

**Minutes
Stormwater Committee Meeting
New Berlin City Hall
3805 S. Casper Drive
Council Chambers
June 14, 2005**

Please note: Minutes are unofficial until approved by the Stormwater Committee at their next regularly scheduled meeting.

Present: Alderman Harenda, Alderman Hopkins, Alderman Hegeman, Mayor Chiovatero and Jim Kern

Others Present: Eric Nitschke (Division Engineer), City Engineer J.P. Walker, Cathy Schwalbach (Project Engineer), Ray Grzys (Director of Utilities and Streets), Chuck Trevorrow (Stormwater Supervisor), and Suzette Hanley (Office Coordinator Utilities & Streets)

Meeting called to order at 4:46 pm by Alderman Harenda and declared a quorum with all members present.

SW 01-05 Approval of Minutes from May 24th meeting

Motion by Mayor Chiovatero to approve the minutes from the May 24th meeting. Seconded by Alderman Hegeman and upon voting the motion passed unanimously.

SW 23-04 Discussion of Culvert Installation Costs to Exclude Cost of Labor and Machine Charges in the Operating Budget

Motion by Alderman Hopkins to remove this item from the table. Seconded by Alderman Hegeman and upon voting the motion passed unanimously.

Cathy Schwalbach said that she included in the packet the minutes from the last 2 times that this item was discussed where staff had asked for direction as they would like clarification as to who was responsible for certain costs when culverts were replaced by the City. Also discussed were problem culverts when a citizen refuses to pay.

Ms. Schwalbach reviewed the history of driveway culvert replacement from 2001 to 2005 and referred to the spreadsheet in the packets. She stated that you will see the difference in 2004 because of the ordinance that was put into effect and we did charge materials and labor. She also explained three alternatives for the driveway culvert costs for the operating budget and CIP budget. They are that the operating budget covers all costs, only the cost of labor and machine charges, or none of the costs. She noted that residents that live on County roads would not benefit from Utility supplementation of culvert replacement costs. Alderman Harenda asked if the County pays for this? She replied that the County requires a permit and the resident pays for it.

Jim Kern asked how we handle culvert replacement today? Ms Schwalbach stated that the policy currently is that Stormwater Utility encourages the resident to contract with an outside contractor unless the culvert is causing a problem and backing up water, and the resident does not respond and replace it. She said that the Stormwater Utility would go in and replace the culvert, and charge the resident full cost. The other condition or case is if there is a Stormwater problem in the area, and the Engineering department determines there needs to be some work done, which includes replacing the culvert such as they need to be upsized or elevations need to be set differently to improve drainage for example. She stated if this happens, the City would replace the culvert and not charge the resident.

Alderman Hegeman asked if the labor and machine charges are City of New Berlin charges? Ms. Schwalbach said that those costs are the City street department costs that are evaluated annually by Stormwater supervisor Chuck Trevorrow and the rates are set according to that.

Alderman Harenda said that he likes alternative 2 where the Stormwater Utility pays for the labor and machine charges, and the resident pays for the material costs. He compared it to a sidewalk or a road being replaced where some municipalities pay for the work, and there is a special assessment. He asked Ms. Schwalbach about the driveway culvert project history single instance charges and she noted that there should be a correction made

on the 2004 examples which should read that the resident paid for materials, labor and machine charges. Alderman Harenda asked if in 2001 to 2003 the Utility was paying for the cost of labor and materials? Cathy stated that during 2001, when the Utility was just starting up; part of the cost was paid for by the General City budget.

Alderman Hegeman asked again about the rates? Chuck Trevorow clarified this and said the machine charges are DOT rates and the labor charges come from the contract, and materials costs are from the vendor. Alderman Hegeman asked if the Stormwater department gets billed back from the Street Department? Mr. Trevorow answered yes; they are broken down to labor, material and machine charges.

