirty years that I've personally been here in New Berlin there has been no major reconstruction in the Industrial Park.

We have and remain, I think, one of the best values in southeast Wisconsin with our taxes. Every other community has referendums tell you it's going to be \$400 or \$500 per household. We have done that in the past without any. Again, I'm looking at to say the Calhoun Road project should be looked at accurately and with honest information. If you do that I believe it will go ahead with four lanes. Please don't forget the Industrial Park is a taxpayer and a corporate citizen. When this get's done please continue and the rest of the road reconstruction, we are and have paid taxes for well over 50 years that this park has been here. We get to pay for the roads when they are put in, we donate them to the City and it is our turn. The schools have had theirs, everybody has had theirs and I think it's time for the Industrial Park. We also pay a tremendous amount of taxes. We are responsible every year for over a million dollars in taxes. Thank You.

Vern Bentley – 3450 So Johnson Road – The Calhoun Road Alternate 3A, four lane road plan will cost over \$10 million. That amount has been established by the staff and the consultants the numbers have been dropping since the two-lane road was mentioned. If the numbers have dropped the estimates were wrong from the beginning. The staff and consultant should explain their errors; this is not a barter situation. The Council directed the Board of Public Works to study the Alternate 1A plan. Calhoun Road is a budget item for a long term debt. A survey or referendum was just mentioned; well a New Berlin community survey was to get input from the community. This is a process where residential and business property owners to develop a strategic plan. In this city survey when asked about the condition of major streets, 90% were satisfied or very satisfied. The condition of residential streets 85.9% were satisfied or very satisfied. The question about the roadway maintenance program, 61% said to delay resurfacing or major repair for an additional 5 years. The residents have concerns and have given direction to the city with this survey and should have at least more then one option for Calhoun Road. Will you please follow the direction of the Council and the residents of New Berlin. I was going to ask the question as to why the NBIA change their minds from the two-lane to the four-lane and I guess I got it answered. They wanted the two thinking they would loose a frontage road. Well now they have the frontage road, that's a bonus. So then why are you now going for a four lane road? Also at the beginning it was mentioned something about 400 members and yet when they put it their original petition it had 13 signatures and I believe that this one has 15 signatures. I turned in a petition with 153 signatures of residents and retail businesses, and I just did that as a token. If you want me to go out and get signatures from this community I can get them and I can get them big time. The residents and retail businesses of this community are a big part of this City along with the NBIA and the other business community. I realize that, but everybody should have an option and I think that you should do exactly what the Council said. At least look into Option 1A. Thank You.

Rhoda Flagg – 3180 Thornapple – I would just like to speak as a homeowner. I really find it offensive that you're going to have Brookfield shoving this road down our throats just because Brookfield is making a big road, does not mean that we have to follow suit. It's going to just peter down to a narrow road at Ryerson. Why do we have to take on this tax burden when we can do it just as well with the widened two-lane road. We do not need a median and sidewalks along that road. I wish you would consider the burden you are putting on the taxpayers.

Ralph Heun – 17765 Saturn Drive – I see that this is the only City Board that still has a paid city staff member in a voting position. All other city boards are composed of alderman and private citizens. I feel this imposes unreasonable pressure on the staff member, Mr. JP Walker, which is not fair to him because he cannot be independent from the Mayor who is his direct superior or supervisor. The staff member might not be able to make a decision that is contrary to the Mayor. Therefore I am requesting that Mr. Walker reclude himself from voting on this very important matter. As a symbol of ethics, I'm not saying anything is unethical, but somehow we should change this so we don't have to put him or anyone else in a position where they have to possibly be voting on their own jobs. Therefore I am also requesting a consideration or reformation of your board eliminating the position of a voting staff member on the board and have it just like the rest of the boards. I question the legality of a non-resident being able to vote on any subject that affects the taxes of the City of New Berlin. Taxation without representation or vice versa. Of the

eight different versions of Calhoun Road, I wonder what was actually done on each one or are we to just grab the greatest one of them all and put the rest on the back burner and really not make any plans for it. Because if our consultant did do his job they would have everything laid out as to what they are planning on doing on each of the proposals. There is no reason why they can't say this it. We really didn't like this one so therefore we just say let's do 3A. Let's take a real close look at this and making sure we are getting the biggest bang for the buck. As Mrs. Flagg said, "why do we have to do what Brookfield does?" Brookfield is possibly getting more money from the state because we hear that Brookfield spends more money on the roads the state gives them more money. If the state would like to have more traffic down Calhoun Road let's have the state cough up some more money and the county as well. We still have to worry about McDonalds and the CITGO station on Cleveland. Are these people going to be cut off from half of their possible business, or are we going to have them go down the street and turn around in someone's driveway and come back?

Steve Podjaski – 2222 So Calhoun – Just a ducktail on the last comment. The benefit of the public as described in responsibility in public office, that's probably where the concern came up with JP. I have no problems with JP as far as what he does or his opinions. With the same type of review of that situation, Dave Ament owns property, I believe you own property on Calhoun is that correct?

Mayor Chiovatero: They are not allowed to answer during a privilege of the floor.

Steve Podjaski – I'm sorry. How far are we going to take that as far as a code of ethics and who can or can't vote. I'm not a resident of New Berlin as far as my home, but I do have a lot of money tied up here. Thank You.

Vern Bentley – 3450 So Johnson Road – The reason about the staff member in New Berlin, this is the only committee that has a staff member on it. Planning, Park and Rec, no other committee has a staff member on their committee.

Eric Nitschke – 2155 So Ridgeway Drive – I wanted to speak briefly about the sidepaths again and also about the intersection of Westward and Calhoun. The requested action statement that came down from Council in looking at 1A verses 3A there was some work taken out of the original scope of services to remove median work at Westward and Ridgeway. I wanted to point out that the traffic studies that have been done show that as one of the intersections that completely fails the traffic study and the level of service that's needed. It is a dangerous intersection. I see people every day taking risks, getting out in the morning and trying to get in in the afternoon and it is something that I would like to see you at least take into consideration, maybe not medians but maybe a right turn lane so that you do have some separation of the left turn verses right turn out of Westward Drive. The second issue as far as the sidepaths go I know that it is a contentions issue some people want them, some people don't and for those of us that do like to get out and do like to walk, do like to run it is a very dangerous situation to be right next to traffic on roadside paths. For pedestrians it honestly just does not work. When I run here to the office I have to actually keep a real close watch on traffic. I can guarantee you that the people that cross the line are the ones that are on their cell phones or aren't paying attention or are looking at me as they are going by and we all know that where you look is where you drive. It's becoming an issue for me where I do want to get out and do want to exercise, but it's very dangerous to do so. I would like you to still consider looking at the sidepaths on the west side of the road and a safe crossing at the Waukesha County bike trail where there is a lot of pedestrian, bicyclists and roller blading traffic that crosses the road. It's a very, very dangerous intersection where you are intermingling car traffic, vehicular traffic and pedestrian traffic. Thank you very much.

Mr. Ken Matheson – 17025 W Rogers – I would like to read the following e-mail that we received from Paul Piotrowski of Hader Industries at 15600 W. Lincoln Avenue.

“Ken,

Sorry that I can not make it to your meeting regarding Calhoun Road but I would like to share my comments. Hader Industries was disappointed that the four lane proposal was shot down. We feel that Calhoun Road is a major road and should be four lanes or at the minimum set up for four lanes in the future. Calhoun Road links our business in the New Berlin Industrial Park with our business in Brookfield. It is used by our employees and trucks coming in and out of our facility. We feel an expanded Calhoun Road will help our future business as well as other businesses in the New Berlin area.

