

CITY OF DELAFIELD PUBLIC WORKS COMMITTEE MINUTES

1. CALL MEETING TO ORDER

D. Jashinsky called the meeting to order at 6:30 p.m.

2. ROLL CALL

Present

Absent

Art Baumann
Pat Hawley
Dan Jashinsky
Beth Leonard
Ed Marek
Bruce Neumiller (exited 7:50 p.m.)
Tom Hafner

Harold Roberts

Also Present

Mike Court

3. APPROVE MINUTES OF MAY 3, 2006 PUBLIC WORKS COMMITTEE MEETING

A. BAUMANN MOTIONED TO APPROVE THE MAY 3, 2006 MINUTES AS PRESENTED. E. MAREK SECONDED THE MOTION. THERE WAS NO FURTHER DISCUSSION. ALL WERE IN FAVOR. MOTION CARRIED.

4. OLD BUSINESS:

a. KETTLE MORaine EVANGELICAL FREE CHURCH – STH 83 & OAKWOOD RD. INTERSECTION

Mark Lewandowski of Eppstein Uhen Architects and Craig Coursin of CG Schmidt Construction were present at the meeting. M. Court stated that discussions have taken place regarding the intersection improvements. Work is taking place on the Developer’s Agreement. M. Court has met with the DOT and the church and its representatives. Realignment of Oakwood to KE has been discussed. It was questioned whether there would be noticeable improvement to warrant this now. B. Leonard stated that it was a safety and visibility issue but that the way the traffic is managed now, and if you are careful and paying attention, shouldn’t be too much of an issue. It is a right turn only for the westbound traffic on KE and then they have the lane that you can either turn left or go straight. She did not understand what Hartland’s side of this was and the effects of the traffic generated by the medical facility and the bank. A. Baumann clarified that the two generators can’t be required to do any improvements because they are not asking for a permit or any permission from the State to do something and therefore the State

CITY OF DELAFIELD PUBLIC WORKS COMMITTEE MINUTES

cannot require anything from them. The only way the State can require that is when a permit is requested. He stated that as of this time, the Highway 83 widening is not scheduled to happen. The representative for the church stated that their preliminary intersection met all of the DOT's requirements and brings the intersections closer into alignment. P. Hawley stated that it was necessary to determine how much the church would be contributing to the problem. A. Baumann questioned whether it was a situation that could be lived with from a safety perspective. P. Hawley stated that this was an opportunity to correct the misalignment. The church representative thought it did not make sense to do the relocation, but proposed to do the revision. The church would agree to do help with the cost for the realignment in the future.

B. NEUMILLER MOTIONED TO ACCEPT OPTION 2. B. LEONARD SECONDED THE MOTION. IT WAS CLARIFIED THAT THIS WAS A CITY DECISION. T. HAFNER CLARIFIED THAT WHEN HIGHWAY 83 GOES TO FOUR LANES, THE CITY WOULD BE RESPONSIBLE FOR THE LOCAL SHARE AT THAT TIME. THE M.O.U. WILL NEED TO BE REWRITTEN. B. NEUMILLER AMENDED HIS MOTION TO ACCEPT OPTION 2 WITH THE PROVISION THAT THE FUTURE LAND RIGHT OF WAY DEDICATION BE ADDED TO THE AGREEMENT, BUT NOT THE COST AS ORIGINALLY PROPOSED IN THE LETTER, AND THAT IT WOULD BE CITY'S RESPONSIBILITY FOR THE LOCAL SHARE. B. LEONARD AGREED WITH THE AMENDMENT. B. NEUMILLER AMENDED THE MOTION TO REFLECT THAT WHEN THE ROAD IS REALIGNED, WHEN 83 IS WIDENED, OR WHEN THE CHURCH EXPANDED, WHICHEVER COMES FIRST, THE LAND WOULD BE DEDICATED. B. NEUMILLER WITHDREW HIS MOTION. B. LEONARD WITHDREW HER SECOND.

