

MINUTES
BOARD OF PUBLIC WORKS MEETING
December 17, 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 Chiovaturo, City Engineer J.P. Walker, Alderman Moore, Alderman Augustine & Alderman Ament.

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

Alderman Augustine asked if there was anyone wishing to speak at the Privilege of the Floor.

Vernon Bentley - 2450 S. Johnson Road - At the Operating Budget Public Hearing I wanted to discuss the 124th Street road project. I was told we weren't discussing the CIP budget that night even though it was agendaized. The City had informational meetings and said they would update the residents further. I talked to people last night after 10:00PM who said they had no clue about this meeting. At the budget meeting all we heard was how tough this year's budget was and next years is going to even be worse. Money was taken out of road rehabilitation and now this money might be used on sidewalks; fiscally irresponsible. There is still no plan for sidewalk maintenance. Either way it will be a burden to residents and an added expense to all tax payers. The residents have said they would put up privacy fences to maintain their quality of life, another unnecessary added expense. Three of the communities are not including sidewalks in their plans. New Berlin sidepaths will go nowhere. The residents were told this plan was waiting for funding. Before this plan is approved or finalized it should go back to the residents. This paperwork was handed out at the meeting. It says that the concepts presented here are very preliminary and are intended to solicit input and discussion. I want to listen to today's discussion. One of the Aldermen on this Board gave a lengthy discussion about sidepath maintenance and there were no changes. It was sent to the Council where it remains tabled. At the last Council meeting he gave a lengthy talk about purchasing Hybrid Cars for the City that get 54 miles to the gallon. I haven't checked the parking lot yet to see if he drove his Chevy van here today that only gets 10 miles to the gallon. To sight another example the same Alderman, after a discussion about a referendum for the paramedic program said that we should "listen to the residents"; does this also include the residents along the 124th street road project? It would be nice to see a little consistency. Just a point to let you know how hypocritical this sounds to some of us in the audience. Thank You.

The meeting was called to order at 8:00 AM.

OLD BUSINESS

ITEM 01-07 Approval of the Minutes from the October 15, 2007 meeting.

Motion by Alderman Ament to approve the minutes.

Alderman Moore 2nd the motion.

Upon voting the motion passed unanimously.

ITEM 27-07 Reallocation of Funds from the Ryerson Road & Lincoln Avenue Design Accounts to the Greenfield Avenue Reconstruction Account (tabled at September meeting)

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 and the transfer of an additional \$50,000 of approved funds from the Lincoln Avenue Design Account 04251100 63014 C2007 to the Greenfield Avenue Reconstruction Account

04251100 63002 C2006 to complete the reconstruction of Greenfield Avenue from 882 feet east of Westwood Road (600 feet east of Baythorn Way in Brookfield) to just east of Johnson Road.

JP Walker made the motion to remove from the table.

Alderman Ament 2nd the motion.

Upon voting the motion to remove from the table passed unanimously.

Mayor Chiovatero – Two weeks ago the State asked to meet with me and City and Town of Brookfield. It was the State's last ditch effort to come to us and say we want you to look at this one more time to see what we could do to get this gap constructed. Basically make us an offer and we will take a look at it. Being not what the offer was, but a solution as to how to get it done. The ball basically lies with the Town of Brookfield. Their fair share would be \$723,000 and they offered \$225,000. The Town Chairman was going to go back to his Board to see if he could get them to put more money in their equation. In the meantime the City of Brookfield discussed that they were willing to add another \$130,000. There was going to be some discussion between the Town and the City on that. I had said that I had brought to the Board for the chance of adding \$100,000 and it was voted down. The Board members pretty well said that if they can't get any answers they aren't going to put any more money in are concerned about the \$1.9 million they have sitting there and that will start to be collecting arbitize on that. We had some questions about the sidepaths and we never received the answers to our questions on that. They apologized for not getting back to us on the sidepaths. As far as the sidepaths go near the gap, I said it was our understanding the sidepaths were going to be taken care of whether the gap was completed or not. They disagreed; they said no they weren't going to put the sidepaths in unless we do the gap. I don't remember the conversation but some of the other members remembered the conversation and felt that it was going to be done. So then I talked about the sidepaths at the east end that we were concerned about those not being completed and he said there were some issues with the elevations and notes can be found in our environmental files. Neither the City Engineer nor the Director of Community Development knew of any environmental files. In the meantime we agreed to talk to the City and Town of Waukesha. I could not get hold of the City of Brookfield and the Mayor was going to contact the Town. The Mayor did call me on Friday. He had some questions about the gap and how we were going to try and get it finished. The point of contention came up with the Town of Brookfield that all they were looking for was a border agreement and they would pay for their fair share. The way I see it right now, it is probably in the hands of the City and Town of Brookfield to solidify their border agreements. So I feel that this item should be removed from our agenda.

