



CITY OF DELAFIELD MEETING MINUTES PUBLIC WORKS COMMITTEE

Chair: Dan Jashinsky

Members: Jacob Berg, Art Baumann, Jack Demski, Matt Grimmer, Elizabeth Lloyd-Weis, Matt Miller

January 4, 2023

6:30 PM

City Hall, Council Chambers
500 Genesee St.

Minutes DRAFT

1. Call to Order

Chair Jashinsky called the meeting to order at 6:30 PM.

2. Pledge of Allegiance

The Pledge of Allegiance was recited.

3. Roll Call

Present

Dan Jashinsky
Art Baumann
Jacob Berg
Jack Demski
Elizabeth Lloyd-Weis
Matt Miller

Absent

Matt Grimmer - Excused

Also Present

Tom Hafner, Administrator/Director of Public Works
Mike Court, Engineer
Molly Schneider, City Clerk
Barbara Dassow, Recording Secretary

4. Minutes

Discussion and possible action on the following minutes:

A. Approval of minutes of the [December 7, 2022](#) Regular Meeting

Bauman requested a change on pg. 2, approximately the middle of the page, to Lapham Peak Rd. from Lapham Pack Rd.

Hearing no further changes, Jashinsky approved the minutes of the December 7, 2022 Regular meeting.

5. Citizen Comments

Tim Aicher, 211 E. Laurel Circle – Spoke regarding item 6.A. Aicher is Ald. of District 7 in the City of Delafield. The issues with Milwaukee St are ongoing. There is Common Council support for traffic innovations to address this issue. He is looking forward to the Public Works Committee suggestions on the issue.

Phil Kasun, 1208 Genesee Street – Spoke regarding item 6.A. Noted that narrower streets slow traffic. Tree lined streets increase property value and encourages visitors to stop and shop. Suggested one-way streets. The suggested one-way streets lack pedestrian walkways. If they were one-way streets, the extra lane space should be a walking path. The Genesee Street path should not be a 10-foot path. It will look like an additional roadway.

Mary Daniel, 309 Wisconsin Avenue – Thanked the DOT employees on the Public Works Committee and the SEH employees for their work on the Public Works Committee. Channel 4 had been doing a program about calming traffic. There are interesting ideas in the series. Tapco has interesting and new solutions for traffic control signs.

Jim Casanova, 1515 Milwaukee Street – Spoke regarding item 6.A. The traffic is unsafe. The primary issue is between Main Street and Garrison Court. Homes are within feet of the road. Would appreciate any efforts to control traffic. More aggressive signage may be enough to help.

Mark Schaefer, 2106 Evergreen Lane – Spoke regarding item 6.A. Schaefer is Ald. of District 2 in the City of Delafield Has been getting residential feedback regarding issues on Milwaukee Street. Summarized issues with traffic on the street.

There are safety issues, but all issues may not be related to speed. Speed enforcement, crosswalks, speed warning signs, trails, sidewalks and stop signs were suggested as possible traffic control. Speed reduction may not be helpful, as the issue with driving too fast will not be addressed because those that are driving blatantly fast will continue. There have been no serious traffic accidents and no incidents involving pedestrians. Addressing only speed will not do the issue justice.

Nancy Kies, 1526 Milwaukee Street – Spoke regarding item 6.A. Questioned how to develop a mindset to deter traffic from utilizing Milwaukee Street as a through street and using I-94 instead.

Fran Bills, 1522 Milwaukee Street – Spoke regarding item 6.A. Supported the idea of one-way streets. Speed bumps would hinder emergency access. Perhaps a formal study would be helpful. A designated crosswalk is important. Safety is an issue. Bauman asked for clarification regarding the location of a crosswalk. The location of First, Main, and Milwaukee for the crosswalk was clarified.

Jackie Valde, 816 Mill Street – Spoke regarding item 6.A. Milwaukee street has been a long-term issue. Receives concerns regularly about Milwaukee Street, but no other street. Doing nothing is not an option.

Hearing no one further who wished to speak, Citizen's Comments were closed.

6. Unfinished Business

A. Discussion and possible action on regarding options to address the complaints of speeding on Milwaukee Street.

Hafner asked if Valde and Aicher would be adding any additional items regarding the topic. Valde explained that other countries have narrowing street lanes to solve this issue.

Berg suggested Golf Road being the only way to access Milwaukee Street. Jashinsky noted the hotel and restaurant would not support that. Jashinsky clarified that this would mean eliminating the turn off from the I-94 on ramp. Discussion occurred regarding the likelihood of closing this being an effective deterrent. Discussion occurred regarding who owns the stretch of road and who would be in charge of the project – DOT, County or City.

Lloyd-Weis explained there are inexpensive possibilities that have LED associated with them and flashing lights. Wondered what the City has researched regarding other ideas. Hafner clarified the previous opinion regarding bright signs and lights is an older opinion. Crosswalks with flashing lights could be helpful.

