



Public Works Committee Meeting
June 11, 2019
6:00 p.m.
Cravath Lakefront Room
Municipal Building-2nd Floor
312 W Whitewater St
Whitewater, WI 53190

MINUTES

1. Call to order and roll call

The meeting was called to order by Allen at 6 p.m. The meeting was held in the Cravath Lakefront Room at the Municipal Building – 2nd Floor.

Present: Jim Allen, Carol McCormick and Jimmy Schulgit
Others: Brad Marquardt

2. Approval of minutes from May 14, 2019

A motion to approve the minutes from the May 14, 2019, meeting was made by McCormick and seconded by Schulgit.

Aye: All via voice vote (3)
Nay: None

3. Hearing of Citizen Comments

No citizens appeared to speak at this time.

4. Old Business

a. Discussion and Possible Action on the location of the wet detention pond in the Park Crest Subdivision in relation to the park playground.

Marquardt stated this item was discussed at the May 14, 2019, meeting. He stated the City was asked to look at a few options and come back with estimates. One of the items was to relocate the sidewalk to the other side of the park and add a fence to the west side. That estimate came in between \$8,000 and \$10,000. Another option was to relocate the park further to the east and that estimate came in at \$15,000 to \$20,000. He did make a phone call to Vierbicher and asked them for an estimate to relocate the pond and what impact that may cause with DNR. They replied the DNR had also reached out to them based on a phone call from a local Whitewater resident. Therefore, they re-evaluated the need for a detention pond, and how much it was actually providing for sediment removal. The DNR also re-evaluated and said they would be okay with the elimination of the detention pond. We could fill in the wet portion and restore it back to the dry basin that was previously there. The cost would be done cooperatively with Loos Homes when they build a house near the pond, which they expect to do with a spec house this fall. They would have material from the basement that they would be willing to provide to fill in the pond. The City crew would then help with moving and compacting the dirt and spreading top soil. We would then seed it and then put down the erosion mat. Based on those options, it would be his recommendation we fill in the wet detention pond and restore it back to the dry basin elevation.

Dan Vosburgh from 1281 Blooming Field Dr. commented that he is the person that spoke with the State. He was very happy to hear about this resolution. However, he is wondering how this process is going to happen. Has there been a plan put in place? What is the timeline? He is concerned about waiting until the fall to remove the pond because it is a current child safety risk. He doesn't think waiting until fall is the best idea. Is there a way to speed up this removal? The other concern he had is the remaining outflow pond. He would like it to stay at the 1ft. intended depth. It had been measured recently and around the edge was 3 ft. and that wasn't even in the center. He said there have been kids falls through ice there as well. There is an actual potential of someone drowning there. He would like the City to address this concern and make sure it has been taken care of in a timely manner and done satisfactory.

Allen asked Marquardt if we have even gone that far to look into these items or are we just looking for approval and take it to Council. Marquardt understands the developer was following the DNR regulations or what the DNR had stipulated and already put a cost into putting in the pond. Therefore, he is trying to minimize his costs, thus the reason why he would be willing to provide the fill from the basements that would be near the site as they are excavated. We would drain the pond, pump the water out and let it into the dry pond that is there and let it filter out through the outfall. As the material is placed in there we would spread it out and compact it. The top layer would be about a foot of top soil with the grass seed. The dry basin is intended not to infiltrate water, but let water run through it to the north west, to the outfall. It is a holding area; a storage for volume and also removes sediment as water goes over the grass. McCormick asked if the contractor would be willing to start earlier on this since there are mounds of dirt already there. Marquardt stated there would be a cost the contractor to bring the equipment in with no other reason to have equipment there. The contractor sub contracts all of the earthwork, Loos just builds homes. Schulgit asked if the City could move the dirt to the pond area. Marquardt would have to check with the contractor regarding the intention of the dirt.

Liz Wynn from 1305 Blooming Field Dr. commented she doesn't know all of the engineering and how it works. Is there a way that they could scrape that out so it could drain or is it just so low it would never drain? When people dig a basement and it's not that great of dirt, where are they hauling it? What is it utilized for? Are there any other projects in the subdivision where someone else starts building a house? Is it possible that it's not costing them any money or they are not losing any money to put that dug out basement dirt in there? Marquardt stated the wet pond is lined with clay to help hold the water in the pond and that is what makes it a wet pond. The water cannot infiltrate through the soil. If someone else does dig a basement, and needs to get rid of material, that would be the same kind of material from any other basement. If the contractor is willing to haul it there instead of offsite, he would expect to save money and that would be fine with him. Wynn commented if they leave the clay basin there, would it always be a wet basin. Could you put a bunch of rocks in there? She asked if they will scrape the clay back out? Marquardt commented that was not in the vision. Having that area at the same elevation as the dry basin, the water coming out that outfall is going to have velocity associated with it and it is not going to have time to sit there. It will go across that area and continue to the northwest to that outfall as it previously did.

A Park Crest resident did bring up the concern of the outfall on the other end. It is much deeper than the plan calls for. With the drowning hazard, she is curious if the City has gone out there to inspect the elevation to make sure it was built according to the plan. She thinks if it was built according to the plan, there is really no worry. She asked if that happened. Marquardt said he would have to check that area of the northwest corner.

