

Minutes
Water Resource Management Utility Meeting
(Formerly Stormwater Utility)
New Berlin City Hall - Council Chambers
3805 S. Casper Drive
April 11, 2006

Please note: Minutes are unofficial until approved by the Water Resource Management Utility (formerly Stormwater Committee) at their next regularly scheduled meeting.

Present: Alderman Harenda, Alderman Hopkins, Alderman Hegeman, Mayor Chiovatero and Commissioner Jim Kern

Others Present: J.P. Walker (City Engineer), Eric Nitschke (Division Engineer), Cathy Schwalbach (Project Engineer), & Sue Hanley (Office Coordinator Utilities & Streets)

Meeting called to order at 4:47 pm by Alderman Harenda and declared a quorum with all members present.

SW 01-06 Minutes from March 14th Meeting

Motion by Alderman Hopkins to approve the amended minutes from the March 14th Water Resource Management Committee meeting. Seconded by Commissioner Kern and upon voting the motion passed unanimously.

SW 11-06 Discussion of Woodland Drive Resident Request

Eric Nitschke said that he had received a letter signed by several residents on Woodland Drive. He said that Mr. Ebenhoch was present and would like to speak about the problem he and his neighbors have concerning the poor stormwater drainage in the area. He said that this project is known as Woodshire Ditch Enclosure Project which has been on the books at least 4 years and is in the draft updated 5-year plan and a priority capital improvement project. He said that the Committee approved funding for a consultant to review the area and complete a drainage analysis along with Parkland Lane and Overland Trail. He said this was one of the areas in the watershed draining through the golf course. He said to improve the Woodshire ditch and keep water from standing there, we would have to first do the Parkwood Lane drainage improvements, then Lincoln and Overland Trail. He said that currently Woodshire is third on the list behind Parkwood which has flooding in basements, overtopping of roads, safety concern for the kids; Overland Trail has overtopping of roads, and Lincoln and Woodshire ditch enclosure has the standing water issue. Eric said that he went through all of the files, and this area was the last to develop and had a natural drainage through the trees. There were promises made that the upstream residents would not be impacted by the final development, but an impact has occurred. The developer proposed a 12" discharge pipe through the area and promised no impact, and there has been no flooding to homes; however, these residents do have adverse impact, including standing water and mosquitoes. There was a proposal to enclosure the Woodshire Ditch, but we felt that would also have an adverse effect because we would have had to clear cut the trees down the channel. Staff said that the residents were in attendance and staff felt they have a legitimate concern, but we are under the gun as far as budgets go and regulatory issues permitting, what we are allowed to do and what we are required to do.

Alderman Harenda asked when the developments went in. Eric said the most recent 1993-1995.

Alderman Hopkins said that he has talked to Mr. Ebenhoch, and asked Eric if he had any suggestions.

Eric said the problem is that the storm sewer along Lincoln is undersized as it stands now.

Several residents were present to talk:

Mr. Karl Ebenhoch, 14615 W. Woodland Drive said that the problem started when the developer came in and built homes that were higher than their area, and caused the problem. He said that he and Mr. Bowers are always cleaning up the ditches. He said that there is drainage underneath Woodland Drive that is blocked up and that they cannot get it with their rakes. He asked if Streets crews could help them remove the blockage.

Mr. Jim Bowers, 14641 W. Woodland Drive said that he also is requesting help to remove the 8-10 trees that have fallen across the ditch which is stopping the flow of water onto Lincoln Avenue. He said there is a problem with the pitch of the original ditch. He is asking for some crews with chainsaws could clear these trees and improve the flow.

Commissioner Kern asked if an annual cleanup of the area would help until the project starts. Eric Nitschke said this would help in minor storm events, but that according to the City Attorney Blum, this is listed as a public drainage easement, but when it was established it was for that addition and it is the homeowner's responsibility to maintain that area. Mr. Nitschke said he is waiting for additional information from Attorney Blum, since it is listed as a public drainage easement. The second issue is the ditchline across Woodland Drive. He said that Street crews do have to the ability to clean this out, but are down in manpower and already have many projects on the ditching list to complete. In the interim to keep it cleaned out, through a consortium of our own City Streets crews and the homeowner's association downstream we can do. He cautioned to reditch the area south of Mr. Bower's property that is now allowed since it is a wetland and the ground can't be disturbed per the DNR and in our developer's handbook it does not allow for this.

