

**MINUTES**  
**BOARD OF PUBLIC WORKS MEETING**  
**November 7, 2005**  
**New Berlin City Hall Common Council Chambers**  
**3805 S Casper Drive**

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

The meeting was called to order at 8:00 A. M.

Members Present: Mayor Jack Chiovaturo, City Engineer J.P. Walker, Alderman Ament, Alderman Moore and Alderman Augustine

Staff Present: Ron Schildt, Division Transportation Engineer, Tammy Simonson, Civil Engineer, Ray Grzys, Director of Streets & Utilities

**OLD BUSINESS**

**ITEM 01-05 Approval of Minutes from the October 3, 2005 meeting.**

**Alderman Ament made a motion to approve the minutes.**

**Mayor Chiovaturo 2<sup>nd</sup> the motion.**

Alderman Ament: On page 5, towards the bottom where it says: "JP Walker: They are adjoining developments that has the same requirements as Honeyager Fields as will have the same requirements....." It should read "and will have".

**Upon voting the motion passed unanimously.**

**ITEM 43-05 Request for Additional Funds for the Design and Extension of Contract Completion Date for the Design of Alternative Transportation Facilities.**

**JP Walker: The Requested Action is to recommend to the Common Council approval of Amendment No. 1 to the Contract with Bonestroo, Rosene, Anderlik & Associates for the Design of Alternative Transportation Facilities. Amendment No. 1 requests \$1,600 in additional funding for services requested by the City related to providing additional surveying services and staking to allow clearing undergrowth by the City in a densely wooded area associated with the proposed Kelly Lakes Trail Segment and to extend the Contract Completion Date to April 15, 2006, and I so move.**

**Alderman Ament 2<sup>nd</sup> the motion.**

Alderman Ament: It says \$1,600 but when you go to do the fiscal impact the original bid was \$81,000 and then it says not to exceed \$85,600.

JP Walker: It is supposed to be \$4,600. The additional \$3,000.00 is the 2006 rates for the contract extension. It should be an increase of \$4,600 over the previous amount not to exceed \$81,000.

Alderman Ament: Under source of funds where it says \$394,300 is that going to be taken away from that?

JP Walker: That is the total amount of funds that are available in that account and will be taken from that account.

**Upon voting the motion passed unanimously.**

**ITEM 44-05 Rural Road Cross-Section / Need for Gravel Shoulders**

**JP Walker: Consider the benefits and drawbacks from using gravel shoulders on our rural roads (i.e. those with ditches). Especially as it relates to resurfacing projects. This change, if done, would need to be revised in the Developer's Handbook update.**

Ron Schildt: The reason I brought this forward is because we have had requests from citizens on streets that we were resurfacing asking us if you are going to do something please don't put a gravel shoulder back because it causes

problems when they are trying to mow their lawns and keeping the ditches clean. The reasons that we do put the gravel shoulders out there is that it creates some lateral support for the road base, allows for drainage, provides places for cars to park, and helps with paper and mail delivery. If the grass does get close to the road base, then the road base starts to break down and the grass grows into the cracks in the road, causing further damage of the roads. Our policies say that we are putting gravel shoulders back and that is how we do any resurfacing project.

Mayor Chiovero: Don't we put a traffic bond on every so often anyway to stabilize the road?

Ron Schildt: We do that for our major arterials more than the local subdivision roads. In a subdivision we do it in the areas where no grass is growing and the soil has been impacted by mail carriers driving on it all the time. Routine maintenance is done on the main arterials. We are looking at just doing this on the local subdivision streets.

Ron Schildt: Every area is done differently; it depends on how prominent the gravel area is.

Mayor Chiovero: With the snowfall and salt the first few feet of grass is lost anyway.

Alderman Ament: I prefer not to have the gravel, because it's much easier to maintain it.

Alderman Augustine: Does having grass there instead of gravel slow down the flow of the water?

Ron Schildt: There really isn't a lot of difference in the time that the water gets to the ditch. The gravel may filter it a little bit, but as a whole there isn't a lot of difference.

