

MINUTES
BOARD OF PUBLIC WORKS MEETING
September 20, 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 8:00 AM.

Members Present: Mayor Chiovatero, Alderman Ament, Alderman Wysocki, Alderman Seidl and John Graber

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

Privilege of the Floor: Mike Morgan, 15385 Coffee Road stated that he is not opposed to the reconstruction of Coffee Road but does have concerns about how it is being constructed. The main one is the fact that the road was pushed to the south right to the property line where it could fit easily to the north within the easements that we have in place. I was part of the City Center planning and at the original time we had a four lane road fitting within the easement rights that we have. I also want to put out that we need to make it a gentler road. The City Center is bounded by Moorland Road which is a better road and National Avenue cutting right through it and this is probably that we have to make a friendly entrance to the other half of the City Center. One of the things would be to slow the traffic out there, the other is we need to start to make it friendly for the citizens going to the City Center and not for the shortcutters that are going through that way and heading out on National Avenue.

OLD BUSINESS

ITEM 02-10 Approval of Minutes from the July 19th, 2010 Meeting

Motion by Alderman Seidl.

Alderman Wysocki 2nd the motion.

Upon voting the motion passed with Alderman Seidl & Mayor Chiovatero voting present.

Approval of Minutes from the August 16th, 2010 meeting

Motion by Alderman Seidl.

Alderman Wysocki 2nd the motion.

Upon voting the motion passed unanimously.

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

JP Walker stated that it is on the Utility Agenda for their meeting on September 28th.

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

John Graber made the motion to remove from the table.

Alderman Wysocki 2nd the motion.

Upon voting the motion passed unanimously.

JP Walker stated that this issue was brought to the Board at a previous meeting, the impetus behind the discussion is to look at how we go about achieving the stated City policy that we want to have our weighted average pavement condition to be 6.0 on the PASER rating or 60.0 on our current pavement condition software program that we use. I laid out a possible way of doing that and how long it would take for us to get up to the 6.0 average. The reason why I brought forth this issue is to combine the annual programs into one to get a lot of work done that will help us get to that weighted average quicker. I received a call from the Village Engineer in Sussex and they did this; they went forth and bonded originally \$6,000,000 last year and another \$4,000,000 this year and they went to what they call a Bond America program. It came in at 2.99% interest but they got a 10 year bond at 1.96% interest. In talking with our Accounting Department, the way we bond there is a term that is called "blended interest rate" and according to Ralph Chipman we would be around 2.5% interest so we are in that ballpark. The question is: is the timing right to consider expediting our program to get us to the stated policy or is it a tough sell because of the tight budgets and the impact that the debt service would have on our operating budget?

Alderman Ament asked if the spreadsheets that were in their binders are based on the way we are doing it right now as far as the 30's.

JP Walker responded yes that is correct.

Alderman Ament said if that were to happen this would cover all of the threes that are here right now is that correct?

JP Walker answered that is correct.

Alderman Ament asked what that would do as far as moving the 30's or the 3's up. Assuming that they didn't get worse over the years, would that take care of all or some of 2013 and move it up into 2011 & 2012?

JP Walker responded that the three year program that he has currently laid out on our five-year plan would be combined into a one-year program and it would eliminate all the roadways that were rated 20's & 30's in 2009. Next year we have our next bi-annual rating program that we will be going through. A lot of the 40's may now be 30's, but we won't know that until we do the evaluation. Based on the current 2009 ratings the 20's and 30's would be eliminated by the end of 2011 if we were to expedite it. Now it may require multiple contracts but if that's what we have to do then that's what we do.

Alderman Wysocki said that he appreciates Staff's initiative on this because our roads are a very important asset to our City. Borrowing would be a good financial decision with the current rates. However, when I reviewed all of this and looked at our Capital borrowing and our five-year plan, it seems to me that we will be putting a greater priority on our Industrial Park. We have major road work that has to be done in there in the next three to four years with substantial amounts of money that we will be borrowing and if the economic times were different if our equalized value had gone up rather than down I could see where we would have an additional tax base to support this idea, but the bottom line to me is that I just don't believe that we can afford it at this time in view of the priority that we have already put out there in terms of our Industrial Park. I just don't think

this is the time for us. We, ironically, can't even afford the lower rates. We can't afford to increase our borrowing, and we are at about 20% of our budget right now in terms of debt service. Sitting up here on the Board I think it's a great idea but in the bigger picture I don't think we can afford it at this time.

