

MINUTES
City of New Berlin
Utility Committee Meeting
Tuesday November 16, 2010

Members Present: Alderman Harenda, Alderman Ament, Alderman Wysocki, Commissioner Bob Dude & Commissioner Jim Morrisey

Others Present: Rick Johnson (Utility Manager), Jim Hart (Utility Supervisor), Attorney Mark Blum, Ralph Chipman (Finance Director), Ryan Bailey (Accounting Manager) JP Walker (City Engineer), Sue Hanley (Admin Supervisor Utilities & Streets) and Mayor Chiovatero (arrived at 4:53 p.m.)

Alderman Harenda called the meeting to order at 4:04 p.m. with roll call and declared a quorum with all members present.

OLD BUSINESS

UT 01-10 Approval of Minutes from the September 28, 2010 Meeting

Motion by Alderman Wysocki to approve the minutes from the September 28, 2010 meeting. Seconded by Alderman Ament and upon voting the motion passed unanimously after the revision is made page 4.

UT 07-09 Discussion regarding the procedures used to authorize the payments of costs and fees for utility consultants and contractors

No for further information or discussion at this time.

UT 25-09 Milwaukee Water Utility rate application PSC contested case hearing – discussion and possible action

No for further information or discussion at this time. No closed session is needed.

UT 15-10 Review, Discussion and Possible Action on how Utility Components in Roadway projects should be funded (tabled)

No for further information or discussion at this time.

NEW BUSINESS

Information Utility Payables, Monthly Financials and Financial Statements

No discussion.

Information: MMSD Charges for 2011 and TAT Meeting Summary

Harenda: The information is a summary of data from the meeting. I will invite Kevin Shafer from MMSD to discuss I & I and MMSD charges for the December meeting and answer questions.

Information: MMSD: Private Property Infiltration and Inflow Reduction Program

Harenda: This is information that Mr. Shafer from MMSD will discuss at our next meeting.

Walker: I sent you information of a summit at MMSD on November 18th from 9 a.m. to 12 noon. This will provide us the information up front and we will be able to distribute the information.

Wysocki: I have a question on the information provided on the last page before the PowerPoint presentation it says "estimated project funding set aside by municipalities". Is that going to be imposed or

something within our planning? Is this a mandatory requirement, a suggestion or something we have committed to? That is one thing I have a question about.

UT 22-10 Approval of Proposed Water Utility Operating and CIP Budgets

Commissioner Dude read the Water Budget Assumptions.

The Water Utility budget was prepared assuming the utility is fully on Milwaukee water the entire year. In addition to the change in rates, the switch to Milwaukee water impacts three expense accounts: purchased water (increase), chemicals (decrease) and power (decrease). In 2004, the year before the purchase of Milwaukee water, the utility spent \$340,741 on power; in 2011 this amount is budgeted at \$130,000. Chemicals were \$49,998, next year it is 0. The abandonment of wells since the change has also saved the utility \$29,555 per year in depreciation and will go up to \$44,904 per year after 2012. The utility also saves on well maintenance costs.

The utility has worked hard to monitor its spending; it has spent less than the amount budgeted three of the last four years. Assumptions used to prepare this budget are as follows:

Revenues: Rates have been adjusted assuming the utility will request a purchase water adjustment (PWAC) from the PSC to keep pace with Milwaukee water rate increases. The PWAC allows the utility to automatically increase rates to cover the increased cost of purchased water. Milwaukee Water is currently petitioning the PSC to increase rates 39% effective January 1st, 2011. The Milwaukee water increases are expected to increase New Berlin rates 9.75% in January 2011. Because the PWAC allows the recovery of the increased cost of purchased water only and these cost are just a part of the utilities overall rate structure, New Berlin's increase in rates is approximately only ¼ of Milwaukee Water's announced rate increase. The PWAC takes effect immediately and lets the utility cover its expenses, a full rate case would take at least three months. Later in the year the utility may need to go for a full rate case, other expenses have remained stable, but revenues continue to decline as consumption declines.

The budget for interest income was decreased to reflect current market conditions. Interest rates are assumed to remain flat thru next year.

Purchased Water: We have estimated total purchased water to be 1 billion gallons in 2011. The utility is continuing to see a reduction in water consumption. In 2007 total water pumped was 1.16 billion, in 2009 it was 1.03 billion; an 11.2% drop. The budget has been adjusted for these projected changes.