Clapper commented that it is incredibly frustrating for City staff to require somebody to spend money on a pond because the DNR tells us we need it and then find out from the DNR that oh, just kidding, we don't need it that bad. Any efforts we can make to get it filled in, we will do. The cost is the concern, the costs for the developer who already built it and spent his money to build it, and the cost to the City if we were to try to fill it in advance of him coming. Clapper doesn't have the knowledge of fill that we have lying around right now that we could even bring over. Even if we did, it will still involve the equipment

and time. We will try and use our resources to the best of our ability, and efficiently as possible, but will be difficult prior to the contractor being available. He is not available until the fall.

Greg Majkrzak of 1294 Tower Hill pass spoke next. He wanted to thank the City for taking this on so quickly. He also just wanted to make one comment on the northwest side. It talks about 1 ft. in the plan. He didn't know if that was a 1 ft. water depth or 1 ft. depth of the hole. He stated that will be one thing you will find out when you investigate.

McCormick asked for approval for filling the wet detention pond to the match the existing surrounding elevations of the previous dry detention pond and seconded by Schulgit.

Marquardt will talk to the developer to see if there is other fill available to facilitate filling in that pond sooner than later. Allen stated this would not need to go to Council, so it's done and will be filled in.

Aye: All via voice vote (3)

Nay: None

5. New Business

a. Discussion and Possible Action on rerouting Janesville Street/Franklin Street Truck Route designation to Whitewater Street.

This agenda item has been brought up at the past two Public Works Committee meetings. Strand took a look at this and ran some turn movements, which were included in the packet. Outlined in the report indicates no good turning movements at any intersection. The one at Janesville and Whitewater would have trucks turning into the opposing lane, eastbound. At Whitewater and Main Street, they need to take up both lanes of Whitewater Street in order to turn onto Main Street. That one is probably not as bad. They also included the existing turning movements that take place at Franklin and Main Street where the semis need to impede into the opposing lane to make those turning movements. Included in your packet was information from a previous meeting where the Council talked about adding Janesville and Franklin to the truck route. That was done in 2012 when those streets were added. Whitewater, Janesville and Franklin Street are arterial streets meaning they are meant to handle the majority of traffic to get people from point A to B, which includes trucks. Allen asked if Whitewater Street was part of any highway designation. Marquardt stated, no. Allen then commented that any truck damage done, if we went back to Whitewater Street, we wouldn't get any grants from the State to redo the streets surface. It's all City property now that we would have to pay for. Marquardt stated, yes.

Beverly Stone from 303 W. Ann St. spoke. She commented she was here when Whitewater Street was passed to take truck traffic off Whitewater Street when Dean Fisher was the Public Works Director. We didn't have nearly as many events on Whitewater Street then, as we do now. The street narrows and you have parking on both sides of the street. We have the 4th of July, which is growing and now we have the City Market. Fisher was all in favor of getting the truck traffic off Whitewater Street and she doesn't think you should put it back on. She thinks it is a safety issue. Allen commented this is only one option they are looking at to help Mr. Gray out on Franklin and Center Street.

Mr. Gray commented again if we could just do away with this truck route. The bypass was put in to reduce through traffic through the City. We now have the bypass, but what we have is through truck traffic. We are defeating the purpose of the bypass. We now have through truck traffic coming through a residential area. In addition, we have trucks going through the downtown area.

Lisa Dawsey asked if she could request another crosswalk sign on Main Street and First Street. This could make people aware that there might be pedestrians getting out in traffic.

Allen brought up the truck route designation. How does someone know the City's truck route designation? Marquardt commented he doesn't think our City marks it at all. He said some other cities

mark it by painting sign posts yellow. He believes most cities don't do anything. Allen asked because it's a highway, we can't make people take a different route. Marquardt doesn't think there is any highway designation on Janesville Street right now coming into the City. Marquardt believes it is a City's option to eliminate Janesville and Franklin or Whitewater as a truck route. When looking back at the minutes from 2012, it implied that Janesville and Franklin were added as a truck route to help the businesses in the business park. Allen commented that he wouldn't count them as through traffic, but as local traffic. It was suggested we talk with Chief Rapp about enforcement on a no through truck traffic sign. Marquardt stated that Whitewater Street already has signage about no truck traffic. Mr. Gray had another option. Walworth Avenue used to be County Highway S. You go from the bypass to Indian Mound with soft curves. The pedestrian traffic would have to be less than what he has on Janesville and Franklin Street. He thinks that maybe Indian Mound should be considered a truck route, if necessary. McCormick suggested that Business Highway 12 would be a better truck route. The Committee took no action.

b. Discussion and Possible Action on approval of Wastewater's Compliance Maintenance Annual Report (CMAR).

