

MINUTES
BOARD OF PUBLIC WORKS MEETING
July 19, 2010
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 8:01 AM.

Members Present: Alderman Ament, Alderman Wysocki, John Graber; Mayor Jack Chiovatero and Alderman Seidl were both excused.

Staff Present: J. P. Walker, City Engineer, Tammy Simonson, Senior Civil Engineer.

Privilege of the Floor: Mike Morgan – 15385 Coffee Road. He indicated that he was there to see how Coffee Road design is progressing. He indicated that he still hadn't received the grading plan. He believes there will be some water problems and traffic problems. He thought that the residents north of Coffee Road should attend the Focus Group because they are going to be impacted by what happens with this.

OLD BUSINESS

ITEM 02-10 Approval of Minutes from the June 15th, 2010 (Special) Meeting

Motion by Alderman Wysocki.

John Graber 2nd the motion.

Upon voting the motion passed unanimously.

Approval of Minutes from the June 21st meeting

Item will remain on the agenda due not having three Board members that were at that meeting in attendance.

ITEM 12-10 Discussion & Possible Action on StreetPrintXD Demo Installation (Deferred)

JP Walker said that this Item was deferred at the last meeting pending approval by Waukesha County for putting the StreetPrint across National Avenue. We do have that approval so it's a matter of funding it.

Alderman Ament asked what action they are looking for.

JP Walker answered that Staff is looking for approval of the funding and recommended that it be paid for it out of the road rehab project for this year.

Alderman Wysocki asked what the cost will be.

John Graber said that the number was \$7,424.00.

Motion by Alderman Wysocki to approve, not to exceed \$7,500.00 from account number is 04251100 59040 C2010. 2nd by Alderman Ament.

Alderman Wysocki said that it does stand out his only concern is the life of it. By reading literature it seems that this will last as indicated.

Alderman Ament said that he agrees that it is very noticeable in busy traffic areas and it has a traffic calming effect in those areas. I like them better than signs and lights it catches your eye and makes you aware that there could be pedestrians or bikes going across.

Alderman Ament asked if that is going to be laid where the existing crosswalk is.

JP Walker answered that he believes that is where Ron Schildt was talking about.

Upon voting the motion passed unanimously.

ITEM 16-10 Review, Discussion and Possible Recommendation on the 2011 CIP Budget Requests (Deferred)

**Motion by Alderman Wysocki to table.
2nd by John Graber.**

Upon voting the motion carried unanimously.

ITEM 17-10 Review, Discussion and Possible Recommendation on the 2011 Roadway Maintenance Budget Request (Deferred)

**Motion by Alderman Wysocki to table.
2nd by John Graber.**

Upon voting the motion carried unanimously.

NEW BUSINESS

ITEM 19-10 Review, Discussion and Possible Action on how Utility Components in Roadway Projects Should be Funded

JP Walker indicated that at the May Board there was a discussion about the amount of money that it was costing to deal with utility components in our roadway projects, specifically the Roadway Rehabilitation projects. The Staff Report presented costs that we have been incurred in 2008 and 2009 what we expect to incur this year and project to incur the next five or six years for culvert replacement and utility adjustments. The costs will be going up over \$100,000 per year for just culvert replacement. Manhole and valve box adjustments will be approaching \$70,000 per year in the Roadway Rehab projects. When you equate that to rehabilitation costs over the next seven years, the components for utilities and stormwater will equate to approximately 2 ½ miles of rehabilitation. Utility costs associated with the CIP projects were listed. The question is: should there be discussion here at the Board, at the Utility Committee and also at the Water Resources Management Committee on consideration for how these associated components should be funded? Should they come strictly out of the road rehabilitation fund, should they be coming out of Utility funds, Water Resources Utility funds?

