

In Attendance

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

Also in Attendance

M. Wagner-Director of Public Works, R. Wirtz-Chief Engineer-Utilities, R. Kincaid-Assistant Utility Manager, M. Gabbey-Chief Engineer-Streets and Development, R. Reed, Billing Specialist

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 Comments

None

3. Discussion and Action Regarding the Minutes

3.1. Discussion and possible action regarding the meeting minutes of 2/22/2024

A motion was made and seconded (J. Tormey, M. Kreiter) to approve the February 22, 2024, meeting minutes. Motion passed: For-5, Against-0

4. Communications

4.1. Discussion regarding Council action to dissolve the Bike and Pedestrian Committee and assign all duties to the Public Works Committee.

Ms. Wagner reported on a discussion with the mayor, and the Bike and Pedestrian Committee (BPC) chair. Due to the lack of agenda items, the fact that most of the items come to Public Works Committee for discussion, and the difficulty in acquiring a quorum, the Committee decided it was best to dissolve the BPC and assign all duties to this Committee moving forward so we can have a comprehensive discussion about projects as they come up. She stated that most of the items are typically part of road projects.

4.2. Discussion and possible action regarding petition for Pewaukee Road Trail Extension.

Ms. Wagner reported that a resident came forward with a petition to extend a trail along Pewaukee Road from its current termination point at Riverwood Drive North southerly to Tower Place. This would allow access for pedestrians and bicyclists to amenities such as the restaurants, gas station, and healthcare facilities in that area. There is a private trail as a connection point on private property to be able to connect Riverwood South with Tower Place.

Ms. Wagner stated that when the trail went in on Pewaukee Road it was a county road, and now that it is a state road the requirements for installing that bike path are going to be more stringent. There will have to be some additional separation from the roadway which is going to push everything back closer to the properties. The challenge is what to do with the grade difference between where the

trail needs to be and where the current grade is. It will also have to be ADA compliant, which again has grade differences that will pose challenges.

Ms. Wagner and the resident discussed the trail extension, that is not scheduled to be reviewed until closer to 2031. The resident was hoping to have that project moved up. The resident provided a petition signed by the neighbors to show support for the trail extension.

Gianni Juedes, W240N2550 East Parkway Meadow Circle, Unit 3, presented the petition with signatures from 135 residents in his neighborhood. He stated the main purpose was to extend the trail for his elderly grandmother who is currently on the mend from being bed bound. She lost a foot, so he got her a scooter as she wants to become more independent and get herself to the doctor. He explained the path doesn't go all the way to the ProHealth Care building. He stated that the 135 signatures of support with every single person either seeing a doctor or working at ProHealth. He also spoke with Maggie that 90% of the business park is empty.

Mr. Wamser asked if he had talked to Hawks Meadow or The Waters. Mr. Juedes stated that he did not go across the street, but he went to almost 90% of the doors, mainly on weekends. He said not many people were home so he got as many signatures as he could. He also spoke with ProHealth, Thunder Bay Grill, Machine Shed and the BMO bank. Unfortunately, the corporations are all under the impression that they would have to fund it.

Mr. Bierce questioned the trail connection and the map. Ms. Wagner said it is basically on the west side of ProHealth, and the next building to the west. The trail is between those two buildings, and It would come up on the west side of Thunder Bay. She thinks there might be an unofficial path, but there is no official path. There is not any gravel on the path, just a worn spot in the grass.

Mayor Bierce stated that the city has been trying to push these bike paths, and we've been concentrating on getting neighborhoods connected to parks. This is just a different segment of our community, not that these people who signed up for this wouldn't like to go to parks, but they also would like to go to the doctor.

Mayor Bierce is in favor of pushing this forward.

Mr. Tormey was also in favor and questioned how much coordination we are going to have with the state since it is a state road.

Ms. Wagner said it is going to be a high coordination if we're going to try and put it within the right-of-way of the state highway or adjacent to it. We would have to acquire an easement to put in the trail if we are going to go between the businesses. And by state law, you cannot condemn for trails. So those businesses would have to agree to having us purchase those easement rights.

Mayor Bierce asked for a motion for either moving to Common Council or to direct staff to start working on the project. Ms. Wagner asked if they wanted the work to start in 2024 or to put it into the budget for 2025. There are no funds in 2024, so it would take council action to be able to move it forward in 2024.