Alderman Harenda asked if we can at least remove the trees. Mr. Nitschke said in the past if public right-of-way drains through an easement, we have taken care of it, but we are talking about an area that a subdivision when platted and installed was responsible to maintain. The question is, is the City going to take responsible for this.

Alderman Hopkins said that if the City Attorney is telling us this is the responsibility of the homeowners, we should enforce it, if not, we should clean out some of the trees. He said that the problem seems to be under the road and we would not have to do this after every storm and maybe there is some way we can give them relief when the Streets crews can get to it.

Alderman Harenda asked Mr. Nitschke if this was similar to what the Committee talked about previously regarding maintenance facilities, pond, etc. in subdivisions are now required by homeowner's associations to take care of. Mr. Nitschke said that subdivisions that come in now are required to sign a maintenance agreement. He said that staff would be coming to the Committee soon with a proposal to bring these older systems that did not have maintenance agreements, but still have the responsibility to maintain them, into compliance. It will be difficult for some folks since they are not used to maintaining them. They will come in phases based on the regulatory requirements to maintain their best management facilities. Alderman Harenda talked about public awareness of this issue, and Mr. Nitschke said that this will be address after some other issues regarding construction practices, and maintenance plans.

Alderman Harenda asked Alderman Hopkins if there was an active homeowner's association in this area. Mr. Nitschke replied he did not know. Alderman Harenda said he would like to walk this area with Mr. Nitschke and asked if the Streets crews could get out there fairly quickly. Mr. Nitschke cautioned said that crews work on many issues internally, and this whittles down the budget and takes away from the drainage list work that is scheduled.

Mayor Chiovero asked Eric if there was any flooding to basements? Mr. Nitschke said there was none reported, besides the flooding in the ditches. Mayor Chiovero said since it is spring and the vegetation and mosquitoes are coming out, maybe we can minimally clear the trees falling across the ditch, maintain the charges we incur, find the homeowners association and see if we can get reimbursed. He said he is

also concerned if the association is dissolves, we have more problems. He is afraid that we will be looking at this further down the road if we don't do something now.

Mr. Nitschke recapped the Committee's direction is to:

1. Find out if there is a homeowner's association
2. Talk with the City Attorney to get his recommendations as to ownership and who is responsible and get his recommendation in writing.
3. Get the Street's crews to clean out the cross culverts and adjacent areas in right-of-way.
4. Enforce the requirement of the homeowner's association to clean out the wetland area and notify them that if they do not, the City will go in to do the work and bill them for it.

Mr. Nitschke said that he will come back to the Committee in May and ask the Street crews to be ready to go after that meeting if the association is unwilling to do this.

Alderman Harenda said that we can use this as a test or pilot case, follow ordinances and procedures, and notifications that we have in place.

Motion by Alderman Hopkins to approve staff finding out if there is a Homeowner's Association and informing them of the situation, get the City Attorney's requested action in writing so that we formally know what his position on this, and have the Streets crews clean out the culverts and areas in our right-of-way in the interim before the May meeting. Seconded by Alderman Hegeman and upon voting the motion passed unanimously.

Alderman Hegeman told Eric he has a similar situation on Cherry Lane and Radisson and check on this.

SW 07-06 Resident Request for Corrective Action Regarding Drainage Concerns

Motion by Commissioner Kern to remove item SW 07-06 from the table. Seconded by Alderman Hopkins and upon voting the motion passed unanimously.

Mr. Nitschke said this area is just north of Lawnsdale Road and west of National Avenue. He said they received a request in writing from the residents in that area to take corrective action regarding the drainage in that area. He said that there is a culvert draining under National east and Lawnsdale and said that the County and the Street department have looked at this and the residents have concerns about obstructions. The other concern is beavers and some other obstructions to the north and east where that area drains out to Observatory and the headwaters of the Poplar Creek area. He said the residents have concerns about their backyards, which they used to be able to use, but now are getting wetter and wetter. He said that it was originally tabled to allow time for staff to look at this with the residents, but this has not happened yet.

Eric said that he has received a letter from Mr. Teclaw and others dated March 15th and has looked at the City's right-of-ways and mapping of the area. He said it is Staff's intent to go out and do a site analysis with residents. He said this area is fairly flat to the north of their backyards and a lot of the ditching system was done when the old farm fields were in place and the farmers were dredging those ditches along their fields to maintain some drainage. This does drain just past Ronald Reagan School to Poplar creek where we do have a flood plain issue and acts as a water quality component.