JP Walker: The biggest concern that I have takes into effect how we control the drainage along the sub-grade from the base course area that needs to be able to drain to the ditch line. That is the main purpose of the shoulders, to have a permeable medium that the water can flow through. If you have topsoil it could tend to block drainage.

Ray Grzys: One of the problems that we found with the Forest View Subdivision was that the residents out there insisted that no gravel be put in, they wanted topsoil put in up to the road. When the road went in it was a little bit narrower than the original, therefore we did put gravel in, and created all kinds of problems with the citizens. What we had to do was remove the gravel put the topsoil back. The problem that we had with the topsoil was the rutting of the topsoil and the constant callbacks of this problem. We finally had the contractor put the soil up to the road, seed, put straw down and stake it to keep the cars off of it. Of course some cars still parked on it. We told the citizens that we would not come out there again. Notified the paper carriers and the postal carriers to stay off of this, if at all possible. I'm in favor of the topsoil in the subdivisions. On the main drags our street department does shoulder to make sure the main arterials are safe and protected against road deterioration.

Mayor Chiovero: I'm inclined to go with the Engineering practice. I would hate to see the edge of the roads start breaking off.

Ron Schildt: Typically any cross-section of a road does have shoulder. There are some things such as turf shoulders, where you would have a gravel shoulder underneath with topsoil and grass on top of that but it does have the gravel below for a firm base and drainage. To do this would be a much bigger expense. This would be good for new road or reconstruction, keep the gravel shoulder and put it in the way it's supposed to be, the problem that we have is that most of the roads we have, the ditch is too close to the edge of the road, so it might not work.

Mayor Chiovero: Since we went from the standard sand mix to just salt there is a lot less debris in the ditches.

Alderman Ament: Is there a specific rule on this? It seems like in certain areas where there isn't much of a shoulder and the ditch drops off rather quickly, putting on gravel isn't going to make a lot of sense anyway. Is there something more that can be done to determine which is the best option?

Ron Schildt: This is usually done on a case-by-case basis. Our policy has always been that if there is any rise in the asphalt surface after a resurfacing project something has to be put in there.

Alderman Moore: When resurfacing do you maintain a certain distance from the road to the edge of the gravel, if you are using gravel?

Ron Schildt: If we were to follow the cross-section in the Developers' Handbook it would be a 3' wide gravel shoulder. This can't be done in most of the places we resurface because there isn't enough width between the road and the ditch to put in a 3' shoulder.

Alderman Moore: Even though it says 3', sometimes we don't put in 3' because we don't have enough space correct? If we use gravel will it harm our waters and water life?

Ron Schildt: Yes, in some cases there isn't enough room between the edge of the road and the ditch to put in 3' of shoulder. I have never heard of the water that flows through the limestone causing any harm to the wildlife in our rivers and streams.

JP Walker: This was just for discussion there is no motion. I think we are all in agreement that we are talking about the resurfacing projects. Where there is a question staff will look at the existing conditions on any road that needs to be surfaced, prior to the start of the project and will make a decision on what is the correct action to take. We have to be cognizant of the resident's wishes. I believe that we should match prior conditions as to what it was before we did our resurfacing.

Alderman Moore: If there were to be a standard my preference would be the gravel under the grass.

Alderman Augustine: Do the rest of you feel as Ray indicates the gravel on arterial roads in case the grass did grow up to the streets, would that be different in some ways then in a residential area?

JP Walker: I go back to my statement of matching to what the existing conditions were before the construction.

Alderman Augustine asked for further discussion and there was none.

#### **ITEM 45-05 Adoption by the Board of the First Revision to the Developers Handbook**

JP Walker: In 2002 the Board adopted our original Developers Handbook and through the three year process since then we have run across situations where there has to be revisions to the Handbook, clarification that has come up from Developers, gray areas that could be interpreted several different ways that have been brought to our attention and any new legislation or standards come along, for example, stormwater. The rules and regulations that were not in the original Handbook that we feel are important to put in the Handbook. What we have attempted to do here is incorporate all those changes into the first official revision to the Handbook. My intent here is to introduce this today, have you take the next month to review it. I ask that you e-mail me the questions before our next Board Meeting, so that staff has time to review it, especially if there are changes that have to go in the Handbook. At the next Board we will discuss your questions and make appropriate revisions over the next month and then bring it back to the January Board and possibly the February Board for the official adoption. In order to follow the proper procedure here I think we need to introduce this as the adoption of the first revision of the Developers Handbook, but then I think it has to be tabled and revisit it next month under Old Business and keep it on the table until the following month, until we all agree that we are ready to adopt it.