Mayor Bierce asked if they could pull funds from the impact fees. Ms. Wagner said she didn't believe that this trail is in that impact fee, so we would have to go through the process of amending the ordinance to be able to use impact fees. We would probably have to take funds out of undesignated, most of the money in the budget and designated from the impact fees right now is for the Meadowbrook Trail, which is on the agenda further down for starting construction, which I would prefer not to slow that down or take funds from that at this point.

A motion was made and seconded (J. Tormey, J. Wamser) to direct staff to take it to the Common Council to get funds to start this project in 2024. Motion passed: For-5, Against-0

4.3. Discussion and possible action regarding correspondence from the Women's Club of Pewaukee regarding Pedestrian and Bicycle Safety.

Ms. Wagner directed the committee in a letter we received from the Women's Club of Pewaukee. The letter speaks in general about some concerns and some desires they have to create some more connectivity between neighborhoods and Lake Country Trail and the Village of Pewaukee. Some of the items they discuss in the letter are specific to county and village crossings, but they do have some crossings that are within the city of Pewaukee.

One crossing is Meadowbrook, which would connect a large portion of residential neighborhoods and the school to the Lake Country Trail. That will be under design in the next couple of months, for construction in 2026. The other crossing that impacts us was Prospect Avenue (County Highway SS); this is on our bike and pedestrian plan as an on-road trail system, largely due to having limited right-of-way, large mature trees along that stretch of roadway, and deep ditches that all create a challenge for putting any sort of off-road trail in that area. Again, since it is in our bike and pedestrian plan, if the county were to reconstruct that, they would have to accommodate the bike path. The county is currently looking at a resurfacing there, which doesn't qualify as a reconstruction, so they don't have to do the accommodation, and that looks like it is going to move forward this year.

Ms. Wagner went on to state that we do have the design of a pedestrian crossing at Oak Street and Prospect Avenue (County Highway SS) at the park in our budget for this year. This effort is to create a safer crossing, which would connect that neighborhood to the park. You can work your way through neighborhoods, to connect with Meadowbrook Trail. You would be on residential roadways within the subdivisions that would eventually get you out to Meadowbrook Trail. The Prospect Avenue (County Highway SS) trail is not within our 10-year budget plan.

Mayor Bierce stated that from what he recalls from the conversations from a while ago, the reason is nobody has a lot of confidence that we will come up with a way to put a bike path safely on that tiny, narrow road (Prospect). Ms. Wagner said it is a challenge, especially when you are not able to condemn property to be able to accommodate a trail. Some of those homes are close to that roadway where there is not much right-of-way that we can acquire. That is part of the reason why they have it as proposed as an on-road trail system, so at least you're widening that shoulder a little bit to give bicycles a little place to be, because right now it is two 11-foot lanes both directions, and a large volume of traffic that runs along that stretch.

Mayor Bierce added that you're in the ditch a foot; you don't have much room at all. Maggie stated that the ditch is two, three feet deep, depending on where you are in that stretch.

Mr. Kreiter asked if that is narrower than the normal right-of-way. Ms. Wagner replied that in a lot of locations, yes. That is an old section of the city. There are some 50-foot right-of-way along that stretch, so it is difficult. There are several sections of topography challenges as well. The main goal of the roadway, obviously, is for vehicles to be able to drive there.

Mayor Bierce asked where we are planning on connecting the trail to the Lake Country Trail. Ms. Wagner explained that the Meadowbrook Trail goes from the Lake Country Trail all the way to Pewaukee High School.

Mayor Bierce stated that originally, we had a problem with the bridge to make the Lake Country Trail Connection. Ms. Wagner stated that we are still connecting to the LCT along Meadowbrook

Road but right now there is a culvert crossing the floodplain. So, part of the design that we're going to be working on is whether it is a boardwalk crossing or a culvert extension or a separate culvert. We did have a different connection point potentially, which was in Fieldhack, but floodplain and wetlands make this even more challenging than the Meadowbrook connection.