B. NEUMILLER MOTIONED TO ACCEPT OPTION 2 AS PROPOSED WITH A RESERVATION FOR DEDICATION OF THE LAND FOR A FUTURE RIGHT OF WAY AND IF THE CHURCH CHOOSES TO EXPAND, IT WOULD TRIGGER A SECOND SET OF CONDITIONS. IF THE CHURCH EXPANDED BEFORE HIGHWAY 83 WAS WIDENED, DISCUSSIONS WOULD BE OPENED UP AGAIN AND IT WOULD BE RE-EVALUATED. B. LEONARD MADE A FRIENDLY AMENDMENT TO REFLECT THAT IF THE CHURCH EXPANDED BEFORE HIGHWAY 83 IS WIDENED THAT THE INTERSECTION REALIGNMENT WOULD BE RENEGOTIATED AS PART OF A NEW DEVELOPER'S AGREEMENT. B. NEUMILLER ACCEPTED THE AMENDMENT. B. LEONARD SECONDED THE MOTION. P. HAWLEY DISCUSSED THE FACT THAT THIS MAY PUT THE CHURCH AT MORE RISK AS IT MIGHT NOT BE LIMITED TO OAKWOOD. B. NEUMILLER WITHDREW HIS MOTION. B. LEONARD WITHDREW HER SECOND.

B. NEUMILLER MOTIONED TO ACCEPT THE CHURCH'S PROPOSAL FOR OPTION 2 AND TO PAY FOR THE INTERSECTION IMPROVEMENTS REQUIRED BY THE DOT IN THE FUTURE ONLY AS

CITY OF DELAFIELD PUBLIC WORKS COMMITTEE MINUTES

THEY PERTAIN TO THE OAKWOOD DR. EXTENSION ON THE WEST NOT KE WORK ON THE EAST EITHER WHEN THE CHURCH EXPANDS INTO THEIR NEXT PHASE OR IF THE DOT MOVES FORWARD WITH THE HIGHWAY 83 EXPANSION INTO FOUR LANES AND THE CHURCH AGREES TO DEDICATE THE LAND TODAY. P. HAWLEY SECONDED THE MOTION. THERE WAS NO FURTHER DISCUSSION. ALL WERE IN FAVOR. MOTION CARRIED.

5. NEW BUSINESS:

- a. PLAN REVIEW - NORTHEAST QUADRANT REGIONAL SANITARY SEWER EXTENSION TO SERVICE THE VILLAGE SQUARE DEVELOPMENT.

The Commissioners had a set of the plans in their packets. M. Court reviewed the sanitary sewer extension for service to the Village Square Development. Hook-up will take place at Highway 83 and Campbell Trace. Laterals are presently being shown to all existing residents. The City's ordinance presently states that this as an optional hook-up for the residences. One of the steps in this process is to send a letter to all of the homes in this area to see if they want to hook-up. B. Neumiller asked if the residential hook-ups were required for the project to go forward. B. Leonard requested the criteria that would require hook-ups. M. Court explained that the criteria for mandatory hook-up included \$20,000 worth of improvements to the home, proof of a properly functioning septic system to the City on an annual basis, and the sale of the property. B. Neumiller asked if the residents were made aware of the ordinance when it was enacted. He asked whether the same rules should be enforced on these residents because they did not ask for this and there was not a need. D. Jashinsky stated that this was the purpose of the ordinance. B. Neumiller was concerned that this ordinance would now be imposed upon the residents solely because of Village Square. D. Jashinsky stated that this was not any different than any other ordinance that the City passes and residents are not given notice of other ordinances. B. Leonard stated that there was a similar situation on Hirschman Lane. No one had any input on the Hirschman Lane sanitary sewer. There was no opportunity for public input on this. She now has owners on Hirschman Lane calling her because they have flags and markings from surveying going on there and they did not know anything about the project. It's being done because it's going to serve the Siepmann property to the east and the Kettle Moraine church to the southeast. She was very concerned that people do not have input on these decisions as to whether to do these projects or not. Although not sure about this project, she stated that on Hirschman Lane no one knew that was going to happen. It was not in the budget specifically as a sewer being run down Hirschman Lane. There is now a lien on the properties. A. Baumann asked what the costs were to hook-up and the annual fees. T. Hafner stated that the assessments had not been worked up at this time. The connection fees were just increased to over \$3,000.