Marquardt stated this a report that is required by the DNR. It is a self evaluation that the wastewater staff goes through. It covers multiple areas including the treatment plant, in addition to the collection system, staffing and overall procedures of the plant. Based on our self-evaluation we received a grade A in all aspects. Going through it briefly, it covers influent flow and loading. We did have an exceedance in April on a BOD, which was greater than 90% and greater than 100% of our design. Therefore, we were docked points in that category. Overall, it still kept us in the A grade. There are a number of Effluent Quality and Plant Performance and it covers BOD and CBOD for effluent quality. We did meet everything in that area and had no points taken off. The same was true for total suspended solids (TSS) as we met all of the requirements along with ammonia and phosphorus. There was one thing Marquardt wanted to mention about phosphorus. Our permit limit right now is 1.0. We range right now from .60 down to a monthly average of 0.124. We are really meeting our permit level of 1.0. However, when our next permit level comes out it is going to be at .075. Another area was the Biosolids Quality and Management. We hired this out for land application because staff is busy with preventative maintenance. Regarding operator certification and education, we need to make sure that our operator in charge has all of the required certifications to run the plant. They also ask for succession planning of which we do have other members on staff who do have those certifications. We are in good hands if the superintendent would leave or be gone for an extended period. Financial Management is an area that he wanted to bring attention to. The DNR requires us to have a certain amount of money in our equipment maintenance fund (ERF). According to this, we are supposed to have \$2,142,719. At the end of December 2018, we were short of that. We were at \$2,038,257. We did use \$1,000,000 that was in that account to pay down part of the plant upgrade project costs when it first went into effect. We are slowly restoring that amount. Back in 2018, we did restore over \$300,000 from 2017. That account is coming back up. The other item it asked is about future planning and asked for the next 10 years. The superintendent put in there that in approximately the construction year of 2023, when our new permit comes into play for the .075 for phosphorus, we will need to be looking at something in the future to meet those new limits. An estimated cost of \$5,000,000 was put in as just an off the wall number. That would be the worst-case scenario where we would have to add onto the plant. There are many other options we can look at when it comes closer to permit time. McCormick also commented on lawn debris in the streets. It's obvious people are doing it. She thinks they need to be fined for this. This is costing everyone in the City. Clapper stated under enforcement rules these people should be reported to Neighborhood Services. Allen also stated it is extremely dangerous for bikes. Clapper said it is going in the lake, or the street sweeper is picking it up when that occurs. He said we try to educate first and then if people have received notices, repeat offenders with lawn clippings are fined. Marquardt stated he did need a motion. Schulgit moved for approval and seconded by McCormick.

Aye: All via voice vote (3)

Nay: None

c. Discussion and Possible Action on eliminating left turns at the Janesville Street and Franklin Street intersection and making Franklin Street one-way north from Whitewater Street to Janesville Street.

Marquardt stated he sent out notices to people along Franklin and Janesville Street inviting them to a meeting on Monday, June 10. Mr. Gray was the only one who attended. What we were looking at was adding delineators to the centerline of Janesville and Franklin; to eliminate southbound Franklin Street from the ability to continue south on Franklin, and northbound Franklin Street from turning left to head south on Janesville Street. The delineators we are looking at are about three to four feet tall. They would be spaced approximately four feet apart. They are glued down to the pavement. They would be yellow with orange on top because of the centerline. There would be spacing where the painted crosswalk is on Janesville Street to allow pedestrians to get through that area. The area where the delineators would be put seems to have no driveways that would be impeded from what he can tell off the satellite imagery. He will go out and visually check for sure. The other option they had talked about was making Franklin St. one-way north from Whitewater St to Janesville St. After thinking about that there is probably no real reason to change that to a one-way. People in that area would have the option to still head south with the delineators in place. He would therefore recommend it staying a two-way and putting delineators up to prevent left turns. McCormick asked if we would put up a no left turn sign. Marquardt said he would have to ask McDonnell if that was needed in his opinion. Mr. Gray asked if they could be driven over. Marquardt said they are approved by the DOT and it says they are good for up to 50 impacts at 60 miles an hour. Allen asked Marquardt if he thinks this is the best option. Marquardt stated he felt it will help the situation, being three to four feet tall, it's a visual impact that people will see. It should make people slow down. It will help show where the centerline is and avoid people from cutting that corner. Therefore, they will have to slow down to go around the corner. This option will cost about \$1,300 and includes a no left turn sign and the delineators, plus extra ones. He will be interested in getting feedback once these are installed. Allen asked if this requires an ordinance change. Marquardt stated he will have to ask McDonnell. A motion was made by Schulgit to approve the addition of the delineators. If staff finds out an ordinance change is required that this acts as the recommendation for the change and seconded by McCormick.

Aye: All via voice vote (3)

Nay: None

d. Update on Milwaukee Street construction project.

None at this time.

6. Future Agenda Items

None at this time.

7. Adjournment

The meeting was adjourned at 7:05 p.m. A motion was made by Schulgit and seconded by McCormick.

It is possible that members of, and possibly a quorum of members of, other governmental bodies of the municipality may be in attendance at the above-stated meeting to gather information over which they may have decision-making responsibility; no action will be taken by any governmental body at the above-stated meeting other than the governmental body specifically referred to above in this notice.

**Anyone requiring special arrangements is asked to call the
Office of the City Manager / City Clerk
at least 72 hours prior to the meeting.**