There were several residents present to discuss the issue and show photos. Alderman Harenda said he preferred residents to physically walk the areas with Eric and then come back in May. Mr. Nitschke said that he has not walked these backyards yet, but has researched the maps and our right-of-ways. Alderman Harenda asked if this was county right of way and if it is sized accordingly. Mr. Nitschke said it is County, and it is difficult to see the size of the culvert under National because it was underwater. Alderman Harenda asked if we increase the culvert under National, do we increase the flooding downstream. Mr. Nitschke said yes.

Commissioner Kern said it sounds like Mr. Nitschke didn't think the culvert is the problem, but asked if Staff did enough analysis to determine the problem. Mr. Nitschke said they have not done an analysis since it is private property, the lay of the land, and size of the properties, and the fact that the farmers in the past dredged the property, that there is an issue of sedimentation and beavers downstream over extensive plots of land over the old farm fields. After further discussion about the history of the property, several residents asked to address the Committee.

Steve Uselman, 18500 Lawnsdale said there was 3 feet of water in his culvert and the blockage is not on his land, but the water is not flowing through at all. He said the culvert on National Avenue was barely assisting at all. He said that when National Avenue was repaved, he asked the Engineering department to clean out the pipes and possibly resize the pipes, but he was brushed off. He said that he wants to raise apacac and farm, but can't with the mud in his backyard.

Terry Koeble, 18820 Lawnsdale said he has been a resident since 1978 and that the ditch under National is a relief valve for when it gets really wet and most of the water goes out onto Observatory. He said when he used to walk out that way years ago, the water poured out of it, but now it just trickles out. He said that the culverts are old and they need help.

Brian Teclaw, 18300 Lawnsdale said his pasture used to be dry enough to raise sheep and goats and food plots, but the culvert under National seems to be impaired. He said they examined the area of restricted flow last summer when it was dry, and an area that was farmed in the past was filled in by agricultural activities. He thinks just a section of the ditch needs to be dug out.

Troy Hanevold, 17880 W. National Ave and 17800 W. National Avenue brought in photos and expressed the same concerns about the area to the north. He asked City Hall a few years ago to ask if he could clean it out himself, and they said no, because of an easement there.

Alderman Harenda directed staff to set up a meeting with the residents, walk the properties and report back to the Committee. Mr. Nitschke said that he will send out notices and work through Mr. Teclaw and the other residents, as well as Alderman Ament, Alderman Harenda and JP Walker.

Motion by Alderman Hopkins to table SW 07-06. Seconded by Alderman Hegeman and upon voting the motion passed unanimously.

SW 05-06 Ditch Maintenance Enforcement and Effects on Drainage

Alderman Harenda said that this item would remain on the table.

SW 08-06 Request Common Council, in Conjunction with Approvals from Board of Public Works and Community Development Authority, to move forward with funding for Calhoun Road and the Industrial Park Roadway Reconstruction Plan (*this item minutes are verbatim*)

Harenda: I am looking for a motion to remove the table 08-06 the discussion regarding Calhoun Road project. Motion by Mayor Chiovatero, seconded by Alderman Hegeman, all in favor say aye. Motion passed unanimously. This is an item we had some discussion on the last couple of meetings. Eric do you wanted to offer something.

Nitschke: Right, the last meeting that we had here, this was an item that was discussed and staff was looking for a recommendation from the Water Resource Committee, so that the Board of Public Works and Community Development Authority and ultimately Council would know where the Utility stood in regards to this project. As some of you may be aware, there's been a lot of budget discussion on what can and cannot be done, and really just bringing this off the table to see if there is any further discussion that the Committee would like to have and if there is any kind of rhetoric or items that you'd like forwarded to any other committees. If there isn't anything in addition, and if you feel that there isn't going to be any action done or any recommendation taken, then we can probably pull this one off the table, and just

remove if from the agenda, but it is really going to be up to you. The only other item that I wanted to pass along is that the last couple of rain events that we've had, Calhoun has fared just like its always fared the last several of years which is not very well. We've had localized flooding on Roosevelt, we had flooding of a couple of loading docks just north of Lincoln and Glendale was Glendale. We had problems there as well. So, that is all I wanted to bring forward to you and see if you wanted to take it any further.

Harenda: Gentlemen any other comments? I've made a number of comments in the past at a couple of the other meetings. I don't know if can build a consensus here, or any motions or actions, but I know the Mayor is looking for verbatim minutes to be put together and supplied to the Common Council in the end regarding our discussions. Anybody else want to interject anything else on this?

