

# Minutes

## BOARD OF PUBLIC WORKS MEETING

DECEMBER 3, 2001

New Berlin City Hall Common Council Chambers

3805 S. Casper Drive.

**Meeting was called to order at 8:03 a.m.**

**Members Present:** Mayor Wysocki, City Engineer J.P. Walker, Alderman Chiovatero, Alderman Scheuble and Alderman Ament

**Staff Present:** Ronald Schildt, Division Engineer, Greg Kessler, Director of Community Development, Mike Holzinger, Director of Finance

**Others Present:** Steve Schultz of Ruckert & Mielke

### **ITEM 01-01** Approval of Minutes

Motion by Mayor Wysocki to approve the minutes of November 5, 2001. Second by Alderman Chiovatero. Upon voting, motion passes unanimously.

Motion by Alderman Ament to approve the minutes of November 27, 2001 Special Board of Public Works meeting with a spelling correction on Page 1, Paragraph 2 -- Change "Coty" to "City" and, top of Page 3, add two punctuations. Second by J.P. Walker. Upon voting, motion passes with Alderman Chiovatero voting present.

### **ITEM 32-01** National Avenue Side Paths -- Median Construction

Alderman Chiovatero: I would make a motion to remove this from the agenda. Nothing has really happened on this. I haven't heard of any problems. The Safety Commission also looked at it again and felt that some of the problems were because of construction on National Ave.

Motion by Alderman Chiovatero to take Item 32-01 off of agenda. Second by Mayor Wysocki. Upon voting, motion passes unanimously.

### **ITEM 37-01** Traffic Signals -- National Avenue and 147<sup>th</sup> Street

1) J.P. Walker stated the requested action is to recommend Common Council approval of the attached Resolution petitioning the Waukesha County Department of Transportation to recognize the need for traffic signals at National Avenue and 147<sup>th</sup> Street.

2. Alderman Chiovatero: I'll make a motion to petition; do we have to petition to do the study still?

Response from J.P. Walker:

This was a requested action brought up at previous board, I believe it was in September. We intended to have this on either the October or November agenda, but it wasn't through with the internal review in time, so it's on this agenda. I believe it was requested by the Mayor.

Mayor: I do not recall requesting that.

J.P. Walker: On September 24<sup>th</sup> board.

Chiovatero: I remember discussing this at Council, the monies.

Mayor: Ok, I'll make the motion for the sake of discussion.

Motion by Mayor Wysocki to discuss Item 37-01. Second by Alderman Ament.

Mayor: As I recall this is a little bit tied to the issue with regards to the item that we previously talked about and the time with the traffic volumes coming out of there as stated in the rationale, we had some concerns. Subsequent to that I've also looked at the idea that I have concern for the potential impact, and I'd appreciate if Ron could come forward, and this isn't fair to Ron since I haven't had a chance to talk to him about it but, there was also concern about the Acredale intersection at National too. For some time in the past there had been talk about potentially putting traffic signal up there. If we were to go ahead with a traffic signal at 147<sup>th</sup> St., are we creating more problems at that Acredale intersection with National, as well as some of the traffic coming out of Culver's. I also want to know that in view of our studies and potential for our development at the City Center, what impacts would we have if we had a light at 147<sup>th</sup>?

Response from Ron Schildt:

147<sup>th</sup> Street is pretty much in between the existing signals at Coffee and at Sunnyslope. So any signal that is going to be in between those is going to help some of the traffic from Culver's, Acredale and other locations because it's going to create a gap in traffic. So I think anything in there, it may not be specifically on 147<sup>th</sup>, maybe we could put it someplace else, a little bit more beneficial in terms of controlling additional traffic. That may solve the problem at 147<sup>th</sup> St. By that same token you might want to put it somewhere different that would create gaps at 147<sup>th</sup> St. So I think, looking at this study for the signal at 147<sup>th</sup>, does not mean we can ONLY look at 147<sup>th</sup>, but we're looking at the area in between Coffee and Sunnyslope for what we can do to ease traffic congestion in that area. I think this resolution is actually more just so Waukesha County knows that we're going to be looking at it. J.P. actually drafted this while I was gone. I think that indicates what we're looking to do, just let them know that it's coming down the pipe. That we would like to look at it, get it on their list so that it's one of the locations that we're going to be looking at and want them to at least have the information to know that it's a place that is causing some problems for us.

Mayor: I would appreciate that because even as I reviewed it over the weekend and saw the traffic there, if you put the light at 147<sup>th</sup>, coming out of Culver's, you could stop that traffic and back up pretty quick so people could not get out of Culver's, even if they wanted to make a right turn.

Response from Schildt: With the extension of Coffee Road also, if that happens there will obviously be some signal modifications that have to take place there so that all will have to be looked at too as to how that affects the traffic flow.

Mayor: We talked a lot in the City Center discussion of traffic issues of having signalization at the entrances on National Ave. to both the Moorland Center and the Kohl's Center. Do you think this would jeopardize that request that formally came out of the City Center study also?

Response from Schildt:

I don't know about that specifically. I think the way the County would probably look at it is both of those are private, it's not a public street on either side of there, so they would probably look at that as less favorable than any other signal that would be along that stretch of National Ave.

Mayor: There's a critical component of that because we realize that there'd be bicycle and pedestrian traffic hopefully going between the two major shopping centers, so I understand then what I'm hearing from you that really the resolution will alert the County to the issue again of National Avenue, primarily between Moorland and Sunnyslope. Our concerns are traffic control through there and it may not be necessarily be at 147<sup>th</sup> St.

Response from Schildt:

Most likely that's going to be the location that we're looking at but it may come out, it may not. I mean it may be some place different, either maybe Glen Park or something like that.

Mayor: Would this ..... be under our direction?

Response from Schildt:

That's what we're trying to do right now. We'd actually like to do it in-house. The money that we actually put in for the 2002 budget assumed a consultant would do it but we'd like to try and do it in-house, and actually purchase some of the equipment that we need to do, so that in turn, we'd be able to do it in-house.

Mayor: If we do that, that allows us to continue and possibly do our own analysis with this purchase of the equipment software?

Response from Schildt:

Yes, and other additional software, we could do the studies for quite a bit less, to do any of those, in-house.