Mayor Chiovaturo said that he agreed with Alderman Wysocki on this one but if you look at our CIP for this year and next year most of it is already weighted heavily towards roads anyway. Those are roads that we plan on rehabbing and reconstructing. This would be added to those projects, correct?

JP Walker answered that about \$6 Million would be added because the \$2.7 Million is already included.

Mayor Chiovaturo said I know this year we moved one of the projects to next year because of some STP funding and it's really putting the burden on next year. It would be nice to do this since the interest rates are great at this time. Our current budget is 18% for borrowing and that is having a lot of impact on our operating budget and other items that we need to do to keep the City running on a daily and yearly basis. As much as I would like to see us move forward on this I agree that it's going to be a tough pill to swallow at this time.

John Graber said that I'm not as familiar with the budgetary process as the rest of the Board members are. I feel if we can get the money at a cheaper rate and perhaps at a cheaper cost, we don't know what the asphalt prices will be next year, they always tend to go up a little bit and as such if we can get & use cheaper asphalt next year than we would in the following years it just makes more budgetary sense in my mind. I would state that if we can get the money for at a blended rate of 2.5% that is a good deal. It also tends to help the overall economy of the area. I do realize that it's going to have some long term impacts over 10 or 20 or the life of the loan.

Alderman Ament said that one of things that I am curious to know is it possible to have Ralph give us some kind of evaluation of how this would effect further budgets if we did this based on current interest rates?

JP Walker said that he has already talked to Ralph about that and Ralph said that it adds \$900,000 to the operating budget per year.

Alderman Ament said then my next question is, is there somewhere in between? When you are talking about moving these up we are talking about a \$9,000,000 jump to move some of these up, say half of them for example. What I'm looking for is maybe \$9,000,000 is too big of a bite, is there somewhere else we can go to improve this without going over the top. I would assume then let's say it was \$4.5 million you would be looking at \$450,000 per year, roughly. Is that pretty accurate?

JP Walker answered that he thinks that is pretty accurate. \$4.5 million if you assume \$300,000 per mile that represents 15 miles of rehab. That puts us into a 15-year cycle which I think is where we want to be, certainly no more than a 20 year cycle since roads only last 20 years. But for our rehab cycle 15 years would be ideal. So that's where the \$4.5 million range would put us.

Alderman Ament said does the Board want to take any action on this now or do we want to think about this for another month.

Alderman Seidl said that he doesn't think another month is going to matter. Even at the \$450,000 per year I don't think that I can support this.

Alderman Ament said that I think we all agree that this would be a great thing to do but I would like to see once we go through the budget because this isn't going to effect the budget for 2011 but it will start in 2012 and 13 and beyond, how many years is Ralph projecting this on tenure?

JP Walker answered that he didn't say, I assume it was 20 years, but it may have been 10.

Alderman Ament said that if the Board or the Council would approve either one of those numbers it's just going to tie future Council's to that debt service but we do that all the time anyway. The mention of the Industrial Park, I agree completely that the Industrial Park needs those improvements for more than one reason. Not only do the roads themselves need it and I think it would be beneficial in attracting and retaining businesses that we have in there which is a big asset for us as far as our tax burden overall especially when you include the school portion of the tax. On the other hand we don't know where we are going to end up with the CIP budget and the Operating budget. I would really like to see that number in future budgets. Not that all of a sudden after 2011 everything is going to be great, because we are going to have these problems going on and on. I just hesitate to throw this out of hand just yet.

Alderman Wysocki said this is the beginning of what we call tough decisions and we can leave it on the table, which I do not want to do. I really appreciate the work that was done, I understand you bringing this forward and I applaud you for that but I don't see even for the next couple of years putting this on budgets. We want to stay under 20% of our debt service or in that area. This will increase it. We have a program that we are going forward with. Right now in this economy and in the foreseeable future we will have to stay on the program we have and work those things out and make the tough decisions that we have to.