*Paul Piotrowski, Controller
Hader Industries, Inc.
15600 W. Lincoln Ave
New Berlin, WI 53151
262-641-6000”*

Donna Goodrich – 3783 Shady Lane – I have one question. We have Moorland Road, a four-lane road, isn't that road being used by truck traffic now, isn't it feasible that when a person, a truck comes off of the freeway that it would be closer for them to use Moorland Road that is already in existence as a four-lane road then to go down Greenfield to Calhoun? You are talking like there is no other alternative here and we have a road that services the Industrial Park and it's a four laner. Do we need a four laner on both ends of that Industrial Park to make it a viable park? And you can sell that? I'm just amazed that the whole Moorland Road has been forgotten as a service road for trucks off the expressway and through town and I don't get it. I just don't understand it. Safety, safety, if you were so worried about safety why is Moorland Road there. This is just going around and around in circles.

Ralph Heun – 17765 W. Saturn Drive – Moorland really isn't four lanes, its six lanes. Why don't we convince the county that we need more traffic to be put onto Moorland Road? Lets' wipe out the white stripes on the side, let's not give people tickets that drive in the right lane, lets make it a six lane road then we won't have to worry so much about Calhoun Road.

Alderman Augustine asked three times if there was anyone else wishing to speak to the Board of Public Works – Seeing none.

The meeting was called to order at 8:35 AM.

OLD BUSINESS

ITEM 01-07 Approval of the minutes from the March 19, 2007 Board of Public Works meetings.

Motion by JP Walker to approve the minutes.

Alderman Moore 2nd the motion.

JP Walker stated that the date has to be amended to May 14th, 2007.

Upon voting the motion to approve minutes as amended passed unanimously.

NEW BUSINESS

ITEM 16-07 Reallocation of Funds from the Ryerson Road Design Account to the Cold Spring Road Reconstruction Account.

JP Walker: The requested action is to request the Common Council to approve the transfer of \$50,000 of approved funds from the Ryerson Road Design Account 04251100 63012 C2007 to the Cold Spring Road Reconstruction Account 04251100 63008 C2004 to cover Legal & Administrative Fees, Contingencies and Construction Inspection associated with the construction of the proposed underground storm water retention facility that is required to handle storm water from the western sector of Cold Spring Road and I so move.

Alderman Moore 2nd the motion.

JP Walker – Back when Cold Spring Road was reconstructed there was an alternate bid item for the underground storage facility actually to be located on Eisenhower High School property. The bids that came in for it were tremendously over the budget that we had and staff determined that the type of contractors that were bidding on the Cold Spring Road project were not the kind of contractors that should be bidding on this type of facility. The decision was made that the pricing would be closer to our approved budget if it was designed as a design-build contract. The Mayor requested that we have this project re-bid. We did that recently and that item will be going to the Water Resources Management Utility in the regular meeting tomorrow night. The bids that were received were within the budget that the Water Resources has but does not include enough funds for legal and administrative fees due to an easement we are working through with the School Board, contingencies and inspection. Therefore, that is the reason for this request to have the additional funds being reallocated to that project.

Alderman Ament – In the last paragraph it states that fees were substantially less than the approved funding for the redesign of Ryerson Road. Do we know how much less?

JP Walker – The bids that we received for the design work on Ryerson Road were about 40% of the approved budget. The approved budget was \$550,000. We bid that project in December and received phenomenal proposals across the board.

Alderman Ament – So 60% of that \$550,000 is available?

JP Walker – Yes, that's correct.

Alderman Moore – Does the way that it was re-bid change the design at all?

JP Walker – No, the design is still going to be with Storm Trap, that was the suggested design component for the project.

Alderman Moore – This is because of Cold Spring Road, correct?

JP Walker – This facility handles stormwater coming off of Cold Spring Road. Basically it's the western sector that does not drain towards Weatherstone Boulevard and that water right now is going in the storm sewer system along Sunny Slope Road but there are MMSD requirements that we have to meet. MMSD has been on hold with us for a couple of years and we still have to do this. It is not something that is going to die by itself, it has to be done.

Alderman Moore – When you say MMSD has been on hold does this mean that they have been letting us hold off?

JP Walker: That's correct.

Alderman Moore – Wherever this water is going now, is it causing a problem?

JP Walker – The drainage easement that this water is draining to drains east, southeast away from Sunny Slope Road, just south of 4400 Sunny Slope Road. That easement area has had a history of drainage issues for quite some time. Putting in this retention facility will help us hold back the surge of water when we have the major storms.

Alderman Ament – So the reason we are doing this is for storm water?

JP Walker – That's correct.

Alderman Ament – Is this created because of the work on Cold Spring Road. Did we do major widening or anything to Cold Spring Road that created this.

JP Walker – Cold Spring Road had the impervious surface increased by more than ½ acre thereby kicking in Chapter 13 requirements for MMSD, This is one of those requirements.

Alderman Ament – Of that \$550,000 that it costs, apparently the bids came in at \$220,000, where does the \$330,000, of that if we take this \$50,000 out of there that leaves \$280,000 left. Where does that go?

JP Walker – We have three years in which to use available CIP funding without entering into arbitrage. It's eligible for reallocation as the Board sees fit.

Upon voting the motion passed unanimously

ITEM 17-07 Award of Construction Contract for the 2007 Roadway Rehabilitation Project

JP Walker – The requested action is to recommend to the Common Council the awarding of a Construction Contract to the lowest responsive, responsible bidder, *Wm. Beaudoin & Sons, Inc.*, for the 2007 Roadway Rehabilitation Project in an amount of \$810,827.85. With inspection and contingencies, the not to exceed Total Project Costs are \$899,100.00 from account 04251100 59040 C2007 and I so move.

Mayor Chiovatero 2nd the motion.

JP Walker – On the back of the issue paper is the listing of bids that were received. Four bids were received which is typical for this type of a project. We usually see three or four bids every year. You will see the comparison of the bids along with the engineers estimate. The bids came in very favorably and I believe that we will be able to rehabilitate 2 ½ miles of roadways this year for this project.

Alderman Ament – Where did this come in on the Paser, was this project part of our total plan for rehabilitation projects?

Ron Schildt – This is one that was actually back in 2005 I believe. Because of some of the other projects that came up, we couldn't fit it into the Budget because there were some extra costs that came up in the other streets. We have been holding this one off and telling people that we weren't able to do it. Now it's time to finally do it.

Alderman Ament – Do you remember what the paser rating was on this one?

Ron Schildt – I think it was 3's and 4's, mainly a lot of it was the curb and gutters that is really bad in there too.

JP Walker – The Board members will remember that back in 2005 we had our last Paser evaluation. We always come in with a three year window for projects that are eligible for rehabilitation funds. This is part of that original evaluation.

Upon voting the motion passed unanimously.