J.P. Walker: The wording on this issue and in this resolution was purposely intended to follow what was approved in our 2002 budget; and that was for a signal at 147<sup>th</sup> and National Ave. I realize through our analysis as Ron has indicated that location may be changed. It may be that Glen Park is more appropriate. We have traffic problems at both intersections. My concern is that if we eliminate 147<sup>th</sup> St., you've got a senior housing project that is now very active at the Preserve at Deer Creek. I've sat there at 147<sup>th</sup> St. and watched elderly citizens panic, trying to get out on National Ave. I think that is a very important consideration to keep in mind that we have some new residents that are senior citizens that we want to make sure that they have the abilities, through traffic control, to get out on National Ave. when they need to. None of us are that elderly yet, although we're getting near it, and so I think it would be easier for some of us more than others to put ourselves in their position. Senior citizens have a tendency to follow a comfortable regime and whichever location the light is selected to be, if we're able to get a light installed, that probably will be the way that they will always travel. Again, 147<sup>th</sup> St. or Glen Park South - either one of those could be legitimate location. I'm just looking at senior citizens, they will probably want to take the most direct route to get out to National Ave.

Scheuble: You have a very appropriate concern about senior citizens. I was talking to a resident about this issue and one of their concerns was the Harley riders that came out of some of the shops down there. She was concerned, not only about motorcycles, but traffic starting and stopping at the stoplight, whatever additional noise and pollution was a concern for her and it was already near that intersection. Keeping the analysis simple, I think the Mayor's concerns about Culver's and other types of issues impeding the flow of traffic going along so people can merge, was in the study. Do we want to be stopping

traffic all the time along National Ave? I think your concerns for the senior citizens are very well taken. This resident of a local subdivision thought that people would find other ways out of that subdivision, that it wasn't required for 147<sup>th</sup> St.

Chiovatero: I agree with J.P., that we need to do something in that section whether it be Glen Park or 147<sup>th</sup>. I do agree that we don't want to lock it in at this time but the only concern I have for having it at Glen Park is one of the reasons that J.P. brought up. They're going to take the most comfortable way of getting out of there and I think this would probably end up creating more traffic in a very congested area with the school on Glen Park. I'm sure that would come up in the study. One thing too, if we purchase all this equipment, then would it be more possible, maybe easier, to look at the Sunnyslope and Wilbur thing without having to go in front of Council with all kinds of funds again?

Response from Schildt:

Yes, I think the cost was \$34,400 for a consultant to actually do the work, which is probably a little on the high side but there's a lot of traffic volumes and other things that they're going to have to obtain to try and get a look at these. Once we do that, if we actually purchase some additional traffic monitors ourselves and software, and some of the other things we would need, it's pretty easy. It would take a little bit of time just to collect all the information but we'd have the ability to do everything in-house then. It would make it pretty easy to do any additional studies.

Chiovatero: That sounds great.

Ament: First of all this \$34,400, I'm reading the rationale and primarily what's catching my eye is it says here that this will benefit traffic from Preserve at Deer Creek, Senior Housing Development on 147<sup>th</sup> St. and the residents in Glen Park Subdivision but primarily this Preserve at Deer Creek and Senior Housing Development. I'm wondering why or if it's not possible, that this money rather than coming out of the Engineering budget, isn't this something that through impact fees or some other way the developer should be paying for it? I mean obviously that development is impacting this intersection, not to mention the whole neighborhood and the whole City, but it specifically is going to be impacting this. I guess especially in that area for many years this was one of my major concerns about the City Center. The traffic in the area was consistently poo-pooed and I'm just wondering why they're not paying for this. I don't know if we can somehow do that, or if we overlooked something or if it's not a possibility to do that -- if the impact fees can't be used, but obviously it is impacting.

JP: I don't believe there is anything in the Developer's Agreement that alluded to the possibility of impact fees. I would be very concerned if I were the developer if the City approached the idea of after-the-fact, enforcing impact fees when there is nothing in the Developer's Agreement.

Chiovatero: From what I remember this development had many, many parts that had to be played out and I think no fault of anybody. I think what happened, is the traffic at 147<sup>th</sup> Street & National was overlooked and there was no traffic study done for this.

Ament: Guess that adds another concern. Doesn't know how that issue could be overlooked, this issue was traffic in that whole area, was brought time and time again. But if it can't be, this should send up a big red flag, especially for Council and Planning in the future when we do these major developments. Similar thing is the Preserve at Weatherstone, another one that we are very concerned about. We already have traffic problems on Sunny Slope Road, with all the major intersections, going to be doing the same thing there. Hopefully we can keep this in mind for the future.

JP: I echo Alderman Ament's concerns. We learn from our mistakes. I believe, I agree with you, that it may have been a mistake, or may have been overlooked in the past, but I can assure as City Engineer, the future developments traffic impacts will be looked at and will be worded in Developer's Agreement accordingly.

Scheuble: Is it a possibility to have the study to have the light along that area or is that specially for 147<sup>th</sup> or would that be an alternative site coming out of the study?

Chiovatero: Do we need to add alternative site to the resolution?

JP: I think the wording can be changed to, "we recognize the need for a controlled intersection on National Avenue and accelerated traffic impact study to install traffic signals on National Avenue" and we can say "at the intersection at 147<sup>th</sup> or Glen Park". It is a simple addition, this is a resolution that we can add language before it is approved.

Chiovatero: Okay, I am just wondering, maybe we should put one on Acredale. How would we put 147<sup>th</sup> Street or alternative site as determined by study.

Scheuble: And we are approving the study and nothing else.

Chiovatero: Motion by Alderman Chiovatero to amend the Resolution to state (.....) traffic signals at National Avenue of 147<sup>th</sup> or alternative site as determined by traffic study. Second by Mayor Wysocki.

Motion on the table for a Resolution as amended. Motion passes unanimously.

#### **Item 38-01** Reallocation of \$700,000 from the 2001 CIP

Coffee Road Extension (requested by Alderman Scheuble)

Scheuble: Motion to discuss. Second by Alderman Ament. Motion passes unanimously.

Scheuble: The \$700,000 for the Coffee Road Extension between National and Moorland Avenue came with the rationale that the developer should also put in a library for the City Center project. It went hand-in-hand. Usually the developer puts in their roads for project and dedicates it to the City. Because they were possibly going to incorporate a library with their plans and subsequent to that, the Library Board decided not to relocate the library at the City Center location. Part of that was due to various attachments to the library issue that they wanted to put on top of the library. So rather than have some developer welfare, and set precedent, the district can be funded just out of the profit to be made by those private developers. It is really not appropriate for the City to be funding this road. So that is why I am asking for these monies to be reallocated towards another project, which is long over due, Grange Avenue. Also, there are a lot of problems about the extension that would come off Wilbur Drive; and issues with crossing the wetlands with DNR and require them to direct water around the wetlands and go around the creek there and there are problems of taking away water that would be recharged to the aquifer to the wetlands. Water quality concerns of that going to the wetlands, their proposing the pipe around Deer Creek which would at that point, take water away from the wetlands. Talking to the wetlands specialist for that project, there is a concern for that. And also there would be water added to Deer Creek from this project. For a number of reasons, this is possibly not a total benefit of the citizens that we get these monies for road developments right now and let those issues be resolved by the developer.