Mayor Bierce asked how someone would get from there if they lived on Oak Street. Ms. Wagner stated that they would go through the neighborhoods. The crossing at the park is for Edgewood Farms and that area to come through. Then take Oak Street through Elm Street, through Peterson and Miami Drive, to the crossing at Prospect and Peterson. This would get you over to Meadowbrook and then possibly through Steeplechase, Deer Haven then should be back out to Meadowbrook Road. The only one that is questionable is whether we might have to go through Steeplechase to make it to the high school.

Mayor Bierce asked if there was anyone from the Women's Club in the audience, and if they would like to come forward.

Jermain McKenna came forward representing the Women's Club of Pewaukee. Ms. McKenna stated that there are several members in attendance as well. Some of the items that we raised in our letter to you were duplicates of what you are already considering. As Maggie mentioned, there were two issues that we were primarily concerned with. One was the connectivity of city, village, and county bike trails. And the second was a signage issue, because while the city and the village have a plan for the bike trails, there is no signage anywhere that shows this is the way for the yellow route, this is the way route for the red route, etc. A person who is biking would have to be looking at some paperwork trying to find their way, which is not safe. The other issue that was very apparent to us, because many of our members are active and are on the trails and or have children and or grandchildren that use the trails, is the safety of the various road crossings. For instance, in Pewaukee on SS, there is great signage. There is high visibility in the road markings in the road themselves, and there are also flashing lights. And then on other, like on Meadowbrook, it's very dangerous to cross there, and there just is not enough notification to cars, and it is very dangerous. The speed limit changes right there, so people are still coming across the bridge from 94 coming north at 45, and then it drops to 35, but they're still very fast there. So that's another issue that we're just looking at, better signage on some of those roadways.

We would like to either collaborate with things that you're doing, either in raising funds for signage or providing manpower, volunteers. We also have a Boy Scout troop that is interested in helping with things like building signage or building benches.

Mr. Bierce said that we started the Bike and Pedestrian Committee a few years ago with the hopes that something like this would happen. And it's kind of a shame to me that our communication was so poor that you were trying to do what we wanted people to do. Personally, I think it's a great idea. It's what we had in mind originally when we formed that committee. To try to get community involvement. And I am all for everything you said. If the Women's Club wants to try to take a role in this, and if they think that they can bring some scouts with them, we'll figure it out. And we'll give the kids something to do.

Ms. McKenna stated that as a mom of an Eagle Scout, I know that troops are always looking for projects. We are also meeting with the village and the county executives to see what we can do physically, and volunteer-wise, but also to help raise funds for these projects. I guess we need your direction to say, hey, Women's Club, we need help in "X". Obviously, we can't work with the Public Works Engineering staff and surveying things, but we certainly have manpower and people who are fairly connected. We have about 100 members now and we want to make an impact in the community.

Mr. Bierce stated that if you can think of what we've done to date, is we've basically created three straight lines, one going down Green Road, one going down Duplainville Road, and going down Pewaukee Road, and now we're trying to build a labyrinth to connect all the neighborhoods on the west side. Really the west side is the prime spot for us because it's so densely populated there. It can have by far the biggest effect, and so I personally think that's where your time and efforts would be best served. We're going to have to help figure out these paths, but I think that we'll take any help we can get.

Mayor Bierce told Ms. McKenna that if you want to try to raise funds for signage, we'll come up with a design and some ideas; I'm all for getting people out biking and hiking and interacting. Tonight is just our first look at it, but I would say stay in touch.

Mr. Kreiter suggested that they could possibly adopt a bike path for litter pickup three times a year.

Mr. Swan stated that he was around when they built this sidewalk along 164, and then they stopped it out at Avondale, because they felt that they get you that far and then you just use the streets to get to Machine Shed and Thunder Bay. Is there a policy on board that says when the city is going to put a bike path in, if they come to a subdivision that has roads that will eventually get them to Thunder Bay or Machine Shed, do you recommend they go on those roads, or do you recommend putting a walk through? Ms. Wagner replied that there isn't any specific regulation, but the bike and pedestrian plan looked at those areas, along with where it would make most sense to do that. The reason it stopped at Riverwood is basically that's where the reconstruction of Hwy 164/Pewaukee Rd stopped. That section from Riverwood South was not part of the reconstruction, because that was already four lanes. When that project was done, that section was not done. They didn't have to do any accommodation for bicycle at that time.