Alderman Wysocki made the motion to move this item from the agenda.

Alderman Seidl 2nd the motion.

John Graber said that he thinks it's something we really should do. By keeping the status quo that we have established right now we aren't going to be really gaining anything on the 60 rating.

Upon voting the motion passed 3 to 2 with Alderman Ament & John Graber voting no.

NEW BUSINESS

ITEM 23-10 124th Street Relocation Order

Ron Schildt said that this item is before you for two reasons. The Board and Council took action on this relocation order last year. We were advised by DAAR Engineering, who is the project management consultant for the WisDOT, that we should not be doing any right-of-way acquisition on any of our STP projects until our environmental documents have been approved by all the respective bodies, so we basically had to stop work on any kind of right-of-way acquisition on 124th Street at that point. It was filed right around the same time as we thought we were going to be getting our ER documents but that was almost a year ago. We finally received the approval for 124th Street. I think the consultant has that in their hands right now. The appraisals that we had for the two properties in New Berlin have expired. They are usually only good for a year or so. The other problem is that we had a third parcel be added because of the WE Energies gas line that is running along Grange Avenue. Because of some changes that had to be made to the road profile, we added a third parcel that needs a small TLE area added around their driveway and in the northeast corner of their property. That's basically shown on the excerpt from the right-of-way plat showing that there is third parcel that is right on the corner of St. Mary's Drive and Grange Avenue. That is really the only change, we would have had to bring it back anyway just to have it re-approved because we added the third parcel. The full relocation order does include the Hales Corners properties also and talking with WisDOT they suggested that we try to combine plats instead of having three right-of-way plats for the three separate municipalities. So we worked with Hales Corners to combine our information with theirs. There are two different types of right-of-way plats, one is called TPP,

Transportation Project Plat, which is done differently and that is the way Greenfield is moving forward. We are still doing the old style right-of-way plat along with Hales Corners. Greenfield will have a separate one and WisDOT was fine with doing it that way. We just need to re-approve this one, have Council re-approve it once that is done we will get the respective signatures and have it filed at Waukesha County and then we can move forward with our right-of-way acquisition.

Alderman Ament asked if for some reason this wasn't approved what would be the alternative.

Ron Schildt replied that we couldn't start right-of-way acquisition. WisDOT does two different dates that are really important, one is the PS&E date, which is when the plan, specifications and estimates have to be to their Central office so they can start their review. That's typically 3 to 6 months before the project is Let to a contractor and then you have the Let date which is after that. Right now I believe this one is set for a February 2011 PS&E date and a May 2011 Let date. They usually want the right-of-way cleared a month before that PS&E date so they know that there is no other lingering issues. Acquisition can take anywhere from 6 months to a year. Luckily we have very little that we have to do and Hales Corners only has one property that they are acquiring right-of-way from so the other ones were all right-of-way reservations that all they only had to do was accept them and take care of the needs that they had. Any delay in this would significantly hinder the project.

Alderman Ament asked that in New Berlin we only have the three properties that are identified on this site plan.

Ron Schildt replied that yes that is all. The right-of-way plat between us and Hales Corners would only have four plats on it.

Alderman Ament asked if this would have any effect on the minimum lot size or the setbacks for these properties as far as creating a non-conforming lot.

Ron Schildt said not that he is aware of. The two first ones that are requiring a fee purchase is just taking it out to what the standard right-of-way width is along Grange Avenue and the third one is just a temporary one during construction. As far as I'm aware of there wasn't any problem with setbacks.

John Graber suggested as I looked at this plat there is really no way of seeing that this is the revised plat and I would suggest that on the final one that gets recorded it makes reference to the resolution number or something like that to show that it is a revised right-of-way plat.

Ron Schildt said that this is only one sheet of the right-of-way plat, we will include the rest of them when it goes to Council.

Alderman Seidl said that he will be abstaining from whatever vote we have. He knows one of the property owners very well and I don't want any sign of impropriety on that.

Alderman Wysocki asked if we are going to have to pay for new appraisals.

