

**MINUTES**  
**BOARD OF PUBLIC WORKS MEETING**  
**August 16, 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: Mayor Chiovatero, Alderman Ament, Alderman Wysocki, John Graber; Alderman Seidl

Staff Present: J. P. Walker, City Engineer, Ron Schildt, Division Engineer Transportation and Tammy Simonson, Senior Civil Engineer.

Privilege of the Floor: No one present

**OLD BUSINESS**

**ITEM 02-10 Approval of Minutes from the June 21<sup>st</sup>, 2010 (Special) Meeting**

**Motion by Alderman Seidl.**

**John Graber 2<sup>nd</sup> the motion.**

**Upon voting the motion passed 4 to 0 with Alderman Wysocki voting present**

**Approval of Minutes from the July 19<sup>th</sup> meeting**

**Alderman Wysocki made the motion to table due to pages missing in the Board packets.**

**John Graber 2<sup>nd</sup> the motion.**

**Upon voting the motion passed unanimously.**

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

**John Graber made the motion to take this item off the table.**

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

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

JP Walker presented a revised 5-Year Roadway CIP Plan spreadsheet along with supporting documentation. The reasons for the revision is because Staff added a request that includes work that needs to be done in City Center and also found a street missing in the 2011 Roadway Rehabilitation Project increasing the amount for rehabilitation to \$2.7 million. Staff is looking for action by the Board to recommending to the Council that the 5-Year Plan be approved.

Alderman Wysocki asked if JP could give a quick overview of the reasons why the additions were made and what they are.

JP replied that the additions were starting with Priority #1, the Roadway Rehabilitation Project. Liberty Lane was not included in the previous submittal to the Board. It is a street that is rated 20 and we are attempting to take care of all the 20's in 2011 and then move on to the 30's. Then the City Center work which was discussed at the last Board was added to the 5-Year Plan. The other changes that have occurred is the re-prioritizing of Glendale and Ryerson, moving Ryerson up ahead of Glendale. That is because we have been approved for an urban construction grant of \$176,700.00 and that has to be spent by the end of 2012, otherwise we won't receive the funding. Originally Ryerson was scheduled for 2013, so I switched the two roads around.

Alderman Wysocki asked what the total cost is for City Center.

JP Walker replied that it is \$382,000 for final paving of the existing roads and the providing pavement treatment. Options were presented at the last Board meeting and the options also included repairing the terraces adjacent to the library because they are going to be damaged when the inlets and curbing adjacent to the inlets are raised to the final grade.

Alderman Wysocki said that he thinks there are two competing issues there. One where we know that there will be construction, we typically wait for the final layer until construction is done. You're estimate is that more than 70% of the construction is completed in that area.

JP Walker said yes, in the areas where the roads already exist.

Alderman Wysocki said the other thing is that you can only keep that base there for so long before that begins to deteriorate and that's another reason that you are recommending that this be done.

JP Walker responded that typically you do not leave a street with just the binder course for more than a couple years. We are in year six.

Alderman Ament said that I see on Martin Road we have the right-of-way acquisition and the construction for 2011, is that because the design is under way by Staff?

JP Walker responded yes, also we have the LRIP grant that we have already been approved for that project and I believe it has to be spent by the end of 2011.

Alderman Wysocki said I sense that this fits in your overall plan and as I look at the Capital Improvement projects relative to all our roads over the next five years, you are very comfortable with all of this being able to be done and it is within a priority of worst to best?

JP Walker answered yes. I will couple that with my on-going concerns about the three STP projects which are priorities #2, 3, and 4. We still have not received the environmental approvals and nothing can proceed until we have those approvals.

Alderman Wysocki asked where they are.

JP Walker replied that they are at the WDNR. We heard that last month and we also heard in November it only takes 6 to 8 weeks and here we are 8 months later.

Alderman Wysocki stated that this has a significant impact on our budgeting.

JP Walker said true, but we are dealing with Federal Funds and part of the approval process is by the Federal Government. In my opinion if they are holding up the project they certainly cannot hold up funding because it's been delayed.

Alderman Wysocki said he's concerned about that because there usually is a time frame on expenditure funds in that situation, are they aware of the fact that this delay is because of another Governmental Agency?

JP Walker responded yes, I have been talking with WisDOT constantly. I have asked the question, "What happens with these approval delays delay this project beyond the spending window and the answer that I was given was that the window would be extended.

John Graber said regarding Woelfel Road, which is about three-quarters of a mile long and there are only 10 properties on there> Why are we spending \$600,000 on a street that only has 10 parcels? Isn't that something that we could better us a half a million dollars somewhere else?

JP Walker replied that the cost estimate is put together for a full rehabilitation of that road. It's beyond the point I believe that we can do our normal GlassGrid and overlay rehabilitation. There is some ditch work that needs to be done that may be extensive. We know we have a number of drain tiles out there which we have now located, survey work is starting this week, so the unknown is the stormwater component. That is why you see the cost estimate more than half a million dollars.