ITEM 18-07 Calhoun Road Alternative 1A – Design Components - Discussion

Alderman Ament – The requested action is to instruct staff and Bloom Consultants to work with the BPW on the design and cost estimates for the modified Alternative #1A which includes the cost share of \$250,000.00 with Waukesha County for the Cleveland Avenue intersection reconstruction. Reconstruct the Lincoln Avenue intersection per the design already submitted in 3A. The roadway surface from Greenfield Avenue to Cleveland Avenue to be reconstructed to remain as a 2-lane road with removing existing asphalt and repaving the surface the road base to be repaired as needed to maximize the roadway life. Per the letter dated May 18,2007 from City Engineer JP Walker the “base patching, proof rolling, grading the road base to create a 3% cross slope per the City’s Developers Handbook.” Alternative 1A does not include a median at Westward Drive because wide shoulders already exist, the roadway construction should provide for a 5’ wide shoulder-sidepath on both sides of Calhoun Road per the City of New Berlin’s approved Alternative Transportation Plan, which is part of the City Master Plan. Both sections of the Industrial Park service drive on the east side of Calhoun to remain in place and to be resurfaced. The total construction cost not to exceed \$3 million and should use a minimum of \$1 million of the approved land acquisition money to lower the overall cost not to exceed \$2 million.

Alderman Moore – I see a letter from the County Board of Public Works, I assume that has to do with the county's possible cost share, is that correct?

JP Walker – They aren’t talking about the cost share in this letter they are talking about the timing of their reconstruction of Cleveland Avenue. There was discussion at the county that there was consideration for using local funds to figure out if they could accelerate the reconstruction of Calhoun Road and Cleveland Avenue intersection in the year 2010. Part of the understanding that they had at the time was that Calhoun Road would be improved to handle the traffic volume. What they are saying in their letter is that since the Common Council has chosen to not pursue Alternative 3A thereby not adding capacity to Calhoun Road that they are no longer considering using local county funds for accelerating the reconstruction of the Calhoun / Cleveland Avenue intersection in 2010. They are still willing to do the project and fully fund the project but it won’t be until 2011 or 2012.

Alderman Moore – So does that change the \$250,000 at all or does that just delays it.

JP Walker – I believe it delays it. They are still applying for STP funds and those funds would be earmarked toward their entire Cleveland Avenue project. Part of that project is the Cleveland Avenue/Calhoun Road intersection, so yes I do expect them to include the intersection work as part of their funding application. If they do get approval, it will be available and then the discussion of cost sharing with New Berlin will be part of action that will be taken.

Alderman Moore – read the following letter that was received from the county.

“Dear Mayor Chiovero:

We are writing as a follow-up to our discussion regarding the timing for the intersection improvement. The County indicated its willingness to accelerate our intersection project and apply federal funds to its construction. This offer was made in recognition of the substantial public benefits that would accrue from a widened Calhoun Road and a widened intersection.

It is our understanding that the Common Council has chosen to pursue an alternative that does not add capacity to Calhoun Road. We believe that lack of added capacity significantly diminishes the public benefits that an improved intersection would bring. For that reason, we have opted to withdraw our offer to accelerate the intersection work. We will still do the project and fully fund the intersection. However, the work will likely not be undertaken until 2011 or 2012.

We appreciate the opportunity to work with the City and are sorry that the accelerated project did not work out. If we can assist you further in any way, please feel free to contact us.

*Sincerely,
Richard A. Bolte, Director
Department of Public Works”*

Alderman Moore – Does this hurt the possibility of funding in the future.

JP Walker – I can't answer that. That is something that would be answered by the state and SEWRPC.

Alderman Moore: Not only does the question remain out there as to if.

JP Walker: When and if, but you have to keep in mind the design of the intersection will be very similar if not exactly the same as Alternative 3A for that intersection. That meets the design standards required and all the professional concerns that we have discussed in all of our meetings. The fact that Calhoun Road may not be widened does not affect the fact that the intersection will be able to handle the traffic volume.

Alderman Moore: That is if it's constructed to a 4-lane intersection right?

JP Walker: Correct.

Alderman Moore: Mr. Matheson there is a specific difference in the petition that you mentioned. Could you explain more about the people wanting the 2-lane road because they were under the impression that they were going to lose their frontage road.

Ken Matheson – We met with one of the Alderman and the understanding was that if we went to a 4-lane road we would lose our frontage road, so they decided for that reason that they really needed to go with the 2-lanes. Now that we understand more clearly that we won't lose the frontage road we are in favor of the 4-lanes on Calhoun Road.

Alderman Moore: Could you give me a feeling as to what constrictions or backup problems that the trucks have now especially south bound when trying to make left turns?

Ken Matheson - Using Hader's Industries as an example of that when their trucks come out of Brookfield to their main plant to the one on Moorland it is easier for them to turn left on Rogers. I'd rather have.....

Alderman Ament – Point of order here, we aren't here to discuss 3A versus 1A. We're here to discuss 1A. We will be here all day if we are going to debate these. That is for the Council to decide, the Council instructed us to work on 1A, not 3a, not 2, not 1, not 8 but 1A and the problems that we could or would foresee and fit that within the budget.

Mayor Chiovatero – I agree with Alderman Ament, that we are to look at the Alternative 1A and then as soon as 1A conversation is going if it has some issues that concern the business owners we will consider it at that time.

Alderman Moore – I just wanted to say that is incorrect because at the City Council meeting not only did two Alderman who voted to send this back to the Board of Public Works state that they expected the discussion of 3A to continue at the Board of Public Works but it was then later re-discussed. I brought that very subject up and reiterated that the Board of Public Works would be expected to continue to discuss 3A. Nobody said at that time that was incorrect, and so I'm sorry, but it was understood at the Council meeting that 3A would be discussed here.

Mayor Chiovatero – All I'm saying is that we need to start discussing 1A. We are discussing 3A and the difference between two lanes and four lanes but we need to discuss 1A because it is what the requested

action was. You are right Alderman Moore that if it doesn't meet the needs there were some members of the Council that felt it had to be tweaked.

Alderman Moore – I think that due to the fact that representatives are here, I didn't want to lose the opportunity to hear from them.

JP Walker – Included in your packet is a memorandum from me dated June 6, 2007 with a series of 13 questions and or statements that need clarification associated with Alternative 1A. With your permission I'm going to read each question and hopefully we will get some kind of response. I'm going to point some of these questions directly at you Alderman Ament since you brought forth the requested action.

Question 1 –The total construction cost is not to exceed \$3,000,000. If construction cannot be completed for the \$3,000,000 or less, what does that do to the Project?

Alderman Ament – I think and this was the intent of the requested action is to stay within or below that \$3,000,000. What I assumed it would do, and that's why I was as specific as I could be in the requested action as to what was in and what was out, is if we accomplished everything that we have in there and say we came in at say \$2,000,000 and we decided that the median at Westward or some other amenity that would be appropriate to be in this project we could add that back in as an option back to the Council.

JP Walker – The reason that I asked the question because in your wording you say the "Lincoln Avenue intersection per the design already submitted for Alternative 3A is to be include." The price for that alone is 2 to \$2.5 million. I really am struggling as to how the rest of the work that would have to be done could be done for \$0.5 million.

Alderman Ament – That is certainly not what we would originally for the cost of that intersection. We are putting the cost of that intersection as the same as the Cleveland/Calhoun intersection.

JP Walker – There is a follow up question to that later on, but I will read it now. The Lincoln Avenue intersection is to be reconstructed per the Alternative 3A design, does that include the median islands to the north and south of the intersection?

Alderman Ament – Yes

JP Walker – Does that include the modification of the frontage road on the north side of Lincoln Avenue so that access is provided to the frontage road?

Alderman Ament – That is up for discussion.

JP Walker – It's that type of question that leads to the price of \$2 to \$2.5 million.