Jim Kern said that it seems fair to have some level of cost share to the residents, and that residents they polled didn't have an issue with paying for the materials, but since they paid in fees, the City should pay for labor and machine charges. Alderman Harenda said that the decisions that we make here will set the framework for the next 5 years. Alderman Harenda approved ordinance 2221 back in early 2004, and stated that you are probably looking for a motion to amend that ordinance to possibly go with alternative 2 in the Operating budget to take into account these culvert issues, but we don't want to open the floodgates throughout the City. He said he talked to Eric and Cathy months ago and noted that we do have a procedure in place if people want their culverts replaced; we are not going to replace every culvert in the City. Mr. Nitschke said that is correct. I would like to recommend that you make a recommendation to prepare a final report for you to actually vote on and approve and to include in that final report the issue brought up of the residents that were fully charged and address the question of were they going to be reimbursed and some sort of back pay for these residents? Mr. Nitschke said the other issue was brought forward to insure that everyone that feels that they would like a new culvert is coming in, and we actually set a guideline (like Culvert invert policy) or standard, if it meets these certain criteria, you do fall in line for having your culvert replaced; if it does not, upon field inspection and verification from staff, your culvert will remain and any kind of request would have to come before the Stormwater Committee for a variance to that. Alderman Harenda agreed that was a good point. Jim Kern asked if staff makes the final call on whether or not a culvert would be replaced? Eric Nitschke answered that it would ultimately be the City Engineer's decision and from there we would take the job to the Street's crews. If staff decided that the culvert did not need to be replaced, but the resident still had issues with it and wanted a variance, the final decision would be from the Committee members or Common Council.

Alderman Harenda looked for a motion to request staff to compile a final report regarding amending and also drafting potential revisions to ordinance 2221 with respect to alternative 2 operating budget to cover labor and machine charges regarding culvert installation, but also ask staff to include the procedure of the way we would review this and approve these projects. Motion was made by Alderman Hopkins. Seconded by Alderman Hegeman and upon voting the motion passed unanimously.

Alderman Harenda also would like to make a request regarding Alternative #2 in the CIP budget to kind of do the same thing with a cost share, (using that comparison with the sidewalk), where the City pays for a share of the project and the residents do too. This will give the Committee an idea when we work on the 5-year plan

SW 06-05 Approval of Stormwater Utility Name Change

Motion by Mayor Chiovarero to remove from table. Seconded by Jim Kern and upon voting the motion passed unanimously.

Eric Nitschke said that staff had looked at creating a logo for identify sake and a name change to help the public better understand the purpose of the Stormwater Utility. He asked the Committee if they wanted to discuss this item or remove it from the agenda.

Alderman Hopkins said that he thought this was a good idea since many people say that they do not have stormwater. He added that he had discussed this idea with Mayor Chiovarero and thought that it should be Water Preservation Utility. Mayor Chiovarero said that he could not think of a name, he didn't have a problem with the Water Resources Preservation Utility, but thought it was too long. In addition, he asked how it would be listed on the utility bill. Mayor Chiovarero asked what other communities called their Utility? Mr. Nitschke replied that he has not found any other names in the area, but he has not looked on the east and west coasts.

After a short discussion, Mr. Nitschke said that staff would establish a short list of names to bring back to the Committee. The committee members agreed that the logo itself was good.

Motion to defer this item by Mr. Kern. Seconded by Alderman Hopkins and upon voting the motion passed unanimously.

SW 21-05 Buena Park Stormwater Improvement Project Additional Construction

Mr. Nitschke said that at the last meeting the Committee asked staff to breakdown the Buena Park stormwater improvement project as to what items were for concrete invert to grass area back to concrete inverts, sump pump discharge issues, etc. He explained the breakdown in the packet.

Alderman Harenda expressed concern about paying for concrete inverts that did not meet the present policy, and felt that the Utility may be setting a precedent. He asked where we draw the line at installing concrete inverts in other areas in the City that have steep slopes, since the budget is limited. Eric Nitschke said that those property addresses identified in red are properties that staff feels need to be addressed. Of these, some were identified by staff and others were requested by the residents. He stressed that each instance has been evaluated individually as there are many different factors involved. Mr. Nitschke said that when there is a Capital Improvement Project, everyone in the project area should be taken care of consistently. He added that the Gatewood and Inez Drive residents did not have to pay for their construction because of the status of being a capital improvement project.

Jim Kern asked if staff did not repair every address on the list, could the residents request to be placed on the list? Mr. Nitschke replied that yes, the policy is in place and they would have to follow through on meeting the criteria, be placed on a list and would have to pay for the work according the culvert installation charges. Alderman Harenda asked if rain gardens have been suggested in this area? Eric answered no, because of the steep side slopes and there is no way to pull back the water for a rain garden on the property.