Alderman Moore made a motion to remove from the agenda.

Alderman Ament 2nd the motion.

Upon voting the motion passes unanimously.

NEW BUSINESS

ITEM 30-07 Creation of a Development Agreement for Condominium Developments

JP Walker: The requested action is to request the Board of Public Works to approve the newly created template for Development Agreements for Condominium developments.

JP Walker: I move that we approve the newly created template for Development Agreements for Condominium Developments.

Alderman Ament 2nd the motion

Alderman Ament: I assume the language is the same as in all developer's agreements

JP Walker: The only change is the wording is in green in Paragraph IX.B.6.

Alderman Ament: The wording on pages 9 & 10 that is about private roads is that added or is that just re-worded?

JP Walker: That's the wording that stays in the template. It only applies if we have private roads.

Alderman Moore: On page 14 in the green wording it refers to all common areas. Is this just inside the buildings or all common areas including outside?

JP Walker: The intent of all common areas refers to the interior of the building. It doesn't refer to the outside common areas because that's covered elsewhere and that's a requirement to be covered under Paragraph B.2 on page 13. So in this respect it is referring to the common areas inside the building itself.

Alderman Moore: So when Paragraph B.2 talks about the exterior it not only refers to the building itself, I see it includes landscaping, we want to make sure everything within the development is complete as well, for an example a swimming pool or something like that?

JP Walker: Not necessarily. You have to take into account the location of the building itself. If the development is being phased, you also have to take into account the phasing, because there also may be other areas of the development that are in a subsequent phase. That wouldn't be expected to be done to approve a unit in a previous phase.

Alderman Moore: What if a recreation building were going to be built would they have to wait for that?

JP Walker: It depends on the phasing that is proposed by the developer. For example, if there is a clubhouse that is planned for the second phase of the development, we can't expect that to be done to approve a unit in the first phase.

Alderman Moore: Are the phasing portions close enough together so that anyone moving into the condos would not be living there for years for those kinds of buildings to be completed?

JP Walker: It is all considered on a case by case basis. I would expect that the area immediately adjacent to any building that is requesting occupancy would be completed so that there are no negative impacts to the perspective new owner that is moving in.

Alderman Moore: I'm asking if the rules are such that the common areas are completed within a certain period of time.

JP Walker: I'm not aware of any specific language that requires that. I would believe that this is an area of contention that would go through the Plan Commission and onto the Council to make sure that is a condition of approval.

Mayor Chiovatero: I would think that would be a contractual issue between the owner and the developer. Whether a swimming pool or clubhouse is built would have nothing to do with us. I see common areas to be basements with storage areas, stairways, hallways, obviously the utility rooms would have to be finished as well as the immediate areas outside the building requesting occupancy.

JP Walker: In general the developer's agreements deal mainly with the infrastructure. It also deals with building and occupancy permits. The conditions of approval that you are referring to are not merited through the developer's agreement, but they are conditions of approval through the Plan Commission.