Mayor Wysocki: Agrees with Alderman Scheuble, because I voted against this as a Capitol Improvement project when it was brought forth in 2001 for the budget. I would suggest, however, a couple things to consider here, 1) not sure reallocation to as requested, Grange Avenue would necessarily be the appropriate one. Maybe we could save it for that discussion, but I would point out to you, this Coffee Road Extension, in a City Center Study, it was clearly brought out that there will be a need for a reconstruction of Coffee Road between Moorland and National. As it is recalled from the study, the amount stipulated there happened to be about the same amount \$700,000. So I would strongly recommend, before we start deciding where this money can be reallocated to, we need to review all our

priority projects and take a look at those also. I would agree that this current allocation for the Coffee Road Extension, which is basically between Howard and National would not be appropriate.

JP: Asked Greg Kessler if he has any concerns about the reallocations of the \$700,000 as it relates to Coffee Road extending. Are there any issues that we are forgetting about that is perhaps something else that money could be used for. For example: Street Scrape, etc.....

Greg: We may have a lot of road projects out there. It would be premature looking at the original City Center plan and planning for reconstruction of Coffee Road between National and Moorland. Still something on the table, one of the things I have talked to you about and the Mayor, have Ron do a presentation to the Council sometime in 2002 on all of our 10-year CIP road projects because we have \$21 million or \$30 million worth of road work that needs to be done within the City. I'm not an engineer, but the work that would need to be done on Grange Avenue, far exceeds \$700,000. Where is the balance coming from? A lot of work needs to be done and I think this discussion is a tad premature. I know Grange is on our 10-year CIP, do you have any idea, JP, when this is scheduled for?

JP responds: I'm not really sure if it is on a 7-year plan, but it is being considered in a 10-year plan. But those priorities can change.

Greg: Ron Schildt, our Transportation Division Engineer, is finishing up a PASER review for the State of Wisconsin and after that is completed, we would have a better handle on the ratings. We could revise our 7-year to 10-year CIP schedule. I am sure Grange Avenue will jump really high on the list, if it isn't already on the list. But will leave the details up to the engineers.

Mayor Wysocki: The motion that is here, is to really decide that we are not going to do this project, that is what the motion in front of us is.

Chiovatero responds: Yes.

Mayor Wysocki: Motion is to drop Item from our CIP budget for account 252.370, "Coffee Road Extension project".

Scheuble: There is a motion on the table to discuss.

Motion by Alderman Scheuble to drop from the 2001 CIP Budget project 252.370. Second by Mayor Wysocki. Motion passes unanimously.

Item 39-01 Reallocation of \$700,000 from the 2001 CIP

Move these monies to the resurfacing of Grange Avenue

Motion by Alderman Scheuble to discuss. Second by Alderman Ament.

Scheuble: Reason I took this course of action, is that I was told that Grange Avenue was on the road maintenance budget for next year and then there was \$200,000 dropped from the Road Maintenance budget in the budget we just approved. I inquired as to whether Grange Avenue was high on the priority list to be taken care of for next year. Since the PASER process hasn't been completed, they weren't able to confirm that, and it wasn't on the CIP for the 2001-2005. So I was concerned and heard a number of times, because of the reconstruction project that was proposed back in 1996, which had funds acquired from the State for that project, had basically failed because it was too heavily imposed on the neighboring property. There was a very ambitious project, which would widen, require lands from private residents, that the Common Council ultimately rejected this. There were a number of thoughts that they were going to let this road rot until finally something would happen, then they would go forward. This sentiment, I

don't think was appropriate because it was recognized back in 1996 that there were some improvements needed to be accomplished on Grange Avenue. It wasn't being addressed because they couldn't come up with Capitalizing. Subsequent to realizing there were problems needing to be addressed, I spent two days talking to Grange Avenue residents, going all the way from 124<sup>th</sup> to Moorland and went out there on site with JP and other staff member from the Engineering Department to initially analyze road conditions and standards which would have to be incorporated in a project, that were acceptable to the Engineering Department, and which were acceptable to the citizens along Grange. I talked to the people from Grange that use the road. I believe there is a compromise that JP and I have looked at and is acceptable in the logical approach. We take \$700,000 and start with the redesign project. We move ahead in such a way, that we make the improvements that can be added on that might become available as the needs seem to be approved by the Board of Public Works and the Common Council, prioritizing the whole project with the rest of the projects in the City.

So what I am saying there are very dangerous conditions right now that need to be addressed. The whole scope of the project is how it is so costly, maybe there are other priorities that would want to be addressed prior to the time of completion. So the plan would be to have a prioritized approach. Which would first address resurfacing, as we pulverize the pavement (we lift it up) and see how the road underneath looks with existing conditions that are, there are some real dips that throw people off the road, down in some of the hills. There you would have to pack it down with some gravel, fix up the road as required. We would want JP to expand the lanes out to 12-feet, keep a line at 11-feet, top off of some of the hills (2-feet maximum) for a couple of areas for site reasons. For considerations for safety concerns, we would take a little bit off the top. I went down and talked to the residents about filling down to the bottom, and there we could use some fill that would bring it up to the level of the driveway, which is on the north slope, so we would not cause problems with the driveway. Because it is flush with the road, if we grade above it, we would have drainage concerns. It would be okay to bring the road up level with the driveway on the north slope. That allows us to take a little off the top of the hills and fill in the dip. There would also be a concern putting a guardrail, down at the dip, because people may slip off into the fields. Guardrail off the side of paved or gravel shoulder, should be determined, as appropriate by Engineering. There would be minimal widening, to the extent it doesn't impact neighboring properties. That widening would be to allow, not to invite, but to allow for a safer pedestrian and bicyclist area. If someone is walking or riding along the road, they actually have to get on the pavement, and there are dips that throw cars around and actually can throw them off the road. So what we would be doing, is a way people could go long range without being on the pavement. A third priority, is resurfacing/reconstruction, for safety purposes, widening within the limits of the existing ditch and as appropriate at intersections to put storm sewer . Paving the shoulder over the storm sewer would allow for right-turn for intersections and for people who want to make left turns, a way to get around traffic. It allows the flow of traffic to continue and will allow people to get out of the flow traffic to make their turns and would be acceptable, I believe, to the people that those intersections would be in accordance with the Southeastern Wisconsin Transportation System Plan, approved for 2010, which called for resurfacing or reconstruction, would now provide a more higher use. Essentially so that we have the same capacity on the road, there would be a limitation of 5000 pounds put on this road, to allow for local trucks but not to have semi trucks going down there. That way it would allow the traffic to flow better for people to have ingress and egress from the road and the side roads and some driveways. We would provide for safety concerns of the citizens, bicyclists, pedestrians, but would keep the traffic at a safe speed. These are the principles and standards that seem to be acceptable to both the Engineering Department and everybody I talked to over two days. If we go this way, the \$700,000 would provide a way down the path of a simple redesign for a prioritized and cost-effective accomplishment of these goals of safety for the citizens and motorists. I think it's real important that we do this as it has been very dangerous situation out there, since 1996. So I'd ask that the monies that are available, I ask very sincerely that we earmark the \$700,000 towards those ends. \$300,000 was estimated for what would be required for the resurfacing and then the other \$400,000, if this Board approves, and then Engineering suggests that we accomplish those other intersection designs and reconstruction of requirements. I really hope you'll approve this.

