

In Attendance

Mayor S. Bierce, Alderman J. Wamser, Committee Members: D. Swan, J. Tormey, M. Kreiter

Also in Attendance

DPW Director M. Wagner, Chief Engineer-Utilities R. Wirtz, Chief Engineer-Streets & Developments M. Gabbey, Utility Manager J. Mueller, Administrative Assistant S. Smaxwill

1. Call to Order and Pledge of Allegiance

Mayor Bierce called the meeting to order at 4:00 p.m. and requested everyone stand for the Pledge of Allegiance.

2. Public Comment

Mr. Swan commented on the early release of the road weight limits. He feels they should be released based on what season is like versus a standard schedule.

Mr. Swan commented on the nice job Matt Stevens and his Highway crew did this last year on salting and getting roads clean. The committee agreed.

Mr. Swan asked, and Ms. Wagner confirmed that there will be a drive through at the new Public Works garage.

3. Discussion and Action Regarding the Minutes of January 27, 2022

3.1. Discussion and Action Regarding Minutes of January 27, 2022

A motion was made and seconded (D. Swan, J. Tormey) to approve the January 27, 2022 minutes. Motion Passed: 5-For, 0-Against

4. Communications - None

5. Old Business - None

6. Status Reports

6.1. Status Update on Well #5 Alternative Water Main Loop

Ms. Mueller provided a status report on a recent teleconference with the PSC. PSC staff stated that because this is a \$4.2 million project, and due to cost escalations, the layout of the water main, and the fact that it will cross the road right-of-way in Waukesha (another community), they felt the criteria met the necessity for the PSC to review it on a higher level.

During the teleconference, Ms. Mueller also discussed the need to establish and provide a reasonably accurate timeline to comply with the DNR consent order that was put into effect to address the radium exceedance at Well #5. The required compliance date is May 31, 2024.

Ms. Mueller then spoke with Ms. Wagner and Ruekert-Mielke, and together decided to go the longer review process, which will be most beneficial to the utility and will not make us compromise on the water main installation. The PSC review process will be approximately four months. Ms. Mueller stated a meeting will take place with the DNR within the next two weeks to understand their review process, and between the two reviews, we plan to keep moving forward.

Mayor Bierce asked, based on past experience, if the PSC is flexible when there are time constraints involved? Ms. Mueller said she hopes they will consider that, and once she has a firm grasp on how long the review process will take she will contact the DNR legal division and let them know where we are in the process, and that we are moving forward though there were cascading events that took place that set us behind. We hope they will be reasonable and amend the consent order deadline. Ms. Mueller spoke with the DNR last fall and at that time they were reluctant to move the deadline, but since we have been in discussion with them, she hopes they will understand and be reasonable.

Ms. Wagner added that as long as we have a schedule laid out and there are no issues, and if we provide documentation showing we are in the process and there is no way we can eliminate any of the process, and that we are moving forward, she doesn't see them having an issue with an extension request.

Mayor Bierce stated he hopes they will be understanding, based on the fact that every part of society right now is moving slow.

7. Storm Water Management Division

7.1. Discussion and possible action regarding the 2021 MS4 Annual Report.

Ms. Wagner gave an overview of the annual report for the MS4 and 216 permit required from the DNR. Mr. Wirtz is the lead on the permit program process and did a good job outlining each component and what activities took place for each component in the report. This report is a direct correlation of all the work that is done, and provides a summary of which part of it comes out of the storm water fees. The report provided in the committee packet is draft of what was finalized today and will go to the Council on April 4, 2022. The final version will be posted on the city website.

Mr. Wirtz reported on a busy year. He stated there was a lot of development which reflected in much higher costs this year, and the DNR wants to see those costs to figure out the cost of the programs. There was a lot of time spent in plan review, with 20 construction sites open with weekly erosion control reports and managing compliance issues; and there were 547 erosion control inspections, which is twice as many as usual. The DNR form included in the packet is very abbreviated but explains the different components and much of what we do.

Mr. Tormey asked if the draft differs much from the final version submitted. Mr. Wirtz said that there were a few revisions, but the final version is essentially the same as the draft.