Labor: Utility workers are a mix of Teamster, AFSCME, and Civil service employees. Rates included in the budget have been adjusted for next years projected amounts. The union contracts were settled for a 3% increase, all the contracts expire at the end of 2011. Go to page 9 of the budget document to review how the labor is allocated, page 11 shows the corresponding duties performed. Based on the latest numbers from the city human resources department, health insurance was increased 10% with civil service premium co pay going up to 15%. I strongly recommend that the Utilities would investigate joining the state health care plan.

Expenses: Outside services other includes \$43,344 for a cross connection program. 2011 is the second year of a four year State mandated program (NR 811.09).

Capital funding: The total capital budget is \$223,000 of which meter replacements is \$135,000. The balance of additions are routine in nature.

Commissioner Dude further explained the budget analysis and said the estimated net income for 2010 is \$423,095 and \$416,015 in 2011. Our total operating expenses are up \$347,768, but water itself is up \$355,400, so all of the other expenses are down \$7,213 which is the difference between the 2010 estimated and 2011 proposed budget. Our investments are down due to the economy. We did put \$2,500 in each budget in 2011 for the toilet rebate program even though the consumers only used about \$4,500 this year so far. Net Assets are \$41,003,802 but only about \$6.67 million are unrestricted. Most is in the ground and has to be replaced some day. Revenue Bonds debt is \$5.9 million and our loan from Sewer Utility is \$3.159 million. We have a debt to equity ratio of .22 and rule of thumb is that you want to be below .5 so we are back in black ink.

Wysocki: Although as unpalatable as the rate increase may be, I think we need to refer back to Ehler's report when Moody's did their ratings scale recalibration, although the city is AAA, it did say that the City's Water Utility debt has a GSR rating of AA2 which is not a bad rating, but I think with this type of action that we take shows that this is a business operation that pays attention to its bottom line. I think we have an opportunity the next time that we have to get into a debt service situation or borrowing, we need to keep the AA2 and try to obtain AAA rating.

Harenda: We are looking at a 9.75% increase. Are we going to be billing for that immediately?

Dude: I presume that the day it rolls out of the courts and we have a number, we go to the PSC and say we want to increase our rates the amount we are buying purchased water.

Chipman: We have a PWAC – Purchased Water Adjustment Clause that means when our main supplier of water increases the rate we go to the PSC to automatically get an increase in rates to cover their increase in costs. It is a 30-day thing. If this is settled January 1st, our bill would not go out until April. When the rate case has come down, I will come to the Utility Committee, then go to the PSC for the PWAC and then we will get approved to increase them.

Ament: Based on this increase, what would the average customer pay?

Chipman: The average customer according to the PSC uses 18,000 but our average customer uses 15,000 gallons quarterly. If the 9.75% increase goes through, the average customer will see an increase of \$7.02 per quarter.

Ament: The industrial customers who use a lot of water will increase more.

Chipman: When we get the PWAC we will give you a breakdown of what the increase will be for residential, commercial and large commercial customers to see what the impact will be.

Dude: We should write a letter to our customers summarizing what has happened since 2004 in terms of Milwaukee Water. We looked at the cost-benefit of radium treatment versus Milwaukee water and talked about the alternatives, what the savings were and that it would be well worth the trouble.

Wysocki: I would second that idea and it is important. In your assumptions on labor cost you have health insurance as 10%. Can you validate that?

Chipman: I have not received that information yet either but we may have to adjust it.

Harenda: We made the transition from city wells to Milwaukee water and we are making efficiencies and cost decreases. Are there any savings within the utility?

Dude: There are chemical savings and electricity savings. I was under the assumption that we would save time checking hydrants. We still have to check them, we just don't have to run them as long as we used to.

Johnson: We are saving a lot on the electrical costs and chemicals. We have 3 more shallow wells that have to be abandoned in the next 2 years. I have put these in the budget for 2012. We will have to look at possibly demolishing the buildings instead of heating them and we have saved money on air development of the wells and maintenance on deep well pumps which was a maintenance cost on each well of \$50,000-75,000 every 5-7 years.