John Graber said that it seems like an awful lot of money to spend for less than a dozen parcels.

JP Walker said that he agrees there are only a few properties out there and that it is three quarters of a mile long, but it is a road that needs repairs.

John Graber said that he could justify it more if it extended up to Cleveland Avenue, but it goes from Observatory Road up to Coffee Road. I just can't see spending that type of money on that low volume roadway.

JP Walker responded that the request came through from the Alderman of the District for us to take a look at it which we have done and we put it in our five-year plan. If the Board has a difference of opinion then the Board has to make a decision.

Alderman Ament said that he couldn't disagree more mostly because that road doesn't have much left to it. The drainage issues are significant along there. They also affect Observatory Road and the residents over there as far as the drainage. If you look out to 2013, we are looking at three years down the road to get this fixed and by then it's going to be in terrible condition and needs serious attention. As these drainage issues especially with the new developments that will be coming in there over the next three years it's going to be worse, but some of it has to do with the drainage issue which relates to some of the issues that JP and I were talking about in regards to funding. If you take those costs of utilities especially stormwater out of these roadway projects these numbers are significantly lower than they are now and so we are being affected here by the stormwater issues. The other thing that I want to ask about is that means that Rogers Drive got bumped down. The roadway itself obviously needs work but the biggest problem there is the railroad tracks. Is there anyway of getting the railroad to repair at least that part of it, there are two sets of railroad tracks there.

JP Walker replied that he has already had discussions with Jim Fisher with the Union Pacific Railroad. We are looking into making repairs that will get us through the next four years at those railroad crossings. One of the

issues is that the Union Pacific says they do not own one of the crossings. One of the businesses in the Industrial Park, according to their records, owns the crossing and we are investigating that.

Alderman Ament asked if it was the east or west track?

JP Walker said it's the eastern one, but they are both in the same condition and we are getting complaints from residents that have to cross, especially those that work on Rogers Drive so we are trying to make progress on that.

Alderman Ament said that he sees everything from trucks to small cars have to come to almost a complete stop, especially the western one, to navigate that. There is no place to go, it is horribly depressed from the road.

JP Walker said yes the issue is between the tracks at both locations so if we are able to put a little bit of pavement in there so that we have equal surface going across there that will temporarily go a long way in solving that problem.

Alderman Wysocki said that the problem with the eastern one is the property that's responsible for it doesn't use the railroad so therefore they aren't interested in investing the money to fix that crossing because they don't use it and haven't for many years.

JP Walker responded that what he is trying to do is trying to negotiate with the railroad and the carrot that I am dangling out there is that our streets department will assist in making the repairs as long as the repairs are made at both locations; we are working on that.

Alderman Wysocki said that 2014 – 2015 are very bare in terms of anticipated scheduling and as I indicated to you in your five-year planning. It seems your window of planning goes from 2011 – 2013.

JP Walker responded that is because we only show 10 priorities on the sheet, the 11<sup>th</sup> priority is 2014 which is Rogers Drive. The numbers are very similar to what you see in the previous three years, it's when we get to 2015 where it starts to lessen out because these are our current design efforts and there is nothing scheduled beyond 2014 other than road rehab. I am hoping that sometime we get to the point where we are talking about our road rehab project and if we can then look at increasing that up to where it needs to be, say 15 miles per year, I think it's a win-win situation.

**Alderman Wysocki made a motion to recommend to the Common Council adoption of the five-year plan for Roadway Capital Improvements.**

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

Alderman Wysocki thanked Staff for the effort in putting this altogether.

**Upon voting the motion passed unanimously.**

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

**Alderman Ament made the motion to remove this from the table.**

**John Graber 2<sup>nd</sup> the motion.**

**Upon voting the motion passed unanimously.**

JP Walker said the Mayor is still looking at a revised budget. From the Boards perspective what I am willing to talk about is the roadway maintenance portion of the DCD Operating Budget. I said at the previous meeting that we need to increase it to \$325,000, which is a \$125,000 increase over the past couple of years. The reason being that we have already been warned that material costs are going up next year and we need to be prepared to handle that in our crack sealing program and also in our pavement marking/stripping program. Those are the two areas that are going to be impacted the most. Having said that, I'm not willing to do that if it's going to cause Staff reduction and the way it looks right now it will cause Staff reduction. So I am now looking at how we can work with the \$200,000 just the way it has been for the last two years realizing that we aren't going to be able to do as many spot repairs. I think I made it very clear that if it doesn't impact staffing levels then we need to be at \$325,000. If it's going to impact Staffing levels I am not comfortable with that recommendation at all.

Alderman Ament said he is not sure how we should handle this recommendation. From the Boards standpoint we would like to see that happen, but that is something that should probably be considered at the Council level when we get to the actual budget. I agree with JP on both parts, we really would like to be able to do that but I also think it would be better to bring it up at the Council level. From the Boards perspective I would like to see us recommend the amount that JP originally had in there and then we deal with that at the Council level.