Alderman Ament said that there will be some resistance from the sewer and water utilities, as well as the storm water since utility. When you first presented these numbers I was taken aback at how much we are spending on

those components. One of the arguments that I would have with stormwater is that I understand where there resistance is going to be because they are struggling every year to get done what they need to get done. But, on the other hand at the very least we need to have these numbers. I think it's only fair that if their projects are part of our Roadway projects, they interlock. They are hard to separate but yet they are separated in the funding category. One of the benefits to this is that we also include the non-profits if storm water utility funds were used. If the funds come out of tax money, which the roadway projects do, it comes out of the property tax. So the property tax payers paying more for that roadway project because the non-profits are not paying in towards it. Whereas when storm water fees are used, the non-profits participate. The other thing is the roadways could kind of fall into the same pattern is if you look at a private driveway whether it's business or residential that is part of their ditching efforts is that culvert. I think the fact that our roads cross that; you could look at it either way. I think a good argument from the roadway standpoint or the Board's standpoint is that that is part of their system not part of our infrastructure and I think they should be paying their share. How they are going to pay for it is something that they are going to have to deal with. I'm fully in favor of having the utilities look at this issue and give us their feedback. Eventually I would imagine that if it goes far enough, the Council will have to decide on how this is going to be funded.

JP Walker said that this issue will be on the next July 27th Utility agenda. I have already provided a copy of this to Nicole Hewitt to get it on the Water Resource Management agenda in August.

Alderman Wysocki said that when we originally adopted our Storm water ordinance it was based on a storm water management plan. If you look at that storm water management plan, the fee was for the major storm water conveyances, not the regular culverts that are along the normal road. In this analysis that you made are all these culverts from that definition apply, or are they normal culverts that we have done in terms of roadway construction, rehabilitations?

JP Walker said that it is both. There are larger size culverts that are part of a major conveyance system and then there are the smaller size culverts that are 15" or 18"

Alderman Wysocki said that he would argue having known how that was developed, because in that development of that plan that's how we determined what the costs would be and that's obviously how we set our fee schedule. If we are now going to recommend or put on that storm water resource funding all of the culverts that are involved in a project that is an entirely different scenario than what was originally envisioned. I don't know if that is not so much fair, but it certainly isn't the way it was envisioned or developed and analyzed in terms of cost. This would be a new way of operating. I need to think about it. I would caution you that I will ask that question being a member of the utility, not storm water, but I would recommend that you try at best to stay within the guidelines of the original storm water management and identify those actual culverts that meet those guidelines relative to cost. Otherwise we are venturing into another area that we are paying for that road but anything literally beside that road, utilities and culverts are going to be paid for from other sources and in the utility perspective they have their own budgets and that something they will have to wrestle with.

Alderman Ament said that he agrees and he realizes that is part of the strain that is on the storm water resources is the fact that they are doing more than was originally planned but on the other hand it was their initiative that did that so we aren't the ones switching gears, it's them. I think it will be good if this goes to both utilities, we will get some good feedback and if nothing else in the end I still think it's a good idea if these numbers are identified within the projects as we do them, whether it's rehab or the CIP.

John Graber stated that a couple of points were brought up that he hadn't thought about regarding the initial formation of the storm water utility. There was something they looked at and said this is the scope of what our expenditures are going to be and this is the revenue that we are going to need to cover it. Therefore they may

have to revisit raising those utility fees just to pay for this. I would say that all of the projects that we have been doing throughout the years if there's a manhole that needs to be adjusted due to a reconstruction or rehab of the road, whatever it is it was always part of the driving impetus of the project, namely the roadway resurfacing. If we are going to be charging each individual utility, that is a dual edged sword because for example in some of the projects where utility is doing the work I could see them saying "we have to cut across street A to lay a new water main we are absorbing the cost of the trench, the gravel backfill and everything for your road and that's part of our cost of doing the utility construction" then they are going to try and charge us back for the street work and I don't want to get into a debate back and forth. Their charges to us would probably be less than ours to them but it's always been something that it becomes part of the cost if the cross culvert is bad; it's just part of the job. We aren't going to resurface the road and then have the culvert collapse and dig it up and retrench it, it's just part of our normal part of doing it. If we are going to resurface the road and raise it two inches we have to put a ring on that manhole or turn the valve box up, that has been part of the cost of the particular driving force for the project. It's a dual edged sword, I can see it coming back and biting us in some of those situations.