Question 2 – The RAS assumes that there will be a cost share of \$250,000 with Waukesha County towards the construction of the Cleveland Avenue intersection. What happens to the Project if the County does not receive STP Grand funds and does not reach an agreement with the City for a cost share of \$250,000?

Alderman Ament – I would say that it's pretty much on the same plain as if it was 3A, I would imagine seeing that we are not looking for any changes in 1A verses 3A that we would have the same situation other then.....I don't know how that would play into it anymore then I would any of the other options. The only thing that is if we constructed this to four lanes and the County didn't make that intersection four, which they are going to then it would be certainly more of a bottle neck then it is now. I don't know how we can address that at this point, no matter which one we look at, which is the reason I did not specifically include that in the requested action. Because that's going to be up to the County. Other then that I assume that Bloom and staff did the initial design for that intersection you were working with or at least get some approval from the County on that design. Because obviously if we were going to do it we can't

just build it we have to have their approval. I'm assuming that by that we should be a go on this, if it's not then we would have to address it as a separate issue no matter if it was 1A or 3A.

JP Walker – The County has reviewed the proposed design that was included in Alternative 3A for Cleveland and Calhoun Road, and are willing to approve it as designed. The real question is the timing of it. Is it going to be a decision that this City is going to make as to who is going to construct that intersection? That is a decision that Council will have to make so I will leave that for further discussion.

Mayor Chiovatero – I want to make sure we are clear on this. Because it's probably kind of confusing to the citizens. I don't think there is any disagreement on how the intersection could be constructed. The issue is to when and who is going to pay for it. My understanding when we met with the County was they approved the intersection as tentatively designed. When we met with the County we asked that either we pay for the entire intersection which I think when regarding the cost, we try to reduce it. The County says they will accelerate the project if you are willing to pay half of the local cost share, that's where the \$250,000 came from. If we wait until 2011 or 2012 there is a zero cost share to the City of New Berlin, correct?

JP Walker – I don't know that for a fact.

Mayor Chiovatero – I think that is my understanding. I thought how could we do Calhoun and just take the intersection out, but because that intersection is a huge part of what is driving the reconstruction of Calhoun. I don't think that we can, but I don't think we can wait until 2011 or 2012 to do that road. I just wanted to clarify who was going to pay for that.

JP Walker – The Mayor is correct. The letter that was read into the minutes does state “we will still do the project (we being the county) and fully fund the intersection; I certainly can interpret that as saying they will pay 100% of the costs. But I don't know that for a fact if that is really true, I don't know if the cost share with us is still on the table.

Mayor Chiovatero – If we do decide to go ahead and add capacity to Calhoun Road they are still currently willing to sit down with us to accelerate their schedule.

JP Walker - Alderman Ament you have already answered this but I will read it for the record. Question 3 – The RAS does not mention what is to be included in the design of the Cleveland Avenue intersection. Is Staff to assume that the intersection is to be reconstructed per the Alternative 3A design?

Alderman Ament – I would assume that's right because I know there are still some issues with primarily McDonalds, but I know that the gas station had some concerns. I don't know if that is something that we are addressing now because the County is involved in that. It's their approval. If we wanted to change that or they wanted to change that the County has to approve those changes. Is that correct?

JP Walker – Yes, that's correct. Those are the type of details that will be included in further work and what the ultimate decisions are made here at the Board, obviously that will include additional conversations and the County will have to sign off on that.

Alderman Ament – I will say yes to that then, what's in the requested action will stay the same.

JP Walker – Question 4 - The Lincoln Avenue intersection is to be reconstructed per the Alternative 3A design. Does that include the median islands to the north and south of the intersection? I have already read that one.

JP Walker – Question 5 – Does Alternative 1A include the relocation of the frontage road connections at Glendale Drive and Rogers Drive?

Alderman Ament – Can we go back to number four, I want to make sure we addressed the second question in there?

JP Walker – Does that include the modifications to the frontage road on the north side of Lincoln Avenue so that access is provided to the frontage road?

Alderman Ament – Maybe we did somewhat address that, I think we will see how that fits into the dollars, lets say for instance that would be something we would want to put back in there if the cost falls within that \$3 million or less, and if they do not we can throw that in as an option we are suggesting would become an option to be considered.

JP Walker – The reason this question was asked is because right now the access to the frontage road on Lincoln Avenue is blocked off by the barricades because it is too close to the intersection. The design that was included in Alternative 3A to connecting the frontage road to have traffic maneuvering for the semis and other vehicles using the frontage road moves the connection of the frontage road further to the east around the bio-retention swales. It is something that you need to seriously consider because of stormwater requirements.

Alderman Ament – As far as the road being connected any of them as a matter of fact primarily on the north side of the southern section and both sides of the northern section that we had in 3A, I guess the main concern of the businesses there is that the service road remain and the main reason in was there in the first place is so that trucks were not backing up or maneuver into a driveway off of Calhoun Road, that is why when they designed the Industrial Park they did that. I think it's important that it remain but as far as the access to it the barricades, something has to be done differently there, we have trucks using it as a parking lot. It would be desirable to eventually get that to swing east to get it hooked up to Lincoln and Rogers but at the same time we have land acquisition to get involved with. I don't know if that is the main focus of the road is the service roads, they can be used either way. Whether we can use one or all of them we will have to see how that plays out with the rest of the project.

Alderman Moore – Is this the proper job of the Board of Public Works, to figure out what a proposal is?

JP Walker – Yes, this is supposed to be a working session, getting direct input from the Board members so that staff and our consultant has clear understanding about Alternative 1A.

Alderman Moore – But it sounds like the question remains. Question #2 is not determined yet, the second question in number 4 is not determined yet. It seems to me that either this proposal includes these things or it doesn't.

JP Walker – The direction that I am hearing from Alderman Ament is that these are the things we need to have our consultant look at and come up with an estimate for that specific component. Right now we have a total cost estimate for Alternatives 1 thru 8. In Alternative 3A we had the most detailed cost estimates. Alderman Ament is suggesting that we look for specific things in his Requested Action Statement and cost out other items that need to be considered so we have a total understanding of the pieces and how we fit the pieces together.

JP Walker – Question 6 – The roadway surface from Greenfield Avenue to Cleveland Avenue is to be reconstructed to remain as a 2-lane road with removing existing asphalt and repaving the surface. The road base is to be repaired as needed to maximize the roadway life. There are areas along Calhoun Road that have had a history of poor drainage that may have compromised the integrity of the road base. Significant effort and costs may be required to maximize the roadway life in those areas. The point of clarification that I am looking for there are a number of areas along Calhoun Road where there is poor drainage, one that comes into mind right away is a low spot at Roosevelt that historically when you look back used to drain directly into Deer Creek. That is no longer available, so we have to be able to do something with storm water conveyance along Calhoun Road in order to get the proper control over that area. There are significant drainage issues by the intersections which I believe will be taken care of as part of the intersection reconstruction design. But there are also significant issues between the intersections that need to be looked at in order to maximize the life expectancy of an improved Calhoun Road. We have to get control over the storm water drainage, otherwise there is the potential that storm

water will set in the road base and exasperate the deterioration of Calhoun Road once it resurfaced. The point of the statements are that the storm water components are one of the issues that have to deal with to maximize the road life.

JP Walker – Alderman Ament what is your intent in 1A as far as storm water management components?