Mr. Swan asked if in the past, those connections were not plowed in the wintertime, is that still the policy as we move forward? Ms. Wagner stated that we do plow those trails. This is a trail, not a sidewalk, and with a trail, you have up to three weeks after the last snowfall event to clear it. We clear Duplainville Road, a section of sidewalk on Northview Road, Pewaukee Road, and then a tiny little sidewalk by WCTC.

No action was taken.

5. Storm Water Management Division

5.1. Discussion and Possible Action Regarding the Annual NR216 Report

Mr. Wirtz reported that he submitted a complex DNR report online that is a summary of the different programs we do every year. Last year the council requested more of an executive summary, which you have in your packet.

Some of the highlights for different development projects included: we completed 422 erosion control inspections, either with our own forces or with consultants. We issued four notices of non-compliance, three notices of violation, and recommended \$2,500 in fines for those violations. We have 17 different best management practices now from some of the construction projects done recently, as well as some of the ponds. We completed 13 ponds last year, which must be inspected regularly. In our future permit, the DNR is going to have us complete more inspections, not just for current facilities, but also the facilities since 2005, which will now become regular inspections.

We re-established the banks of Wagner Park to correct some muskrat damage. We also improved some of the storm sewer outfalls that have been failing as they entered the ponds. We did work

within Hill n Dale subdivision to create an almost five-acre dry pond to try and alleviate flooding issues that they've had with surface and groundwater.

Mr. Swan asked if we ever collected any money from those that were fined. Mr. Wirtz said he puts together a recommendation for fines to our sheriff's department. They issue the citations and take it from there. I do not hear what the attorneys negotiate or carry forward unless I am needed in court.

Mr. Wamser stated that he has seen people mowing their grass and just shooting it all into the streets. I know it's dangerous for more motorcycles and bikes. What can we do about that? Mr. Wirtz stated that Ms. Wagner has included statements in the DPW and Utility newsletters that are sent out at different times during the year informing the public of the rules against this practice. Ms. Wagner added that if you do see this happening, you can call the sheriff's office and they will issue a ticket because it is in violation of our ordinances.

No action was taken.

6. Water and Sewer Division

6.1. Update on PFAS Contamination Limits

Ms. Wagner introduced Rob Kincaid, our new Assistant Utility Manager. He is going to help Jane out and oversee the guys in the field.

Ms. Wagner reported that the EPA has issued their ruling on the limits for PFAS. PFAS is a general term to encompass all the different types of PFAS/PFOS that are out there. The DNR previously established the limit at 70 parts per trillion; a health hazard index of 1 was issued by the Department of Health. It is a little unprecedented because normally the federal government sets the Maximum Contaminant Levels (MCL) and then the states follow. In this case, Wisconsin, largely due to what we've seen in general for PFAS contamination, felt that they needed to move forward quicker.

At current levels, we had two wells that reached the health hazard index level. We are currently working on treatment systems for those two wells. At the time we started looking at the design of those systems, we knew that the federal government was considering the idea of a level of 4 parts per trillion. When we contracted with our consultants, we decided on 4 parts per trillion with the intent that is likely what the federal government would mandate.

Ms. Wagner reported that the EPA is working through the official maximum contaminant levels for the legislation, which is probably going to take two to three years to promulgate and put out to the communities. We decided that we were sticking with the 4 parts per trillion in our design of the treatment systems for our two wells. We're also looking at other alternatives for those wells. I'd say we are ahead of the curve here because of the hits that we had at the 70 parts per trillion that pushed forward those two projects.

The litigation regarding this is still ongoing. Ms. Wagner also stated that we are participating in the PFAS settlement in case contamination is found we may be able to receive compensation from the two manufacturers. We will update you once we have more information. The DNR requires pilot studies once we decide on which treatment systems we're going to move forward.

Mr. Swan stated that there is a lot of distance between 70 and 4, so we will try to get to 4. As we try to get there, whatever treatment we use, are we tracking those costs? Because at some time, maybe the federal government is going to reimburse us for that. Ms. Wagner responded that all our projects have separate account numbers. This study that we're doing for the PFAS treatment and on those specific wells they have their own account number. We did include in your packet the American

Water Works Association (AWWA) publication. It's probably one of the best written articles that puts it in a language that everybody can really understand with a synopsis of what it is, where it came from, and how we're moving forward. We will post it on our website.