Ron Schildt said that we did have to do the two appraisals because of the delay in the project and then we had to add the third appraisal and acquisition services for the third one. It is WisDOT's requirement that we had to follow, even though there is no Federal funding in the land acquisition phase, but because there is Federal funding for the construction phase we are trying to follow all their guidelines and they are only good for a year.

Alderman Wysocki asked if this project gets delayed because somebody else goofs up and there is another appraisal they will pay for it, correct?

Ron Schildt said that at this point we have everything we need in place. We have our information from the ER for the entire project, all three of us can start right-of-way acquisition.

John Graber asked if we are dealing with the same appraisal company that did the first appraisal, so it's just updating their appraisal, it's not like we are starting from square one.

Alderman Ament said that when he looks at the schedule that basically addressed the three STP updates, but we are looking at the right-of-way acquisition completed by April 1st, does that allow enough time for us to do that. In the past I've always heard that's a big long project, is it shorter because we have already been involved with this with these parcels to some degree.

Ron Schildt said that yes, because one of them is only a temporary one, that's usually something quick. You only have three parcels you are trying to coordinate rather than a dozen or so and the two other property owners were already contacted, even though they weren't supposed to be yet until we had the environmental document approved. Everything is in the works and the appraisals are under way because we have the document signed plus there are only three parcels that we have to work with.

Alderman Wysocki made the motion to recommend to the Common Council to approve the 124th Street Relocation Order via Resolution #10-25.

John Graber 2nd the motion.

Upon voting the motion passed 4-1 with Alderman Seidl abstaining.

UPDATES

3 STP Projects

JP Walker said that he created a memo and a revised five year plan based on discussions in the memo. We had a teleconference with WisDOT and DAAR Engineering a couple of weeks ago and two of the STP projects are being moved back to 2012 construction. They are Lincoln Avenue and Coffee Road East. 124th Street is still on schedule for construction in 2011. In the memo that you have in your packet it lists the PS&E dates and the Let dates. By the State allowing the project to be moved back we asked the question, is there going to be an impact on our ability to obtain the Federal funding. I asked for the response to be in writing and we received an e-mail from DAAR Engineering and then a follow up e-mail from Robert Schmidt in WisDOT confirming that moving the two projects back to 2012 will NOT effect or jeopardize Federal funding. We learned for the first time that there is actually a 10-year window in order to get the projects completed. I was not aware of that before the teleconference two weeks ago. We are well suited to get these projects completed without jeopardy to the funding. Since two of the projects are going to move back, it causes us to reconsider the five-year plan which you see in your packet. By moving Lincoln Avenue and Coffee Road East back to 2012 that significantly changes the total budget request. It decreases the 2011 budget by about \$3.2 million to \$5.8 million and increases the 2012 budget to just over \$12 million. Consideration should also be given to looking at moving Coffee Road West up so that we can balance the budget between the two years a little bit better. The bottom line is that 2011 total budget request is now \$7.95 million and the 2012 budget is estimated to be approximately \$10 million. Talking to Ralph Chipman, if we were to consider moving Coffee Road West up to 2011 but look at not bonding it until late in the year in 2011 we could avoid arbitrage costs on that project because construction won't start until late in 2011, most likely in 2012. I had talked to Alderman Ament about this when we were talking about the overall agenda and it made sense to try and move it up and try and get the funding in 2011 even if construction doesn't start until 2012. This is our attempt to try and balance the two year budget so there isn't as large a discrepancy between one year and the second year.

Alderman Wysocki said it looks like this is workable.

JP Walker said that you will have to take a look at this as part of the CIP budget because it's different than what is in the budget packets for Council.

Alderman Ament said that it shouldn't have a significant impact on the debt service other than in 2011 will be a little less and 2012 it will be a little more than we originally had because of the way you balanced it out.

Calhoun Road

JP Walker stated that as far as the Calhoun Road rehab construction goes, it is on schedule. If you have had a chance to drive the construction zone you can see that the road has been milled. Work on the water main is completed and the hydrant relocations are completed. There has been a slight snag in the Roosevelt storm sewer completion because they ran into a conflict with an unknown conduit below grade that has caused a delay but they are still working on all the grading of the ditches north of the railroad tracks. I have no doubt in my mind that the project will be completed on time by the end of October.