Alderman Ament – The only way I can think to answer that is to ask you a question first. That is what they did it with Lincoln Avenue. How did we determine the cost of making those repairs when we did Lincoln? We had a similar situation where we had certain areas of that road base that was pretty shaky and needed to be repaired. I would assume that without knowing where those areas are or roughly what their costs are.... Is that part of what you are addressing in Question 12? Maybe it will be easier to address it then.

Alderman Moore – I believe that the answer to the Lincoln Avenue question is in three from the May 18th memorandum. Reconstructing the Lincoln Avenue intersection must also include storm water management components. Installing left and right turn lanes in all directions, including storm water components will require transition areas and cost an estimated \$1.5 - \$2.0 Million.

Alderman Ament – I'm talking about the project when we paved Lincoln from Calhoun to Springdale.

JP Walker – On Lincoln Avenue, just for the audience to understand, we resurfaced Lincoln Avenue 4 to 5 years ago. There are wetlands on both sides where there are really no ditches, just wetlands up to the road. We put under drains in there so that it was a clear conduit for water to flow under the road from one side to the other and for water to move back and forth. Water doesn't flow anywhere there because it sits in those lowlands. It's a different situation here because water has to go somewhere and that somewhere is what was designed in Alternative 3A, the bio-retention swales, basins, storm sewer components etc.

JP Walker – Question 7 – Is it the Boards intention to have the geometric design requirements in the City's Developers Handbook for adding turn bays and tapers at intersections included in Alternative 1A?

Alderman Ament – There already is one at Liberty Lane, there is one at Glendale. As far as Westward and Rogers the original plan 1A that I was requesting did not include that, but if an estimate could come in with that as one of those other things that we may want to consider in discussions. In comments from former Alderman Gallagher that was an issue in that area. In discussions with the current Alderman it doesn't seem to be as important, but I can see where that could become an issue. I would like to at least see it as an option we could discuss later if we are within that \$3 million. Or at that time the Council could decide to add it. I would like to see it as an option though.

JP Walker – Question 8 – Is it the Board's intention to have side road improvements (adding wider approaches to Calhoun Road to provide right turn flares) included in Alternative 1A? That would specifically be Glendale, Rogers and Westward Drive as you get to the intersection.

Alderman Ament – You are talking about on the side roads themselves. We are already doing Lincoln, Ryerson and Glendale I would assume that would be part of that project to blend into this and be coordinated with it. Rogers, I don't know if it's an issue there, I've never noticed any backup going out onto Cleveland. As far as Westward I would say no, I don't see why we would need to do that.

JP Walker – Question 9 – Because of the wide shoulders that already exist, the roadway construction should provide for a 5-foot wide shoulder-sidepath on both sides of Calhoun Road. Staff has concerns about the lack of physical separation between pedestrians and motorized vehicles. The City's "*Bicycle and Pedestrian Facility Plan*" states in Chapter III Section A, to "include bike lanes and walkways when arterials are being built or reconstructed". The intent of that statement is to construct sidepath with a physical separation from the drive lanes. What is the Boards intention as far as the physical location of the side paths that are mentioned in the requested action statement?

Alderman Ament – The Alternative Transportation Plan does call for that to be a shoulder. It also calls for one to be on Beloit which is a County Highway, one of Cleveland which is a County highway; Cold Spring Road already has it, 124th Street calls for it. If the concern is the separation because it's traveling at 40 miles an hour, lets just spend a few bucks, buy a few 35 mile an hour speed limit signs and put those up. We have a relatively wide enough shoulder there to work with. If it's safe enough for some of the other roads, I don't know why it wouldn't be along Calhoun.

Alderman Moore – When I was on the Alternative Transportation Committee we didn't anticipate the reconstruction of Calhoun Road. If we had we would have recommended putting a sidepath along Calhoun Road. We had the whole city to deal with and to sit down and say whether or not it was going to be a bike lane or a walk way at each section, we just wanted to make sure that there was some means of somewhat of a separation and availability for bikes and pedestrians. There is also Chapter 3, section A which it says the walkways will be provided in construction when a situation like this occurs. If Alderman Ament wants the Alternative Transportation Committee to look at this they would include walkways along Calhoun.

Alderman Ament – I guess I will fall back on what our job is here, unless we want to look at that as an additional alternative down the road. Right now the requested action is to use the roadway and construct the shoulder sidepaths. I think we should stay on course and if there is a strong enough feeling to add that as an option that would be appropriate.

Mayor Chiovatero – As far as the on-road side paths I would tend to agree with Alderman Moore made, this is a different type of traffic, it is industrial as well as regular vehicular traffic. As far as the on-road design and on-road comments with 124th and the same with Beloit Road, those are not installed. We had to take a serious look at that time as to what kind of sidepaths we would put in. I think Alderman's Moore's comments were that they were trying to look for a route through the city when you are designing the Alternative Transportation Plan but the actual comments, I don't think they made any regarding an actual plan. When it comes to riding a bike along Calhoun Road, I have done it. I don't like it, but there is no way that I would walk along Calhoun Road. The one unique thing that Calhoun Road does have is the frontage road, even though there is Industrial type traffic along there, it is slower.

JP Walker – I'm on record as stating at various meetings that I have major concerns trying to mix pedestrians with motorized vehicles, it just doesn't work. As the Mayor just said, the intent of Calhoun Road is to not only handle local traffic, but regional traffic, whether we want to admit it or not and always will. It started out as being a County road, in the 70's it became the City's. Calhoun Road does handle industrial traffic and will continue to handle industrial traffic. My professional opinion is that there has to be physical separation, especially for the pedestrians who want to walk along Calhoun Road to get wherever their destination is.

JP Walker – Question 10 – We may have already answered this but I'm going to ask the question just for the record. The RAS does not mention bypass lanes at Rogers Drive, Westward Drive, Liberty Lane, or Glendale Drive. Is it the Board's intention that bypass lanes be installed where needed?

Alderman Ament – We did answer that and the answer was yes.

Alderman Moore – Are they included in 1A?

Alderman Ament – Liberty and Glendale already have them, I assume we wouldn't take them out.

JP Walker – This was for clarification, the answer was yes.

JP Walker – Question 11 – If Alternative 1A results in an increase of impervious surface exceeding 0.5 acres, MMSD Chapter 13 requirements will need to be met. Is it the Board's intent to include storm water BMP's in Alternative 1A?

Alderman Ament – The intent is to keep it from going over that ½ acre and to stay within what we have and that includes any additional roads or connections. If determine one or both of the service roads should be connected or bypassed east there will be a certain amount of pavement where it is existing now and shut off, which is where we are showing some of those bio-retention ponds. I would say that every effort should be made to stay within or under that half-acre, if any of the additional things we talk about take us over that. The intent was to not go over that ½ acre. Again we are eliminating the Cleveland Avenue intersection.

Alderman Moore – Alderman Ament are you saying then that you don't want to include the bio-retention swales and all the other storm water improvements that have been indicated by our Water Resources Division as necessary to be included with the reconstruction of Calhoun?

Alderman Ament – No, I'm not saying that.

Alderman Moore – So are you saying that you are including everything that is suggested to be included by our Water Resources Division as indicated as part of 3A?

Alderman Ament – If it's required. If you look at the intersection of Lincoln and Calhoun, if they are required and they will fit in the \$3 million, yes if we aren't going to bypass and run those roads east and connect to Lincoln there isn't going to be a place for them anyway unless we cut off some of that road. I don't know what the alternative would be there. If that's required for the intersection or not, we would have to add ½ acre or more.