J.P. Walker: I need to clarify a few issues here. I think this work that needs to be done on Grange Ave. can be accomplished in a phased approach as funds are allocated or approved through our budget

process. We all know \$700,000 is not going to go very far. What Alderman Scheuble was talking about was a prioritizing of concerns. I think we can all agree that Grange Ave. as it currently exists is at the very least dangerous. I think Alderman Scheuble used that word. There are line of sight issues, there are uneven surface issues, I believe and I'll have to ask Ron to come to the podium, the Alternative Transportation Plan - does that call for a bike path along Grange Ave.?

Schildt: The adopted Alternative Transportation Plan for Grange Ave. from Moorland all the way to 124<sup>th</sup> St. has a five foot wide paved shoulder to be used for pedestrian and bicycles.

J.P. Walker: Okay, what I have talked with Alderman Scheuble about and he has talked with citizens, we're talking about reconstructing Grange Ave. from a rural cross section to an urban cross section with storm sewer. The majority of the ditching out there right now is on the north side. That's also where the water main is between Sunnyslope and Moorland Road so there's going to have to be some careful design considerations and analyses done to see if that concept, first of all, will work. When you put a storm sewer near a water main there are other issues that come into play, such as potential for freezing of the water main. So there would have to be design considerations taken into account when you design storm sewers; such as, insulation etc. Those things can be accomplished through engineering, that's not an issue. I am concerned about a bike path being inside of the curbs at the speed of the traffic. Engineering has a responsibility to create safer conditions for the biking traffic and for pedestrians. I would like to look at the idea of putting bike paths behind the curb but we would have to look at the entire right of way. I fully intend to abide by the wishes of the residents on Grange Ave. I'm very well aware they do not want trees removed, they do not want the right of way changed. I think, from just an initial analysis we could accomplish this through a rural cross section with one bike path. The original concept that Alderman Scheuble was talking about was putting a walking area and a biking area on both sides, just inside the curb. I am concerned that that may not be feasible.

Scheuble: That was one of the things we were discussing but since that time more...?

J.P. Walker: So right now we're looking at an urban cross section. Our standards require 12' wide lanes. I believe what the citizens have been saying in the past is that they don't want to see the lanes widened because fear of widening the right of way. My initial analysis, and believe me this is just initial, I believe we can do it with an urban cross section and not even come near the limits of the right of way. So therefore I think that concern can be alleviated. There should not be any removal of trees required. With urban cross section and a bike path we can tie that into the existing slopes that are near the right of way. I think it's do-able but it has to be in a phased approach and monies will have to be approved through future budget issues to do all the things that need to be done. What Alderman Scheuble was talking about -- there are some intersection issues out there. They do not have appropriate turning lanes, turning radii. They do not have excel, decel lanes. At 35 m.p.h. I believe that is a requirement. Those areas will be looked at. Alderman Scheuble did say those areas will need storm sewers. I'm intending to storm sewer the whole thing.

Mayor: ...I can tell you too that (Paul Scheuble?) was correct in the sense that people there had seen a projected project that was much more extensive than what they wanted and in many cases what some us believe was even needed. However I do think that this is the kind of project, I know that Alderman Wilkens has been working on this also. This is the kind of project that -- I want to be careful -- you can't just do a block at a time when you get the dollars. This is the kind of project that really needs, at least in the segments that I saw; the proposal for instance was 124<sup>th</sup> to Sunnyslope. Then the second phase would be from Sunnyslope to Moorland. The engineering consistent. The issues that we're talking about here in terms of alternative transportation, the widths. One thing to keep in mind, everybody's been talking this right of way. The right of way along there is not consistent. It is not consistent and that was one of the problems. Where some of the areas where right-of-way is most needed is where there was a problem. So again your study is correct J.P. to bring you up to speed because there were a number of properties where the right of way is not consistent. That was one of the issues, to try to get a consistent right of way an needed. There certainly is a safety issue. I'd recommend this is the kind of thing that should be put in front of our staff. Take a look at what we require under different parameters than what was before in the

96' proposal. Let's get the possibility of phasing this, that's one way of doing it. But I don't think you can do this \$100,000 at a time, or even \$700,000. So I would suggest and recommend that we direct staff to put this project proposal, i.e. the Grange Ave., into their analysis for their work, to come back to us with a recommendation for a potential for phasing. We could then look at that in terms of the rest of the PASER studies that you've got and are doing right now. Let's do this in an organized way. I think now there is more support from the people along Grange Ave. than there was back in 96'. That is to say the people are a little bit more comfortable that we are acknowledging their concerns for the kind of design that's appropriate but at the same time they want us, I think, to do a good job of designing this to incorporate the appropriate types of line of site for reconstruction needed, the appropriate lane widths, the alternative transportation issues that they would also be looking for there. So I'd recommend that we would let staff put Grange Ave. back within their study purview. Come forward as a result of your PASER study and let us know what it would take for this and the other projects that you would recommend. Therefore I would move to table.

Motion by Mayor Wysocki to table Item 39-01. Second by Alderman Chiovatero. Upon voting, motion fails with Alderman Scheuble, Alderman Ament, and City Engineer J.P. Walker voting no.

Ament: I think tabling it's a good idea, first of all, but there's something else I wanted to address before we did that and that was my main reason for voting against it and that is the \$700,000. I'd like to see some kind of mechanism that we have now taken that \$700,000 out of the Coffee Rd. extension and somehow put that somewhere so it can go towards Grange Ave. rather than just being out there and six months from now we'll take that and use it to put up a stoplight or fix some other road or do something else with it or buy a piece of equipment. I'd like to somehow lock that in so that's what it's used for. I don't know how we can do that, maybe one of you more experienced fellows have a way of doing that.