2011 Capital Budget for Water Utility

1. Communication Wireless Upgrade – (split with Sewer utility). Server for Scada system needs to be replaced and some of the antennas and lightning arrestors at the pumphouses
2. Water Meters – yearly replacement required by the PSC and DNR

3. Mini Excavator – (split with Sewer utility). Many stopboxes and hydrants in driveways need to be replaced and our backhoe only rotates 90° each way. We need to rotate around 360° to fill up trucks. We rented a unit 5 times this year, which is time consuming and costly.
4. Utility Service Truck with Dump Body – split with sewer utility. We need another towing vehicle and will be replacing an older van with high maintenance.

Harenda: This is all coming out of working capital so we aren't borrowing anything. With the water meters we are required to replace and test a certain number every year correct?

Johnson: Yes. We charge the sewer utility rent on the water meters because that is how we charge for the sewer rates – on volume.

Harenda: Separating it into working capital is better than rolling it into the operational budget?

Johnson: Yes.

Wysocki: On the Scada system upgrade, is that just equipment, not software?

Johnson: Just the equipment. The server is limping along. The Scada system collects data from the water and sewer utility system. We are working with Nick in IT to take some of our system into his system so that if our server goes down we still can run the system through his.

Morrisey: Are we doing the Scada work or is there an outside contractor?

Johnson: Because of all of the things that need to be done we probably have to have a contractor come in. The server information we have from R & M because they are currently running the Scada part of it until we get an upgrade.

Morrisey: How much will you be using the mini excavator since you said you rented one 5 times this year?

Johnson: We have 250-300 stopboxes and valves to repair so we will be using it a lot.

Wysocki: I appreciate the work you did in Parkland Green and want to thank JP and his staff for coordinating with you.

Harenda: We authorized money for the Scada system before. Will we be done with it?

Johnson: We will be looking at upgrading the whole system within about 2 years since the PLC's and radios are getting outdated. This will hold us until we can get the whole system upgraded.

Motion by Alderman Wysocki to defer the 2011 Water Utility Operating and Capital budgets. Seconded by Commissioner Morrisey and upon voting the motion passed unanimously.

UT 23-10 Approval of Proposed Wastewater Utility Operating and CIP Budgets

Dude: This budget does not have a rate in it yet, but I think we will have to ask for one.

MMSD capital and disposal charges make up 74% of the total Wastewater budget. These numbers come directly from MMSD and are to a great extent out of our control. Any change in these charges will have a significant impact on the utilities budget. Required inflow and infiltration (I/I) control costs accounted for an additional 5% of the budget, bringing the total non controllable costs to 79%. Costs that are directly controllable by the utility have only increased an average of 1.13% over the last three years. The utility has worked hard to monitor its spending; it has spent less than the amount budgeted three of the last four years.

Assumptions used to prepare this budget are as follows:

Revenues: The last time rates were adjusted was January 1, 1996. The rates need to be adjusted to give the utility a positive operating income after showing a loss the previous two years. Sewer rates are controlled by local ordinance and need only Common Council approval to be adjusted. Every 1% increase in rates equals an additional \$85,000 in revenue for the utility. The enclosed current budget is projecting an approximate \$800,000 loss.

The budget for interest income was reduced to reflect current market conditions. Interest rates are assumed to remain flat thru next year.

MMSD Capital: Increased \$632,366 (12.9%) from 2010 based on their latest estimate. The capital charge is made up of various components, but the major reason for the increase is the 9.1% increase in their tax rate. MMSD projects the capital charge to increase 4% annually in 2011-2017.

MMSD Operating: Increased \$35,950 from 2010, this is a 2% increase. The disposal charge to the City of New Berlin has increased \$764 thousand from 2004, an average of 10.2% per year.

Labor: Utility workers are a mix of Teamster, Afscome, and Civil service employees. Rates included in the budget have been adjusted for next years projected amounts. The union contracts were settled for a 3% increase, all the contracts expire at the end of 2011. Go to page 8 of the budget document to review how the labor is allocated. Based on the latest numbers from the city human resources department, health insurance was increased 10% with civil service premium co pay going up to 15%.

I&I Expenses: Account 81001131-52030 Collection System-Contracted (inflow and infiltration work and monitoring) increased \$250,000 to \$750,000. This number will decrease in the future as the older sections of the city are completed. Included in this budgeted amount is \$20,000 for new MMSD mandated testing.

Capital Projects: The capital projects for 2011 is \$278,000. \$190,000 of this is funded by impact fees.