No action was taken.

6.2. Discussion and Possible Action Regarding the Village of Lisbon Water Service request

Ms. Wagner reported that previously the Village of Lisbon came to us and asked if we would be willing to serve a portion of their community with water to assist in them becoming a village. They are coming to us again and asking if we would serve basically five areas, including the business park and an existing subdivision that is along Townline Road and north of Townline Road. Essentially, those areas adjacent to the quarry that are having issues with their existing wells.

One of the things that we must consider is the facility plan study that was done. We included the area in Lisbon in the study. If we were to serve it and how it may impact our system? We have our own challenges, especially with our wells being out for the PFAS contamination. One of the potential alternatives is to abandon those wells or reduce their capacity, which then reduces the overall capacity of our system. When we take those wells out of our service, we are at a point where we need to start looking for additional capacity. With those wells online, at their current pumping rates, before treatment, we had some additional capacity. As we looked at our build-out capacity, we still had some capacity.

Ms. Wagner went on to say that we still will have to drill a new well at some point in the future if the entire community is served. Depending on how the PFAS treatment goes with those two wells, we may be looking at that much sooner to be able to continue to meet the demands of our citizens. Adding Lisbon to that will increase the deficit that we would have in our system.

Lisbon has offered a potential well site and tower site. They identified an area that is on the corner of Lisbon and Townline Roads. We have not done any analysis to determine whether it's feasible, but it is close to the quarry. We would anticipate it to be a deep well, and more than likely it would have radium which means we would need to install treatment on that, and possibly have a tower on that site.

Ms. Wagner stated that there is an airport not far away, so we don't know how tall that tower could be. If there was a well and a tower it would provide some backup for our long dead-end that we currently have on the northeast side of the city.

She also stated that we're working on a loop for Lindsay Road, which would create a secondary loop in that area. And at that point, everything north of Lindsay Road is basically a dead-end. The loop that we're doing in Lindsay is critical for us to provide reliability of that system.

Ms. Wagner reported that Ms. Mueller recommends we ask Lisbon to allow us additional time to be able to work through our issues before we say yes or no to servicing them. If they don't want to wait, then she recommends we decline their request.

The other thing that she could potentially offer is to consider a short-term service agreement until Lisbon can construct their own infrastructure and get their system up and running. Then it would remain as some interconnects between the two communities.

Mr. Tormey asked how this area is being served now. Ms. Wagner replied that they're on private wells.

Ms. Wagner explained that Menomonee Falls, recently ran a water main up Townline Road north of Lisbon Road and it created a loop in their system. We don't know what communication Lisbon has had with the Village of Menomonee Falls.

Mr. Tormey commented that adding this Lisbon area to our system would have the potential of running us short for our own residents. And then they would offer to provide a well and a tower, assuming that the well is clean? Ms. Wagner said that is correct.

Mr. Tormey said that assuming that the well is clean and assuming that the tower doesn't get in the way of airplanes, is that combination going to offset the shortage that serving this area would put us in?

Ms. Wagner said potentially, that depending on where it falls within an aquifer, and what kind of recharge that portion of the aquifer has, every well has its own capacity limit that you can pump it to. There could be some benefits. We know that long-term, if PFAS wasn't an issue for us, with the current wells that we have, we need at least one more well in the future to be able to serve our community. With those two PFAS wells being up in the air, we may need not one, but two more wells, and they will likely be deep wells that would require radium treatment.

So pretty much any well that we drill from now on will probably automatically have some sort of treatment system, whether it's a PFAS treatment or it's a radium treatment. With those PFAS wells being out, we would need to drill a well in the next two to three years. A deep well offers more flexibility in where they can be placed. With shallow wells, you're trying to find a vein basically that has good capacity. And we did a study 10-15 years ago that identified two locations, both were developed for a shallow well.

Mr. Swan said that he likes the idea that if you can help your neighbor then you should. But he also said that they should pay the bill for the tower and a well, if that's what we must do.

Mr. Bierce agrees with Jane's recommendation to ask for an extension. We have unknowns that need to be resolved. I don't think this is a pressing issue for Lisbon, this is just them thinking to themselves, this is a solution to something in the future. I think they're looking for some sort of direction, will we serve them or not. I think asking them for some more time for us to finish, because we're going to have our study done probably in the next six months. We will know what direction we're probably going to go with those two PFAS wells and that will give us some comfort. Once this treatment system is in, which is probably a year to 18 months after we get the approval, before it's up and operational, we'll have an idea of where we're going to be at capacity-wise.