Alderman Moore – The question is whether it needs to be part of your 1A?

Alderman Ament – If those retention ponds are part of 1A or part of that intersection and are there for that intersection, then yes.

Alderman Moore – Are all of the 3A storm water improvements part of 1A already?

Alderman Ament – No.

Alderman Moore – Do you feel that they should be?

Alderman Ament – I don't know what they would be, because you aren't creating that entire impervious surface. You are basically leaving the driving lanes for the most part, just the way they are. 3A adds another complete lane, so you will have more impervious surface and you would need more stormwater facilities which is where the ½ acre comes in. The intent was to stay within or below that half acre.

Alderman Moore – It seems to me that there was more then just impervious surface requirements here.

Mayor Chiovatero – Storm water along Calhoun Road was one of the main reasons for reconstruction of Calhoun Road. I think it needs to be included for reasons of the road base. Let's do the work and do it correctly. If we put in a new road and don't address the storm water it's only going to effect and deteriorate the new road sooner. If the storm water was related to the impervious surface I could see Alderman's Ament request right now. Let's keep the new impervious surface to less, then ½ acre we won't have to do these improvements. What alternative 1A does not address one of the main issues along Calhoun Road is storm water.

Alderman Ament – He was very clear about the question. His questions was "Do you want the storm water improvements to be the same as 3A?" My answer is no we are going to have less then what we would have with 3A, we would have somewhat less. Do I want it addressed, obviously. How much less it's going to be is peel off two lanes for 1.7 miles.

JP Walker – The stormwater components that are required for any roadway reconstruction is to put it in your words to maximize the life of the roadways. We have to be able to get the storm water or the water

that is penetrating the stone under the pavement out from underneath the pavement. It has to get to a storm water conveyance system, a bio-retention, an uptake by vegetation. It has to be moved away from the road, to it's ultimate location, which in the area of Calhoun Road would be either Deer Creek or Poplar Creek. Whether its alternative 3A or 1A, both alternatives have to be looked at in order to maximize the potential for protecting the roadways.

Alderman Ament – I agree with that. The question was do I want to do it the same as 3A and the answer is no, because we wouldn't have as much impervious surface.

JP Walker – When Alternative 3A was designed it was designed for a road that had curb and gutter. It had catch basins and inlets directing toward a storm sewer. The storm sewer most likely would have been located under a driving lane. In Alternative 1A you don't have that option. We have techniques available to the City for putting storm sewer under properly located ditches. We call that our "Gatewood Technique". We did that with great success in the Gatewood Subdivision. That adds costs because you are putting in twice the amount of storm sewer piping. Yes, it is a smaller diameter but the material costs and construction costs associated to install the additional piping does add up. Until we see those numbers from our consultant we will have to present it as a design component for future consideration.

Eric Nitschke – When we look at projects in the City, we break it down by different levels of problems. There are different areas that we have to look at. I think there is some confusion between 1A and 3A in the different stormwater components. 3A is a full reconstruction project; 1A is a retrofit when talking about stormwater components. As we have discussed in the past the major issues are regulatory requirements which we are talking about if you increase the impervious area more then a half acre. You have to follow MMSD Chapter 13 requirements; you also have to follow the WDNR 216 and 151 requirements for water quality. You also have to look at historical drainage problems. When we are talking about retrofitting in 1A we aren't addressing storm water drainage problems along the entire corridor of the road. It is a lot different when you're talking about retrofitting Cold Spring Road, now that there is a functional storm water conveyance system along that road or if you are talking about retrofitting Calhoun Road because there is not a functional conveyance system along Calhoun Road. According to all the design standards that we have, we are undersized on the ditches that we have, undersized on the cross culverts and in some areas it just flat out fails. The third issue is what are the impacts to downstream and upstream conditions. What are you going to be doing to water that is coming into the system, what are you going to be doing to water that is leaving the system and when you are discussing the difference between 3A and 1A reconstruction or retrofitting, you still have to address what's happening to the downstream condition. That's where we look at storm water management citywide. We typically look at a region and start with the downstream conditions and work our way up. However, the way the Industrial Park was built and the way the subdivisions around the Industrial Park were built storm water management was not a priority. So in this instance the storm water management actually has to start in the upstream end and work it's way downstream so that you are addressing the impact as you go downstream instead of upstream and that is a key component. When we talk about not increasing impervious area more then ½ acre in 1A, that eliminates one component, we don't have to fulfill our MMSD Chapter 13 requirements, but we still have our 216 and 151 requirements through WDNR. We also haven't addressed the regional storm water problems that the residents have fully made us aware of. It's not just one specific location; we are talking about Calhoun Road, Glendale, Lincoln Avenue, and the Lincoln Avenue drainage easement, Westward & Rogers, Roosevelt, Fullerton and Addison. There are specific problems that are unique to each individual area. Those have specific solutions to them, so that's not being addressed in 1A. We also aren't addressing the downstream component as well. The Water Resource Utility is aware of the problems in the downstream. They are doing their best from first to last and worst to least worst. That's where some of the work is going to be done on the Lincoln Avenue easement first, but there are still problems at Fullerton. A resident got up and spoke about the flooding downstream from him, problems at Rogers where there is no discharge point and the discharge point that it should be going to is a wetland. We have problems with crossing the railroad, problems at Westward, problems with flooding at Glendale and problems at Cleveland Avenue. So please be careful when talking about the differences between 3A and 1A because 3A was a reconstruction redoing the conveyance system. 1A you are talking about retrofitting, you are basically talking about leaving the system as it is unless you are going to put in a lot of time and money into doing the stormwater

management that is necessary to prevent some of these problems that are occurring. Last, I do want to point out that there is a lot of talk about the consultant should have solved all these issues in 3A. It's very counterproductive to do storm water management when you are doing a design project right in the very beginning because things change as the project progresses. The general rule of thumb is that you get your roadway project up to about 60% plans before you fully get into the storm water components. 3A was at 60% plans so there is a rough estimate for storm water management but they haven't delved into the real meat of what needs to be done for the storm water components. That's an industry standard that's a design standard because, as we found out on Cold Spring Road, you get to a certain point and changes are made adding speed tables, all of a sudden your inlets have to be completely relocated and there is a lot of design work and expenses that go into redoing your storm water management system as the road design is progressing. Now that you are looking at 1A, there are still problems out there that residents have made us fully aware of and there is going to be a lot of expense in completing this.

Alderman Ament – But we don't know what those expenses are for 3A either yet.

Eric Nitschke – We have a rough estimate for 3A for the conveyance system. Basically they have the main conveyance system, the storm sewer or ditching system, cross culverts, those types of things. But when you get into the meat of the number of inlets, the size of the bio-retention swales, the plantings, the specific tweaks, where are the discharge points, etc. They have to address this downstream condition versus that downstream condition that's what they haven't gotten into. They have a ballpark figure but they aren't getting into downstream impacts and specifics of the system.

Alderman Ament – I understand why they have to do that. I think we have the same basic situation. It wasn't a rough estimate for storm water for 1A. If memory serves me correct it was about \$600,000 for 1A as a rough estimate. I'm trying to answer the question with the limited information that we have and at the same time I'm told that both the consultant and staff can't even give that to us for 3A at 60% along. I can't answer these all specifically other than try and give you direction. Question 12 again ties into some of these other questions and if they are part of having to do the roadway and provide for the road to maximize its life then it should be part of it, yes. We don't know what those numbers are yet anymore then we do with 3A.