Dude: We can't control the expenses from MMSD - Disposal and Capital. We can control the I & I expense which we cut to \$450,000. Even with increases in MMSD expenses, our average increase over the past 3 years has been 1.13% and the Utility should be complimented. There was a net loss in 2008 (\$599,798), 2009 (\$442,410) and (\$13,136) estimated for 2010 and without any increase the budget as it sits for 2011 will be about \$800,000. We have a strong balance sheet. There is no debt, in fact we loan money to the Water Utility and have an unrestricted net worth of \$17,640,773. I am recommending a 9.39% increase for the sewer rates would make our projected bottom line zero. Four years of losses is not a good thing. The increases are coming from a source we do not control. A 9% increase would result in the average customer's quarterly bill to go up \$14.11 per quarter.

Harenda: Does the projected budget revenue include the 9.39% increase?

Dude: This budget does include the increase. You need the 9.39% increase to make the budget a zero increase. We haven't had a rate increase since 1996, but in reality we can't control the MMSD expenses.

Harenda: Is MMSD projecting any credits in the future for us?

Chipman: This is what it is going to look like going forward. If you look at the last paragraph in their letter, they are going away from doing some of the watercourse credit that was out of our district and doing more. Their projections of how their capital and watercourse activities haven't been real reliable going forward. Situations like the flooding they had may change their focus as far as what they are going to do on other projects. Hopefully Kevin Shafer can answer some of these questions next month. The Summary of changes in the capital charges for 2011 shows how we determined the increase that was needed. MMSD talks about a 3.9% tax levy increase but that is for Milwaukee and their equalized value dropped substantially and when you multiply out the rate, their rate increased by 9% which translated to a \$484,000 increase on the capital charge for us. We are concerned about what that charge will be in the future.

Wysocki: Over the last 10 years we have received awards for doing good work in I & I and also awards for our efforts in stormwater management. Do we receive any credits for flood control efforts we do?

A lot of work that we have done has substantial impact on the downstream watercourses. This should be taken into account.

Harenda: You can ask Mr. Shafer that at the next meeting.

Wysocki: I do share Mr. Dude's concern about running a negative balance next year but with the economy it will result in increases not only in residential customers but commercial and industrial will see huge increases.

Ament: The total increase for utility customers who are on water and sewer will be \$21.13 per quarter for residential. It will be very interesting to see how much the increase will be for the large industrial customers like Industrial Towel.

Chipman: We can do a scenario for various users and do an analysis for high end, middle size and residential users.

Harenda: Can you do that for our next meeting?

Chipman: Yes.

Ament: When you look at how much money we have spent on I & I over the past 10 years – almost \$9 million – and look at what other communities have spent, MMSD still hasn't solved the problem. They keep pointing out this way, but if you look at the amount of impervious surface in Milwaukee alone and we are dumping it into the same system and for them to say the biggest problem is the I & I including the laterals coming from people's homes, you would think their efforts would be spent on fixing their problems first.

Morrisey: You have \$450,000 budgeted for next year. Is it possible to reduce this?

Johnson: There are 2 areas that have holes in them and have pipes that are showing fatigue on the joints. They need to be relined. I could probably go a little lower, but I don't recommend putting this off.

Dude: We did reduce this \$300,000, but as Alderman Ament said, why am I doing this? In a sense you are rebuilding your capital structure which are your pipes. I am not suggesting we should capital your expenses but you are enhancing the pipes. The other way you look at it, you are cutting down the amount you are paying MMSD on the disposal fee because you don't have as much water getting into their system. There is no way that you can reduce the fee enough to pay you back for your I & I.

Wysocki: Did Moody's look at the Sewer Utility?

Chipman: They don't have any outstanding debt.

Johnson: 2011 Sewer Utility CIP Capital Budget.

1. Cleveland Avenue Liftstation Upgrade – 31 years old. Structure, pumps and control panels that make liftstation operate need to be changed out.
2. Communication Wireless Upgrade (1/2 Water Utility)
3. Moorland Road Liftstation Upgrade – Due to increased flows, the pumps can't handle the flow and we had issues with the impellers clogging up. I will put this on hold until we have additional information.
4. Mini Excavator (1/2 Water Utility)
5. Utility Service Truck with Dump Body (1/2 Water Utility)

Motion by Alderman Wysocki to defer the 2011 Sewer Utility Operating and Capital budgets. Seconded by Commissioner Morrisey and upon voting the motion passed unanimously.