Alderman Wysocki said that it's also important to keep in mind with the new changes with the Governmental accounting that these roads are an asset to us and we do have a responsibility to manage that as we do our finances, and this is between a rock and a hard place. You have talked to us long and often about the idea that we are behind and if we want to get up to that 6.0 plus rating we can't let roads go. I hear from people in my District how important the roads are not only for traveling purposes but also for the value of their home. That has a significant impact in adding to the value of a neighborhood and individual homes. I do agree we are going to have some tough decisions to be making in terms of our financing. I for one believe, both from a financial point of view and with the idea of what seems to be a high priority among our citizens, roadway maintenance is a very important thing. We could make a recommendation to the Council to seriously consider the appropriate amount but this is a real budget item that is going to have some real discussion. I'm sure the Mayor is pretty much at a point where he is starting to look at his budget in regards to what he told us and he is going to have to be making some tough choices.

Alderman Ament said the he agrees that ultimately the Mayor and the Council will have to make that decision. I think that we should stick with the plan we had. We dropped it down over the last two years because of budget reasons, now we are trying to get it back up and try to recover from that. Once the Council looks at all other Departments and aspects need be adjusted so that we don't lose any people because of that, I think that's a decision the Council should make but from our standpoint we need to stick with our plan.

Mayor Chiovarero stated that he is real strong roadway maintenance and this is a tough decision. JP had come to me as a possible solution to help decrease our shortages in our budget right now. I agree that probably as a Board we should push this forward as a recommendation but the Council is going to have to make some decisions. Right now I have a bunch of Departments going back and looking at things to see how it's going to affect the budget. It's a tough budget, as we all know, and we have some significant increases in expenditures that are out of our control and we have some significant shortages in revenues which are out of our control. We are spinning our wheels as far as that part of the budget goes. Everything else is pretty well controlled as far as operation costs go, it's just the things that are outside of our control. As far as the Boards recommendations go I think it should be brought forward. When it gets to Council it will be discussed as to where we stand on this.

Alderman Ament said that he thinks in the past the Streets Department kind of helped us out with this when we lowered this. This would have a negative effect on them as well because they pick up some of this that we don't get or is it strictly with the crack sealing and things of that nature?

JP Walker responded that he has had many discussions with the Streets Superintendent and they have a limited budget as to the area of their budget that can be applied to the maintenance of our streets. We have been supplementing them. Whatever we have left over after the crack sealing program, after the pavement marking program, and we pay our monthly fees for the preemption signal controls on Moorland Road, we know how much we have to allocate per year. Then the remaining funds go towards spot repairs. The Streets Department uses those funds to make the spot repairs so in essence our budget has been supplementing their budget. If we don't have excess funds because of increased costs in pavement markings and crack-sealing, that's less that we may have to assist the Streets Department. In that light both departments would be impaired to do what needs to be done. We have seen over the last year and a half that the streets that are currently rated 30's are really starting to deteriorate to the point where they need more and more spot repairs just to buy time until we are able to fully rehabilitate them. That's the issue. We use whatever funds are available to do spot repairs but that has to come second to crack-sealing and the pavement marking.

Alderman Seidl said that he is in agreement with a lot of what has been said in regards to the fact that we are in the business of making sure that we recommend what is right for the City and the roads and roadway maintenance. However, by sending this forward we are giving our recommendation with this and my concern with this is the same as JP said, it's going to get before Council and we start looking at the possibility of other budget reductions. I'm uncomfortable sending this forward with the recommendation because when it gets to Council there are going to be some tough decisions to make and I would hate to set this up for failure by moving it forward.

John Graber said that he agrees with Alderman Seidl, but you wear different hats. I'm just on the Board and you are on different committees. The only hat that I'm wearing is the Board of Public Works and as such I think that every Board, Commission, Sub-Committee of the Council is looking out in those meetings for their own interests as to what they feel is necessary. I feel that this is something that is necessary. If the action isn't taken to push it forward that may be looked at by other members of the Council as if we aren't really that concerned about it. They may think that it isn't that important if we are willing to cut back a little bit. I think that more money is needed in it and as such I think the Board should be pushing forward to say, "yes, we have to do this roadway maintenance as the budget has been prepared".

**John Graber made the motion to forward the 2011 Roadway Maintenance budget of \$325,000 onto Council.**

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

Alderman Ament said that he thinks it's better to recommend it because if we don't we aren't going to get it even if it is possible to get. I prefer to recommend it and if it needs to be trimmed back then we can trim it back at that level.

Alderman Seidl said that is where he is struggling. I recognize that we do have that responsibility to the citizens, however if we are pushing something forward with our recommendation I believe that we all need to believe in that and I believe we all do. However, when we get up there and the possibility of Staff reductions and other possible reductions come up is it pertinent to recommend this even going forward? Realistically you said it best Alderman Ament that it can always be shot down at Council or it can be reduced at Council. At this point in time in supporting this we are pushing forward our recommendation of spending the other \$125,000.

Alderman Ament asked are we at a point in your budget where we need a recommendation or is this something that we can bring back next month?