CITY OF DELAFIELD PUBLIC WORKS COMMITTEE MINUTES

He stated that the developer here (Village Square) was making a major contribution to the cost of installation by paying for almost one-half of it. B. Neumiller felt that the residents should be given some options. T. Hafner stated that there were several people in the area that he has talked to. B. Neumiller stated that perhaps in this case the ordinance requirements should be handled differently because they don't all know and it wasn't specifically done for their benefit. B. Leonard asked how people were notified of these projects and why they weren't noticed before the project started. M. Court will be notifying the residents of the area shortly. B. Leonard thought that the residents of this area should have been notified before it was even designed. She has had calls from two people on Hirschman Lane regarding the flags. It bothered her that there was not a budget hearing process where people would have had input on the Hirschman Lane project. She was not sure how this sewer extension was described in the budget. B. Neumiller stated that in all of the newspaper articles in the paper, not one stated that because of Village Square there would now be new conditions (in terms of sanitary sewer) on their properties. He did not want to create more animosity about this project. T. Hafner stated many times the design process is a dynamic process. At budget time last year it was expected that the sewer would go down Oakwood Road. As talks proceeded with the church, it was identified as an option that had extreme depths (costs for installation). The developer identified the opportunity to come through the farm fields through Hirschman Lane. If you go too far in front of the project and if people were notified last year, they would have been notifying people on Oakwood Road that the sewer was coming and now it is not going that way. B. Leonard thought that in regards to the capital budget you have to not only say that sewer is going to go in, but also note where the exact location is going to be. She felt that you had to give people a chance to have a public hearing on it. T. Hafner explained that the master system is provided by Del-Hart. The City is responsible for the individual alignments of local collectors. B. Leonard stated that this is a huge household expense for this and that on Hirschman Lane. T. Hafner reiterated that if people were notified earlier, the information would not have been correct. B. Leonard stated that no one was notified. T. Hafner wanted to be more specific as to what the scope of the project was before notification. B. Leonard again stated that there was no opportunity for input. She stated that although she does not live on Hirschman Lane, it would upset her that the City was doing a project that she couldn't find anywhere in the budget. T. Hafner stated that the decision was made in March of 2006. Another option would be that the City would not be reactive to developers and to make them wait until a later date (not a feasible option). B. Leonard stated that there is a public process. It was requested to put the ordinance on the next agenda as she would like to better understand it. A letter will be sent to the residents prior to the next meeting. The method of payment for the hook-up was briefly discussed.

CITY OF DELAFIELD PUBLIC WORKS COMMITTEE MINUTES

M. Court reviewed the pathway of the sewer line. He recommended doing spoil backfilling for the majority of this project. The corporate limits are on the centerline of Campbell Trace. They are in the process of changing this and it is being handled by the City Attorney. A 60 or 66' right of way will be added that would change the corporate limits. It is a matter of going through the process. B. Leonard discussed the possibility of sharing Hartland's sewer line on the other side of Highway 83. M. Court stated that in order to service the residents on Campbell Trace a main would have to be in front of them so that the sewer would be in that area. Because it is a state trunk highway, the surface would have to be bored. It was M. Court's opinion that the proposed method was more efficient. B. Leonard stated that they still could put laterals in if the line was designed to serve the end destination and not to serve the properties in between until a future date when the land to the west was developed. Capacity would be a factor. It was stated that it would not be feasible to run laterals from the east side of Highway 83. Clarification was made that the sewer line would not move if the road was moved. Specs are being done to use the native spoil material by mechanically compacting (mounted behind a backhoe). The project will be bid out next week, advertise for opening of bids by the end of month, and a recommendation will be submitted to the Public Works Committee by next month.