Motion by Alderman Hopkins to recommend to the Common Council approval of additional work in the Buena Park Subdivision. The work is to be completed by the current contractor, Capitol Pavers, Inc. The amount awarded to Capitol Pavers, Inc. is to be \$133,363.75, the estimated cost for additional improvements is to be \$181,641.42, and the remaining construction cost is not to exceed \$1,527,770.16. Source of funds is Stormwater Utility CIP 04251171 61707 C2003 for \$1,284,865.00 and Stormwater Utility CIP Account Number 04251171 61707 C2004 for \$530,223.50. Seconded by Jim Kern.

Mayor Chioverato agreed with this motion since it was part of the CIP project and I think that is the criteria so as not to set precedent and since it is an entire project, it should be capitalized according to do this. Jim Kern asked if most of the residents had some sort of culvert concern prior to this project? Mr. Nitschke replied that most have some sort of issue on their property or special circumstances; either they put in bricks or rocks, there is a 50 year old tree on the ditch line, there is a steep side slopes, a neighbor's sump pump runs continuously, etc. He added it is a prime example of how our development review process is now because when a new development comes in, staff makes sure that stormwater conveyance are easily maintainable will work now and 50 years from now; however, there was no criteria in the past such as slope, setbacks, etc. and people were allowed to put in more obstacles or other things in their ditch lines. Alderman Hegeman again asked if the people not in red were contacted by staff, or did they come in to be put on the list. Mr. Nitschke said that some of the other people we put on the list, while others came in at a public informational meeting that we held in May and this is a new policy that we do with large capital improvement projects. He added Staff does a field visit first, establish areas that still need to be addressed on the project, and then meet with the residents and give everyone a fair shake before we close the project out. The idea is that when we finish the area, there should be no reason that we have to come back 3 years from now and have to address something; we address everyone's concerns no matter how big or small. Alderman Harenda said that he still had concerns, but would support the motion from the Committee and reserves the right to oppose it at the Council meeting.

Upon voting on Item SW 21-05, the motion passed unanimously.

SW 25-05 Approval of Industrial Park Stormwater Management Plan

Mr. Nitschke said that the requested action is to approve the Industrial Park Stormwater Quality Management Plan as prepared by HNTB Corporation by the City of New Berlin Stormwater Utility. Mr. Nitschke said that the

first master plan we have had for awhile. Most of the other master plans such as the Westridge and Deer Creek were prepared in 1995, 1996, 2000, and it is time to be updated. He said it is a housekeeping measure as far as when we have a plan completed by a consultant to be formally approved at the Committee level so that if there is any question as to the validity of the plan itself, there was an approval of the plan to be used for a specific area.

Mr. Nitschke stated that HNTB did a presentation before the Stormwater Committee and the Community Development Authority. He said the approval of the plan is not intended to supersede any direction that the CDA wants to go a certain direction in the Industrial Park; it is merely to provide a matter of fact agenda item that the plan was viewed by the Committee and that you did approve the final draft.

Alderman Harenda asked if approval of the Industrial Park Stormwater Quality Management Plan is part of the Stormwater and City Master Plan correct? Eric replied yes. Alderman Harenda asked if the Committee still had the ability to change things and do what they wanted to, as well as the CDA, within the budgets that we have available. Eric replied yes there are options in the recommended plan and there is no timeline, and typically a plan like this starts to become outdated in 5 years and it is staff's recommendation that after 10 years it should be updated. Alderman Harenda asked if Stormwater and Engineering staff was comfortable with the plan and its recommendations? Eric replied yes, and the recommendations actually save money over and above what was actually laid out for the Industrial Park.

Mayor Chiovaturo asked if this was the plan that talked about bioretention swales and wildflowers? Eric replied yes. Mayor Chiovaturo said that two issues came up when talking with people in the Industrial Park – namely that there was concern about some plants in there and that they are not salt tolerant and would be killed off on a yearly basis. The other question was about engineered soil and how to dispose of it, is this hazardous material, who would be responsible for it. Mr. Nitschke said that the bioretention swale alternative, the plant species question is answered by one of the options to curve up on the landscape up onto the side lots by the trees and it was his understanding that this is where the non salt tolerant plant species would be, up out of the area where water pooled in the aesthetic area. Eric said the plan called for salt tolerant plants to be in the bioretention swale area. Mr. Nitschke said that with regards to engineered soil there is the potential hazardous material and that will have to be disposed of, that is one of the costs of a bioretention swale. The plan calls for a pre-treatment before the flow comes to the ditch line. Eric said that the maintenance of the actual swales, if they have to be cleaned out that the City will do it since it is a water quality issue. Mr. Nitschke stated the homeowners will do the general maintenance, the mowing and landscaping. Mayor Chiovaturo agreed, and he has tried to convince them that the maintenance will actually be easier with the swales. He added that he is concerned with industrial park street runoff and suggested that some additional street sweeping will help. Mayor Chiovaturo said that there is real concern that engineered soils will be replaced, but did not remember discussing hazardous material. Mr. Nitschke said that the removal and replacement of engineered soils because of the heavy metals, would be similar to end of pipe treatment devices on storm sewers such as vortex devices that would need to be vacuumed out with a vacuum truck and taken to a fill site. Whether or not the material would be hazardous or not would depend on what site the material came from. Mr. Nitschke said that this is one of the true definitions of an unfunded mandate; water quality requirements that we are required to meet, we have heavy metal sediment load and items that we have not addressed in the past. He said that this plan does address this and the costs and alternatives. Mr. Nitschke said at the New Berlin Golf course streambank stabilization was completed and takes care of erosion, but the water quality upstream has not been addressed yet and is still brown.