Alderman Ament said that he agrees except that if you look at it from the utility standpoint some of those adjustments are made because the road is changing. I do understand that because the roadway project is initiating that change. When it comes to the storm water, however, when we are re-ditching and we are replacing culverts that should be replaced I think that's a better discussion for them to come back with their thoughts on it. This isn't an attempt to try to change the whole thing but to have a fair discussion which is why when JP and I were discussing this we decided they need to be involved with this because they are going to have their viewpoint on it that maybe we aren't seeing but I see this more of an issue with storm water not to mention the fact with storm water you have the political aspect of raising that fee. If it went this way there is no way around that. That definitely would be linked from their standpoint. I think it will be a productive discussion but I think it will help storm water discuss their whole operation as far as the ditching, the culverts and things of that nature because I think that is part of what happened when they took that part of the system over because they wanted to be all inclusive in that system and if there are culverts that have to be replaced if not then maybe they don't need to be replaced and it shouldn't be part of our project.

Alderman Wysocki asked if to the best of your knowledge JP, for the recent work on National Avenue the utilities weren't charged for anything were they?

JP Walker said that our utilities had to do it. It was part of our operating budget.

Alderman Wysocki said that even on the county roads it could impact the utilities.

JP Walker said that the National Avenue was a state project and that's what they consider to be non-participating costs. There were just some minor adjustments that our utilities took care of.

Alderman Wysocki asked if we had to do anything on Greenfield Avenue.

JP Walker answered that yes we did the same thing. Most of our utility costs had to do with manhole adjustments, manhole corrections and valve box corrections. Everything that was storm water related was covered by the project.

John Graber said that what we are basically talking about here is roadway maintenance and some capital improvement programs. We have talked about the drainage facilities, the sewer and the water facilities. One of the things that happens in some of our newer projects that we have talked about, Calhoun Road being the most recent is sidepaths. Now that isn't really necessary for part of the traveling public, the vehicular traffic on there, but if we are going to be putting in sidepaths it's Alternative Transportation, are they going to get billed for

those facilities also, because it's part of their city-wide plan, the same as the sewer plan or water plan? I don't suggest that we do that but it's another source of income and then they would have to look at that as well.

The main thing that is there is the driving surface and whatever else is put in that road right-of-way for the convenience of maintenance and everything else. Just something else to consider.

Alderman Ament said that he thinks that anything to do with sidepaths or sidewalks falls within the roadway projects. I think you were talking about some potential sidepath repairs that we are going to be responsible in our budget.

JP Walker stated that repairs are a budget component. What Mr. Graber is talking about is actually a CIP component. When we were doing Alternative Transportation funding that was CIP. Alternative Transportation is not a utility; it doesn't have its own funding mechanism so I don't see the connection.

John Graber answered that if they want to say "that part of the Alternative Transportation" calls for sidewalks or sidepaths along some street that we are reconstructing as part of their plan, they want us to include it, and then we are paying for that.

JP Walker said that the issue is it's not they want, it's a State mandate that when we reconstruct arterials that we have to look at Alternative Transportation components. Then it really comes down to the Board making a decision like we did on 124th street, do we go with the off road trail or sidepath or do we not. There was no Alternative Transportation committee involved in that decision.

Alderman Ament said that Alternative Transportation just sets the plan but in the end it's our responsibility.

Alderman Wysocki said that's why many years ago when our City started to really grow and this Alternative Transportation was an idea it wasn't even in the statutes I argued for impact fees to cover those things. As the City started to grow it became more of a reality as far as the potential for that kind of use. When we talked impact fees way back when I argued that that could be and should be a component for that because it represented growth in the City and it represented some real Alternative Transportation components that would be used and that would have been the source of funding for it, but it didn't happen.

JP Walker said that he is agendaizing it at the two committees. Where it goes from there, maybe it needs to come back to the Board and then the Board makes a motion all inclusive to go to Council for a discussion.

Motion by Alderman Wysocki to table.

2nd by Alderman Ament.

Upon voting the motion carried unanimously.

ITEM 20-10 Review, Discussion and Possible Action on Recommending that the Rehabilitation of Roadways be Expedited.