Scheuble: That's the idea, to put the money towards the design, so that I know that we'll have some money to start off with that phased project. I agree with the Mayor, it should be done a block at a time but the major safety concerns should be addressed and done in such a way that if we do an additional storm sewer and a bike path we accomplish that part of it, in a phased fashion, which could be in a monitored modular way. Construct what we can and then keep on with the ditching and the storm sewer and we want to put money in the 2003 CIP budget. It was not appropriate to do this project in 2002 because they'd be building the school next year, and then we don't want to be tearing up the road when they have all the construction, all the truck traffic. So the construction date which would be appropriate would be 2003 but I think we have to put the money towards the design right now and know that the monies are there and then follow the mayor's advice and then we can do it all at once but get those funds in 2003. So I hope, we can table this now but actually I'd rather see that actually say that this \$700,000 is going towards the project and then come up with the design and then deal with the idea of whether they're going to go towards the project when we deal with the budget for 2003.

J.P. Walker: You're looking for ways that we can encumber the money. There is a requested action coming before the Committee of the Whole on ways of doing it for another reason, not this particular reason. It has to do with monies that are still available to put towards our old maintenance projects and that is called a reserve account. I think something similar can be done here and I can put together the requested action and take it before Committee of the Whole instead of coming back to the board. And it's the same way, set up a reserve account that's earmarked specifically for Grange Ave. I think that is the way to do it and I so move.

Chiovatero: Okay, there's a motion on the table, second? Mayor Wysocki..

Mayor: I have a concern about that in the sense that these were borrowed funds for a particular CIP project and contingent upon that I've asked that Mike Holzinger come here just to make sure about it. We need to be aware of the fact that when you borrow money for a particular project you have a time limit for that to be done, so that even if you were not to do the project the issue of the time limit on the expenditure of the funds still exists as I believe it. So we need to be careful in the sense that this money under the 2001 Capital Improvement budget was borrowed for a particular project. Under the state statute

stipulations I believe for any CIP borrowed money Michael, you have to expend that money within a certain time period even if you were to change the particular project. Mr. Holzinger, what I'm concerned about is currently we have a motion before us -- we have already dropped a 2001 capital improvement program project for Coffee Rd. of \$700,000. The issue in front of us is an attempt to put that money into a reserve fund and use it for road projects, upgrades, etc. if I understand it. My concern is, I've asked you as our City Treasurer what impacts, having borrowed for a CIP project, those funds, what limits there are on that kind of funding or standards we have to be aware of.

Mike Holzinger: Well they can't be used for operational expenses, #1. So basically they need to stay within that CIP budget and the funds you're talking about if I'm not mistaken were in 2001. So what you do is reallocate those funds for other projects of that nature-- road projects per se, like they were there, or some other type of project. Those funds have to be spent within that three year time window is what the Common Council has used in the past anyway and the guidelines that I follow. Previously Common Councils have reallocated funds. There was a massive one where the storm pond SP-2, where it was reallocated from a lot of different accounts, to that project. So what you need to establish is what kind of projects you want to do and reallocate the funds to that. Right now nothing is happened even though you're saying that the Coffee Rd. extension is not going to happen, those funds are still designated for that until the Common Council reallocates it for another specific purpose.

Mayor: If I hear you correctly, the time limit is still there, that is to say - #1, that it would have to be spent within the three year period. #2, Can we set up a reserve account for a capital project yet unknown?

Holzinger: No, no you really can't. It's going to stay where it's at, you just need to work with the Engineering Department to come up with other type of projects that you want to reallocate those funds for. If you don't do that then, the Common Council could designate the \$700,000 to go for future debt service payments.

Chiovatero: I have a concern too that we' are borrowing money out of the bond and putting it into the reserve. The biggest concern I get about this whole project as we see it and this is why I favored to table it, is I don't have any costs or what it's going to take to redo this reconstruction of Grange Ave. and if it would be approved in future use. So I have some concern about taking funds and maybe throwing them away. That's one of the things I'm concerned about.

Scheuble: Jack, all these concerns I appreciate and I think what J.P. our City Engineer was suggesting is that this the identified funds to be put in a Reserve Account, which have to be used within three years, they get reallocated for Grange Avenue. Basically those funds, from the 2001 CIP budget no longer would go to the Coffee Road Extension and that they could go to Grange Avenue. The reason we should vote on that now and get that going, some of those funds I believe, if Mr. Holzinger conquers, should then be designated for Grange Avenue.

Holzinger: I would not support reallocating where you are renaming those funds reserved. Leave the funds as they are currently designated until you have established what you want to do. What you need to be concerned with, is what is known as arbitrage. We can't be sitting on these monies earning interest. We need to start doing stuff with these funds and there are time limits. By 6 months you are suppose to spend a certain percentage and in 12 months you have to spend within a certain percentage and within 2 years those monies have to be spent. Those are the federal guidelines, otherwise you run into the arbitrage problems.

Scheuble: We can designate that money, now we have taken out the Coffee Road Extension project, designate that money towards the design of Grange Avenue project to be accomplished in 2003.

Holzinger: I think you would want to give directions to the Engineering Department to come up with another method for those funds being spent if you are not going to use Coffee Road. Now, that may be

Grange, but give them some direction so they can come back to the Board of Public Works and Common Council with how those funds should be spent.

Wysocki: So we are clear on two things, we took a previous motion, which still has to be approved by Common Council, and our recommendation was to drop Coffee Road identified by CIP. My purpose of tabling was, to allow Engineering as I said, in the purpose of that motion, to do that perhaps within the next month. Not sure how we are in PASER, we could be looking for a January meeting on this issue. How long of a time frame, that Ron would need to at least come forward to the Board here and give us a preliminary view of what you believe are the types of priorities and in fact, the initial cost of planning, for this Grange Avenue, what this amount would be?

Ron: Well the first part is PASER. The study needs to be done by mid-December to January 1<sup>st</sup>. We have to run through the information and identify all of the streets which now have to be analyzed and determine which ones are worse rated, and how they are all prioritized based on traffic volumes, safety experience and a number of other things. Now we have to go through all the streets that are rated a 2 or 3, which is really bad and figure where do they fall in priority, as to which ones should be done next. Then we have to look at what it might cost. Then you really have to get into the design and look at more details. I think with this prioritizing stuff it, is going to take about to the beginning of the year. The design that we already have done for Grange Avenue is basically going have to be scrapped. Start from scratch and look at something different, from the way it sounds right now.