Mr. Swan commented on the salt use for winter roads, stating he is happy to see a decline as we work towards using less salt. Mr. Wirtz said that he and Matt Stevens discussed how hard it is to make salt use comparisons, as salt use is weather dependent and is based on level of service. Review of state documents showed that some counties use less salt and rely more heavily on brine; and the levels of service are very different. Using comparisons is difficult as they are just a

relative gauge as to how are we doing - and Mr. Wirtz feels the condition of our roadways are good during weather events.

The committee discussed the different types of salt and other treatments, and those used by the city and the effectiveness of the materials.

Mr. Swan commented that the report indicates that 2021-22 had the lowest number (salt use) in the last 10 years. Ms. Wagner stated it was due to the mild winter. She said that our salt reserves are at capacity in our current salt shed, and we are required to take a certain amount of the salt we order each year or pay for storage. Then we have to figure out how much to order for next year.

Ald. Wamser asked if there has been a decision made related to the old salt shed? Ms. Wagner said that no decision has been made. She stated we won't have our new salt shed until late 2022 at the earliest, depending on supply chain issues which could push it out even further. Ms. Wagner said that Phase 2 of new DPW building will include discussions on the salt shed, fuel island, and possibly the recycle center.

8. Water and Sewer Division

8.1. Discussion and possible action regarding the possible PFAS testing.

Ms. Mueller reported that PFAS (per- and polyfluoroalkyl substances) has been found in the water supply throughout the country, and is being found in some instances in Wisconsin. She received an email from the EPA in early January 2022, informing us that we will be participating in the UCMR5 (the fifth Unregulated Contaminant Monitoring Rule), which is the sampling of the unregulated contaminants for the fifth version. The EPA provided a listing of the PFAS sampling that will take place in 2023, and will pay for the testing.

In December 2021, we received an email from the DNR offering testing for PFAS for free in 2022. Typically, what happens with contaminants is the EPA does all research and establishes contaminant levels that are acceptable for human consumption, and then provides a process for every community in the US to test for these contaminants to figure out where the levels lie.

With PFAS, the State of Wisconsin and surrounding states feel they should set the limits within the communities in their state and use the resources from the DHS rather than have the EPA set the contamination standards. Ms. Mueller stated she is reluctant to jump on the bandwagon because she is not sure what the DNR will do with that information if we were to test positive in any of our 12 wells. Other communities have tested positive and have had to act on it. If we were to test quicker than we need to and would have an issue, we would have to be ready to act on it as well. Ms. Mueller recommended we decline the DNR testing in 2022 and wait for the required EPA UCMR5 testing in 2023.

Mayor Bierce asked if there was any advantage to getting first in line? Ms. Mueller stated we would not be first, as other communities are already in the program.

Ms. Wagner stated she participated in a webinar and learned that a community in Minnesota found PFAS in 5 out of 11 wells and ended up having to do a temporary treatment system because they did not have enough capacity while the 5 wells were out of service, while they built a larger permanent treatment system. It was expensive to build a building, buy the tanks and treatment system in order to move forward so they had enough capacity within their system to serve their customers. Ms. Wagner cautioned that even though the levels have not been legally established, if

they are found in our wells we will have to move forward with a treatment system ahead of whatever level the DNR decides because at this point there is no federal regulation.

The committee discussed the ramifications of participating vs not participating in the 2022 DNR testing. Ms. Wagner stated that we are following all the regulations for our drinking system at this time, and she does not feel participating in the DNR testing would gain us anything.

An additional discussion took place regarding PFAS testing, contaminate levels, exposure, and our well sites.

A motion was made and seconded (D. Swan, Ald. Wamser) to concur with the recommended motion and not participate in the Wisconsin DNR voluntary monitoring program at this time as the federal EPA UCMR5 monitoring program will be taking place in 2033. Motion Passed: 5-For, 0-Against

9. Engineering Division

9.1. Discussion and Possible Action regarding a stop sign request at the intersection of Nottingham Drive and Busse Road.

Mr. Kreiter asked for clarification on the request. Ms. Wagner stated that though she was unable to locate the original communication, the request was for a stop sign to be installed on Busse Road to slow down traffic. Currently, Nottingham Drive has a stop sign and Busse Road does not. The concern addressed safety and the speeding traffic on Busse Road.