Mayor Chiovaturo said that his time line is to get the budget solidified by this Friday. I don't know if it's going to happen because we are still waiting for some of the costs out there. I'm hoping they come in low to help us. I know that JP has this in the budget, I am working with every Department. They each have some suggestions which are going to impact everybody. We are \$2.1 million out from where we have to be, so there are a lot of things going on. I understand where Alderman Seidl is coming from. I'm on both sides of the fence. I have to recommend a budget that is doable at the Council level and you know how strong I am on roadway maintenance but I do think as a Board of function, we have to recommend what we have to do and if there are cuts they will be coordinated between the Department and myself, brought to Council as a cut and Council is going to have to work through that and struggle also.

Alderman Ament asked if we recommend the \$325,000 based on what JP is recommending, once it gets to your desk and your going through the budget you would recommend reducing this to the \$200,000.

Mayor Chiovaturo said that it is one of the last things on his list to use. It is on the radar screen.

Alderman Ament said that he understands what Alderman Seidl is saying because if every Board, Commission, and Committee sent in whatever they thought was the highest amount, that would make the Mayor's job that much tougher.

Alderman Ament said that we could recommend \$200,000 that if there is an extra \$125,000 somewhere we could go the other way as well. It would be nice to get this done, it would also be a good idea to send the signal back to Council that we are concerned about Staff reductions and we are doing our part as best as we can to help control that.

Mayor Chiovaturo said that if the recommendation goes to \$200,000 I will not be touching anymore of that area.

John Graber said that in his mind he feels we need to recommend what is necessary and I realize that makes your jobs harder, but I feel we need the \$325,000 to maintain the roads the way they need to be maintained.

JP Walker said that we have seen the success of our crack-sealing program. The last two years we have been re-sealing roads that have previously been crack-sealed, sealing new cracks that have occurred. The appearance of new cracks is slowing down, we aren't seeing as many new cracks as we were before, so that's a plus. We are adding in new roads that are now becoming 80's because they may have one crack and they were roads that had GlassGrid applied so we are seeing a slower appearance of cracks. We are seeing a slight reduction in the amount of money that is needed for the crack-sealing portion, but it's the spot repair portion that is increasing. The whole idea of the spot repairs is to buy time for the roads that are rated 30's until we are able to rehabilitate them. We have a three year program that it's going to take to rehabilitate the roads that are currently 20's and 30's. I had brought forth a discussion about accelerating that program, but we know the budget implications of something like that. So crack-sealing is lessening, it's the spot repair portion that is increasing. A lot of that is due to the cost of the spot repair materials.

**Upon voting the motion failed 4 – 1 with John Graber in favor.**

**Alderman Wysocki made the motion to recommend to Council an allocation of \$200,000 recognizing that where and if possible \$325,000 is advisable.**

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

**Upon voting the motion passed 4 – 1 with John Graber voting no.**

**ITEM 19-10 Review, Discussion and Possible Action on how Utility Components in Roadway Projects should be Funded (Tabled)**

**John Graber made the motion to remove this item from the table.**

**2<sup>nd</sup> by Alderman Ament.**

**Upon voting the motion passed unanimously.**

JP Walker said that he hasn't been taken to the Water Resources Management Utility yet because Alderman Wysocki said that that Utility is only responsible for the primary drainage system. Those numbers that were previously presented to the Board are greatly reduced. It's the secondary systems that are adding the numbers up over \$100,000 each year and that's not part of that Utility's responsibility. I don't know if there is anything that I can take to that Utility because we are only talking about a few thousand dollars a year, maybe \$15,000 and that isn't going to have a significant impact on what direction we are looking at as far as total impacts to our roadway funding.

Alderman Ament said that it seems this is getting to the point where some decisions do have to be made and even by us or we need to make sure the Council and the other two Utilities understand these costs and how they are affecting our roadway budgets. JP you had a list of one project where you had separated out the utilities and the stormwater.

JP Walker replied that it is on the backside of the staff executive summary.

Alderman Ament there was another one that had a breakdown of what the costs were and I ran the numbers, you had a total at the end as to what part of it was stormwater. Do we need to identify that stormwater is the reason these projects are going the way they are going as far as the cost. When I look at your breakdown sheet you are showing a total for stormwater on just this project of \$717,900 , water main \$384,700, so the total of those is over a million dollars for the utilities portion of the Ryerson Road project. The utility has probably always been part of what has been done for roadway projects and some ditching was done. The amount of stormwater work that is going into it, Woelfel Road is a good example, that's going to be resolving a lot of stormwater issues and the concern I have is that as we do that when it goes through our tax dollars for the Board of Public Works there are certain entities that are not contributing to these projects. Whereas through the utilities (water, sewer and storm water), the non-profits and everybody is helping to pay for that not, just the taxpayers. I realize that would be very unpopular decisions to make, but I think it needs to be pointed out.