Mayor C: The only thing I have to say is we have to look at this with our Stormwater hats on. I know several of us sit on several other committees and we will have to take that hat off and put that particular committee hat on before we go to that Committee. I know right now that the Council is struggling with some decisions that have to be made fairly soon as far as the 5-year financial plan and also how to direct Staff and myself instruction to conduct the upcoming budgets. And there are some tough decisions that have to be made, but we need to look at this project from a stormwater issue and if we can't afford it we can't afford it, but we've got to say that, and moving on, so we have got to make some decision on a Council level as to do we look at how we can afford it or do we table it or do we move somewhere else. That's all the comments I have, except for the fact that we are looking at several options for Calhoun Road and you are right Alderman Harenda that we are going to have verbatim minutes that are being given to the Council, but I would like to have some very informative information that I would like to pass along to Council if we can.

Harenda: I think I discussed in the last meeting was I agree I think that Eric pointed out as well as JP in the past that this is the headwaters and everything flows downhill in this area, from a standpoint of stormwater utility if we do this work, it will hopefully it won't not abate but minimize potential increases within the utility, stormwater utility for the fees that we charge for this as well as the residents in the community. From a water quality, water patrolman it is something we should be doing, the point is from the utility standpoint can we physically do what's on our end as well as fund it with the Citywide CIP budget and be able to pay for that. But I do agree it is an option and I know Staff is talking about alternatives but if we could do I guess, from a utility standpoint yeah. Do Calhoun Road and it will start us off in the direction of other improvements within the Industrial Park? But from a standpoint of trying to feasibly finance that, I don't know, I can't see that, I guess that is the only concern I have. I am looking for any comments from Commissioner Kern or anybody else.

Hopkins: I'd go with what has just been said from a stormwater standpoint I'd like to see this project go through just the way it was first intended, but realistically just some of the stuff we are talking about like cleaning out ditches we don't have the monies, I don't see where we are going to get the money for the full project. I think we are going to be looking at some alternative.

Kern: Eric, what does it do in your opinion not going the full route, to future stormwater costs and I would assume it is going to be higher to do the Industrial Park piece?

Nitschke: When you say not going the full route, what exactly do you mean by that?

Kern: Well, without total reconstruction of Calhoun.

Nitschke: OK, say like just a resurfacing and doing the intersection of Cleveland and Calhoun. Well as far as cost...

Kern: How much would we save in your opinion if you did it all now?

Eric: I don't have a specific number for how much we would save. I know JP can speak toward where construction costs go the further that you wait. We've also found in the past that the further you wait it seems to be a couple more requirements that kind of add themselves to the list, so you are doing a

couple more things. I do know that when we moved forward with the Gatewood, Buena Park, Malone Park projects, all in one year instead of spacing them out over 3 years we saved a significant amount of money because we were getting very low bids at that time. Now the bids are higher and like we saw on the underground storage facility by Eisenhower High School, we had an estimate of cost of materials around \$250,000 from the supplier and we were getting bids at \$700,000 from the contractors. So where the extra \$500,000 came from to put some pipe in the ground we're not sure, but that's the type of thing that we see the later we wait. I'll let JP speak to the cost.

Walker: Each year that goes by and no action is taken, you can increase the cost on average of 3%. I think that also applies for stormwater components, but in general terms you will get about a 3% annual increase. Ah, the concern I have without gaining control of stormwater at Calhoun Road and trying to go forth, if the CDA decides to go forth with projects within the Industrial Park, you will probably going to be adding costs to those projects because you did not achieve the control of the stormwater that is needed on Calhoun Road. Anything that is done on Calhoun Road, I believe you cannot short circuit the need for stormwater control at least at Lincoln. You are going to have to have detention capabilities for the Cleveland Avenue intersection, because it looks like the increase of impervious area will exceed the half acre threshold. We are all aware of stormwater problems that are even north of the railroad tracks so, you have to look at the project as a whole and then break it down into its parts and make a decision, but one of the parts that cannot be totally eliminated is stormwater. That has to be factored into whatever direction we need to go on that project.

Kern: So I guess idealistically like everyone else is saying we'd like to do the whole project, but realistically there just aren't the funds to do it. but it does feel like we are pushing off the ultimate. Somebody is going to pay for it someday and have to make that tough decision, but if the funds aren't there to do it you can only do what you can do.