Ms. Wagner discussed previous studies which showed that Busse Road is a low volume roadway and traffic is not excessively speeding. She also reiterated that stop signs do not slow down traffic. She said that an ordinance was passed in 2016 which did reduce the speed limit to 25mph (from 35mph) on Busse Road to termination, but the signs on the roadway were never changed.

Ms. Wagner stated that staff does not support the installation of the stop sign.

Public Comment

Tom Mueller, W225N4226 Duplainville Road, questioned where the request to change the speed limit to 25mph in 2016 came from? Ms. Wagner said it was a request from property owners to reduce the speed of the traffic. Because it is a dead-end road and the bridge was removed, there was no need for it to continue to be a 35mph roadway.

Members of the committee asked Ms. Wagner if it was possible to leave the current 35mph speed limit signs up. Ms. Wagner stated that in order to leave the current signs up the ordinance would have to be changed back to 35mph.

Public Comment

Brent Redford, W235N991 Busse Road, stated he lives on Busse Road, and is for the 35mph speed limit. He said that traffic does speed, but is not getting stopped, and putting a cop there for that amount of traffic would be a waste of time.

The committee had a discussion regarding the traffic and other related issues on Busse Road. Mayor Bierce directed staff to either change the speed limit signs to the current 25mph ordinance, or request a change in the ordinance.

9.2. Discussion and possible action regarding establishing Railroad Quiet Zones

Ms. Wagner stated that Mr. Gabbey created a summary of what has been completed and what it would take to move forward with establishing a quiet zone in these areas.

Mr. Gabbey reported that there are two locations in question:

1. Weyer Road (where it crosses the railroad tracks). We have an understanding of the general improvements that would be needed to allow us to move forward with the process for requesting a quiet zone in that area. At this point it would be moving forward with requesting the variance because of the spacing from the intersection, and then getting the quiet zone approved with the FRA.
2. Green Road (at Weyer Road). Because because there are multiple other railroad crossings within a half-mile radius, it would trigger us to have to investigate those other crossings as well. A study that would investigate what it would take to get these crossings to meet because we don't know where they fall on the safety index vs what is the acceptable risk level.

Mayor Bierce asked if the two being discussed are the CN Railroad. Mr. Gabbey said correct, but as part of Green Road there is a CP crossing that gets brought into it. He also stated that there is a private crossing at the Zignego property.

Ms. Wagner stated that we did not do the CP crossing at the time the studies were being done because the FRA was making intersection improvements to allow for higher speed trains. She stated there is no money in the 2022 budget for any quiet zone studies. We could request proposals to do the CP crossing as well, as most improvements are now complete. This would help us with our quiet zone, but we still need to do the full analysis.

Ald. Wamser asked if the private crossings (Zignego) have to be signaled? Mr. Gabbey explained that it depends on a rating system of risk versus allowable risk. If the risk goes above what is acceptable, we would have to make some improvements. Making signals would be an option, but not sure if necessarily a requirement. Mayor Bierce asked if the improvements fall on the municipality? Ms. Wagner said she doesn't think that Zignego cares if it is a quiet zone or not, so yes, it would fall on us if we wanted to pursue the quiet zone at the Green Road crossing.

Mayor Bierce said this comes up annually with the Common Council. Ms. Wagner stated that she has regular contact with someone in Woodleaf Reserve and a couple people in Victoria Station.

Lawrence Marincic, N30W22121 Green Road, stated he has wanted a quiet zone for the last 40 years.

Mayor Bierce previous conversations the Council had about doing them one at a time versus all at once. They weren't aware that there would be two private crossing to deal with as well. Ms. Wagner pointed out that the \$250,000 was the cost for the improvements, not for the study. The study was \$40,000-60,000. The cost is for one type of ASM and may not apply depending on

what location it is at, or it may be a combination of things we have to do to meet the quiet zone. Mr. Gabbey stated that right now at Green Road we don't even know what is needed.

Mayor Bierce is in favor of the quiet zone. He commented on the the number of train aficionados with backyards on the south of Green Road.

Mr. Swan asked if the private crossing with a house on other side, is one that we would have to have a quiet zone? Mr. Gabbey replied, yes, but we don't know what the improvements would have to be until the study is done.

Mr. Swan asked about the Weyer Road on the west side of the railroad tracks, commenting that there is not a long spot to put the median. Mr. Gabbey stated that based on initial conversations, the FRA and city had a meeting to initially to give feedback about those medians, and that was what they suggested.