JP Walker said that Staff trying to achieve the stated goal of the City in the Comprehensive Plan that says "the city-wide average PASER score should not decrease below 6.0. We are at 5.4, so how do we go about getting the average up to 6.0, under our current software it's 60.0. The only way I know is that we have to expedite the repairs of the roads that have the lowest ratings. To get those to be new roads they go from being a 20 or 30 to being 100 and that helps increase the average. One of the things that I looked at following a discussion with Alderman Ament is what would happen and what kind of impact would there be if we were to combine three years worth of roadway project into a one year project where we have multiple contracts. Well, the impact is it would be \$9 million and that definitely has an impact on the budget, but I bring this thought to the Board for

discussion because according to the Village Engineer/DPW at the Village of Sussex they have done that very thing. They took action to borrow \$6 million for roadway work and they are currently working on borrowing another \$4 million to take advantage of low interest rates. According to our Accounting Department the last borrowing that Council just approved ranged from 0.6% to 3.39% in annual interest, so using a blended interest rate it's about 2.5%, which is about as low as it's ever going to be. Are there savings to be had by borrowing more money at the low interest rate instead of borrowing each year as we have been doing? The point I'm trying to get across is that there is a mechanism that we can get our average up to the goal and maintain it. But it's going to take a considerable effort in one or two years to do it. But then what the Board has to deal with along with Council is the funding and the budget impacts of it. I provided information in your Staff Report that kind of summarizes what I've said here and I'm bringing it forth to the Board for consideration.

Alderman Wysocki said that he appreciates this report and he recognizes that you recognized that we are in tough budget times the economy that's impacting the people that pay our bills is really hammering these people hard. We have very few areas of discretionary funding that we have power over when you take into account all the mandates and the things that we have to do. We have to be careful in this time period that we are in, especially with the financial management plan that we will be developing these types of things are the things that are under our control. Having said that, let's keep in mind as you have indicated an estimated cost of \$9 million, that is only one component of a total CIP and there are other competing needs there that we recognize and struggle to maintain in terms of replacements and or capital projects. I struggle with the idea that this is the best time to borrow, the interests rate are, as a matter of fact, we just approved at Council going out and it looks like we will be getting a report in August from our consultant on the sale of our bonds, but he too indicated the same thing you did that we are in an extremely favorable good times, we have an extremely favorable rating which also helps. If you take a look at this as I hope we do that this is an investment, not just a cost of extending the life of these important assets, i.e.: our transportation system. It's a compelling argument to say ironically that now is a good time to do that with the favorable rates. I'm struggling with this from a financial point of view in terms of the impact on tax rates. We know that 20% of our overall operational budget are dollars that go to Capital cost borrowing. It is a sizeable amount in terms of how we allocate it, but at the same time we are reducing our other capital.

Alderman Ament when I look at the 2011 CIP budget for 2011 it shows a total of \$6,609,000, does that sound right?

JP Walker said \$6.9 million pending what happens on the next agenda item.

Alderman Ament asked assuming that that number is a solid number at this point, is the \$9 million in addition to that?

JP Walker said \$9 million minus the \$2.62 million that is already listed in priority one so it would be \$6.4 million added. You are doubling it to over \$13 million.

Alderman Ament said that I think these are things we need to discuss and knock around a bit rather than me and JP just talking about them.

John Graber said relative to spending money and the cost of the things are going up I would rather spend \$1.00 today than \$1.50 next year. I think that this is something that obviously has financial implications to the budget and everything else, but it is something that has to be looked at. Rather than tabling it is there some formal action that the Board should take to say that at least those of us that are here, let's look at this and we are going to think about it some more, but at least at first blush look at considering this strongly in the needs for the

coming year that we can accomplish getting up above the 60.0 rating, we can do it at a minimal cost but yet go on record for it.