Alderman Wysocki said that what he needs to point out is that we began our initial planning for stormwater we made a definition that essentially the stormwater utility is responsible for the primary conveyance systems, the secondary systems of stormwater that is still identified with the roads. Right or wrong that is how it was decided and what is most important in that decision that then decided on our formula as to how much the stormwater fee would be knowing the kinds of major facilities we would have to maintain and potentially replace. The Storm Water Utility is not responsible for the complete stormwater systems, it is the major conveyance systems that we had to design it for and pay for. This kind of discussion that you are making should be done at the Water Resource Management Committee. If they want to take on at somebody's direction the idea that they are responsible for the entire stormwater systems that is another whole ballgame. That then

would fit in the analysis that JP made with regards to those components being responsible relative to the payments from that Utility.

Alderman Ament said several years ago the Storm Water Committee made the decision to take on those responsibilities and so they need to decide which way they want to go on it. If the ditching, which in the past always was part of the streets or the DPW project responsibilities, that's fine, but they took that over some time ago. They wanted the entire conveyance system and if they want to control that then they need to fund it and part of the reason that that was acceptable at the time was the financial end of it, taxpayers versus through fees that everybody pays for. I don't want to make a decision, I agree that Water Resource should be looking at this but they need to decide which way they want this to go. If they want to keep control of the ditches and things then they need to help fund it. If it's part of our projects and will remain there then they can focus on the major facilities that need to be taken care of, which I agree with. But that wasn't the decision they made some years ago.

Mayor Chiovaturo said that where a lot of this discussion came forward is that the storm water items are an asset to that Utility and that's where we start saying "well, if that's an asset to that Utility, then the Utility should be held responsible for maintaining their asset". I think that's where we started to look at this differently and this is why we are at this discussion. The other thought was obviously Engineering is looking to see how they can stretch their roadway dollars and it seems to be more and more a percentage of their roadway projects, more than 37% of the projects is more than just roadway maintenance. As a Board we have to look at the roads, storm water management does help keep the water out of the roads to help maintain and keep the roads in better shape, but obviously also in the right-of-way storm water has to drain out of the City to protect the properties within the City. I think we have a balancing act that we have to decide if this is an asset to the Storm Water Utility, I agree they should pay for it. We need to look at the Storm Water Utility for what it was set up to be, to maintain a primary conveyance system and they have since become not only maintaining but constructing and building and taking credit for all of the conveyance systems. I think this probably should be discussed at the Water resources management Committee so they can decide which way they want to go. In rehabilitation I think they should pay for it, in reconstruction that's another story, but this discussion should be taken up at the Storm Water Utility so they understand exactly how they are affecting the other utilities and the roadway maintenance.

Alderman Ament said that when this goes to them for discussion it isn't just about money but also the coordination of the projects.

JP Walker responded that it is the responsibility of Engineering to coordinate with the utilities when it comes to scheduling our roadway projects, not only the wastewater and water utility, but also the water resource management issues and we do that. We take careful look at where the work needs to be done, look at the utilities first and then factor in the roads that need to be done and that coordination is taking place.

Alderman Seidl asked if this was discussed at the Utility Committee.

JP Walker replied yes it was.

Alderman Wysocki said that it is still open for discussion. There were a number of questions that were raised that still have to be answered.

Alderman Ament said that he wanted this off the table so that he could clarify what his position is. I'm not necessarily advocating it, I'm just saying is that if they are going to use it as an asset and we are funding it through this, the aspects of the non-profits versus putting it on the taxpayers and what it would free up for us to

get done would be a major political issue on the other end. I think we need to have that discussion so when we do a roadway project I still would like to see that that is separated out like you did with Ryerson, so it's easy to identify for when someone looks at a roadway project, a constituent or a resident or a business, they understand that it's more than just going in there and taking out asphalt and putting some new stuff in. There are a lot more costs involved that we didn't have 20 or 30 years ago.

**Alderman Ament made the motion to put this item back on the table.**

**2<sup>nd</sup> by John Graber.**

**Upon voting the motion passed unanimously.**

**ITEM 20-10 Review, Discussion and Possible Action on Recommending that the Rehabilitation of Roadways be expedited (tabled)**

**Alderman Ament made the motion to remove from the table**

**Motion died due to lack of a second.**

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

**John Graber made the motion to remove from the table.**

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

**Upon voting the motion passed unanimously.**

JP Walker stated that at the last Board meeting we talked about the work that needs to be done in City Center and I laid out a financial picture and also a physical picture as to all the work that needs to be done. Then we factored into the entire discussion that has been taken on City Center as a whole and whether or not this consideration just really is part of that broad picture and that's where we tabled it at the last meeting. The issue is that we know work needs to be done on the roads in City Center. There is a concept plan that called for pavement treatment at the intersection of Michelle Wittmer and Library Lane and also at the driveways adjacent to the Library and to the Medical Office Complex. I added in the crosswalk at National Avenue so it is all part of the overall concept that the walkways and possibly even the main intersection at Michelle Wittmer and Library Lane be accentuated with pavement treatment. I laid out a series of options that varied in costs and then gave a recommendation as to what I thought should be done. The thought that I had was that we at least do the crosswalks and I looked at a comparison of decorative concrete versus the StreetPrint XD version that we just had installed at the bottom of Casper Drive and the one across National Avenue. It turns out that decorative concrete is about half the cost of StreetPrint XD. I presented all that information to the Board and now it's up to the Board to discuss it.