Alderman Moore: I was also wondering what the definitions of common areas is? I could have assumed that the common areas meant all common areas exterior and interior of the buildings.

JP Walker: The complete sentence says, all common areas...have to be completed in accordance with City ordinances and State Building Codes and pass final inspection prior to any occupancy permits being issued.

Upon voting the motion passed unanimously.

ITEM 31-07 Redesign of 124th Street and a Portion of Grange Avenue

JP Walker: Request that the Board of Public Works discuss and approve the design components for the 124th Street project, and I so move.

Alderman Moore 2nd the motion.

JP Walker: Earlier in 2007 the City entered into an inter-municipal agreement with the City of Greenfield and the Village of Hales Corners in which all three communities agreed to cost share in the redesign of 124th Street. So what we are bringing forth today are the design components that have been prepared by the Crispell-Snyder, our selected consultant on the project.

Alderman Augustine: We have to in the final analysis come up with which one of these options we would like to do?

JP Walker: No, its part of the design component, so we have to look at the specific design components and decide is there is any alternative that the Board has a consensus on.

Ron Schildt gave visual demonstration of the three different design alternatives as related to sidepath location:

- 10' Wide Side path located 1' inside of the ROW limits along the west side of 124th Street

- 10' Wide Side path located 15' from the shoulder along the west side of 124th Street

- 5' Wide Paved Shoulder on both sides of 124th Street

Alderman Moore: The people that I have been in contact with regarding 124th Street have the following concerns about the sidepath: They want to make sure it wouldn't add to flooding issues along 124th Street and they didn't want the path too close to the trees. In the northerly section just south of the interstate there are shrubs close to the roadway. Is this path as close as to the expected road right-of-way as possible or can it be moved closer in the section?

Ron Schildt: It could be moved a little closer, but the problem that we have is that we have a ditch there, which could be moved to the other side. It could be moved a little closer but obviously the closer to the road it gets it loses some of its safety factors.

Alderman Moore: Just in that section I would recommend that it be moved just a little closer because either the sidepath will be going down a tunnel of shrubs or too many of them would have to be removed, and also the ditch being moved to the far side of the shrubs so we would leave as many shrubs as possible along there.

Ron Schildt: One of the things that we are going to have to do is cross over to the east side of the roadway just south of I-43. The State is planning to re-do the bridge over I-43 and their plans were to plan a sidewalk on the east side. Their plans are too far along to change. We could possibly look at coming a little bit further south and cross over even sooner.

Alderman Moore: That would be the 2nd plan in our packets with the modifications that I would favor.

Alderman Augustine: Are the other communities going to be putting in sidepaths or do we not know that at this point?

Ron Schildt: This would be the trail system for 124th Street. It would serve all the people along there. When you get to Hales Corners they have very limited amounts of right-of-way. The areas that they would need to purchase are very limited. The west side is better from the standpoint of driveways and other things that would cross the path. Most of the houses on the west side have their driveways coming out onto some other street so it would be a consideration. In addition the right-of-way on the west side is already there so it wouldn't need to be purchase, where as on the east side they would have to purchase additional right-of-way to put the path in which would be hard to do considering where most of the houses are located.

Alderman Augustine: Because of the policies that we have in place does this mean that we would maintain these sidepaths?

Ron Schildt: That is in the maintenance agreement that is being considered at this time and how it is worded.

JP Walker: I will give you the overall project broken down.

- 1st section-Grange Avenue heading north to I-43. Right now it is 22'-24' wide. With the 3' shoulder it will now be 30' wide.
- 2nd section-The overpass at I-43 and Layton, which is under State jurisdiction. We aren't anticipating anything in that zone other than just making sure that if there is going to be a sidepath that there is an actual connection where the State had called for it to be.
- 3rd section-Layton to Beloit Road, This is going to be converted to a 36' wide urban cross section with storm sewer. There is a need for storm sewer in this area, and a limited area for rural ditching, being an urban cross section it will have curb and gutter and 40' of pavement. 40' is the face of curb to face of curb dimension.
- 4th section- Beloit Road to south of Cold Spring Road – Already 48" wide we are just planning to mill 2" from curb flange to curb flange.
- 5th section –On Grange Avenue there is a line of sight issue with 124th Street. The hill will be lowered 6' starting just east of St. Mary's Drive in New Berlin to 121st Street in Hales Corners.