Alderman Ament said that since it's been milled it's actually smoother than before.

Ron Schildt stated that he had met several times and Waukesha County had a public informational meeting with some of the property owners and area residents about the Calhoun Road/Cleveland Avenue intersection. When the County looked at the design concepts they basically looked at the original design, similar to what we had when we had that as part of our Calhoun Road project. One of the other ideas they were looking at is a roundabout and how that would fit through the intersection. They did have a consultant at the last public informational meeting and a preliminary layout for the roundabout just to see how it would fit in there and seeing that it does work and does fit through there, at this point with the preliminary design, not knowing the vertical alignment of how it's going to work, they went the next step further and did their intersection control evaluation which is their procedure to look at different design requirements; to see the cost differential for different designs. Because a roundabout has less conflict points it may be a better option. They looked at:

- an operational analysis
- delays, how much traffic they have and what it would be with current volumes and the designed volumes
- construction costs as to what the costs would be for reconstructing it with the signal compared to the roundabout
- right-of-way acquisitions for both of them
- what things would have to be changed, obviously access to properties and how things work out there
- maintenance costs, the cost of the signals, there is actually more street lighting for a roundabout because it's important for people to see where the lanes better
- environmental issues would be pretty much the same for both of them
- pedestrian and bike accommodations, what they are planning typically for a roundabout you do have an area of each of the sides of the four quadrants where it gives an opportunity to a pedestrian or cyclists to walk and get around the outside of the roundabout and get to the crossing points of the four legs of the intersection.

Then they go through the whole matrix and they weigh everything and show what things work and what things don't. They show the layout of both alternatives. There is less right-of-way costs with the roundabout. They rank these and as you can see the roundabout had a ranking of 347 and the signalized intersection had a ranking of 264. At this point they are looking that the roundabout functionally seems to work better, it provides better

safety. They still aren't sold on the roundabout over the signalized intersection. They are looking for input from the City. They would like to start construction in June of next year. Any delay in the schedule would push this back because they would not want to do this over two construction seasons. If there is no real difference from the Board members and it's more of a County issue and let them decide and we will react to their decisions. If you have a formal decision they would accept that as well. They will probably make their final decision within the next month or two.

Alderman Ament said that he doesn't think they could take any action other than you collecting our comments.

JP Walker stated that all the County is looking for is information in our minutes; if the Board has an opinion. There doesn't have to be an official motion from the Board, they are just looking for input. Are there definite opinions of the Board or is the Board comfortable with either alternative and if the Board is willing to go with the County's decision or if you have objections to specific alternatives.

Alderman Seidl stated that he has an issue with the roundabout. Looking at the gas station, the strip mall and McDonalds would all be losing some of their access. If you are traveling southbound, the gas station has diesel pumps right there, there are two exits onto Calhoun Road from the strip mall which I think they would have some serious concerns with that. As well as McDonalds, you wouldn't be able to go south on Calhoun and turn left into the McDonalds parking lot anymore which would impact their business, and they might even have to reconfigure their drive-thru at that point in time. We are affecting three different businesses right from the start. I did talk with the owners of the gas station. They didn't give me an idea of how they felt about either one but I know they weren't wild about the roundabout and losing their entrance on Calhoun Road. The County stated that they could join up their parking lot with the strip mall but what would end up happening is then all the traffic would go through the strip mall's parking lot and there would also be semi-traffic going through the strip mall. I haven't heard from anyone at McDonalds so I don't know their feelings. I don't believe that we should wait and see what the County does and then react. I think we need to be proactive with this. I would prefer that it would stay signalized.

Alderman Wysocki said that he shares the business concerns with Alderman Seidl. Did they bring this up at the public informational meeting?

Ron Schildt answered that they brought them both up. Remember at a roundabout you can do a u-turn at one. You can now make a u-turn at a signalized intersection as long as it's not marked against it. Because of the way the configurations would be with the turn lanes there probably wouldn't be enough room to be able to make a u-turn and there will be medians going through here where they might be able to put a left turn lane with the roundabout option. With the signalized one they wouldn't do that so there would be medians there so the people wouldn't be able to make a u-turn.