Alderman Wysocki said that we just approved the five-year plan for Capital Improvements and included in there was the City Center at an amount of \$382,000 is that different than what is being described here?

JP Walker answered that is his recommendation of doing the crosswalks and the paving of the final lift.

Alderman Wysocki said that what he is asking is that \$382,000 that amount.

JP Walker replied yes, it is part of your recommendation under Capital Improvements.

Alderman Wysocki asked what action they need to take here.

JP Walker replied the whole discussion when we tabled it was, should this be part of the overall discussion of what's going to happen at City Center and do we really want to be doing the crosswalks. The reason why I presented it was this is our attempt at providing a clear identity in City Center and that is the pavement treatments. Special consideration is needed for clearly marking the crosswalks for the pedestrians so they are more apparent for the motoring public.

Alderman Wysocki asked, so your recommendations are in addition to the \$382,000.

JP Walker responded no, it's in the \$382,000 but the discussion that I'm attempting to have right now that solidifies why it's in the five-year plan.

Alderman Ament said so we don't need to take action on this it's just because we already acted on it through the CIP budget.

Alderman Wysocki asked are you asking us which of the versions we would recommend, is there still a decision need on the decorative concrete or the streetscape.

JP Walker if you were to go with something other than what I recommended that changes the number in the five-year plan.

Alderman Wysocki asked in the five-year plan which one do you have incorporated in there?

JP Walker replied that the one he has incorporated in there is the paving of the final lift, and then putting in the crosswalks with decorative concrete, not the StreetPrint XD because that would double the cost.

Alderman Ament said that we don't need to make a recommendation on that because you already had that in the CIP budget that we approved.

JP Walker replied that he would like to have Board concurrence, it doesn't have to go anywhere beyond the Board as long as you agree with me.

Alderman Wysocki said that he was surprised it was cheaper with the decorative concrete.

JP Walker replied that the costs are what they are, decorative concrete has been around for years StreetPrint XD is new. We know that decorative concrete has life to it, we don't know yet about the StreetPrint XD. Wall Street already has decorative concrete and so we know what it looks like.

Alderman Ament said we want to stay consistent; to a change now would change the appearance of City Center.

JP Walker asked if they all agree with him, he needs concurrence from the Board.

**Mayor Chiovatero made the motion to remove Item 21-10 from the Agenda with concurrence that the Board agrees with the stamped concrete.**

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

**Upon voting the motion passed unanimously.**

## **NEW BUSINESS**

### **22-10 Calhoun Frontage Road Relocation Order**

Ron Schildt stated that this is the Relocation Order for the Calhoun Frontage Road. As you remember we took that area out of the rehabilitation of Calhoun Road that's underway right now. We broke out the frontage road realignments and we will do that as separate projects. This is the Relocation Order for the areas where we need to acquire right-of-way. The funding of \$550,000 was approved in the 2010 CIP budget with the construction project so that is still in there. A Fee Purchase of a little over an acre will be needed and some slight temporary grading areas that need to be acquired will also be needed. Attached to this is the draft resolution which the resolution number will be filled in by the City Clerk prior to going to Council, and also have a draft showing the Relocation Order that will be filed at the County Clerk's office within 20 days of passing at the Council.

John Graber said that this is standard procedure for acquiring right-of-way, it's the first step.

**John Graber made the motion to approve the requested action.  
Alderman Wysocki 2<sup>nd</sup> the motion.**

Alderman Ament said that originally when we took the service roads off of Calhoun Road because of this issue we were talking at that time of making the service roads part of the Glendale, Lincoln and Rogers's project. Will that still be incorporated in the cost of the actual cost in those separate projects?

JP Walker answered that they have already coordinated that with the three consultants. The information from this Relocation Order has already been provided to the consultants and incorporated into their individual designs and it will be part of those construction projects and they are part of the cost estimates.

Alderman Ament said that he is assuming the southern leg from Lincoln to Glendale will be part of the Glendale project or is some of that going to be in the Lincoln project?

JP Walker replied that only the portion that's included in the realignment of the frontage road is part of the Glendale project. Resurfacing of the remainder of that frontage road will be part of an annual; rehabilitation project. The same thing with the Lincoln Avenue and the Rogers Drive projects, the portions in between will be part of our annual rehab work.

Alderman Ament asked so when we get to Rogers Drive, that will only be the relocation and construction of that road the way it's going to wind away from the Calhoun Road intersection a little bit.

**Upon voting the motion passed unanimously.**

## **UPDATES**

### **Calhoun Road**

JP Walker stated that there will be a major change starting today, the work on the water main portion, the changing of the valves, eliminating the valve vaults and working on the storm sewer will be paramount in the next couple of weeks and then the major roadwork starts around the 30<sup>th</sup> of August. I'm still very confident that the project will be done by the end of October.