Eric Nitschke – You are looking at two completely different components between 1A and 3A. I can tell you that if you are looking at maximizing the life of the road, the storm water components have to be completed based on historical problems that we have seen in this area. I can guarantee that the storm water components are going to cost more than anticipated. The Lincoln Avenue drainage easement was a prime example. Our estimate three years ago was \$300,000. We just bid the project for \$500,000.

Alderman Ament – We also could have the same thing with 3A. In question 13 it states "Storm water management solutions are typically added to the design after there is general agreement of the 60% design. We were further ahead with 3A than we are with 1A but we are really faced with the same questions.

Eric Nitschke – It's very difficult because you can't get your answers right up front with storm water management but what makes it even more difficult is setting a specific number and saying we are going to hit this without knowing those variables.

JP Walker – With the statements the Eric has just made and Alderman Ament has just made we have basically covered items 12 and 13. For the record, I want to read the bullet points that I have in item 12. The following drainage problem areas need to be addressed as part of Alternative 1A:

- Fullerton Avenue cross culvert and drainage ditch on the west side of Calhoun Road
- Roosevelt Drive cross culvert and cross culvert on Calhoun Road near Roosevelt Drive
- Cross culvert at Westward Drive
- Cross culvert north of Lincoln Avenue
- Drainage at Glendale Drive
- Drainage at Cleveland Avenue

These are key storm water related areas that need to be part of any solution in any alternative that applies to Calhoun Road. Item 13 has already been discussed. A couple of other questions that I want to make sure that the Board is aware of especially when we look at a ceiling of \$3,000,000 cost. The cost estimates that we have been dealing with to date are based on 2006 dollars, which applies to all alternatives. We are half way through 2007 the design that will be worked on further with our consultant I assume will be using 2007 dollars. If we can estimate 2008 dollars we certainly would, just so you have an understanding as to how costs increase over time. Serious consideration has to be given to the timing of reconstruction of whatever it may be on Calhoun Road. We have heard from the County that they are looking at their work in 2011 or 2012. I don't think Calhoun Road is going to last that long. Part of the decision that the Board has to make and recommend to the Council is what can we do between now and 2011? That has to take some serious discussion because there are certainly cost impacts and we don't want to be doing something that in a few years is going to be torn up.

Alderman Moore – Is there any possibility with the reconstruction of Cleveland Intersection, Lincoln intersection, all the additional turn lanes that have been discussed, the bike lane goes 1.7 miles to the north and 1.7 miles to the south, all of that impervious surface added, is there any possibility that is less than ½ acre?

JP Walker – I would say the answer is no.

Alderman Moore – So even with the basic money we are going to have to take a look at the best storm water in this alternative.

JP Walker – My opinion is yes.

Alderman Ament - Ron, the frontage road, from the letter on May 18th from JP, resurfacing the existing frontage road will cost and estimated \$207,000. Do we have a paser rating on just those roads? Is this something that can be just cracked sealed?

Ron Schildt – They are probably going to need to more than just being cracked sealed.

Alderman Moore – There may be some items on the May 18th letter that may not have been discussed, I would like to know in the \$207,000 how much of the frontage road section is included in 1A?

Alderman Ament – It was in 3A so I assume it would be in 1A. I just wanted to get some back up information from Ron on that, but being on it everyday I don't think it is rough, it's not falling apart but it is alligator cracked. I don't know if it could just be sealed unless you cover the whole thing.

Alderman Moore – So it may have to be added to 1A.

Alderman Ament – I already did.

JP Walker – Toward the end of the main paragraph in the requested action it says “both sections of the Industrial Park service drive on the east side of Calhoun to remain in place and to be resurfaced”.

Alderman Moore – Is there anything else on that May 18th letter that needs to be clarified in relation to this latest proposal?

JP Walker – The largest item on that May 18th letter is item 8, traffic capacity. Two lanes will not handle the current traffic capacity, when you factor in the conflict with side paths and the conflict with driveways.

Alderman Moore – What are the minimums?

JP Walker – The threshold that is typically used is 13,000 vehicles per day. The latest traffic counts say we are just under that. What's not being factored in is the number of vehicles that are avoiding Calhoun

Road right now because of its condition. When Calhoun Road is resurfaced and changed to four lanes in Brookfield you are going to see an increase in traffic. It will certainly exceed the 13,000 vehicles per day which is the threshold for changing to two lanes. Staff and our consultant have been saying that for two years. That is the design standards for the industry.

Alderman Moore – I seem to remember something about 9,000.

JP Walker – There was a table that was part of the power point presentation that looked at worst case conditions for a two-lane road versus the best case conditions. The worst case condition was 9,000 vehicles per day and the best case it is just over 22,000 per day. Calhoun Road is listed at 13,000 per day and that is the threshold for changing from two lanes to four lanes.

Alderman Moore – Is there a possibility that there are some people that are not driving on Calhoun Road right now specifically during the time the counters were out there purposely to keep the counts down?

JP Walker – I have no way of knowing that. I can tell you that Alderman Poshepny stated at the Council he will drive north on Calhoun but he will not drive south. I can make a leap and say there are other drivers out there doing the same thing, or avoiding Calhoun Road altogether.

Alderman Moore – Is there anything else on the May 18th letter that has to be discussed?

JP Walker – The largest contention is the difference in opinion in costs. I laid out a figure of \$3.8 - \$4.3 million for alternative 1A instead of the figure that Alderman Ament had. Until we get to the actual components and break it all down and bring those costs back to the Board we won't know. I don't believe the costs are in the low range. I believe they are closer to what I had put in my memorandum.

Alderman Moore – I have heard that we can do that if it stays within the \$3 million. It seems to me using money to determine what we are supposed to do along Calhoun is the inappropriate thing. Either something should or shouldn't be done and I would hope that as we discuss this in the future that we take a look and each and everything that we do or not do and make the decision as to whether it should or should not be done, rather than just say it doesn't fit within the \$3 million range.

JP Walker – I have used the term professional concerns, you can see these up on the screen. You will see that safety, traffic capacity, avoid delays, optimize life cycle costs, construction time, assured dependability, assure convenience and satisfy drainage and stormwater management criteria. At that presentation Alternative 3A ranked first, Alternative 1 was 10th. The original Alternative 8 is very close to what Alternative 1A is, the difference is that Alternative 8 said reconstruct two-lanes, where 1A said resurface two-lanes, that is really the only difference. Alternative 8 was ranked 9th. It does not meet the professional concerns.

Alderman Moore – You are saying that Alternative 1A is not going to take care of what needs to be done in relation to reconstructing. You are saying it is just a resurfacing?

JP Walker – Resurfacing with improvements to the road base.

Alderman Moore – What about those areas that don't get those so called improvements? How long will they last?

JP Walker – I don't think there is four years of life left in Calhoun Road.

Alderman Moore – At any place along there?

JP Walker – At most places along there.

Alderman Moore – Are you saying if we improve the road base, based on 1A we are going to dig down a little bit in certain sections and improve that and then do this whole resurfacing and essentially make a five year road?