Alderman Ament: If there is a frontage road on Grange Avenue, why are we putting in sidepaths along there?

JP Walker: There are no sidepaths being designed for Grange Avenue in New Berlin.

Alderman Ament: When I look at the Alternative Transportation Plan I see no sidepaths. Are we just hanging our hat on the part of the Plan that calls for looking at them every time we do reconstruction? On the Requested Action Statement it says that the Plan also lists 124th Street as being constructed with wide paved shoulders to accommodate bicyclist. There is no way I'm going to support this when we can use the shoulder of the road. If the City does maintain this sidepath it's going to be quite costly, and if the residents do it they would have to come all the way around the block to get to their section of the sidepath. I feel they should be either on Greenfield and Hales Corners side of the road. I feel we should stick with the shoulders and have no sidepaths along there.

Alderman Moore: I think it is a fear factor being given to the citizens that they are going to be responsible for these walkways, when in our current policy it states that only if a sidewalk/sidepath crosses their driveway are they required to keep it clean.

Alderman Ament: JP, you said that we are going to cross the sidepaths on the east side near I-43?

JP Walker: On the bridge over I-43, yes.

Alderman Ament: I heard earlier that you want to avoid the conflict with the driveways on 124th Street on the Hales Corners and Greenfield side. If I was a pedestrian and wanted to walk through the snow I would rather cross a driveway than try to cross 124th Street to get to the other side and continue my walk or ride my bike. Again a shoulder path is what we should have there and from the maintenance standpoint I don't think it's a fear tactic. They have the right to know that it could happen and that they are going to have to pay for it. Even if the maintenance plan stays where it is, certainly somebody is going to have to pay for it, because if we are going to have to pay for all the sidepaths in the City where it's along a backyard, it's going to be costly. What's the purpose of having them partially maintained? I would say to include this in the motion to the Council would be to go with the third option on the list, which is 5' wide paved shoulder on both sides of the roadway.

Alderman Ament: I would like to move that the original motion includes bullet point #3, which is a 5' wide paved shoulder on both sides of the road.

Alderman Augustine: 2nd for discussion purposes.

JP Walker: Is that a friendly amendment?

Alderman Ament: I am adding it to the motion.

Alderman Poshepny: This is an emotional issue for the residents along 124th Street. I also want to point out that there is the fear of God being put in these people that no matter where the sidepath is put on their property it is going to devalue their property. We don't think that's true; when we had this meeting there was a lady that pushed this. We have to be sure that this is a fair situation; I will ask the City Assessor to make some assessments on properties that have side paths and what has happened over the years. The crazy thing is that when we talked to these people, we told them that we probably aren't going to destroy your property and tear down trees, we will do a minimum of trees, most of the people were very agreeable to it, not a bad thing. The wrong impression has been given these people. I think to be fair we should wait for the Assessor's report. I fear a sidepath that is part of the shoulder, we don't know what the traffic is going to be in three or four years and I feel we should look at something safer for the people or forget them entirely.

Alderman Moore: I have to agree with Alderman Poshepny. The citizens were in favor of the sidepath as long as the trees were being preserved and they didn't have to clear the snow. Having a sidepath along the side of the road doesn't offer protection from the traffic. A sidepath with a terrace is much safer than using a paved shoulder right next to the traffic. I would oppose an amendment with the third bullet item (5' wide paved shoulder...) and would like to offer plan #2 with the second bullet item (10' wide side path located 15' from the shoulder...).