Narrowing Milwaukee was discussed. Pathways were suggested.

Bauman is against speed bumps. There are issues with maintenance and safety. One-ways actually cause speeding issues and will hinder emergency access. Roundabouts are helpful but may be overkill. Small round-a-bouts are being used in some places. Also, small islands that make the intersection similar to a round-a-bout are being used in some areas. This acts similarly to a round-about but doesn't change the footprint of the existing intersection as much. At pedestrian crossings, a refuge median may be helpful. Stops signs are not warranted and people often just roll through them, excess stop signs create fast stop-and-go type traffic.

Lloyd-Weis asked about whether a 4-way stop was ever considered at the intersection of Main, Milwaukee and First. This had not been considered recently.

Speeding issues were discussed. The posted speed limit that is there is appropriate. The traffic analysis was discussed.

The trail plan along Milwaukee was discussed.

Weis noted the lighted signs are programmable.

Lane narrowing was discussed again.

Jashinsky summarized the possible options that the Public Works Committee would look into. Court suggested eliminating the center line as a deterrent for speeding. Bauman explained some other pavement markings that have been used as another deterrent. Pavement marking would also be investigated. Berg reiterated changing traffic behavior. Lloyd-Weis asked about the added stop sign being on the list. Discussion ensued and this would be looked into further. ROW availability may limit any roundabouts or other similar ideas.

Weis asked about dead ending first street access to main. This would only simplify the intersection.

Berg asked about the thoughts for location on signage. Jashinsky suggested type of signage and best locations should be investigated further.

A subcommittee was discussed. Hafner and Court would further investigate signage.

Hafner noted that dead ending First would cause issue with emergency services. This would not be effective.

Bauman would look into the DOT concerns on the ramp access. There is no alternate route around I-94 and HWY 83.

Motion by Jashinsky, seconded by Bauman, to direct City Director of Public Works and the City Engineer options along Milwaukee Street involving electronic signing and pavement marking options.

Discussion: Berg asked about the ramp route being another option for review. Lloyd-Weis asked about the additional stop. Jashinsky noted that this should be considered, but separately. Sidewalks/trails, crosswalks, and a stop sign in this area should be considered as one package at a different time. Bauman suggested a short-term and long-term solution. A long-term solution could include investigating these options.

Jashinsky amended the motion to include the limits from Golf Rd to the intersection of Oneida Street. Bauman seconded the amended motion.

All in favor. Motion carried.

Motion by Bauman, seconded by Lloyd-Weis, to investigate longer term improvements in this corridor which could include median circle islands, and reviewing Main and Milwaukee intersection for an all-way stop and crosswalk location in accordance with adopted Bike and Pedestrian Path Plan.

All in favor. Motion carried.

7. New Business

A. Discussion and possible action regarding Family Dental site plan engineering.

Rizal Iskandarsjach, Waukesha and Benjamin Freeland, Oconomowoc, were present to discuss the proposal.

Jashinsky explained that had been before the Plan Commission and this was before the Public Works Committee to review for stormwater and sidewalk consideration.

Court explained there was review letter provided. There is a low water area. The drainage on the property was discussed. A note to the plans for the core was requested. A cut sheet is usually requested. Jashinsky reiterated adding a note to the plans regarding the intent to core into the existing inlet.

Jashinsky asked about the private well location. This would have to be reviewed for setbacks.

Hafner asked if the plan being reviewed satisfied the requirements for stormwater. Court confirmed.

Jashinsky asked about the street opening and slurry back filled being required. This needs to be changed on the plans.

Jashinsky asked if the sidewalk was in the easement. The ROW is the dashed line on the plans. There is an old easement/ROW. There are sidewalks and underground utilities in this area. The new sidewalk will be entirely in the ROW and no easement is required.

Motion by Jashinsky, seconded by Berg, to approve the Delafield Family Dental Office plans contingent upon meeting the requirements of the City Engineer's review letter, providing well setbacks and a note for connecting the storm sewer to the existing field inlet and the slurry backfill in the road opening of Poplar path.

All in favor. Motion carried.

B. Discussion and possible action on the Stern CSM related to driveway locations.

Jim Stern, Sullivan was present to discuss the proposal. This was discussed at Plan Commission favorably. The applicant wants to combine the four lots into two, but driveway location is difficult.

Stern would prefer the properties have separate access and the suggestion was to have these access points west of Garrison Court.

Court included information in the packet the provided sight guidelines for the driveway. On the west lot, the site distance is easily achieved. On the east lot, there are issues, and a suggestion was made to require a note on the CSM that the driveway location must be reviewed by the engineer. A turnaround was encouraged.

A shared drive was discussed. It may not be the best option. Separate drives would be best. The smaller lot should be on the west side and the eastern lot should be east of garrison. Stern mentioned there might be issue with the electric company ROW and how it may affect driveway location. Berg noted that a driveway would probably be acceptable, but a building would not. There is not easement on the map.