Alderman Wysocki said that the roundabout concept is good, but I still see problems with them. They aren't large enough for trucks. I don't see them as safe unless people are really paying attention to them. If they signalized them and used their computer systems and cameras to make sure at peak times, I think that would be good. I would prefer to stay with the signals.

Alderman Seidl pointed out that there will also be quite a bit of school bus traffic traveling through there.

Mayor Chiovarero said that the thing about the roundabout here is that those accesses will be open where in a signalized intersection the accesses that Alderman Seidl brought up regarding the gas station and McDonalds will be closed. So the roundabout is a better access than the signalized. The fact that if someone can't make it into one of those establishments they have the u-turn capability of turning around and getting into it. I think the

familiarization of the roundabouts is getting better with people but I still here complaints about the ones on Moorland Road. I still complained to the State that the south roundabout is too small and it's confusing because it's also the entrance to the theatre but people are getting used to it. In this particular area I wonder how it would fit because of the space restrictions, I'm glad to see it fits. I would say I'm about 51% roundabout and 49% signal because there are a lot of advantages to the roundabout, it keeps traffic moving and you won't have the backup. I have been contacted by the gas station owner every couple of months worried about his access off of Cleveland Avenue. I remember we talked about combining access with the strip mall. I know there hasn't been any work with that yet. I don't know if that's even possible because I think it would require some type of CSM or notation so they both could operate properly. McDonalds, they are in a tight spot as it is, but I don't think it affects the other two corners much. As far as the access to the businesses, roundabouts are the way to go in my opinion. I am concerned that this could be a heavy truck area and exactly what Alderman Wysocki brought up is that some of these trucks are getting used to maneuvering through the roundabouts but I don't think they are 100% comfortable with it. If I had to make a choice right now I would go with the roundabout, but with the signaling definitely more preferred in today's world but I would say in a couple of years, especially with Brookfield putting them in now as people get more familiar with them they will be more accepted.

John Graber shared the concerns with the others, the truck traffic and the school bus traffic. Being an engineer I would like to see this agenda'd at the next meeting for a more detailed look. This is just kind of off the cuff type of comments that I am able to make on this without any previous review or analysis. I think the comments that have been made regarding the gas station and McDonalds especially, I don't see a lot of problems because at the Northeast corner there is no effect now. The southwest corner, I don't see a lot of problems, but it's the two remaining corners, the northwest and the southeast that are really going to have to be looked at.

Alderman Ament said that the biggest problem that he sees with the roundabout is the retail areas as far as the traffic. There is a lot of traffic going in and out of both of those establishments but with the roundabout my concern is that if you are going south on Calhoun Road you are going through that roundabout and paying attention to all of the people that are trying to come in and are you in the right lane, then you will have people, if that median isn't there, trying to turn into McDonalds that close to the intersection. Whereas on Cleveland Avenue, both sides have at least some separation. As we all know if something happens in the roundabout it pretty much stops everybody in all directions which is the biggest problem. I do appreciate that Waukesha County is letting us weigh in on us. I also would like this not to go too long because it would be really nice to see that intersection, one way or the other to complete that leg from Greenfield to Cleveland for Calhoun Road traffic flow, regardless of how good Calhoun Road works out internally as far as the City's part of it we are still going to have a lot of issues until that intersection is resolved because that is a major part of the construction. I would prefer to keep it signalized. JP do you think what we just discussed is enough for them to go on or do you think based on the discussion that there was some hesitation with the roundabout we should give this another month?

JP Walker responded that he doesn't think it's worth waiting another month. What I've heard hear is opinions both ways but the majority of the opinions are leading towards the signalized intersection versus the roundabout in that location. One thing that I would like to point out and make sure is if we go back to the original agreement that we had with the County that there will be coordinated signalization between Lincoln Avenue and Cleveland Avenue. I want assurances that the County is going to follow through on doing that.

Alderman Ament said that he would imagine when they are doing the intersection now on Lincoln Avenue they are installing whatever the County needs for that or is that something the County can install later on when they do Cleveland?

