

MINUTES
BOARD OF PUBLIC WORKS MEETING
June 15, 2009
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 PM.

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

Staff Present: J. P. Walker, City Engineer, Tammy Simonson, Transportation Senior Civil Engineer, Greg Kessler, Director of Community Development

Privilege of the Floor: No participants so the meeting was called to order.

OLD BUSINESS

ITEM 01-09 Approval of Minutes from May 11th, 2009 meeting.

Motion by Alderman Seidl
2nd by Mayor Chiovatero

John Graber abstained from voting, Alderman Wysocki voted present because he wasn't a member of the Board at the time of the meeting.

Upon voting the motion passed 3-0.

Approval of Minutes from May 18th, 2009 meeting.

Motion by Alderman Wysocki
2nd by Alderman Seidl

Upon voting the motion passed 5-0.

NEW BUSINESS

ITEM 20-09 Approval of Roadway Rehabilitation LRIP Contract for Calhoun Road south of Beloit Road.

JP Walker: Asked that this item be tabled because no bids were received. The project will re-bid on July 9th.

Motion by John Graber to table this item.
Alderman Seidl 2nd the motion.

John Graber asked if JP knew why we didn't get any bids?

JP Walker responded that he had no idea. Verification was made of the ads being placed in the local paper; nobody took out any bidding documents. We have verified that the new Ad is in the New Berlin Now and the

Daily Reporter. We've contacted a number of contractors that we are re-bidding and hoping that we will receive bids this time.

Upon voting the motion passed unanimously to table the item.

ITEM 21-09 Approval of Amendment No. 3 to the Glendale Drive Design Contract

JP Walker introduced the Ruckert & Mielke letter amendment dated May 29th, 2009 that outlines the reasons why they are requesting additional funding. The additional work is to prepare a Transportation Project Plat which was not part of the original scope of work because at the time that the original budget was established we weren't sure if there was going to be any land acquisition required for the project. The fact that there is requires that a plat be prepared. Additional services of \$22,755 for that plat were reviewed and deemed by Staff to be reasonable. The second design changes that have taken place have to do with whether or not bio-retention swales would work on this project. As the consultant got into the design they determined that in many of the areas bio-retention swales will not work so they had to look at a different concept and that concept was the Gatewood Technique, eliminating driveway culverts where we can, installing field inlets and storm sewer laterals ect. That additional work was \$23,660. The consultant is requesting a total amendment amounting to \$46,415. The original budget of \$284,900 was approved by Council in our budget process a couple of years ago. To date prior to Amendment No. 3 we have used \$136,962. With this amendment there will still be \$85,128 remaining in that original approved budget.

Motion by Mayor Chiovaturo to approve Amendment No. 3 to Glendale Drive Design Contract.

2nd by Alderman Wysocki.

Alderman Wysocki stated as we refer to the Gatewood method of storm sewer it seems that it works well. He asked JP if we have had reports on that?

JP Walker responded that the best testimony that can be given is the lack of complaints from the Gatewood Subdivision residents since we installed that technique years ago. That used to be the #1 hot spot for flooding issues. We have had none since we did this, so that's the testimony that holds the most weight.

John Graber stated that there was an Amendment #1 to the contract; I think that was before my time, what was that for?

JP Walker responded that he did not have the information available but could get it for the Board.

John Graber asked if the \$46,415 is a fixed figure or is that a not-to-exceed figure?

JP Walker responded that it is a not-to-exceed figure.

Alderman Seidl asked who designed this Gatewood technique?

JP Walker responded that City Staff came up with the design.

Alderman Seidl stated that we have talked quite a lot about this technique lately. We are using a design that Staff came up with and we are paying more to a consultant for a design that Staff came up with.

JP Walker indicated that they have to prepare the construction plans; they have to add the details. It does take an effort because you are talking about multiple plan sheets that may change. There is not a lot of new design thought that has to go into it, but it still takes time.

Alderman Ament asked that on the back of the Rukert & Mielke letter in the table for tasks the last part of the second item says “compensable and non-compensable facilities”, what does that mean?

JP Walker responded that is in the land acquisition phase. When they lay out the plat they look at areas that are fee simple interest, TLE’s, temporary easements, PLE’s that are permanent easements. There might be things that are deemed as compensable and non-compensable facilities.

Alderman Ament stated that he thought maybe there was an easement on something already and so no compensation would be required. They are looking at a completion date change as well; I think it was from April to October.

JP Walker stated that R&M is waiting for Council approval before they start.

Alderman Ament stated that on the Ruekert & Mielke sheet it says “time to develop a proposal for the STP stimulus”, what are they referring to there?

JP Walker stated that that does not apply.

Alderman Ament asked would that lower the \$46,415 by \$2,450?

JP Walker responded correct.

Alderman Ament asked with the motion do we change that number? The motion is just to approve the amendment.

JP Walker responded that it is to approve the amendment. The amendment deals with a not-to-exceed amount, if you decide to take that out that’s your choice.

Alderman Ament stated that the motion for Amendment No. 3 would be a not-to-exceed amount of \$43,965.

John Graber stated that when you mentioned the change in the completion date, obviously that would mean that there would be no construction in 2009, that will push it back to 2010. Is that going to be a problem with all of the construction activity in that area?

JP Walker responded that Glendale will not be constructed before 2012 because of all the other projects that are going on.

John Graber stated that on the last sheet of Amendment No. 3 they have background data, nature of amendment and then there are several blank spaces in there. The first one “additional services” is checked but as I was reading through it, it includes “modification of services by engineer” which is not checked, “modification to payment by engineer” which is not checked, and “modification to times rendering services” which we just talked about is not checked. Shouldn’t those be items that are part of the reason why we are going into this Amendment No. 3?

Alderman Ament asked if the schedule right now is start construction in 2012?

JP Walker indicated that when we look at all the projects that are lined up, the designs that are being completed, we have a number of projects that are in that category. It looks like Calhoun Road will be 2011, you don’t want Calhoun Road and Glendale being under construction at the same time so that pushes Glendale back and that pushes back Ryerson and Rogers. Lincoln will be constructed in 2010, so there is a sequence that we are following and you will see that sequence in the upcoming budget requests as to how that is all planned.

Alderman Ament stated that we have a motion that is the approval of Amendment No. 3 to the Glendale Design contract not-to-exceed \$43,965.

Upon voting the motion passed unanimously.

ITEM 22-09 Discussion on the Roadway Design Process

Alderman Ament indicated that JP will give us a little presentation on the Roadway Design Process. This is primarily to familiarize us with how this process works once there is a decision to go ahead with a rehabilitation or reconstruction project on a roadway. It will give us a little indication as to what the order of the process is.

JP Walker: Gave a presentation on the Roadway Design Process that Staff goes through. The process is a roadway design is typically a three year process. Year 1 is for design; Year 2 is for land acquisition if needed; and Year 3 is for construction. If there is no land acquisition, the construction phase may be moved up depending on CIP Budget constraints.

Motion by Alderman Wysocki to adjourn.

John Graber 2nd the motion.

Upon voting the motion passed unanimously.

Meeting was adjourned at 8:36 AM.