Mr. Tormey asked if we went ahead with this, when would we start serving that area, a year or two from now? Ms. Wagner responded that first they need to nail down the service area, because we're getting different stories as to what their boundaries are. There are a lot of details that need to be worked out after we make the decision whether or not we are going to serve. But if they are on private wells now and we go ahead and serve this area, we've got a whole infrastructure to put in.

Mr. Tormey asked that if we told Lisbon yes tomorrow, would still have a year or two before we could get the infrastructure in place? Ms. Wagner explained that it is probably three to five years because they're going to have to assess their residents and collect it. The long dead-ends need to have people connected to keep that water moving.

Mr. Swan questioned if we should bring Menomonee Falls in, because I believe they're right at the corner of Town Line and K, then Menomonee Falls might want that loop to help solve their problem. Ms. Wagner said that they did loop their system by extending service down Town Line Road. If we're going to move forward with it, we would approach them about a potential emergency

interconnect. We do that with a lot of our communities. Sometimes they say yes and sometimes they say no.

Mr. Swan stated that at this point in time, I don't think we're going to be able to move forward. There ought to be information included that we're interested in helping the neighbors if we can. We don't want to be at a disadvantage for us by helping the neighbors, but we want the neighbors to step up to their costs or whatever they must do to make it work.

A motion was made and seconded (J. Tormey, D. Swan) to request additional time from Lisbon to make this decision. Should Lisbon choose not to grant the extension, the city would deny Lisbon's request for service.

Motion passed: For-5, Against-0

7. Engineering Division

7.1. Discussion and possible action regarding selection of the consultant for the Meadowbrook Trail Extension.

Ms. Wagner reported that Meadowbrook trail on Meadowbrook Road from Lake Country Trail to Pewaukee School, is what we included in a grant we applied for and subsequently secured with an 80-20 share. The state is paying 80 percent of the cost, and we will pay 20 percent. Design must be completed by the end of 2025 and construction for the project is anticipated to take place in 2026.

The state process requires us to select a consultant from a quality-based selection with no cost and then negotiate the costs after. We received eight RFPs and have narrowed it down to four consultants for the committee to rank and review. We hope to get the final selection of the consultant tonight so we can begin negotiations on the fee for the project.

Mr. Swan stated he is leaning towards the consultant that Ms. Wagner has some input from.

Mr. Kreiter stated that his top two were MSA and Strand. Mr. Kreiter asked Ms. Wagner if she has worked with several of these. Ms. Wagner replied that we've worked with MSA on non-engineering project, they helped us with our GIS. Robert E. Lee is sub-consultant on our Busse Road Bridge project, and they've done a nice job. And, we've worked with Strand on several projects.

Mr. Kreiter stated that considering his own background, what experience do you have with the consultants as far as their field services. Ms. Wagner replied that the only field services were with Strand, and we had no issues.

Mr. Swan stated that he still has trouble not looking at the cost. He feels that if the projects and people that are doing the work are acceptable, then the price shouldn't matter

Mr. Tormey said the state requires qualifications-based selection. Once you select a consultant based on qualifications, then you negotiate the price. Ms. Wagner said it's hard for us because normally we must take the lowest qualified bid. I understand where you're coming from, but this forces you to focus on what the quality of the work is, and what this firm can provide.

Ms. Wagner asked for Mr. Tormey's top ranking. He responded that he likes Robert E. Lee (REL) because I know him so well. REL is his choice, as he has worked with them on many projects.

Mr. Wamser said that he agrees with Mr. Swan about going with Strand.

Ms. Wagner asked Mr. Bierce his opinion and he stated he is fine with Strand.

A motion was made and seconded (D. Swan, J. Tormey) to recommend the selection of Strand for the consultant for the Meadowbrook Trail Extension. Motion passed: For-5, Against-0

7.2. Discussion and possible action regarding Garbage Collection Contract.

Ms. Wagner reported that our current garbage collection contract with John's Disposal expires on December 31, 2024. The county has typically put out an RFP on the community's behalf for garbage collection services. The communities go in a pool to figure out what we want from our garbage collection services. Waukesha County would gather all that information, and put out an RFP., and the garbage collection agencies decide what they're going to bid on.