Alderman Ament said he agrees with that but obviously we don't have enough people to go through this but the catch is going to be from the Council's standpoint. This would be a great time to do this, but there are a lot of people out there hurting right now and this could push some of them over the edge. This is going to be a balancing act once these things get to Council

Alderman Wysocki said that he wants to table it because in fairness to the Mayor, he's the budget driver to begin with, and I would really like to have him in this conversation which has been very worthwhile. The other thing is as Dave has pointed out we may need to re-prioritize our CIP plans. This may take on a higher profile than something we currently have and as you know we can discuss our CIP budgets a little later into our budgeting process, so for those two points that is why I would like to table this.

Alderman Ament said that in the end with several of these things we are bringing up it's going to require some thinking and decision making. From our point if we don't make a recommendation to Council it won't go anywhere, but if it does go to Council it will force the Mayor and all of the Aldermen to make a decision, because I know one of the biggest complaints that I get on a regular basis is the condition of our roads.

Motion by Alderman Wysocki to table.

2nd by Alderman Ament.

Upon voting the motion carried unanimously.

ITEM 21-10 Review, Discussion and Possible Action on Including the Paving of City Center Streets as part of the 2011 CIP Budget Request

JP Walker introduced the topic because the streets that have already been built in City Center, Michelle Wittmer Drive, Library Lane and Wilbur Drive to the bridge were built in 2004 so they have been sitting there, being impacted by traffic for six years with just the binder course. The City has a policy that says "when a development reaches 70%, the City Engineer can approve or recommend placing the final lift of asphalt". The three streets that were mentioned have build-out exceeding 70%. We are at the time where we need to consider funding for the final lift and I say we the City because the original developers are no longer around, so there is no source other than the City to make the necessary repairs to the inlets, raise the inlets to final grade, make the repairs to the curb and gutter in those locations and place the final lift. Once the final lift is placed then we have to consider what was included the original concept for City Center. In your packet is an exhibit that shows pavement treatment at the intersection of Library Lane and Michelle Wittmer Drive then also at the driveways adjacent to the Library and also at the driveway that goes to the Medical Office Building. We are aware of what the StreetPrint looks like and we are also aware of what the costs are, so I did a cost analysis comparing StreetPrint pavement treatment to decorative concrete pavement treatment. It turns out that decorative concrete is half the cost of StreetPrint. Alderman Ament brought it up when we were talking about Item 12-10 that we don't know how long StreetPrint will even last but we have a good idea of how long decorative concrete pavement will last. My recommendation as the City Engineer, if we are going to consider pavement treatment at City Center as originally envisioned in the concept plan is that we consider decorative concrete, take advantage of the half-price sale and at least have that as a direct comparison to a couple of the crossings that we are currently doing with StreetPrint. There are a number of alternatives that have to be considered when we do the pavement treatment. Option A is to do the entire Michelle Wittmer and Library Lane intersection as shown in the concept then just do the crosswalks in the other locations including up at National Avenue and Michelle Wittmer at a cost of \$180,000. Option B is just do the crosswalks at each of those locations at a price of \$71,000. Option C is do all of the intersections as shown in the concept at a cost of \$339,000. Option D then

takes option A and adds terrace replacement adjacent to the Library. The reason why I'm suggesting that is because when we repair the curbs and raise the inlets we are going to damage that stamped asphalt terraced area and in my opinion they look terrible anyway and also how would we match color? I am suggesting that consideration be given to using the same pavement treatment as on the roads in the terraced area, in this case I am suggesting decorative concrete. The cost for Option D is \$250,000. Option E is to take Option B but then include the terrace replacement at a cost of \$143,000. Option F is doing all the entire intersections plus the terrace replacement at a cost of over \$400,000. When you combine that with the cost of paving the final lift, my recommendation is that we do Option E, the crosswalks and the terrace replacements and the final lift. \$143,000 plus \$239,000 for a total cost of \$384,000. That cost should be included in the CIP budget request for 2011.

Alderman Ament said that he is wondering what the impetus is behind this. Is this the roadway itself or is it the City Center. We are already considering quite a bit in additional funding for roadway projects. I would be concerned that this is going to get in the way of these other projects that we are talking about. When you mention that normally the developer pays for this, but I would imagine somewhere along the line someone is going to pick up on those properties.