Alderman Ament: If we are so concerned about safety then why do we have paved shoulders along Racine, Cleveland, Calhoun Road-South, Moorland, Sunny Slope, Beloit and other portions of 124th Street? I'm not aware of any problems created by any facility. I still think it's better than not having any along the road. I think putting in a shoulder path is appropriate. The maintenance of these side paths is going to become more and more of an issue, right now if your driveway doesn't cross the side path you don't have to clear it, but that could change. If it doesn't, it is going to become very costly for the City. I just can't see the extra expense and inconvenience to those people if they have to do that.

Alderman Augustine: Ron do you see an increase in the traffic along 124th Street in the near future?

Ron Schildt: The numbers have remained very consistent over the years. The only thing that would change is when Section 35 is developed there could be some increased traffic, but we are pretty much removed from a very large increase in traffic.

Alderman Moore: If it were designated a trail, which we haven't determined yet, if it were to be cleared by the City it would be a minimal cost, we are talking about a few hundred dollars a year in addition. In a \$33 million dollar budget the cost is \$5,000 to \$15,000 a year for the entire city. We are talking about a few pennies for the people a year and that's just a scare tactic.

Alderman Ament: You have to include the cost of purchasing equipment, maintaining current equipment and man-hours, the cost would not necessarily be minimal if you include all the factors. That's why I am in favor of an amendment with the 2nd bullet item in it.

Upon voting the motion failed with Alderman Moore, JP Walker and Mayor Chiovatero voting no. Alderman Augustine and Alderman Ament voting yes.

Alderman Moore: I would like to move that we amend the motion to include bullet item #2, "10' Wide Side path located 15' from the shoulder along the west side of 124th Street."

JP Walker 2nd the motion.

Alderman Ament: Despite what the residents do and don't want we are going to go ahead with this, is that correct?

Mayor Chiovero: We are only voting on the design here, not the final plan. Will we see this again after the design is done?

Ron Schildt: Yes, we heard from the residents and we needed some direction from the Board and any changes that are made will be presented at the next informational meeting.

Alderman Ament: I would assume that this is the plan we are going to go ahead with unless something major happens; this is what we are going to go with, if this is what the majority is going to vote on.

Mayor Chiovero: The hugest contention that I felt the residents were talking about was the fact that the sidepath was going to be so far from the road and against their property line. Talking with a few of them they doubted the sidepath, but were okay with having them closer to the road. I would like to see them closer to the road, but I understand there are issues that have to be taken into account. I think the one we are talking about now is the best of all three. I don't know if we have any numbers as to how many bicycles would be using it, or number of people that use it. A local high school cross country team uses this route, which I know they do. Have we gotten any feedback from the other municipalities, don't they have a say in this also?

JP Walker: We had internal meetings with the other communities and they are aware of the design components and turned it over to our Board to make the final decision and have indicated that they will back it.

Alderman Ament: What high school uses this for their cross-country team?

Mayor Chiovero: I believe its Whitnall.

Alderman Ament: Why would we put the sidepath on the west side if it's for their cross-country team? I would think it should be on their side of the road if they are using it. I think Hales Corners and Greenfield should share in the cost and maintenance of this project, if it passes here.

Mayor Chiovero: I think that was a poor reason to put in the sidepath, I didn't say we were putting it in for them. I guess to me the sidepath makes more sense closer to the road. I know we can't put it too close because of the ditch and drainage issues. But it doesn't make sense to have the sidewalk 20' away from the shoulder of the road. If it were to go in I think the best place is closer to the road. We can always take the sidewalk out right. My choice would be as close to the road as possible.

Ron Schildt: It is an item that we could separate out later on.

JP Walker: The Inter-municipal Agreement is strictly for design. There would be future inter-municipal agreements regarding the construction phase. I agree that we should reach some type of payment agreement with the other two communities. Right now the intent is to prepare a design, have an understand of the incremental costs of the designs, so the Board can make decisions at the appropriate time as to what the total project will be when it comes time for construction. Right now we have to give direction to the consultant as to what to include in the design so we have a fair understanding as to what the total fiscal impact would be for the project.