The county goes through the process of outlining in our current contract what the maximum rate increases are and how to rate those increases based off fuel prices and the commodities index. Unfortunately, the MRF where we take our recyclables had a huge fire and is still not operational. The county arranged for Johns Disposal facility down in Whitewater to sort our recyclables. The county contract is paying for any overages it would have cost to take it to the MRF we are part of. They are currently working on a study to determine what will happen to the damaged MRF.

Ms. Wagner went on to say that they are not going to have that decision until probably late this summer or early fall, which will be too late to put out an RFP for garbage collection services for the city. The county is recommending that we go to Johns Disposal and get a one-year extension on our contract. Then they will know which direction they're moving with the MRF at that point. We will have a better direction in the RFP as to where our recyclables need to go long-term as part of a contract.

Ultimately, it is the committee's decision. We have not talked to Johns yet to determine if they would even consider a one-year extension to our contract. The last extension that we did with them was a three-year extension. We have not begun those discussions because we wanted to get the feel from this commission.

Our other option is that we go it alone and we put out our own contract and we find our own MRF that we can send our recycling to. It will be a lot of work on our end to be able to do that, but that certainly is an option. It will also require a lot more reporting than the county currently does for us that will come to our staff to complete if we go it alone.

Mr. Bierce stated that there is no way Johns Disposal isn't aware of this situation. Ms. Wagner stated that we think they know the contract expires and they're just waiting for us to make that first contact. They know the county is weighing their options as to what to do with their MRF because they're one of the sites that the material is going to. And quite frankly, it's a tight-knit community.

Mr. Wasmer questioned if Advanced has been calling on us. Mr. Wagner replied that we had not heard anything, although we are not happy with Waste Management right now for a different reason.

Mr. Wamser commented that Johns is the one to keep. They've been great and the communication is good.

Mr. Bierce stated that he is in favor of the extension.

Mr. Tormey commented that if they don't go with the extension, they risk losing us. Ms. Wagner stated that the risk is still there in the RFP if they end up not being the lowest bid. The city could go with someone else because we don't have to take that lowest bid because it is a service. We could go

with someone else, but they've been good to work with. The biggest complaint we get is when they blow a hydraulic line in the subdivisions. but they do come out and clean it up.

A motion was made and seconded (D. Swan, M. Kreiter) to recommend to the Common Council to request a one-year extension from Johns Disposal and participate in the county RFP.

Mr. Bierce stated that before we take the vote, when you go to talk to them, please also inquire as to whether or not our recyclables have increased, or what the tonnage has increased to since we went to every week. Ms. Wagner stated that they will.

Motion Passed: For-5, Against-0

8. Highway Division

8.1. Discussion and possible action regarding collection of waste oil at City Hall Recycling Center.

Ms. Wagner reported that Matt Stevens was not able to make it to this meeting.

We moved our recycling center over to the new DPW building. When we were preparing to move our waste oil tank over, we determined that it was starting to rot out and just wasn't worth moving. After further consideration, Mr. Stevens is reticent to continue collecting the waste oil at the new recycling center.

Ms. Wagner stated that we have some challenges. Right now, it is not covered and the containment unit around the tank gets filled with rainwater and then the rainwater becomes contaminated. We must have that contaminated rainwater pumped taken to a special facility for disposal. Sometimes we can convince our fuel guy to pump it out.

Mr. Wagner went on to explain that when they were preparing the bid for the DPW building they included a canopy for over the oil tank. The bid came in at over \$60,000 just for the canopy. Our Administrator, Scott Klein, took that out of the bid and thought that we would rebid it at another time or rebid it ourselves. The containment is in, along with supports in the concrete, so we can build a canopy in the future over the tank. With the tank being an issue, we have suspended collecting used waste oil and antifreeze until we determine what are going to do. Mr. Stevens reported today that the rough estimate to replace the tank will be about \$15,000. This will be a custom tank because they don't build tanks that are manufactured regularly.