UT 24-10 Discussion & Possible Action to make a recommendation to Council on a request to contribute funds for the Private Purchase of land directly north of Calhoun Park and the impact of said purchase on Future Utility Operations & Infrastructure

Harenda: There are a couple of environmental and conservancy groups looking to purchase the land north of Calhoun Park which is a tree farm for watershed protection purposes, passive open space, protecting things that flow down into Muskego that get into the Linnie Lac and Little Muskego area. They have come to the City of New Berlin to contribute \$30,000 and in exchange we would get access to properties such as access to trails as well as protect the open space in that immediate area. In a way it is a buffer between the industrial park to the east and the residences to the west. Alderman Ament and I had a town hall meeting with the residents in the area. This group is also looking to utilize an acre of the property to compost weeds that are collected from Little Muskego Lake which is in front of the Plan Commission for conditional use. They want to close on the property at the end of December. We would not have ownership, but we would have some easement rights. I emailed you a projected routing of an interceptor that loops around this area. The concern is that the property won't be acquired by the city but is looked as a donation to this group but we would get certain accessibility rights. From the Utility standpoint, if we eventually use the routing that is projected, we have the ability to do eminent domain, but we may want to lock up for the ability for an easement now versus in the future. This is on the Council agenda. One thought was using impact fees to acquire the rights to an easement in the area for future use.

Walker: I want to remind the Utility Committee members that the routing is conceptualized. In that area it follows Calhoun Creek and serves the area of Beloit Road west of Town Court.

Harenda: This is everything east of Calhoun that has been on the books for some time. Nothing west. Do we want to get involved in this and add some language for some rights with respect to the land?

Ament: When I look at the proposed local sewer service which is the red dotted area and the proposed interceptor that would be to serve Beloit Road is that the residences and businesses on Beloit Road west of Town Park?

Walker: It will also serve anyone north of Beloit Road south of Regal Manors West. That interceptor would be the route in which local sewers would be tied in.

Ament: It is not possible to run it down Beloit?

Walker: It is possible. I didn't show any sewers on Beloit Road because it is beyond the concept that was laid out. That would have to be looked at.

Ament: I know this is conceptual, but I think about using \$30,000 of Utility money, why wouldn't the interceptor just continue down Calhoun Road once it gets in Park area?

Walker: You follow geography. The interceptor follows low land because all local sewers would flow by gravity to the interceptor. If you go along Calhoun Road, there are areas east of Calhoun Creek that would not be served.

Ament: When I look at our future land use on our Comprehensive Plan there are only 1 or 2 small parcels west of Town Park that will be served in that area. I have a hang up with \$30,000 for something we are not even sure we will use or when we will use it. It seems like we are trying to use Utility money where we can't get it someplace else.

Harenda: Utility has some interest in this, not to say we have to give \$30,000 for it. If we have a Utility interest is there some language we want to add to the agreement to protect the Utility going forward?

Ament: Wouldn't the City and the Utility be better off buying it and renting it out to Muskego? That gives us control of where we put the interceptor, we don't need an easement. If we have an easement how wide is it to get equipment in there. I have issues with this and also with the trail. Our benefit will be getting some trails and an easement for \$30,000. If we purchased it, we could use it for ball diamonds and rent it out to them, if the stink and smell from the composted weeds are too bad, we just get out of the lease. We have the money available in park and open space. We could still dedicate it as a passive park use and put the trails where we want and we can put the force main in when and where we want. If Muskego misses out on this, why don't we just buy it?

Harenda: They applied for a DNR grant to acquire the land. The Utility has interest in an interceptor and the City has interest and I prefer to buy it as an addition to our park system. I think the price is \$450,000-500,000. If we add passive uses, the DNR grant goes down so we have to make that money up.

Schroeder: The only use of the grant money is for passive type activities.

Harenda: If we have 40 acres and use 20 for active and 20 for passive, the grant would shrink to cover just the 20.

Schroeder: Correct.

Harenda: Is there any way for the Utility or the City to get involved within the next 30 days to split the property where we purchase it so that instead of them giving us access and rights to it, we give them the ability to access it for their operations?

Schroeder: I will defer to Mark but I think there is an extensive process with land surveys and having it certified with the DNR so timing could be very challenging to do anything different.