Harenda: Well that was the question and I don't like to beat up JP and Eric on this, I hate to piecemeal it together, but you've got the hot spots along the road corridor I guess. We talked about the Cleveland Calhoun section as one area and working backwards towards the north is there any way to do like the Lincoln area to look at, I know we've got all the plans here but anyway to piece meal it I guess. I know that in the end, if you look at the spreadsheets, yeah, it is going to cost a little bit more but basically do you want to pay now or pay later I guess. Have we, the possibility as meeting our 2013 requirements just doing certain areas I guess versus all and still try to slowly work ourselves into the revitalization plan of the old Industrial Park. I talked to Eric briefly before the meeting and the next item we will talk about is the 5-year plan, but looking at all these things, the Industrial Park Plan, Calhoun Road, other CIP budget items and what we are trying to do with Ehlers planning all of this stuff overlaps, and what I am ultimately seeing is that it's nice to plan all this stuff but if we don't have all of the money available to do that we are going to have to go back and adjust timelines and how we are going to prioritize some of these projects I guess. That's just looking at the big picture I guess. So, I don't know, suggestionwise that I know.

Nitschke: And that was, you are right, money these days it is tough to come by and you are facing legitimate concerns in all sorts of areas. That was why one of the proposals for Calhoun Road was spend the money up front so that STP funding could be used for other projects down the line where you wouldn't have to borrow additional funds and additional monies. And you hit it right on the head, we're running into 2008 and 2013 requirements, and Staff is doing its best not to put all of its eggs in one basket. We would like to reemphasize that. We are not just looking at the Industrial Park, we are looking at initiating a legitimate street sweeping program and we have done streambank stabilization projects, and we are working with developers for new development coming in and you know we are also looking at in our stormwater conveyance projects, like Gatewood subdivision that we are not just curb and gutter and take the water directly in, that we have some pretreatment through shallow grass swales. And so we are trying to hit this 2013 requirement from a bunch of different sides. But one of the big ones is the Industrial Park and it, the question remains, they put in a lot of money to the Utility, how is the Utility going to give back to the Industrial Park, and JP and I discussed it just last week, with the drainage easement along just north of Lincoln that runs through a couple of businesses and creates some flooding problems for them, we don't know exactly how to do that. That project is estimated at approximately \$300,000 to do that drainage easement, but if Calhoun Road was done, that drainage easement where the drainage

comes out is going to be modified and so the work along that easement may not be needed or may be needed in a much smaller scale. These are all types of things where, when you start lining it up you have to start at a certain point, that's where the discussion a couple of meetings ago was. Typically you start on the downstream end and work up, but because we are in an urbanized area, we are trying to start on the upstream end and work down and if we don't start on the upstream end we are kind of in limbo with other elements. And that's ultimately, I guess where the funding is stuck, and that is we do have some funding for the Industrial Park, where do we start with it if we don't know what's going to happen on Calhoun Road and if that's extended out.

Harenda: OK. Any more comments, questions or directions I guess?

Mayor: For this comment for which Eric would like to say is clear as mud. Ah, the recommendation I'm getting is that the Stormwater or Water Resource Management Committee would like to see this done. They understand that it could have some effects on projects down the road in a positive direction, but we just don't know where to go as far as funding and obviously we have stated that we don't want to raise our fees to fund this either so, do we want to just push it onto Council with that recommendation? Is everybody comfortable with at least that part of it or is there something else you want to say.

Harenda: Can you sum it up?

Hopkins: I think that's well worded from a Stormwater or Water Resource Management prospective.

Mayor C: So with that then we will be able to take it off our agenda I guess. With the verbatim minutes we will be able to pass that onto Council.

Nitschke: Fair enough, thank you gentlemen.

Harenda: Then I look for a motion to drop item 08-06 from the agenda. Motion by Commissioner Kern. Seconded by Mayor Chiovatero. All in favor say aye. The motion passes unanimously.

SW 19-05 Approval of Stormwater Utility Updated 5-Year Plan

Motion by Alderman Hopkins to remove SW 19-05 from the table. Seconded by Alderman Hegeman and upon voting the motion passed unanimously.

Mr. Nitschke said at the last Council meeting there was discussion whether or not Stormwater Utility should pay for their share of funding on roadway projects. One of the projects is Calhoun Road where the stormwater component has raised those rates at least \$2 million. He said that if we go that route and share funding of roadway projects, we do reap the assets, the storm sewers, the culverts, then we would have to revisit the 5-year plan for rate increases that are only to get the Water Resource Utility to 2010 and setting it up for the water quality components of the Industrial Park plan, but it does not include doing the stormwater components, curb and gutter, inlets, bioretention ponds, etc. He said he wanted to bring it to the Committee's attention to be aware of and have a chance to think it through.