Mayor Chiovaturo expressed concern about the silt, sediment and heavy metals in the soil and the quantity. Mr. Nitschke said that in structures you do not get rid of all the particulates. In total suspended solids, you have phosphorous, nitrogen, herbicides, and pesticides used for landscaping, but in a bioretention swale the plants uptake that and breakdown much of this. He added, in a standard structural BMP, these items, and things like salt just get moved downstream, but the plants in a bioretention swale do help break these things down. Mayor Chiovaturo said that he will try to explain these things in his visits, but is worried that 10 years from now, someone will be sitting here and asking for \$6 million to dispose of it. Alderman Hegeman asked if there is any history of replacing soil? Mr. Nitschke was brought up at the CDA and HNTB answered that typically you look at a 10-15 year cycle, but it depends on the pretreatment and the load are actually taking to the bioretention swales, the filters can help with pretreatment. Mr. Nitschke said that the east and west coast have some history, but not much in our area, however Milwaukee County is getting into it. Mr. Nitschke said it is a glorified rain garden with an under drain in it, and the bioretention swales also handles the detention of the road expansion as well, so if you went with the swale without the engineered back fill, you still have the potential of sediment load of the swale itself and the ditch starts to get humps and you will have to clean them out and regrade them over time. Mr.

Nitschke said there are a lot of pluses to bio-retention swales, and that they are more cost effective to construct than underground storage, and they play two roles with water quality and stormwater detention issues, but the requirements we have to meet our WPDS Permit are not cheap. Alderman Harendt said that at this time we do not have any best management practice alternative according to HNTB, and regarding cleaning these systems out, he did foresee it being seen labeled as hazardous materials, we are not going to be loading them anymore than what is going through that park already. He added that if there is an illicit discharge there is an illegal operation, we will be catching them. Alderman Harendt said that the Mayor is correct, and that the Utility and Street will be maintaining them, except for the normal maintenance of the ditches.

Motion by Alderman Hegeman to approve the Industrial Park Storm Water Quality Management Plan prepared by HNTB Corporation for the City of New Berlin Stormwater Utility. Seconded by Alderman Hopkins and upon voting the motion passed unanimously.

SW 26-05 Approve the Bidding of Westridge Stormwater Management Plan Update

Mr. Nitschke said that he is asking the Committee to approve the City of New Berlin staff to solicit bids for the Westridge Stormwater Management Plan update. Rationale: The existing Westridge Management Plan, completed by Ruckert and Mielke in November of 1995, has become outdated and is in need of updating. He said the specific area in need of storm water management planning is north of I-43 and west of Moorland Road. Future construction, on the I-43 interchange at Moorland Road, and potential development in the area of Beloit and Moorland Roads currently do not have a specific storm water management plan to follow. Mr. Nitschke said that future development and the I-43 interchange may be constructed independent of each other's storm water management plans, but without a proper management plan for the entire area there is a potential for short and long term conflicts. Staff would like to utilize an updated storm water management plan to ensure that the remaining Westridge storm water issues are addressed in one comprehensive management plan.

Mr. Nitschke added that the State and DOT are working on plans for the I-43 interchange and that there is a question of building in a flood plain. He added that since our 10 year plan is outdated, and the 5-year plan is still out, we need to be proactive, and if we delay, we may be pushed out beyond where developers and DOT have made plans. He said the DOT is currently in design for the interchange; we have developers going back and forth about what to do about parcels in the area. He added that it was staff's plan to try to get the management plan updated prior to moving forward with great certainty to have things ready for these people to follow. Eric said staff wanted to bring it forward so that we could go out for bid, and that the update may be under the \$60,000 budgeted, but may be over, and what area of the budget it will come out of has not been determined yet.