Alderman Ament said that we might not see a great deal of that storm water work around Roosevelt initially because it is starting on the eastern end first or is it all going to be all at once. I think I saw the e-mail that they are going to have two crews on this.

JP Walker said they are going to have two crews on the watermain portion and then once they get ahead of that pull one crew off onto the storm sewer project. Typically gravity mains are installed from the lower end to the higher end which means you start from the east and go towards the west. There is a lot of work that has to be done right at Calhoun Road and there may be a timing issue there as to when they actually cross Calhoun Road, because that will impact traffic. Other than that typically it is from east to west.

Alderman Ament stated that he knows Staff is comfortable with the contractor on this job. But isn't this the same problem we had on the southern end of Calhoun Road last year where it got tied up till the end because they had to many other projects going?

JP Walker replied that he doesn't see it as a problem but sees it as a challenge for the contractor to work it into their schedule. I'm very comfortable that Musson Brothers will do the same thing that they did on Calhoun Road. They will complete the project on time and it will be done correctly.

Alderman Ament said that he trusts that they understand we expect them to do that and that is their contract and that is what they agreed to. That last e-mail that you sent with the update for Calhoun is still the status. If you would keep Alderman Seidl and myself updated since this is within our districts or keep the Council posted if there are any changes so we can let people know, primarily to avoid the areas on certain days or plan ahead if you coming out of your subdivision.

### **Coffee Road East Design**

Ron Schildt said that they are still waiting for the environmental report from WDNR.

### **Coffee Road West Design**

Tammy Simonson said that JP put together a memorandum to go along with the diagram that I had drawn up. Coffee Road has two intersections with Wehr Road and in going through some of these intersection redesigns we looked at what would be the best way to go about some of the issues that we have with the western section of Wehr Road. It comes in at a 38.6° angle which is sub-standard for current designs. It should be coming in at about 60° at a minimum. If we were to re-align that section of Wehr Road it would actually cut into the parcel, owned by Mr. House, so that is one of the considerations we are looking at. We might be able to not cut into his parcel if we were to cul-de-sac this roadway. Because it would have less traffic we would be able to grandfather that intersection in knowing that less people would be driving down that road. We do have the other connection to the east so to close that roadway with proper radius at the northern end wouldn't be a significant problem for commuting traffic. As traffic is coming south on Wehr Road they would be meeting Coffee Road at a 90° angle which is better for sight distances.

Alderman Ament asked if there are major cost differences.

JP Walker said that Item 3 of the memo talks about the costs, land acquisition costs are \$6,200 and the estimated cost of construction of that cul-de-sac is \$21,000, which is relatively minor when you consider it's only about 1% of the total project costs. We would have to have a neighborhood meeting with the residents that are shown in the aerial view, because that would be a change to the traffic pattern. I understand why Wehr Road was constructed the way it was, but the Barrett Landfill is no longer active and I questioned whether or

not we should have two Wehr Road connections to Coffee Road. I fully support Tammy's suggestion that it be cul-de-sac'd off. I do have a concern about if we do change the angle down at the Coffee Road intersection it will be wiping out three huge evergreen trees which I'm sure will be a topic of discussion with the resident. They are located on that person's property and we would have to acquire right-of-way in that area and obviously if we take out huge trees there is a cost associated with that in the negotiations. It would be good to hear the Board's thoughts on this and if the Board is interested in pursuing this. We would have to have a neighborhood meeting with at least the ten residents that are shown in this aerial.

Alderman Ament said that seeing this is in his District and the fact that I have been advocated for some time that Coffee Road needs to be done as soon as possible, what would this do to the timing of this? I was really hoping to see this done in 2011 or 2012 originally and I think right now it shows on our CIP as 2012. What does this do to the timing because we had a lot of the design has been getting worked on this year. I don't want to do anything that is going to slow this project up because as much as this is important that roadway surface is terrible. I realize straightening out that leg is important overall but I'm not even sure at this point if that is necessary. Maybe we don't have to deal with this until we deal with Wehr Road. I'm not saying this is a bad idea, I think having a neighborhood meeting is still a good idea to get their input but if that's going to slow down this project then I don't think I could support it.

Tammy Simonson replied that they just resurfaced Wehr Road either two or three years ago. So resurfacing Wehr Road between the cul-de-sac bulb and down by Coffee Road would not be necessary, we would just be adding extra pavement near that bulb and then doing the re-alignment down by the intersection. Most of that pavement between there would not be replaced. The re-aligning of Coffee Road because of the amount of right-of-way acquisition that we have on the rest of the roadway this would not slow down the progression of the project at all.

Mayor Chiovaturo agreed that discussion has to be held with the neighbors, they may say "no" they don't want it. I see it as a positive for them for safety reasons and also distinguishes between the two Wehr Road exits. I think a lot of this will depend on the discussion of the neighbors and make sure they have a good explanation as to why and go from there. If it's not going to hurt the construction of Coffee Road I don't see why not. I like the idea, I like that we are being progressive and looking at the safety of the intersection and the people in the area as long as we are doing this.