JP Walker – We have data available to us, from geotechnical borings performed along Calhoun Road. Based on the data that was obtained I can say with a certainty that at least 20% of Calhoun Road has problems below grade. There is probably more than that. I can also say that in order to maximize the life of an improved road we have to improve drainage; we have to be able to get water out from underneath the pavement quickly. We have to increase the cross slope of the road. Our handbook requires a 3% crown, which means from the center to the sides it slopes at 3% to help get water off of the pavement. We have to look at areas of the base and sub-base that will not pass proof rolling. What that means it has to have a certain capability of being compacted and create a solid surface on which to put the base stone and pavement, otherwise you are going to have the differential movement of the pavement which leads to the cracking prematurely. All that has to be looked at as part of 1A. Is that close to a reconstruction of the road? Yes. In some areas we can mill and remove the existing pavement and create the proper cross slopes with the proper storm water components in place, do the proof rolling. If it passes the proof rolling it's ready to be resurfaced. Yes, it's close to a total reconstruction. That is the difference between 1A and the original 8.

Alderman Moore – How long would you expect the road on that basis to last?

JP Walker – If it has all the storm water components in place, 10 years.

Alderman Moore – What would we be facing in 10 years?

JP Walker – The same issue we are right now.

Alderman Moore – Instead of a reconstruction that would last how many years?

JP Walker – 20 years. You have to take into account the traffic issues on Calhoun Road, the heavy vehicles not just the common everyday traffic. As the term has been used, some would consider this a band-aid approach; it is not something that Staff is endorsing.

Mayor Chiovatero – Looking at the 1A alternative as compared to any of those that are on the screen every alternative agrees that something has to be done. We all agree it's getting worse every day. We also agree that costs are accelerating everyday as we sit here and discuss this. So we need to make sure whether we go with Alternative 1A or we go with some other alternative we keep moving this as fast as we can. Otherwise it won't be an issue in 2011 or 2012 because we will still be sitting here discussing it at that time. Some of the things that we do disagree on is the design. We have to make sure we design this correctly. There seems to be concern about storm water. Alderman Ament and Alderman Seidl's requested action was to get the basic road resurfaced and improve some intersections. It will get us through and of course if there are some things we can get within the \$3 million we will do it. I disagree with the \$3 million dollars at this time after looking at all the stuff we talked about today. I think it's going to be really tough to keep it under \$3 million dollars. I think the costs in the requested action from Alderman Ament and Alderman Seidl were minimized but it did bring to attention to get this looked at. So we have to look at this alternative. But at the same time, I don't want to take a chance of building a road that will not last. We all know that Calhoun Road is years past when it was supposed to be redone. Whether we build this road with the intent that it's either 5 years or 10 years before we have to do something else, we all know that by then there will be other roads and issues to keep pushing Calhoun Road off. Let's get something done. JP do you have enough information to work with the consultant?

JP Walker – I think we have enough information to start; there will be questions that come up along the way, which we will discuss at future Board meetings.

Alderman Augustine – How soon would we be able to come up with figures on this and if there are questions that come up along the way there are ways to interact and address those so as Mayor Chiovatero says to keep moving forward?

Chris Rossmiller – Probably two months, August most likely

Alderman Augustine: I ask that if any questions come up by the Board that need to be answered before our August meeting, please e-mail them to JP, so he can answer them as needed.

JP Walker – If specific questions come up and we aren't near a scheduled Board meeting I will send out e-mails to the Board members requesting responses. Because really we are trying to deal with this as a working session like we are today working our way through all the issues that may come up as part of putting together what is called Alternative 1A.

Mayor Chiovatero – All I ask of the consultant and the staff is I would like to see these done on a timely basis. I think everyone deserves to get this looked at in an expedited manner to make sure we do the right thing. Two months seems kind of long, but I understand there is a lot of work that needs to be done. If there is anything we can do to accelerate this please do so but don't compromise the intent.

Alderman Augustine – Speaking of the next meeting, because I have full time work obligations in July and JP said that there at this time aren't any issues for a July meeting that possibly our next meeting would be in August at the regular time and be able to get some things addressed at that point. Would that seem to work for the other members of the Board?

JP Walker – I look at the issues that come forth to the Board. We have dealt with all the contract issues this year. I'm not aware of any development agreements coming up. There is a very good likelihood that we won't have any new items for July.

Alderman Augustine – Because we have been skipping around a lot on these on the third Monday or are we on the second Monday of the month?

JP Walker – Our regular schedule is the third Monday of the month. I think this is the third time this year that we have had to change it, we don't have it on the agenda to reconsider changing the dates, if that is something that wants to be brought up again that is something we can discuss at the next meeting. Or we can leave it as a flexible schedule.

Alderman Augustine – So it should be the third Monday of the month so therefore it would be on August 20th.

Mayor Chiovatero – Just for the record I requested that this one be changed because I will be at a conference next week. Right now it will be the third Monday of August.

Alderman Ament – I think we arrived at this date because it would coordinate between the Plan Commission and the Council so when we have time-sensitive issues like Developers Agreements we could time those out so we weren't delaying the project for a month or something.

Alderman Moore – I want to ask about the 20 year plan for any road. Once the 20 years is up is that an average? Does it then require a full reconstruction at that point?

JP Walker – Every road is different, I can't make a general statement.

Ron Schildt – Most roads can last for different periods of time but it really depends on what the maintenance is. That's what we have been striving to do. We try to make sure our maintenance schedule keeps up with. If you graph it out you see that the road declines and what with the PASER rating and everything it usually stays up in the 7 or 8 rating first and then as the base starts to wear out and you get distress on the pavement the rating drops quite fast. If you can do something to extend it out a ways, you

have a small maintenance job where you fix some parts of the problem it brings it out a little farther. The problem is that we don't usually get around to that as we did at the Board before we showed that our cycle is over a thirty year period before we actually get to a road again. Normally if you are doing routine maintenance you are probably looking at 30 years before you would have to do a major reconstruction but because we haven't been able to stay at that cycle it is probably at a 20 year cycle where it needs to have major stuff done.

Alderman Moore – Is it possible that if this is taking all the way down to the base and reconstructed that it could last as long as 30 years.

Ron Schildt – I would say probably not, when you're talking about part of the base out.

Alderman Moore – I was talking about taking the whole base out.

Ron Schildt – Probably not, a full reconstruction if you were to do that and maintained proper maintenance over those years you probably could stretch it out. Some people would say the Calhoun Road is past its cycle now but it is still drivable but it's a rough ride. With the amount of traffic our 30-year cycle is meant more for a residential road with lighter traffic where you don't have the trucks. Calhoun will probably take a number of things to just make it to its twenty years because of the traffic capacity and heavy trucks that travel on there.

Alderman Moore – The twenty years is assuming that we do a full reconstruction.

Ron Schildt – Even with that it won't last as long as a typical residential street.

Alderman Moore – Do you know when the last time reconstruction was done on Calhoun Road?

Ron Schildt – I don't know, in that section. I think in the late 80's the section from National to Cleveland was re-done. I'm not sure about the section North of Cleveland.

JP Walker – It was resurfaced in 1983 but that was not a total reconstruction, I don't think it was totally reconstructed since it was originally constructed.

Alderman Moore – So the gradual increase of traffic is a significant factor here then.

Ron Schildt – We charted before what the traffic volumes were back in the 60s and the curve actually follows what the population of New Berlin is, which makes sense. The traffic volume has increased because of the Industrial Park and with the heavy trucks on Calhoun it causes the road to deteriorate further and further.

JP Walker made a motion to adjourn.

Alderman Ament 2nd the motion.

Meeting adjourned at 10:35 AM.