Wysocki: But there may be some base issues. In 2002, we already have the completion of Sunnyslope from National Avenue south, with the cooperation of West Allis, in the budget. We have a beginning plan. We do also have beginning plans for the Coldspring Road study. All I am suggesting is there might be something salvageable from the work that was done on Grange study in 1996. There may be some base work-study at least. All I am suggesting if you could come forward for us, from whatever you have initially, because you are working something out, on these priorities, we do have to be cost sensitive, as the City Treasurer pointed out, we have money that will go away. I would just think at this point, to give us a little bit better feel before we start identifying a particular project over others or more importantly, since everyone agrees that this is an important project, what the actual cost may be initially to start the phasing of planning, and certain aspects. We would be in better shape here and make some recommendations to the total Council. I am asking is it possible at least have a preliminary look at our January Board?

Ron: January would be difficult. Ratings won't be done until late December. February would be better allowing us a month to look through it

Wysocki: I would ask the City Treasurer if the clock is running on this 2001 Funding. Do we have to start spending any of that fund? Mentioned some proportional costs that need to be spent for these projects?

Holzinger: We receive the money in July. We sold that bond issue and received the fund in July. Six months from, we need to have spent the majority of that money and for all the other projects, we don't have a problem. So that means we have a year to spend 75% of the total amount that we borrowed.

Wysocki: Since we changed the project, it is going before Council which potential could drop this project. Is there possibility that this clock be started again?

Holzinger: No. The clock is running. Needs to be done ASAP. Come up with a project to be completed within that 2-year window or close to it as soon as possible.

Wysocki: Ron, is it possible for us to at least start the design work for Grange?

Ron: We can do a little bit of the design. Part of what we are trying to do is a little more design work in-house. Instead of having a consultant do the work, we can at least purchase some of the tools and do it in-house now. We are planning on doing that for Cold Spring. Plans are to purchase tools and software

and do the design and get it done in a timely fashion. If we wanted, we could take some of the money for this project and actually purchase the design tools that we need to do the work and start spending the money. One of the problems is, we want to move this project into the Maintenance Operating Budget, which we can't do anyway. We have never used design dollars in maintenance account. The maintenance account is basically to work on streets and resurface what is out there. So we have not really done any design with that money. Sounds like we might have to add another CIP project to do something with Grange.

Wysocki: As a CIP project, do you have a cost estimate for the software and tools that you need? I would ask Mike if that is a legitimate capitol expenditure for a particular project?

Holzinger: No. No it really isn't for a specific project, simply because it is not just going to be exclusive for that project. You're going to use that for other projects. Depending on the dollar amount, it could possibly fall under the City's pay-as-you-go capitol expenditures more so than the CIP project. It would have fallen under that \$50,000 window and taken as part of that discussion. I would not support buying software or something that would enable staff to do that internally at this time.

Wysocki: Using Capitol funds:

Holzinger: Yes. To me that is an operational cost. Something is going to be ongoing from here on out.

Wysocki: I am just looking to table this for another month, look at the various options that are available to us, and have staff come back to us. Maybe these kinds of questions we are asking right now, would be able to prompt him to at least to some sort of report. Again we need Council action to approve the recommendation to drop the project. That would be coming up next week. My sympathy comes because we have taken the opportunity to drop the project and that money is out there. There is still time for us to identify where it should go or could go; we don't have to do that within the same time frame.

Holzinger: My preference would be that you don't go to the Common Council to drop that at this point in time until you have decided what you're going to do with it and then reallocate it to that project or those projects that you've identified. It's a total reallocation of funds for another specific purpose. If you just go in there now and drop it I think I'm going to have problems. I think our Bond Council is going to say you now have problems so that I'm probably going to take you back in on that motion to basically say let's use it for debt service payments. I don't think it would be beneficial to go to Common Council and say we're going to drop the Coffee Rd. Project out of the 2001 CIP budget without having identified another expenditure to replace it.

Mayor: So we need to do that at this meeting if we're going to have that first motion go forward to Council, which we've already passed is a recommendation to Council, we should have a follow up motion here, to identify at least a percentage or how much of that borrowed money goes to another project.

Holzinger: You could probably reallocate it to Grange Ave. and other road projects that are identified and involved within the parameters of it. Have the engineers come back to you with the costs specifics for Grange Ave., the design, construction aspect of it and any other road type project that would qualify for that -- not ones that are in the operational budget, but the total reconstruction.

Mayor: I would feel much more comfortable with that if that were the motion so what you're suggesting is a follow up motion would be, I guess Alderman Scheuble would like to make it. Could you state a follow up motion that you feel comfortable with.

Holzinger: I think that the recommendation would be to reallocate the 2001 Capital expenditure identified as Coffee Rd. Extension to Grange Ave, for the design and reconstruction of Grange Ave. and any other road projects that the engineering department identified that would fall within that category.

Scheuble: That was my original motion when I brought it before Common Council so that's what I move for here.

Holzinger: It's just re-identifying the \$700,000, they'll come back in with the design and actual construction costs to do Grange Ave. and another particular project.

Mayor: Is everyone open to the idea that other projects would be listed so we could know how to prioritize, because it's still in front of this board to do that and just for the sake of a motion the actual account number is 252.370 which would be the reallocation. Is there a second to Alderman Scheuble's motion?

Walker: We have a motion on the table. I'm the one that brought forth a motion about a reserve account. I'm willing to withdraw the motion, with this reallocation issue.

Chiovero: Okay, J.P. wants to withdraw the motion, who is a second to that? I think it was Alderman Scheuble.

Motion by J.P. Walker to withdraw his motion requesting establishment of a reserve account. Second by Alderman Scheuble.

Chiovero: I have a big concern here, that we're trying to make decisions too fast, and that we don't have anything in front of us. I agree that Grange Avenue is a problem. I had a couple calls, I know people in the area and they do talk about Grange a lot. I would love to see Grange get done but I'm concerned that the amount of work that that needs to be done is in the millions of dollars and I don't know if we will be able to get that done in a reasonable amount of time.

Walker: The Mayor had made a motion before to table, I thought it was premature. We needed to complete this discussion so that we all have an understanding as to what all the ramifications are of what we're trying to do with that \$700,000. We've got the wisdom of the Director of Finance. He's told us there's certain things we can do, certain things we cannot do, and a certain time frame in which the monies have to be spent. I think we're at a better state now as to understanding what all the issues are before us and I would ask that the Mayor reapply the motion.

Ament: Is it more appropriate for someone like myself to reconsider that, I don't know what the procedure is.