Ron Schildt said that they will have the same video detection as what they are using on Moorland Road right now. The only thing we won't have is whether they are planning on doing a radio interconnect or whether they want to hard wire, so if they choose a signal here they would hopefully appropriate that same equipment for that intersection and not make us pay for it. That would have to be the clarification with them as to how we get the interconnect between the two of them.

Alderman Ament said that he distinctly remembers that there wasn't any question as to they were going to handle that. They committed verbally that they would take care of the intersection connect.

JP Walker said that he will send the excerpts from the minutes on this particular item along with statements that Ron and I have made to get clarification on it. I want it in writing from the County on this signal issue coordination.

Coffee Road East

Ron Schildt said that there isn't really anything new until we get the ER signed. They have made final changes and those are supposed to be sent to DAAR Engineering and to get the FHWA write off from all the respected people in Madison. Hopefully that will have the ER done by the next time we meet and we will have the relocation order. We have that all set right now, the right-of-way plat is completed by the consultant, we have the same resolution that we had prepared for 124th Street, we have that all ready. It's just a matter of packaging it all up and bringing it to the Board once that ER is signed so we can start that process. There is a lot more land acquisition that we will have for the pond and the number of parcels along there.

Alderman Ament said that this is primarily because of the west of Moorland Road area as far as the storm water issues, that's what the primary hold up is, we aren't looking at WDNR issues on the eastern leg are we.

Ron Schildt said that the whole environmental document covers the different alternatives that you are considering, everything from there, so if you start looking at changes in design that also means the environmental report would change also. You have everything from endangered species with the WDNR plus the different design concepts that you have looked at.

Alderman Ament asked that even if there were changes east of Moorland Road that could throw this whole thing back again.

Ron Schildt said that it's one whole document. It covers the entire project.

Alderman Wysocki said that we have had a variety of different examples or design features for that segment. Were they all figured in this package?

Ron Schildt answered that it does to a point, you basically put in there what the cross-section is, and then it's expansion at the intersections with just turn lanes and a single thru lane for a different area. If you start to call it something completely different than what that part is considered and make a substantial change to it then it would be looked at differently. We would have to talk to the consultant and see if all those options were in there and we just specified that we are looking for something in this range and whether that fits in there.

Alderman Wysocki said that he wants to have another neighborhood meeting on the eastern leg of the project between Moorland Road and National Avenue and I really need to have that because of some of the changes that we have made. I want people to know exactly what is being proposed. We have heard some concerns from

the privilege of the floor and I want those concerns addressed. Once we get that ER the project is designed within those parameters is that correct?

Ron Schildt answered that is correct. I will check with our consultant to see what impact that would have.

Alderman Wysocki stated his second point is, did we ever check on the availability of land, that parcel is for sale on the corner of Coffee Road and Calhoun Road. Did we look at the possibility of putting some sort of storm water facility in that area and what the costs would be.

Ron Schildt answered that we did meet not specifically for that, they actually came to us looking at what they would have to do to develop that property and we talked to them at that point that we would like to incorporate some features maybe from our project into what they are doing. If we can do it mutually that makes sense. That would be a no cost alternative to the City. We are still pursuing just the pond option as what we need to do for the road portion and hoping that when they come through with the rest of whatever they plan to do we can still incorporate some features maybe into that. They are still in the midst of trying to figure out what they can and can't do. We can't go through any right-of-way discussions with anybody until we get the ER.

Alderman Ament said that he would also like a neighborhood meeting to give updates to the people, it will help them understand that Staff has not been sitting on their hands other than waiting for things that are out of their control to develop so that they understand this isn't being put off because we can't make a decision. The problem is we have to wait for an answer from the State before we can do anything. To some degree this goes back to what we were discussing originally and part of the earlier agenda item as far as the cost of doing this project. I don't know exactly what the cost is but I would imagine at least half or more of this project has to do with storm water so just a point for the storm water utility and I know their issues but I know on this road a substantial part of this project involves storm water issues, not just along Coffee Road but also in the surrounding subdivisions. This project is coming through to their benefit. The other thing is that I would like to ask the questions, between Moorland Road and National Avenue, as far as the right-of-way on the south side, to address Mr. Morgan's concern's, if this was a four lane road we would still need all of that right-of-way to get this job done, is that correct? We aren't doing anything more by this design as far as the right-of-way than we would be with the four lanes is that correct?