**JP Walker: Made a motion that On review by the Board members and the completion of any requested revisions that the Board officially adopts the Developers Handbook First Revisions at the appropriate time.**

**Alderman Ament 2<sup>nd</sup> the motion.**

Alderman Ament: You want us to send you these questions in advance?

JP Walker: Yes

Alderman Ament: The Use Approval Checklist is a vast improvement over the other Handbook.

JP Walker: I don't know how many of you were here when we adopted the Developers Handbook in 2002, but in reading the requested action statement that was brought by previous City Engineer, Jeff Chase, to the Board it referred to adopting the Handbook after the revisions were made to Chapters 17 & 18. That's the old zoning and subdivisions codes. Subsequent to that the Council has approved the adoption of Chapters 235 & 275, which even tightens up those codes. The checklists that are here now really do follow the Chapter 235 & 275 requirements.

**JP Walker: Made a motion to table further discussion on the Handbook.**

**Alderman Moore 2<sup>nd</sup> the motion.**

**Upon voting the motion passed unanimously**

**ITEM 46-05 Discussion on Changing Board Meeting Dates**

JP Walker: The requested action is that the Board of Public Works consider changing the monthly Board Meeting date from the first Monday of each month to the third Monday of each month. The starting time will remain the same at 8:00 AM.

There are two reasons to request this change. First is that for projects that receive Plan Commission approval, the Plan Commission and the Board meet on the same day. Actually the Board meets before the Plan Commission and sometimes depending on the issues that are brought to the Board there may or may not be some pending Plan Commission action that hasn't occurred yet. We usually try to delay the action at the Board and this has developed some problems with the developers causing a whole month delay in the process. By changing the date of the Board we shorten that process by two weeks. It will still have to go through Council approval; we still can speed up the process. And the second reason is that it gives the staff more time to have the understanding about what the Plan Commissions intent is in their approval process prior to Board action and then on to Council for final approval.

Alderman Augustine: When would this take place?

JP Walker: If this is approved it will take effect in January 2006.

Alderman Moore: Does the action that goes to both have to go to Plan Commission first?

JP Walker: Usually actions at the Plan Commission precede actions at the Board. By having the Plan Commission on the first Monday of the month, action is taken by the Council at the first Council meeting of the month, which is the 2<sup>nd</sup> Tuesday. If we follow on the third Monday, this would be an advantage to the Board members.

Alderman Moore: It would not be appropriate most of the time for an action to be at this Board before it goes to Plan Commission?

JP Walker: The type of issues that we deal with that require Plan Commission action, would have to happen at the Plan Commission meeting before the Board discusses the issue. For example if we have an action by the Plan Commission that approves zoning permit for a subdivision, we can't even present the Developers Agreement to the Board until the Plan Commission takes action on that zoning permit and Council approves that. So we are talking about a month delay

Alderman Ament: It would be easier for us here as well. We do see a lot of this at the Plan Commission and then the Board. I feel it is a good idea.

Mayor Chiovero: The third Monday is a good choice.

**JP Walker: I move that we change the Board of Public Works meeting from the 1<sup>st</sup> Monday of the month to the 3<sup>rd</sup> Monday of the month, with the time remaining the same at 8:00 AM.**

**Alderman Moore: 2<sup>nd</sup> the motion**

**Upon voting the motion passed unanimously**

**Alderman Moore made the motion to Adjourn**

**Mayor Chiovero 2<sup>nd</sup> the motion**

**Upon voting the motion passed unanimously**

**Adjourned at 8:44 AM**