Alderman Ament: That sounds fair, except there will be no cost to analyze that would show just the shoulder sidepath or the one that's closest to the road, the first bullet point, we are only going to be looking at #2 so I don't know how we can have a fair comparison. I would rather see them eliminated then installed. We are looking at the cost and design of a 10' wide sidepath located 15' off the road and it still doesn't address the maintenance issue. Until that maintenance plan is approved by the Council, I don't know how we go forward with this.

Alderman Moore: I would be happy to include language to say that the outside of the sidepath would be no farther from the shoulder than 25'. It could be closer and that could include that the sidepath being 8' wide rather than 10' wide depending on the design.

JP Walker: I'm OK with that.

Alderman Moore: It would be farther from 124th Street as designed here because of stormwater flow by Marquette Drive.

JP Walker: There are stormwater issues and stormwater conveyance that have to dictate in some areas where the sidepath has to be and I was concerned with the 25' distance.

Alderman Moore: Except where necessary due to stormwater then it would be no farther than 25' from the shoulder.

Alderman Ament: I think that's difficult to put that in there until we know what the design is going to be. Is that not what the design is about to make those determinations?

JP Walker: Yes.

Alderman Ament: Then I wouldn't support this either.

JP Walker: This gives us direction to pass onto the consultant as to what we want. I understand what Alderman Moore is saying there is a window as to where the sidepath can be located. What I'm getting from this is we want the sidepath within a certain zone near the pavement, not on the shoulder, so that there is a safety terrace. In some cases the separation may be a ditch.

Alderman Moore: There could be the possibility of the ditch to be on the outside of the sidepath.

JP Walker: That would be part of the engineering analysis.

Mayor Chiovatero: So right now the amendment to the motion is to locate the sidepath as close to the road as possible relative to ditch work, but no greater than 25'.

Alderman Moore: Amended the motion to read as follows: The redesign of South 124th Street shall include an 8' wide sidepath located as close to the road as possible with the outside edge of the sidepath being located not more than 25' from the road unless storm water requirements dictate that the sidepath be located further away from the road.

Upon voting the motion passed with Alderman Ament and Alderman Augustine opposing.

ITEM 32-07 Results of the Citywide 2007 PASER evaluations (Discussion Only)

Ron Schildt gave a computer presentation on the PASER evaluations for the City.

JP Walker: I just want to update one of the costs based on what we've seen. Ron had shown \$170,000 for a typical mile, for pulverizing and resurfacing. What we are seeing on the streets that we are rehabbing were typically rated a 3, or 30 in this case, there is a lot of damage to the base area of the road. Any repairs to those areas can escalate those costs. Right now we are seeing an estimated cost for those areas around \$385,000 per mile. So that shows you the impact when you are looking under the pavement and not just the pavement itself.

ITEM 33-07 2008 Roadway Maintenance Program (Discussion Only)

JP Walker: As part of the 2008 operating budget, \$300,000 has been approved for roadway maintenance. All funds will be paid out of the maintenance account 15110029 59040. As you may recall in 2007 we crack sealed approximately 70

miles of roadways that had a PASER rating of 7 or 8. In 2008 we are proposing to crack seal new streets that have been rated as 8's there are some sporadic 7's and now we are adding 6's. A total of 32.90 miles of crack sealing will be completed costing \$129,000 including inspections. We are working with our Streets Department to give us a priority list of areas that need spot repairs. We have listed the following streets as priorities:

- Cul-de-Sac at the end of Needham Drive
- 149th Street from Janice Place to Cleveland Avenue
- Pfeil Road from Pinecrest Lane to Greenfield Avenue
- Observatory Road from National Avenue to Crescent Drive
- Langlade Drive from Beloit Road to Marin Way

Our current cost estimate is approximately \$135,000 including inspection. These will be bid and Staff hopes to get favorable costs like we did this year. The remaining \$36,000 is for pavement marking and the pre-emption signals on Moorland Road.