Alderman Hegeman asked why we need to spend the money now on the 5-year plan when each individual parcel has to have a stormwater plan by the developer? Mr. Nitschke said that usually works when we have good development come in, we require the developer to analyze their impacts upstream and downstream, but in this case, most of the park has a set plan with ponds to the east, southeast and west, but there is nothing in this particular area. It would be difficult to ask a developer to do a flood plain analysis upstream for a property just in between another project, and to analysis a project downstream. Mr. Nitschke added that it is really the cohesion of everyone together, and it may be difficult to implement different plans. Mr. Nitschke said that we have seen in areas such as Parkwood and Overland Trail, one area project as an impact on another, instead of doing piecemeal, do together because of navigable waters, permits and other requirements, we need to look at this area together. Mr. Nitschke said that the DOT is governed by a separate set of rules than our developers and if there is no plan in place, they will develop their own and we will have to react to that. Eric continued that there needs to be alternative from the original plan for wetlands, and this needs to be updated.

Alderman Harendt asked if the State is doing a significant amount of construction in the area, will they be contributing to the cost of the plan? Mr. Nitschke said that it is staff's intent to prevent the state from making things worse, by the development of the interchange, such as the proposed ramp in the flood plain. Alderman Harendt said if we did an update on a stormwater management plan for these specific area, the state has had a habit of not doing what we would like them to do, why would it be any different? Mr. Nitschke said that he did not have an answer for that. Alderman Harendt said that he see why we need to do this, but said that he would like to put this plan update on hold until the 5-year plan moves along and we have an idea of where we are going, but was concerned at how far the DOT is? Mr. Nitschke said that Ron Schildt thinks about 40% planning stage, and that stormwater issues come up in the planning process around the 60% range, however the state has the layout of the interchange and they are moving along. He said that they have voiced our concerns with their consultants,

but they do not know where they are with the stormwater plans. Alderman Harenda said that there are a lot of decisions to be made, and would like to solicit bids and then hold them. Mr. Nitschke replied that staff is willing to hold the bids, but the time crunch and what budget funds will be used will depend on the 5-year plan. We do have some money this year in the operating plan, but it depends on where you want our streets crews to go, and what capitol improvement projects you want done.

Mayor Chiovarero said that staff should process and solicit bids since the current plan is outdated, and an updated plan will look at new construction and regulatory rules that have changed. Mayor Chiovarero added that property owners in the area have already expressed concerns about what the state plans to do and how it will affect their property, and having this plan will help. Alderman Harenda asked if a EIS (Environmental Impact Statement) is required by the State. Mr. Nitschke answered yes, and he will check into when it will be completed.

Motion by Alderman Hopkins to approve the City of New Berlin staff to solicit bids for the Westridge Stormwater Management Plan update, and report back to the Committee at a later date. Seconded by Mayor Chiovarero and upon voting the motion passed unanimously.

SW 19-05 Storm Water 5-Year Plan Update

Mr. Nitschke said that the original 5-year plan was issued in January 2002, and staff is looking for direction as to how to project and what items to bring to the Committee next time in more of a final form? Some of the items in the financial report have many facets.

- No detailed culvert or storm sewer repair schedule and quite a few need to be repaired, currently more than 220.
- Yearly Wisconsin Discharge Elimination System Permit is \$6,500
- No systematic streambank stabilization program
- Street sweeping efforts – should be updated and documented better
- Maintenance of the BMP's has to be updated and documented.
- Maintenance costs for equipment are 3-4 times estimated cost in 2002. In 2002 they were looking at prorated equipment costs of \$40,000. In 2004 it was over \$100,000. Whether or not equipment be purchased or continue to pay costs to street department
- Our debt service estimated in 2002 would be \$120,000 to \$160,000. Our debt service for 2005 is approximately \$260,000
- The plans established in the original 5-year plan did not have the coordination with Streets, Stormwater and Utility
- Storm events and problems predicating the Stormwater Utility (Item 1.11) – we need to be proactive to do routine and preventative maintenance – ditch and maintenance list.
- Difficult to put price on unfunded mandates. Example: Code Compliance officer 40% paid by SW (\$21,000/yr); DES Permit is \$6500/yr, GIS mapping will be \$10,000 per year to update once completed. Our public information requirements are approximately \$10,000/year. Illicit discharge screening program will be approximately \$40,000 to start and \$15,000 to maintain. Hard to figure in floodplain coordination. Maintenance ordinances and agreements need to be documented and reported to the DNR yearly – hard to put an amount on that. Maintenance water quality devices such as ponds, bioretention swales, vortecnique systems must be maintained.