Alderman Harenda said the discussion was who pays for what, if it is an asset to the Utility, the Utility should be paying for these projects and taking it off the tax roles. He said, in the past a lot of these projects, before stormwater utility came about, a lot of these projects were funded by the CIP or the road maintenance budget anyway, and now the question is are we looking to transfer that over to the Utility and slowly phase that in.

Alderman Harenda asked Eric to take a couple of scenarios of road projects over the next 5 years, and present it to the Committee as to how it would impact the Utility with the current rate structure and what we would have to increase the rates to accommodate this.

Mr. Nitschke asked if this could be left on hold until Ehler's completed their analysis. Mr. Nitschke said that the City of Appleton use their stormwater funds for roadway projects, and although their ERU's are

set up a little differently, it is approximately \$110 per year for residents, and are looking to raise it, compared to our fees of \$60 per year. He said in order to do this, we would have to double or triple our fees.

Alderman Harenda said the CIP budget as well as the roadway maintenance project paid for this in the past, if you shift this to Utility, would there be a net decrease on the other one? JP said that looking at the Industrial Park improvements, they broke out the stormwater improvements it looks like the percentage of the total project that would be attributed to the Water Resource Utility would be 30-40% of the total cost, so now factor that into the \$54 total projects, that is \$16 million, and said he did not know how the Water Resource Utility would even come close to those type of dollars.

Commissioner Kern asked which way most communities go on roadway projects? Mr. Nitschke said that most communities are starting with handling long-standing drainage concerns and regulatory requirements. He said the City of Appleton has taken it to the next step in also handling roadway projects, and are ahead of the curve. Mr. Nitschke said that the City of Pewaukee is just starting their Utility and the funding is under \$200,000 a year just to handle what their permit requirements will be, so there is a wide variety.

Mayor Chiovaturo said that he wanted to make us aware, if we are shifting one to another, like JP pointed out that 30% of these costs for stormwater didn't exist a few years ago, but because of state mandates they do and that anything we do for stormwater becomes an asset for the stormwater utility. Mayor Chiovaturo said that he has talked to a lot of the communities around the area that said New Berlin is ahead of the curve, and with this current fee structure coming up they are rushing around trying to get something in place. Mayor Chiovaturo said he wanted to make sure that everyone was aware that this was going to be an asset of the Stormwater Utility, and we were not shifting costs, but these were added costs to our projects which were not a part of the project 6-7 years ago.

Commissioner Kern asked if for a taxpayer is it a wash and if I pay more under Stormwater Utility fees would I pay less in taxes. Mayor Chiovaturo said unfortunately no because this was something added that we never had to pay for in the first place. Commissioner Kern asked where we add less taxes or fees. Mr. Nitschke said that this is a question for Ehlers, but if you are looking at a charge to the Utility vs. a charge to the taxes, individual residents will pay less if it is a charge to the Utility, that's why the Utility rating system with the ERU's was established back in 2000. He added that churches and the city even pays a fee for stormwater Utility vs. taxes where there are some properties that are tax exempt and he further explained the percentages.

After a brief discussion, Mr. Nitschke said that Staff would wait for direction from Committee and Council what needs to be done with these large roadway capital improvement projects and asked to leave the 5-year plan on hold until the report from Ehlers. Alderman Hegeman said that he would still like to see some scenarios, but he didn't want them to get deep into it and waste a lot of time.

Motion by Commissioner Kern to retable SW 19-05. Seconded by Alderman Hegeman and upon voting the motion passed unanimously.

SW 10-06 Woelfel Drainage Easement Discussion

Alderman Harenda said that this item would remain on the table.

Alderman Hopkins said he had a couple of comments to make and it is not on the agenda so he did not want a discussion. He said that we have had 3 major rain incidents in the past few weeks and thanked the crews from Streets and Utilities and the Water Resources Management Staff for assisting on Meadow Lane and Conrad, which had to be cleaned out 3 times, especially during the night. He also thanked the Police officers who worked with neighbors clearing out a culvert at Parkwood Lane. Alderman Hopkins said that he talked with Cathy Schwalbach about the problem at Honey Lane and Elm Grove and felt it was not just a stormwater problem, but would probably come back to this Committee at some point after talking to the neighbors.

Motion to adjourn by Commissioner Kern at 6:18 p.m. Seconded by Alderman Hegeman and upon voting the motion passed unanimously.

Respectfully submitted, Sue Hanley, Office Coordinator Utilities and Streets