Blum: That and the fact that there is an existing contract and an existing grant. For us to apply for a property that already has a grant on it, it seems to me that they wouldn't consider it at that stage. Typically you would have an appraisal done, the appraisal that already exists is sufficient for that purpose. The only thing you could do is if they don't follow through and close on the purchase is for them to look at the situation at that point.

Harenda: If we could work it out before the closing date, they win and we win.

Blum: But if you take title of the property, one of the fundamental conditions of the grant is for them to acquire the property and putting the restrictions on it. I don't know how we get involved as a co-owner or co-applicant. We would have to amend all of the acquisition and grant paperwork to indicate that.

Wysocki: This association is buying it to purposely keep it undeveloped to protect the watershed area. I am not sure they would be interested in a 50/50 deal knowing that we would like to put some activities on there such as ball diamonds or parking. No matter who owns the parcel, we eventually may have the need for getting our easement across the property. It is late to be involved in co-purchasing and co-using, but I don't think the Utility or City should be involved in paying for this. In our future plans there is a possible planning need to have this easement going through the property. I would assume the easement width would be sufficient for any work we would have to do which is generally on Utility easements.

Walker: The minimum standard is 30 feet wide. For a deep interceptor it may be wise to have a wider easement of 50 feet.

Wysocki: The dilemma I face is that I think we want an easement and there will be a cost no matter who the owner is. I don't like through eminent domain, because there are legal costs. As it is being presented, I can't support allocating any money.

Morrissey: If we purchase an easement with this group and in the future we put an interceptor line in here, which requires digging a trench which is very invasive, will that be a problem?

Blum: I haven't read the terms of the grant, but when we have had lands set aside for conservation purpose, we have language in there that refers to essential services that can be conducted within those areas and that would include utility lines. My assumption would be that the state in their paperwork and the grant made to the group would have language to allow for that. We would have to verify it before money could be contributed.

Dude: Is there any precedence where the utility has purchased the right to an easement?

Blum: Is there any precedence of donating to a private group for their acquisition of land? We have purchased easement rights over the years, but have not pre-bought.

Dude: We do have the right of eminent domain, although I hate it.

Blum: That is correct. For legitimate public purpose you can acquire the land for those reasons.

Dude: From an accounting viewpoint I assume we would capitalize this. Does this come out of impact fees?

Blum: It is very unusual for a public body to make a donation for a private purpose. The whole reason that you have impact fees is to accommodate public facilities that are necessary to accommodate new development. If you put a subdivision in and they have a need for park services as a result, you expand a park or put improvements in, that is the reason you would have impact fees collected. In those situations the city owns the infrastructure; it is acquiring the land and improving it. In this instance you would use the funds to contribute to a 3rd party's use of land albeit for what would be a quasi public purpose but I have concerns with using the money for those kinds of purposes under those circumstances because it could be challenged because it doesn't fit the model for what it could be collected for. In addition this is not on the radar for any public facility studies you have done which is typically the way you collect the impact fees. If the Utility feels it is a legitimate public purpose, you are getting the rights to put the interceptor through the area; you could use public funds for that reason because you will own an easement at the end of the day.

Ament: From that standpoint this is the better route to go.

Blum: Correct.

Ament: What do we normally pay for a 30 foot easement this long?

Walker: It is the cost per square foot of the land value according to the assessor's department times the square foot of the easement. The line is about 2,500 to 3,000 feet.

Blum: You are not acquiring the full rights to the land; you are just acquiring the easement.

Harenda: Can you put a calculation on it based on what was done in the past?

Walker: I can look at the current land value and the length of the utility easement. I am going to make an assumption that it needs to be 50 feet wide because of the depth and will email the Committee members.

Ament: Maybe it will be a steal, but usually when a developer wants to do something, we tell them if they want to do it they give us an easement. We don't normally pay for it.

Hart: Just make sure we can get our equipment in there. We have sewer cleaning and televising to do. If there is tall grass in a conservancy, we may not be able to get the equipment back in there to do maintenance. We have 50,000 pound trucks.

Harenda: We will leave this on the agenda. Please check your calendars to see if you would be able to meet on December 21st before the holidays. Sue please facilitate this and email the Committee members and check the room availability.

Motion by Alderman Wysocki to adjourn at 5:37 p.m. Seconded by Commissioner Morrisey and upon voting the motion passed unanimously.

*Please Note: Minutes are not official until approved by the Committee
Respectfully submitted,
Suzette Hanley – Administrative Supervisor, Utilities & Streets*