B. NEUMILLER MOTIONED TO ACCEPT THE PLANS AND TO HAVE T. HAFNER TAKE IN ACCOUNT THE CONCERNS EXPRESSED BY B. LEONARD AND HIMSELF REGARDING PUBLIC NOTIFICATION. P. HAWLEY SECONDED THE MOTION. FIVE WERE IN FAVOR. B. LEONARD OPPOSED. MOTION CARRIED.

B. Leonard asked about the other project (Hirschman Lane). D. Jashinsky stated that it was not on the agenda. She asked what she should tell people about the flag markers. T. Hafner stated that the calls could be referred to him.

- b. CONCEPTUAL DISCUSSION OF PROPOSED GENESEE STREET ENTRANCE SIGN ON THE NORTH SIDE OF DOWNTOWN & BYPASS LANE AT THE INTERSECTION WITH EXETER STREET.

M. Court displayed a drawing of the area. He stated that direction from the Common Council was to take a look at putting a mirror image of the south entrance sign at the north end. The City does not own Genesee Street at this location, but it is owned by the County. It was not thought that the County would allow an island with an entrance sign in the road right of way. This is an approved project from the Common Council. The repavement of Genesee Street north may not take place by the County due to increased asphalt prices. Discussion took place as to the advantages and disadvantages of the City owning this road. B. Leonard thought that the City had trouble keeping up with resurfacing the roads now and if this road were the city's it would be another one. She stated

CITY OF DELAFIELD PUBLIC WORKS COMMITTEE MINUTES

that the road where she lives on is in terrible shape. T. Hafner stated that this would be a significant conversation at budget time. D. Jashinsky stated if the County improved the road, it would be good for 20 years. T. Hafner stated that if the City wanted to erect signage, it would most likely have to take over ownership. B. Neumiller stated that more information was needed in order to discuss taking over ownership of the road. It was suggested to have a possible location for the sign north of Exeter Street on Genesee Street. A location in front of the post office may be better because there are softer shoulders available to widen the road. A. Baumann stated that north of Exeter would not have a site/distance issue. With the median you could put in a left turn lane for Exeter which would eliminate the need for putting in a bypass lane and reduces the paved area for the whole thing. A left turn lane would be like putting in the bypass lane with the sign in but would have the sign there as well. If the sign was on the south with the bypass, it would be widened twice. T. Hafner stated that the Common Council had specific discussion regarding two particular items; one was taking the guard rail off of the bridges that go across the Mill Race and Bark River and replacing that with decorative rail and the Council did not see the cost benefit of that. Immediately following that discussion at the Common Council was the discussion of this one and although not unanimous, the majority of the Council saw this as enough of a benefit to approve it. B. Leonard questioned the cost benefit of the entrance sign and that it was this committee that questioned the cost benefit of the equestrian improvement. T. Hafner stated that last year at budget time this committee also did question the cost benefit ratio of both the bridge railing and this project. He stated that it was frustrating if staff's direction was to proceed with the project if there were a potential that the project might be canned. D. Jashinsky stated that the entrance sign had a much bigger benefit to more people than the horse trail. B. Leonard stated that it was a "walking trail and horse trail." D. Jashinsky stated that this item was for thousands of vehicles a day. B. Leonard thought that the private sector should pay for this. The commissioners felt that a left turn/bypass lane was needed whether or not the sign was installed. T. Hafner stated that this sign is intended to be the same as the existing sign including lighting and the masonry structure on the side. B. Leonard commented on the funds being spent on maintaining the planter boxes and the landscaping on the streets, and the elimination of brush pick-up that would have benefited every resident of the city at \$6,000 a year. She stated that she was making a value judgment. D. Jashinsky stated that these things need to be debated at the Council level. The function of PWC was to deal with safety issues, not cost issues. He stated that personally he did not care too much for the sign, but did care about the left turn lane or bypass. B. Leonard would like to have the project costs pinned down. It was explained that in order to do that you needed to start with preliminary work. T. Hafner stated that if the project was just the bypass lane, it was possible that the County may pay for it. M. Court has requested this in writing but has not received a