Mayor: I appreciate that but I am concerned now that Mike has also told us that with the motion that we've already approved to go before Council, essentially dropping this project, that we best, at least here now, make a subsequent motion to perhaps rather than identify Grange specifically although that's what we want, why don't we have a motion to direct those funds from Account Number 252.370, direct those funds to an appropriate capital road project or projects, as determined by the engineering recommendations. That would allow then for, what we all are concerned here with regards to a particular road-- Grange, and some potential phasing of it, so that's all I'm suggesting. If we put the word Grange in there I understand what you're saying Alderman Chiovero and I agree with you but I think staff is fully aware of what our discussion here is and what our issues are. So again, a motion would be, now that we've dropped it, to reallocate the funding for 2001 Capital Improvement Program Account 252.370 to a capital road project study recommendation by the engineering department to the Board of Public Works.

Chiovero: I think that fulfills our obligations to redirect the funds, doesn't it Mike? For changing this for next Tuesday?

Holzinger: If it's my understanding that the staff is preparing an in-house study, and we're not going to out-source that, I think it probably does.

Motion by Mayor Wysocki to discuss reallocating funds from Capital Improvement Account 252.370 to Grange Ave. and other roads determined, after the engineering department conducts an in-house study and comes forward with recommendations on which roads should be included in this project. Second by Alderman Chiovaturo.

Scheuble: I was assured by the City Engineer that Grange Ave. would be top priority, my concern is that I've spent two days talking with all the people on Grange Ave. and I was told that I was coming forth with these monies since these monies had to be spent, there would be a top priority. I just wish we would as originally suggested by Mr. Holzinger, identify Grange Ave. and if there's other monies of this \$700,000 that also have to go towards another prioritized project, in order to spend them quick enough. That might be appropriate but I think we have to let people know that we're serious this time, that Grange Ave. is going to be addressed. It's been an issue that's been out there for so long now and I think it's really appropriate that we take Mike Holzinger's original proposal that it be directed towards Grange Ave. and other projects as identified by the staff and Board of Public Works.

Chiovaturo: I cannot support that because of the fact that I have no idea what Grange is going to cost and if we even have the funds to move forward in the project. I would be in favor of, in knowing that Grange is a priority, that the engineering department takes that into effect when they do the study as far as spreading these funds. We are concerned that we have to move with these funds and allocate them somewhere pretty quickly.

Scheuble: That's what I'm saying Jack. Because Grange Ave. is an identified priority and is right there at the top of the list, it's way past overdue, and safety. If we allocate those funds now we could start with design, and that means we could spend the money, we could enter into discussions with the residents. We could really get the plan well developed. If we're just holding off on a tentative prioritization process which is really part of the operational expenses, I believe, not only the capital improvement project itself. If we have any money toward the capital improvement projects towards the equipment to do a project, the prioritization process obviously would not be getting money this year. So therefore it really is appropriate that we go towards a definite CIP project which would be Grange Ave. and understand that monies might have to be further directed from the 2003 CIP budget but at least get that planning process started and it needs to be just a modular approach which can be done so we can get the essential safety concerns addressed and taken care of. It's real important that we start on this and not just put it off.

Chiovaturo: One of the things to is to use the funds to start doing the engineering on Cold Spring Rd. I would imagine that all of our funds from 2003 would probably go to constructing Cold Spring Rd. and so I would I assume we probably will for the next couple of years I'd be very concerned that we'd be putting engineering studies into Grange and then 2 -3 years down the road we go to reconstruct Grange, the engineering study would no longer be valid.

Mayor: This is the kind of discussion we will have when engineering brings to us their analysis. I agree with Alderman Scheuble that whether Grange is the top priority or not but let's make sure that we're comfortable with regards to what the necessary financing. Let's make sure the Council is comfortable with what we're doing in terms of bringing it forward. This is the kind of discussion we'll have when engineering brings to us their first blush analysis of priorities. I am also concerned about the cost because as you know they go in stages -- the engineering studies, the preparation, the actual construction. There's going to have to be purchase of right of ways, I'm sure. I remember from 1996 there are some properties along Grange that buckle into there so we got those kinds. Let's let engineering come to us, A.S.A.P., with their priorities. The motion I believe you heard from the City Treasurer is legitimate to keep those funds identified for the appropriate capital road projects that we need to do so they're preserved for that aspect of it. Engineering will come to us A.S.A.P. with their first flush of prioritization and estimates of cost and then we can put that together and then we can have up here a debate, relative to priorities. It may not be that long a debate or necessary, Grange may come to the top and then we still have to take this to Council and convince them that that's the appropriate procedure but there's a lack of planning here. There's an element of planning we can't have in a very timely way from what I'm hearing from staff. I would suggest that the motion we have in front of us is the appropriate motion. We're not saying no to

Grange, we're saying to start to come forward, with a total picture so that we can then decide and actually what the stage costs of what it takes to do a particular capital project. We'll know exactly what funds to allocate where.

Chiovero: Anymore discussion on the motion? Okay, a motion on the table, all those in favor, opposed.

Upon voting on the above stated motion, it passed unanimously.

**Item 40-01** Recommendation of Award of Contract, Well #8 Rehab W-139

Walker: You have before you an amended Item 40-01. The reason it's amended is we got the bids Friday. The original issue paper had blanks in it, now the blanks are filled. The requested action is recommend to Council to approve the award of Construction Contract W-139 to the lowest responsible bidder, Layne-Northwest a Division of Layne Christenson Company in an amount of \$34,000 for Project #W-139, and waive any irregularities, for a total project cost in the amount of \$49,400. You will see under Fiscal Impact how those calculations were made and come up with total project costs of \$49,400.

Mayor: Motion, to recommend to Council.

Chiovero: I'll second the motion.

Motion by Mayor Wysocki to recommend to Council to approve award of Construction Contract W-139 to the lowest responsible bidder, Layne-Northwest, a Division of Layne Christenson Company in an amount of \$34,000 for Project #W-139, and waive any irregularities, for a total project cost in the amount of \$49,400. Second by Alderman Chiovero.

Chiovero: What was approved on Council Tuesday?

Walker: If there are any specific questions I've asked Steve Schultz from Ruckert & Mielke to be available. He is in the audience so I'd ask that if there are technical questions they be directed to Mr. Schultz.