Ms. Wagner stated that when we first started doing the waste oil collections, the city received money from a facility that would recycle that oil. The only time we would have to pay for it is if it was contaminated. That payment no longer exists, and on average, we are spending approximately \$1,100 annually to dispose of the waste oil that is collected from our residents. It's not a huge dollar amount, but we are not collecting a large amount of oil.

Mr. Bierce asked if we knew how much oil was collected. Ms. Wagner stated that she did not have the exact amount but each time it is pumped it is about 100 gallons, and we pump it approximately 5-6 times a year, maybe 500-600 gallons total. In addition, we also collect oil filters as well.

We restructured our agreement with Waukesha County for the recycling services and the dividend we would get from all the recycling would depend on whether the MRF is profitable and how profitable it is. But with the new agreement that we signed, some of those dividends are contingent on what services you offer in your community. If you offer more services for collecting electronic waste, waste oil, and various other things, they weigh those and are factored in the dividend calculation. The less services you offer, the less points you get that count towards the dividends.

We currently offer this service, which is a good thing as far as those dividends, but there is no requirement that we have it. They obviously encourage those locations that make it easy for residents to dispose of these materials to keep them out of the waste stream. Unfortunately, there is no good way to give you an estimate of how much it is going to impact our dividends, but it will have some sort of impact on it.

Mr. Bierce questioned how much, if someone lives in a community that doesn't offer this service, do you think it costs them to dispose of their oil? Ms. Wagner responded that it depends. Mr. Stevens did some research when he first came to me with this. There are some businesses that will take the waste oil and there are some businesses that will take the waste oil and the filters. There were a couple that took filters, but most companies would strictly take the oil. It was unclear whether there was a disposal charge.

Mr. Bierce commented that so a private citizen could go there, and they would take it, but they wouldn't take ours because it's too much at once? Ms. Wagner said yes.

Mr. Bierce stated that there are five quarts of oil for a typical oil change, which is roughly 440 oil changes a year in the city. That's eight to nine a week. It's a service, we have very few services that eight to nine people use of ours in a week.

Mr. Swan wondered if we had heard of any complaints since we have not collected it. Ms. Wagner stated that yes, we've received some phone calls asking when we're going to have it again.

Mr. Bierce said that he thinks it's a valuable service he doesn't think we should get rid of it

Mr. Wamser stated that he agrees. People are starting to do a lot more to their cars on their own as opposed to taking them somewhere.

Mr. Kreiter said from the perspective of recycling, he would be in favor of providing that service, having done the recycling grant. What does the city get for a recycling grant, and do you have that figured? Ms. Wagner stated that she did not have that with her, but it varies because it depends on the operation of the MRF and how successful the MRF is. If the commodities that the MRF is selling is high, which it has not been, but is trending up, we do get some money back. It's not a huge amount, maybe \$20,000 or so or less. I think last year it was \$7,000. We incorporate that into what is calculated in that garbage fee. We take those credits and put them back into it, depending on the year and the other costs for the recycling.

Ms. Wagner also said that the other thing that was not mentioned is that we are offering electronics recycling at the recycling center now. We had a lot of discussions about the service, regarding what happens if it is contaminated, and how much it would cost us. They said there is no cost, and we take it away and we find a way to dispose of it. It was decided to give it a try with a six-month trial with them to see how it goes and how much use it gets at the recycling center.

Mr. Kreiter had to leave the meeting at this point.

Mr. Swan stated he always tries to do more things for the community. He thinks this is an important one. He is having trouble with the cost of \$60,000 for the canopy. Ms. Wagner said that she didn't know what the cost would be at this time. That was what was in the contract that was bid as part of the DPW building. If we look at it by itself and remember that DPW building was bid in 2020 when COVID was just starting to take off, there might have been some hedging in there.

Mr. Wamser wondered if the metal carports that are all metal that are sold at Menards would be big enough? Ms. Wagner stated that she is not sure if it would meet the code, and if it could be secured or anchored enough to keep it in place.

A motion was made and seconded (J. Tormey, J. Wamser) to continue with waste oil collection at the new DPW site. Motion passed: For-4, Against-0, Absent-1

9. Public Comments

None

10. Adjournment

A motion was made and seconded (J. Tormey, D. Swan) to adjourn the meeting at 5:44pm.

Motion Passed: For-4, Against-0, Absent-1

Respectfully Submitted,

Magdelene Wagner
Director of Public Works