Alderman Wysocki said that his concern is that there will be more development and construction vehicles. One of the reasons that we would not put that final phase on was also recognizing that there is going to be heavy traffic as things get built. Although these roads have over 70% of it developed, I'm afraid that there is going to be significant development yet to come. Is there any concern on your part that this space is being deteriorated without this final cap?

JP Walker answered that he is concerned about the impact on the roads with only having three inches of asphalt there, but you bring up a good point. When development returns and roads need to be constructed, what are the routes? The routes would be the existing roads. There could be the potential of heavy equipment impacting the roads further. Would you rather have them impact the binder, or the final surface? I would rather have them impact the binder, so that brings up a reason for not considering this at this point. To answer Alderman Ament's question, what is the impetus behind this? The impetus has to do with the overall identity of City Center. Staff is trying to figure out how to create that identity with what we already have there and that is where the intersection treatments come into play. Secondly, there is also the age of the roads. They are 6 years old and I think we are going to see more degradation appear which will have an impact on placing the final lift because you have to repair the base areas first. As each year goes by those costs go up. You factor in potential impact of construction traffic that takes this in another direction. Maybe this needs to be part of the discussion that is going on now about the City Center plan, but I wanted to bring it to the Board to get the Boards take on the urgency of this also.

Alderman Ament said that is a good point, because I personally would be uncomfortable making any recommendation until that City Center Plan is gone through and I would imagine that will go relatively quickly from what I am gathering from Greg. I don't think this is a panic mode, looking at the whole thing do you think it's appropriate to table this until we get that information or are you looking for some direction.

JP Walker said that he has no problem tabling this pending how the overall City Center discussion takes place. I think this should be part of that discussion.

John Graber said that he would agree with that also. There are three layers down there now and the final layers would be two inches. The structural numbers out there now are such that if there is heavy traffic on there I think it can be somewhat controlled. We can do some restriction on construction traffic, getting it off of National Avenue at Acredale, you have the south end off of Howard Avenue, the contractor is going to want to

be able to go back and forth assuming those are both done more or less at the same time, so there will be some heavier traffic on that section of Michelle Wittmer or from Wilbur Drive north to try and connect those two and also from Wilbur Drive itself. I would like to get the thing completed so that we have a better base to work with for that construction traffic, especially since we are the apparent owners of those roads and we can't go back to a developer and say you have to do the base patching and whatever, that's not an option anymore. It is something that we have to take care of. If we put the surface on there next year, what would the total life span of that development be with or without the final lift going on? I think we probably would get through the construction traffic a little bit better but how it would affect the long term, 20-year or 25-year life expectancy, I'm not so sure what that would do. What is the timing right now for the City Center and those plans of upgrading it?

JP Walker said that there will be decisions as to the vision of City Center, the route that the City will be going. Part of that decision will be timelines but having not been part of that discussion to date I'm speculating.

John Graber said then perhaps the best thing is to just table it as we have the other items.

Motion by Alderman Wysocki to table.

2nd by John Graber.

Upon voting the motion passed unanimously.

UPDATES

Calhoun Road Construction

JP Walker said that Musson Brothers will be mobilizing this week, they are going to be doing survey work, grade staking, erosion control and the first component that they are going to be working on is the storm sewer at Roosevelt and Calhoun and then going down Roosevelt. They have already changed out the lights at Lincoln Avenue, temporary lights are now in. Not sure yet as to just what point along Calhoun Road they are going to be starting.

Alderman Ament said that it is going to be a major disruption to traffic. Could you get with them and get some kind of schedule and send it to all of the Aldermen so they can answer constituent questions.

John Graber wanted to know if there are going to be weekly or bi-weekly update meetings with the contractors and the City.

JP Walker said there will be meetings, but not sure at this point as to how often those meetings will take place.

Coffee Road East Design

JP Walker said the only thing right now is that plans are progressing. Still haven't received the WDNR decisions on the storm water detention pond. We don't have the environmental approvals. We can't go to the next step until we receive these. The consultant is in contact with the appropriate parties on a weekly basis. We did supply Mr. Morgan with a plan sheet. I would like to take some time to answer the questions that Mr. Morgan has. He indicated that there are some drainage issues that may have not been resolved. I would definitely ask that he meet with Ron Schildt when he returns to look specifically at the areas that he is concerned about. My understanding is that it is going to be curb and gutter and terraced areas are going to drain over the curb into the storm sewer to the catch basins.