Alderman Ament said that he would assume that some of the people on Wehr Road in this section between the other Wehr – Wehr intersection and the Wehr – Coffee Road intersection may not have as much trouble with it as the people on the other section because that will see dramatically increased traffic. Would the cul-de-sac require land acquisition as well?

Tammy Simonson stated that yes the pink area on the map is the new right-of-way area that we would have to acquire. All of those trees would stay through there we would just have to add that extra wedge of pavement and then there would be some minor ditching that would go around the outside of that bulb.

Alderman Ament asked if the home that is the farthest north would connect to the bulb?

Tammy Simonson answered yes.

Alderman Ament asked if that is the home where the drive is so much lower than when they paved Wehr Road. I think that is the one where they have to back their car out of the driveway because when they go out forward the bottom of the car hits because Wehr Road was so much higher when it was paved that they can't drive their car straight out of the driveway.

JP Walker said that is the advantage of putting in the cul-de-sac. The cul-de-sac could be lowered somewhat to help out that situation. I see no reason why the cul-de-sac would have to be at the same elevation that Wehr Road is right now, if that is an issue.

John Graber asked if it would be possible in order to keep the Coffee Road reconstruction on track to just discontinue that cross-hatched area and put in that cul-de-sac and make those seven houses have a non-conforming connection with Coffee Road and not even impact that. I think you would greatly improve the overall traffic in the area without a lot of hassle with the people in the section that would become a cul-de-sac and just leaving that 38° intersection for that small number of houses. That would still keep that going, in the worst case scenario.

JP Walker stated that one of the things Tammy has been looking at is our concern about that driveway right at the intersection. That driveway needs to be pulled away from that intersection somewhat. We have the opportunity to do that if we change that angle. We may have the opportunity to do it if we didn't change the angle, we would have to look at the property lines. If it were a cul-de-sac I would be less concerned about that angle than I am right now with it being a full blown road with the amount of traffic that it does have. What I didn't mention at the start of this is that if we were to go forth with this cul-de-sac is that we would have to rename it. My suggestion would be Wehr Court and renumber the houses.

Alderman Wysocki said that when he looked at he thought what if we flipped this and put the cul-de-sac at the Coffee end and then that way you would eliminate entirely that intersection angle. Granted, there would have to be very good signage that this now becomes a dead end and to continue onto Coffee.

Tammy Simonson replied that they would have to buy two houses probably in order to do that.

JP Walker said that one nice thing about where the cul-de-sac is proposed right now is that we wouldn't have to take out any trees, it's just an open area and there really isn't a drainage issue there. There would have to be some ditching done but that ditching could be connected to the west side of the eastern portion of Wehr Road.

## **Martin Road Design**

Ron Schildt said it's still the same but the one question that did come up with that is when I started doing the geometric layouts for intersections I did put bypass lanes to see how they fit. Mainly there are three of them. When we redid the southern section of Calhoun last year we didn't do any bypass lanes and even with the Cold Spring project a couple years ago, we originally had them in there as something we would do with the new roadway construction and ended up taking all of those out of there. Right now it's one of those areas with the storm water issues is what do we do when we have those bypass lanes because there is not a whole lot of right-of-way once you add the bypass lane onto there and we could pipe it through underneath the bypass lane which adds a little more cost than just doing ditching or we could acquire a little bit of easement or we could try to fit a ditch in there depending on how it all works. One question that I have is: Should we just plan to put the road back the way it is right now and not have bypass lanes? The one at Beres Road might be the only one that is more heavily used of the two streets that connect to Martin Road but the bypass lane at that spot would get very close to one of the residents on the west side of road. I think from that standpoint it would be easier not to include them in the project. The road will be a little wider because there will be a little bit of a paved shoulder plus the three foot regular gravel shoulder so somebody would be able to get around a little easier than they can now.

Alderman Ament said that apparently you haven't heard much in regard to those bypass lanes or the request for a need to have bypass lanes. My suggestion would be that we do not include the bypass lanes, just get this road done. It would also affect the cost of the project which is a major issue with our budgets.

JP Walker said that they had a discussion with Dr. Kreutzer at the School District about the possibility of a storm water retention facility on the School District's property south of Beres Road. But he has not heard back from Dr. Kreutzer on the District's thoughts.

John Graber said the only comment that he would have is that is something changes, agendaize it with the appropriate background and then we can take care of it that way rather than discussing it as an update.

JP Walker stated that at the last Board meeting Alderman Wysocki suggested the need to notify the residents along Martin Road of this proposed plan. We intend to do that, but I would like to have more information from the School District on this storm water facility before we send out the notice so we can include as much information as possible. We have time, but we do need to notify the residents, then we may receive more phone calls.

**Alderman Wysocki made the motion to adjourn.**

**Alderman Seidl 2nd the motion.**

**Upon voting the motion passed unanimously.**

**Meeting was adjourned at 9:45 A.M.**