Scheuble: Yes Mr. Schultz could you come to the microphone? The monies that were allocated for Well #11, I think it's real important that all the implications of these individual projects, specific incremental steps of accomplishing an overall water strategy as recommended by Ruckert & Mielke that we put these incremental steps in perspective of the whole picture and the cost. As an example, the \$173,000 that we approved for Well 11 last week at Council, the actual cost which I've become aware, I think some people were not really aware of the costs for that well, to actually get water in the system will be over more than a half million dollars actually, not \$173,000. That the actual project cost is more than a half million that was approved and \$173,000 was reported in the paper and that's a little misleading. Also I'd like to put this project in perspective and understand that one of the rationales for this the back-filling and plugging the bottom of the well will cut off the poor quality of water supply. Now under this rationale I've heard it stated that this would somehow solve the radium nuclide problem and in order to move the project along I was trying to comply with EPA standards for water quality. From what I understand is that this actually from filling the bottom of the well and capping off with some cement will help solve the solidity issue which some of the chlorides had problems for the aesthetics of the water, that that will be improved, but not the radium nuclides that are, a number of areas out there as far as what causes the radium nuclide presence in the water, the radium 226, 228 and other gross alpha, isotopes, radium being one of them. Through some sort of chemical process and the decomposition of the sandstone and everything that's down there, and that seems to be somewhat uniform through the aquifer and therefore as we draw water to fill in the cone of depression, even though the water won't be coming in from underneath, this plugging process that we're proposing here, the waters will still be coming in and most likely drawing radionuclides into the water, and I don't know that we have any assurances that that level will be reduced to such an extent that we will comply with the EPA standards. Could you comment on that Mr. Schultz please?

Steve Schultz: Yes I can. The back-filling of the well was designed to take care of the total dissolved solids or salinity problems, as you said. It is not designed to take care of any problems you have with radionuclides. However, if that zone is a zone that is a high contributor to radionuclides it could have an effect on them but it is not designed to take care of that. If you recall the study we're talking about, that was completed in August, in that study if we were to remain on a ground water based system we included costs to treat for radium, assuming that any work done on wells to take care of salinity problems would not take care of the radionuclide problems.

Scheuble: So when we look at the whole project of accomplishing the recommendations to maintain ground water supply for New Berlin, I think it's important, could you comment on the effectiveness of this and water softening and in relation to costs, right now, what would the product be, after softening and taking out the hardness relative to the quality of water that would come from Milwaukee, with their alternative process and the type of water that's coming out of Lake Michigan.

Schultz: Basically this project is designed to reduce the amount of salinity or total dissolved solids ( TDS) in the water. We have a similar project that was recently completed in Waukesha which reduced TDS from about a thousand parts per million down to roughly 360 parts per million. We would anticipate seeing a similar reduction here. That however will not get TDS as low as the lake water. Lake water is generally considered to be much better quality, softer and the treatment methods used for disinfection which are ozonation and chlorination are state of the art methods. Milwaukee water is considered some of the best in the nation if not the world.

Scheuble: I want to continue this line of questions here. In order to get the water quality of Lake Michigan water, then there ought to be additional salt or filtrations at the homes. What possible costs for the individual home or a utility owner might be incurred there.

Schultz: To bring ground water quality up to the quality of Lake Michigan water you would probably first treat it at the source, and that would bear a cost with it. The types of treatments you would be looking at are either membrane filtration or softening in combination with filtration. If you are looking at doing that on a per customer basis to obtain high quality water, softening runs, somewhere in the neighborhood of \$170 a year, in individual homeowner costs. Iron filtration somewhere less than that, maybe about \$120 a year to run that filter in a home.

Scheuble: So when we're trying to figure out the most cost effective way to serve our citizens, our utility customers with a high quality product , those considerations should be looked at also.

Schultz: Yes, it's on a case by case basis obviously because not every home has these units. Not everyone softens, not everyone iron filters at their home.

Mayor: This is the kind of conversation we've had at the Utility Committee. What's before this board is the approval of a contract. You all got a copy of the study on this well. Now this discussion has taken place often at the Utility Committee so I would suggest that we maintain our discussion with regards to the issue in front of us which is the awarding of a contract. That's why it's before the Board of Public Works. The discussion with regards to all the other issues takes place at Utility Committee, has taken place and will continue to take place. Everyone got a copy of the report on the geophysical study well 8 and what this is attempting to do so I would recommend that that's the issue before us, is the award of the contract.

Ament: I'm looking at these two different sheets and unfortunately we just got them so maybe I'm missing something here but on the sheet that shows the amended BPW 40-01, on the bottom it says estimate of project \$49,400. On Ruekert & Mielke it says \$59,973.

Walker: No, that's a different bidder. Layne-Northwest.

Schultz: I think you may have miss-stated the Layne -Northwest bid.

Walker: Yes I did, I'm sorry, I did. The correct bid, and I miss-read this, did the same thing you did Alderman Ament, looked at the wrong line. The correct bid was \$27, 845. So that means the \$34,000 has to be revised on the amended, we're going to have to revise the amended item. It should be \$27,845, we'll do the calculations to come up with a total. I would guess that would be right around \$44,000 but I can do the math and have the revised issue papers for the Council.

Chiovero: Okay we have a motion to table. All those in favor.

Scheuble: The reason I brought up the quality concerns and put this in the whole perspective is awarding this contract right now, before we spend these monies, I think it's important that we have the total strategy. We've done the study, the project. Utility understands the benefits and maybe not all, maybe they weren't totally understanding what was necessarily guaranteed with this well, namely the radionuclide problem. I was led to believe that there might be another issue, when we look at the whole strategy of the timing of taking Milwaukee water and supplying needs for next summer or the following summer, those issues is a quantity of water. Quantity seems to be one of the major concerns and that this project will reduce the amount of water, the yield, for Well #8.

Schultz: Following the rehabilitation currently there is about 1,375, well actually there are currently 730 available with the pumpage of the wells. One of the second tasks of this project will be putting a new well pump in to maximize what is available after the rehab is done. It is important to realize that the 1,375 gallons per minute is almost on well water right now. The limits on the wells use will be the availability of blending water. So the 1,375 probably isn't available on a full-time basis because there is a limited supply of water blended down to the acceptable quality.

Scheuble: Is that for Well #9?

Schultz: That is correct.

Scheuble: How much do you think will be blended and used. In contrast with the 650, what porportion of the 1,375 will be made available?

Schultz: I don't have the figures available.

Scheuble: It seems to me be an important issue as far as water quantities by the number. That is why I don't feel comfortable right now issuing the contract until we figure out whether we will have enough water supply.

Chiovero: Somewhat agree with Alderman Scheuble's concerns. I know a lot has been discussed at the Utility committee. To me, all these discussions we are having, have been done already. This is just for an award of contract.

Motion by Alderman Chiovero to vote on the motion at hand. Motion passes with Alderman Scheuble voting no.

Motion by JP Walker to adjourn. Second by Mayor Wysocki. Upon voting, motion passes unanimously.

**Meeting adjourned at 9:38 a.m.**