Alderman Harenda said you are looking for input:

- Finish up what is on the books
- Can't support increase in Stormwater Utility rates at this point or near future
- Ranking projects – what we need to do and why
- No CIP spending this year, if we have debt service on projects in the last 5 years, we need to look to pay on those and free up some money
- Look at grants
- Issue of special assessments or shared costs. Doing now for culverts and concrete inverts, can we do with capital improvement projects?
- If we want to put money in the Industrial Park, what can we do there and work with the CDA?
- Can we freeze CIP projects?
- Do we need a full-time Stormwater crew and equipment? Water quality, watershed, and other benefits.

Eric Nitschke said that finishing up on what is on the books, the original 5-yr plan in table 3.2 financial report they listed Parkwood Lane drainage project as \$280,000, and to do a feasibility number. They put a number to a project that they did not do a feasibility study was difficult. The study showed it is \$2.8 million to do that project. The problem is, if we want to do work in other areas, we have to do the more expensive work first. The original plan identified the problem in Parkwood Lane, but for \$280,000. That is where staff is looking for direction on where the Stormwater Committee would like it to go, and which projects Staff should address? The original plan called for no rate increase for 5 years, but there were no other plans. Mr. Nitschke said between Parkwood and Underwood, Staff has approximately \$1 million dollars left to reallocate, and between the two, Underwood creek would take up approximately the whole amount. Mr. Nitschke added that he talked to people in Parkwood Lane, and they understand a feasibility study must be done and there are many options. He said that is what we are trying to do with the next 5-year plan – to plan for these things with feasibility reports.

Alderman Harenda commented about a dedicated crew for Stormwater Utility, and trying to work more efficiently. Mr. Nitschke said we are entertaining ideas, such as working in the winter months and doing some things, like the DNR approval of spraying adhesive area in a small area of disturbance and work on it in the spring again. Staff would have to work around snowplow schedules. Alderman Harenda said that he understands that we are more efficient, but we are also taking on more responsibilities. He suggested a special meeting.

Alderman Hopkins said that he will do everything he can for the people in the 1st District, especially Underwood Creek that has had flooding problems since 1972, and have worked with various administrations in the City and people in the Engineering Department. Some of them said nothing could be done, but in the past few years people at City Hall have understood the problem, and now it is on the 5-year plan, but it has been postponed and not addressed yet. He said that people can't afford many more flood and can't cost share in that project. Alderman Harenda said that he was only looking at cost sharing in culvert replacement and the like, but not in these cases. He asked if there is any way you can breakdown some of the projects in the financial report? Mr. Nitschke, we can breakdown some of these areas, but he recommended breaking them down per project area. He said that because of the costs, if you are going to do Underwood #1 which is the creek area, and not do the box culvert cleanout and trash rack and switch over the Parkwood, you would be looking at a project that is much higher. Mr. Nitschke recommended working in one area, such as Underwood Creek. Mr. Nitschke continued that Stormwater Utility has remaining funds now because we came under budget from Gatewood and other projects, because we finished an area, and the economy provided for a good climate, whereas now the economy is improving and bids are coming in a little higher.

Mr. Nitschke recommended a special meeting is scheduled for 4:00 pm on Tuesday June 21, 2005 because of budget planning. Mayor Chiovatero said that he would be out of town next week, but the other committee members said that they should be able to attend. Mayor Chiovatero added that we need to do what is mandated and then do Underwood Creek and other areas.

Jim Kern said that he is new, but if he is a citizen and he is sure of getting value, I would not be against a small increase. Mayor Chiovatero said that he has had conversations with staff and we need to get the word out and information name change may help. Alderman Harenda said that a majority of the CIP has been in the northeast part of the City, and that the Industrial Park pays the majority of money into the system and they should get some benefit. He added in the western area of the City, a rate increase won't go over well at this point, but if we get information out regarding water preservation and some ponds, that may help.

Motion to adjourn at 6:48 p.m. by Alderman Hopkins. Seconded by Mayor Chiovatero and upon voting the motion passed unanimously.

*Respectfully submitted,
Suzette Hanley, Office Coordinator Utilities and Streets*