CITY OF DELAFIELD PUBLIC WORKS COMMITTEE MINUTES

response from the County. A. Baumann stated that if the sign is desired, the bypass lane will need to be built. If the sign and the bypass lane were done at the same time, it would most likely not be paid for by the County. However, if the bypass lane was requested from the County and the sign put in at a later date, the County might pay for the bypass lane. T. Hafner is under Council direction to pursue installation of the sign. B. Leonard thought that the exact costs of the bypass lane without the sign and with the sign were necessary. The commissioners thought that in terms of safety and site the location for the sign should be north of Exeter Street. Curb and gutter were addressed. This would involve many other issues such as new bridges, sidewalks, etc. E. Marek discussed the difference between making this area part of the downtown area and matching it up so that it did not have an hourglass figure versus starting the where downtown area begins now. M. Court will provide project cost estimates for placement of the sign north of Exeter Street by the next meeting.

6. DIRECTOR OF PUBLIC WORKS/CITY ENGINEER/TRAFFIC COMMITTEE – REPORTS

a. DIRECTOR OF PUBLIC WORKS

1. EAST SIDE WATER SYSTEM EXPANSION CONSTRUCTION UPDATE.

The water main is fully installed and tested. The City is putting on some anti-vandalism collars on the hydrants. The contractor is onsite drilling the production well. Bids for the well house and reservoir will be opened on June 15 and will go before the Common Council on June 19.

2. MUNICIPAL PARKING LOT - RAIN GARDEN PROJECT UPDATE.

The rain gardens have been installed. T. Hafner distributed an informational sheet on rain gardens.

3. 2006 STREET IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM UPDATE.

The preconstruction meeting was held with Wolf Paving. Pulverizing will take place on all streets during late June. Curb and gutter replacement, small patching, and ditching will take place in a week or so. T. Hafner reviewed the roads that would be done.

4. MS4 GENERAL STORM WATER PERMIT – NOTICE OF INTENT TO APPLY FOR COVERAGE.

CITY OF DELAFIELD PUBLIC WORKS COMMITTEE MINUTES

The DNR 216 Stormwater permit requirements are now a new State regulation. The permit application will be provided at the next meeting. T. Hafner briefly discussed the changes that would occur.

Discussions have taken place with regarding the pond. The pond is presently holding 2-3' of water and should be holding 5-6'. EarthTech has stated that there may be some significant changes in the sub-surface in addition to breaches in the berms. It was stated that the burden of proof should be the responsibility of EarthTech. The DNR will be contacted to see if it is possible to get a grant extension. The City would like to have the facility function as originally intended. Discussion took place as to possible causes.

b. CITY ENGINEER

No report.

c. TRAFFIC COMMITTEE

T. Hafner discussed the removal of two stop signs in the Valley Road Place Subdivision. Two documents were distributed to the commissioners; the letter was written by T. Hafner and the Petition was written by the Petitioner. Discussion took place on ways to encourage responses. P. Hawley suggested adding a statement into the letter saying that in order to consider this request further a certain number of responses would be required. It was the committee's opinion that the submitted petition was biased. The committee liked the letter that T. Hafner wrote and suggested adding a statement that the PWC would take the responses into account before making a decision. T. Hafner will report the response results at the next meeting.

7. CORRESPONDENCE

None.

8. ADJOURN

P. HAWLEY MOTIONED TO ADJOURN FROM THE MEETING. A. BAUMANN SECONDED THE MOTION. THERE WAS NO FURTHER DISCUSSION. ALL WERE IN FAVOR. MOTION CARRIED. THE MEETING ADJOURNED AT 8:57 P.M.

Minutes Prepared By:

Accurate Business Communications, LLC