Alderman Ament: I'm concerned that we are using roadway maintenance funds for projects that should be in the CIP budget. That is why I thought we separated this in the first place. We are looking at spot repairs of \$135,000. This is the problem we ran into originally when we used roadway maintenance for projects like Lincoln Avenue and Buena Park. I would much rather see us use this \$300,000 a year to do the crack-sealing, shoulder work, curb & sidewalk repairs, things of that nature should come out of the roadway maintenance. We are talking more for the spot repairs then we are the crack sealing and shoulder work. I would prefer that we didn't do it this way and used the CIP. The other thing I have is looking at crack sealing streets with a rating of 60. It says 124th Street from Greenfield to Cleveland. If we are looking at doing 124th Street from Greenfield to Cleveland shouldn't we be working with West Allis on this or are we paying for the whole thing.

JP Walker: That's a very good question; we should be working with West Allis, thanks for bringing that up.

Alderman Ament: Calhoun Road it says from Beloit to National. It doesn't need anything south of Beloit?

JP Walker: It needs rehab; it's rated as a three.

Alderman Ament: Street rating 80 - It says Calhoun Road, Fullerton to Greenfield, does it pay to do that area?

JP Walker: That is the area that was part of the Greenfield Avenue project.

Alderman Ament: The last one I have is Heidi Lane and Lynette Lane which was done about two years ago. Dana also needs work maybe that is something you could look at. A little earlier in the year after the crack-sealers were done there was about \$60,000 left in 2007 and I know we used about \$10,000 for some work in the City Center. Is there still some money left in 2007, or is that all used up now?

JP Walker: \$10,000 of the remaining money was used for Calhoun Road north of National Avenue crack sealing per your request and pavement makings in City Center. If there is any left over it is probably just a few thousand.

Alderman Ament: Maybe that would be enough to make up for some of these here. I'm still not in favor of using Roadway Maintenance account for repairs. I'm afraid we could end up back where we were a few years ago when we were using all of the roadway maintenance for road repair.

JP Walker: Our #1 priority is crack sealing. We did 70 miles in 2007 which reduced the need for 2008. Spot repairs are small areas where the pavement is broken up in about 20' sections. Curb & gutter replacement is also available. I am working with the Streets Department on this. In 2009 we hope to look at curb and gutter and possibly crack-sealing for roads with a PASER rating of 5 to give us a longer life span for those roads to eliminate the damage that can be done by water.

Alderman Ament: My concern would be that we would start gravitating towards using more of that. I know at one time there was the thought that we could reduce that \$300,000 once we got caught up. As you well know, you are never done with crack sealing; it's going to continually need attention. Just don't want to see us gravitate away from that.

Alderman Augustine: If the road has a rating of 7 or 8 how often do we have to crack-seal it again?

JP Walker: On a road with a rating of 7 or 8 there is a 3 year warranty from the contractor if any of the cracks reopen. The problem with crack sealing is that other cracks could appear on the road in areas that weren't crack-sealed before.

Alderman Augustine: What about the ones with a 5 or 6 rating, is it harder to warranty those?

JP Walker: No it's not harder to warranty but the repairs to these would be more costly. We may see a road that's rated an 8 costing \$2,500 - \$3,000 per mile, where a street that's rated a 6 could cost \$4,500 per mile, depending on how much material is need to crack-seal that road.

Alderman Moore: I think it's more appropriate to put short term work in operating budget that last 3 or 4 years. Why should citizens pay for it for 10 years down the line?

Alderman Moore made the motion to adjourn.

JP Walker 2nd the motion.

Upon voting the motion to adjourn was passed unanimously.

The meeting was adjourned at 10:00 AM.