Alderman Wysocki said that he wanted to point out the Coffee Road East design is still part of the City Center issue. A lot of discussion has occurred in regard to the vacant areas in our City Center, but I just want to remind everyone that Coffee Road East is the northern end of City Center and a lot of things have developed along there in a good way.

Alderman Wysocki asked if we have looked at the storm water issue and the fact that the land is for sale at the corner of Calhoun and Coffee. Have we investigated further, I know the Assessor gave us the land value, the WDNR apparently has restrictions as to what you can and can't use as far as wetlands. There is a major issue that needs to be addressed and that is where can we get a storm water facility along there in some manner, shape or form?

Alderman Ament said that there is a brand new sign up there again.

JP Walker answered that there was a discussion with the WDNR last Thursday. It was part of the discussion because MLG is the owner of that land right now and their task is they aren't trying to develop at this point but they want to make sure that they are able to repair the drain tiles that are there, to do whatever they can to enhance the sale of that property for potential development. At that meeting I brought up the point that the City has an interest as far as a regional facility of some type, working in conjunction with a development on that property. The WDNR and MLG are both aware of it. MLG did make it very clear that they aren't going to develop that parcel, they will be selling it. The whole idea of the pond that we would be considering would be to retain water not eliminate the water from drainage, but just hold it back and have a controlled release. That obviously will benefit the residents to the west of that location that are always impacted by stormwater and it will still hydrate the wetlands as they naturally occur.

Alderman Wysocki asked if there was anything from your perspective to the WDNR's view of these underground facilities. We had great success with our underground stormwater facilities. That would allow them on the top to plant things. Have they considered the concept of the value that would bring to it.

JP Walker said that he believes the issue is similar to the Underwood Creek issue. You can't get the capacity that you need in the underground structure, typically like the one in Malone Park only has a one acre feet of storage and the one at Eisenhower has similar storage, what we need is probably 20 acre feet of storage, which in this case would be a pond.

Coffee Road West Design.

Tammy Simonson said that we are still looking at the layout of Coffee Road West. One of the major things that I have come across as we are laying out the intersection alignments is that the intersection at Wehr Road is actually meeting Coffee Road at about a 38 degree angle. Standards say that the minimum angle you can meet intersecting roads is about 60 degrees, With that we are going to have to realign Wehr Road slightly in order to get that up to standards. Hopefully I will have a detail for you to look at during our next meeting. We need to discuss it with the resident at that corner as well, as to how we are going to realign that to meet standards.

Alderman Ament asked that as you are coming from the north towards Coffee Road this thing is going to have to take some sort of a bend to the left or further east.

Tammy answered that it will have to shift east to meet Coffee Road. Ron and I are trying to figure out what the best angle is to come in at it. Ideally you are supposed to come in at a 90 degree angle but that would not be beneficial to the homeowner on that corner. We are looking at several different alternatives for that corner.

Alderman Ament said that maybe we should also look with the Police Department to see if there has been any crash history there especially relating to that angle and the other thing is that we are just doing a rehab here, not a full reconstruction. My concern is that we don't hold this up any longer.

Tammy Simonson said that since 2000 there have only been three accidents at that intersection. Hard to say if they are related to the angle of the crash or the profile of the roadway. Hopefully the best alternative will be to minimize the amount of impact but we are widening through there and purchasing right-of-way so now would be the best time to at least straighten out that intersection.

Martin Road Design

No update on Martin Road.

Alderman Wysocki asked if the residents along there have been made aware of this project coming.

JP Walker said that he doesn't know the answer. I don't think there has been a mass mailing.

Alderman Wysocki suggested that those folks are made aware of it.

Alderman Ament said that it is schedule for 2011, right?

John Graber made the motion to adjourn.

Alderman Ament 2nd the motion.

Upon voting the motion passed unanimously.

Meeting was adjourned at 9:22 A.M.