Court suggested requiring a 150-foot sight line should also be added to the notes on the CSM. It was also suggested to require a turnaround location. Stern is not supportive of this requirement. Discussion occurred regarding the restriction to require a turnaround.

Motion by Berg, seconded by Bauman, to include a note on the CSM to require at the time of build that the driveway locations get approved through Public Works Committee and the City Engineer.

All in favor. Motion carried.

C. Discussion and possible action on preliminary review of the 2023 Street Improvement Program.

Robbie Malzahn, SEH, was present to discuss.

Court explained that a public information meeting would be held regarding the path. Court would send out mailings to adjacent property owners and information will be posted on the website. The timeline was summarized.

Malzahn review the Street Improvement Plan for 2023.

Jashinsky asked if these were the result of the previous analysis. Malzahn confirmed that this is the list from that analysis.

Jashinsky asked about the timing of Dopkins and Milwaukee. Hafner explained that the building construction in the area might be completed by August, but this may not be done this year. If that is the case the roads will be pushed out. This should be included as a special condition in the bid paperwork. Jashinsky suggested putting these off for now to stay within budget anyway. Hafner cautioned putting these off, as there was an understanding that the streets would be paved shortly after the construction was complete.

Bauman suggested the budget may be a determining factor on the road plan and the roads that may be delayed due to construction could be considered as an "if authorized" part of the plan. Malzahn noted the budgeted amount for the SIP for 2023 was including at least a 5% increase over last year's budget. Hafner suggested touching base with Hendricks to determine a timeline and whether to push off the roads.

Court noted Moraine End Drive had a distinct pavement difference about 800 feet in on this road. That is where the limits were set for improvement. Additional items in the SIP were discussed.

D. Discussion and possible action on the Genesee Street Path design.

Court summarized the design. Genesee is proposed to be a 10-foot path. There may be an easement necessary from the Carriage Hills development. There may be an option to stay out of the ROW, but that is not preferred. This is county jurisdiction and permits need to be obtained.

Bauman is concerned about the slope on one section. This would be softened. Some other slopes were of concern. Court would address the slopes and reduce them if able. Bauman would like to see 4 to 1.

Jashinsky asked about the page with 10 plus 50 and 10 plus 0 where the sidewalk flip flops the cross slope. Court explained that this is to accommodate draining, but they would look into it.

Bauman and Jashinsky noted drainage issues. Court would look into these as well.

Hafner explained Christ the King would be willing to grant an easement to move the path onto their property, but Court did not think this was necessary. Jashinsky explained this would be costly. Miller pointed out there is a rain garden that would obstruct the pathway on this property.

Jashinsky asked about connecting to the existing 6 ft. path. Court explained this is not required, but the crosswalk in this area is near the sidewalk for the church, so it makes sense to connect if the church approves. Hafner noted the church also indicated intent to connect to this path once it was complete.

Berg asked about adding shrubs or trees. Discussion occurred. County approval may be required. Smaller shrubs would be nice and would not be dangerous.

Jashinsky noted on the detail sheet on page 8 the state needs to be corrected.

E. Discussion and possible action on the Devonshire Path design.

Court provided an updated survey.

Court explained that the original cost estimate was based on 6-foot path. Jashinsky explained he would not go under 8 feet. There is potentially an issue with the location of the existing gap in the trees on the easement. The gap is outside of the ROW. Court is looking for direction on the preferred location, the width of the path and whether there should be an S-curve Where the path ties into the ice age trail the grade is off.

Discussion regarding path width occurred. 8 feet is the preferred width.

The location was further discussed. The path would likely be located as far west as possible in the ROW.

Bauman suggested approaching the property owner on the west side for an easement to avoid cutting down the trees.

Court noted the north side connection would likely swing closer to the existing driveway. Hafner suggested including specifications regarding working over the gas line.

Grades were discussed.

F. Discussion and possible action on the City Ordinance related to Remote Participation and Notification of No-Attendance Policy

Hafner briefly summarized the City of Delafield remote attendance policy for meetings. There is a formal process.

Notifications for nonattendance should be made to Court, Jashinsky, Hafner, and Schneider. These notifications should be provided as far in advance as possible. Bauman asked about clarification regarding if notifying at the meeting before would be sufficient. This is sufficient notice.

8. Reports of City Officials

- A. Director of Public Works**
- B. City Engineer**
- C. Traffic Staff**
- D. Clerk**
- E. Public Works Committee Meeting Dates & Deadlines**
 - i. Next Meeting: February 1, 2023**
 - ii. Meeting Submittal Deadline: January 4, 2022 at noon**

9. Adjournment

Having no further business, the Public Works Committee meeting adjourned at 8:47 PM.

Respectfully Submitted,

Molly Schneider,
City Clerk