Ron Schildt said that we are very similar for the majority of the section with the four lane concept except for the median that would have been in the middle of the roadway. The original concept had the sidewalks on both sides, we took off the north side one. Other than that right-of-way through there, in fact when we did the original concept for the one that I drew up originally we thought if we were to do sidepaths on both sides of the road, bike lanes, the full median width, we would have actually had to acquire from both sides of the street to fit all of that into the roadway.

Coffee Road West Design

Tammy Simonson stated that on September 9th Alderman Ament held a neighborhood meeting with the residents near Wehr road to discuss the realignment of Wehr Road west. Some of the points that were made at that meeting were that the residents along Wehr Road East did not want the increased traffic that would be produced if we were to put a cul-de-sac on Wehr Road West. Residents along the western part were in favor of the cul-de-sac but they understood the concerns of the other residents as well. We also had the opportunity to talk to Mr. House who lives on the northeast corner, which is most impacted by the realignment of Wehr Road on the west side and he is OK with the realignment that would go through his property and the removal of the three pine trees on the corner. So that is a significant marker as to which plan we are going to take. So the plan moving forward from here on is to realign Wehr Road West at the 60 degree minimum standard angle to take

out those three pine trees on the corner and to not put in the cul-de-sac on Wehr Road West and to leave everything else as is. We are also going to be looking at the realignment of Coffee Road at Racine Avenue and that is going to be a discussion with the County in the future.

Alderman Ament asked what they think the timetable would be on the design and overall assessment will be.

Tammy Simonson answered that at this point she has the geometric layouts about 95% complete. The next step is going to be moving on to discussing with the storm water utility to see what their needs are going to be as far as storm sewer and culvert layouts, if there is going to be any buried culvert in certain locations, getting that storm design figured out so that we can get the geometric and profile finalized, it's getting close. I would hope before the end of the year.

Alderman Seidl asked if you could get me something more finalized when you have it so I can have a neighborhood meeting.

Martin Road Design

Ron Schildt said that the only major things that have taken place in the last month is that we trying to get a meeting together with the School Board about some of the school property just south of Beres Road where we would like to put a stormwater pond on for the project. Right now Nicole Hewitt and I are trying to work on the storm water part of it. Within the next week or two she will try to work on storm water needs and how to get all of those to work with the pond. Greg is going to talk to the School Board members on Friday and see if we still should bring something to them or if we should wait until we have something a little more final storm water design to see how big the pond has to be and how the water would get to it. We will probably be pushing it back until the next meeting in October. The geometrics are laid out for it; we are working on the profile as we work on the storm water issues, we will find out if we need any right-of-way acquisition. Right now it looks like we would only need it if we do the stormwater pond and then a little bit down at Beres Road for the radii around the intersection.

Alderman Ament said that again he assumes a large portion of this project is going to be storm water related and one of the reasons it is taking so long, and who is going to be responsible for the land acquisition of the school property assuming that could work out.

Ron Schildt said we are hoping that there wouldn't be any. Dr. Kreutzer said that the school really didn't have any plans to use it as a school, but they talked about different options of what they might use it for, what they might sell to somebody. They understand that us starting a storm water pond or sizing it to have enough capacity for whatever goes in there in the future is a benefit to them. He was hoping that we could work out an agreement that we could use the property for however big the storm water pond has to be and that it worked out for them to be able to not hinder some type of development in the future.

Alderman Wysocki said also consider it an underground storage facility like they did at Eisenhower and they could use it for some recreation purposes or even our Park N Rec could use it.

Ron Schildt said that we will be sending out information to the residents yet, we are waiting on this whole storm water thing and what happens with the School Board. Once that happens we will send out information to all the residents and put information on the web site as we get closer we will have a meeting with them too.

Alderman Ament said that if we are going to end up paying if there is any underground storage facility that the utility committee is keenly aware of how much the borrowing for these projects is affecting our budget that is to their benefit.

Alderman Wysocki made the motion to adjourn.

John Graber 2nd the motion.

Upon voting the motion passed unanimously.

Meeting was adjourned at 9:20 A.M.