Mr. Swan commented that if the extension of Springdale to CTH K or further were to happen, he feels they should just close the Weyer Road crossing. Ms. Wagner concurs.

Ms. Wagner stated we can take this off the to-do list or complete the studies for Weyer and Green Road, but it would have to come from contingency or 2022 borrowing.

The committee had a discussion on the train noise in different parts of the city, and that if this passes, patience would be required because it is not an easy process.

A motion was made and seconded by (J. Wamser, D. Swan) to move ahead with the Quiet Zone studies and forward results to the Council for recommendation.

Motion Passed: 5-For; 0-Against

10. Highway Division

10.1. Discussion and possible action regarding removing the Heavy Weight Restriction on Lindsay Road from Redford Boulevard (CTH F) to Duplainville Road.

Ms. Wagner reported that the current restriction on Lindsay Road is heavy weight restricted to 6 tons from 164 to Duplainville Road. With some of the development on Lindsay Road and the with intersection improvements that are going to be occurring at the Lindsay and Redford intersection, we have been looking to lift that current weight restriction at the section of Lindsay Road from Redford to Duplainville. Our Planner is looking at the vacant land on the north side of Lindsay as being industrial /manufacturing type buildings which will have trucking. There is a bark mulch and storage facility on south corner of the intersection of Lindsay and Redford, which is currently allowed to go to Redford but not east to Duplainville. Duplainville is not heavy weight restricted and does have a lot of truck traffic that currently uses that roadway, and we will be reconstructing it to handle the trucking load. Ms. Wagner feels that with all the intersection improvements that will be occurring at Lindsay and Redford, this section of roadway from Redford to Duplainville should be allowed to have trucking on it. And when Lindsay Road is built in the next 5-10 years it will include the heavy weight standards.

Intersection improvements will be occurring in 2023. U-turn crossing will be restricted at that intersection, and we have had a lot of concerns from the businesses and future business that is going in on the north side about the trucking associated with that intersection. Duplainville Road

is not that far from that intersection, and it makes sense to open this up especially when the rest will be manufacturing and industrial, which typically has more trucking traffic.

Ms. Wagner recommends the city removes the heavy weight restrictions from Redford Blvd to Duplainville Road; it would remain in place to the west.

Mr. Kreiter asked when was Lindsay Road slated for reconstruction, and would it stand up to the trucking during that period? Ms. Wagner stated they did an overlay on that roadway when the water main was installed, so it is beefier by nature of the overlay. It certainly will not last 20 years, but we are revisiting our program to see where it falls, knowing that we want to do the sewer extension for that area before we reconstruct the road. She said it is coming up in our program in next 5 years and the road should be able to last that long.

Mr. Kreiter asked if traffic on the road and future construction of private development could handle it until it is time to repave the road? Ms. Wagner replied correct.

Mayor Bierce asked if you were building a house on this road, would your project have to stop because trucks are not allowed to deliver to your house because of the weight limits? Ms. Wagner stated that is during the spring weight limits. Spring weight limits eliminate all trucking on the roadways for that most vulnerable time when the road base is soft.

This is permanent weight restrictions. They are allowed to go in if they have to make a delivery if they have it on that route, as long as they take the shortest route in and out.

Mr. Tormey asked what was the logic for putting the weight limit on Lindsay Road in first place? Ms. Wagner replied that she didn't know the history but speculates that it was no longer a county road they didn't want them to use that as a shortcut from Redford Blvd to Pewaukee Road. They wanted to keep construction and truck traffic off residential streets.

The committee discussed the need to keep construction and truck traffic off residential streets. They discussed the train derailment and the damage done by the railroad to residential streets. Ms. Wagner said the damage is being documented and the city will go back to the railroad for reimbursement.

A motion was made and seconded (J. Tormey, S. Bierce) to remove the 6-Ton Heavy Weight Restriction on Lindsay Road from Redford Boulevard (CTH F) to Duplainville Road.

Motion Passed: 4-For; 1-Against

11. Public Comment - None

12. Adjournment

A motion was made and seconded (J. Tormey, M. Kreiter) to adjourn the meeting at 5:02pm.

Motion Passed: 5-For; 0-Against.

Respectfully Submitted,

Magdelene Wagner
Director of Public Works