

**PUBLIC WORKS/UTILITIES (PWUC) COMMITTEE
MEETING MINUTES
Monday, December 12th, 2022 6:00 p.m., Reinders Room**

1. Roll call.

Meeting was called to order at 6:04 pm by Mr. Schindler

Present: Mr. Schindler, Mr. Koleski, Mr. Casperson, Via Zoom Mr. McNamara, Ms. Cornell and Mr. Coons

Absent: Mr. Harley

Also Present: Mr. De Angelis, Mr. Paul and Stacey Berry Coffey, pathway ad hoc committee member

2. Review and act on minutes for November 14th, 2022 Meeting.

Mr. Koleski corrected the capital "T" to lower case in the word "it" not to be confused with the acronym "IT" that would identify "Information Technology" for the record in the second sentence of paragraph 1 under Item # 8 of the minutes. Mr. Koleski asked to amend the end of the third paragraph of the same item, to read "for future projects." to remain in the context of his original intent.

Mr. Schindler moved and Mr. Koleski seconded to approve the November 14th, 2022 meeting minutes. As amended. Motion carried 6-0.

3: Update on Grants

Mr. De Angelis reviewed with the committee how the state has changed the TAP grant criteria and how the Village will not meet the criteria based upon the fact that it will be focused on rural communities with populations less than 5,000 in non-urbanized areas. Mr. Schindler inquired if there was any other aid available that the Village may qualify for in the future. Mr. De Angelis confirmed there was nothing available that the Village would qualify for at this time, but the Village is on a number of list serves that are monitored for opportunities along with Ruckert-Mielke and staff staying in tune with opportunities.

Ms. Coffey inquired as to whether or not the Knowles-Nelson Stewardship Grants would aid in assistance to the Village for the daylighting project. Mr. De Angelis explained that unfortunately that is typically used for land acquisition as they have reviewed that in the past. Mr. Schindler inquired whether or not AASHTO money may be available for our pathway, in which Mr. De Angelis explained that to qualify for that funding we would have to have a 12' two way path.

Mr. Koleski confirmed that the total cost of engineering services from R-M to apply for the grants totaled \$7,454.00 but was curious as to what a typical cost to prepare a grant application would be. Mr. De Angelis explained that the scope of required submittals determines how much work there is in preparation but typically speaking it would cost \$5,000-10,000. At times if there is a smaller project or need for less deliverable such as drawings, etc. it could be under \$5,000.

4: Update on Gebhardt Rd reconstruction, realignment and pathway

Mr. Paul informed the committee that after speaking with Ruckert-Mielke last week Friday, we are still looking at January for updated drawings. No new timeline was available.

5: Review and possible recommendation of the Recycling Agreement with Waukesha County

Mr. De Angelis explained that this agreement was put in place as an update to replace a similar document that the municipalities had with Waukesha County to administer the Recycling Programs for the communities in Waukesha County. The initial agreement with the communities after Waukesha County and the City of Milwaukee to build the MRF (Milwaukee Recycling Facility) the scope now needs to change to reflect the possibility of no dividends or even a cost assessment. The County also felt it was necessary to address the fund balance level, grants for projects as well as impacts of recycling materials prices and how they impact the dividend which are addressed in this agreement.

Mr. De Angelis clarified due to the lengthy timeline for this agreement he was unsure whether Atty. de la Mora specifically reviewed this agreement but did note there were other municipalities who have staff attorneys as well as Municipal Law Partners who would have reviewed it on behalf of the other municipalities.

Mr. Koleski moved to recommend approval of the Intergovernmental Agreement regarding Recycling with Waukesha County to the Village Board. Mr. Casperson seconded and the motion carried 6-0.

6: Review, discussion and possible action on Gebhardt Rd Bridge Maintenance Agreement with the City of Brookfield

Mr. De Angelis summarized the maintenance agreement with Brookfield and fielded questions from the committee. Mr. Koleski inquired about lines 24-29 stating the fact that in the agreement it stated that “the bridge has deteriorated significantly since then to warrant replacement” at which Mr. Koleski pointed out that we don’t necessarily agree on the timetable and should adapt the statement to read if or when the bridge needs replacement” as it has been discussed that it currently is not in dire need for replacement as is at this point. Mr. De Angelis agreed that it would be more appropriate to change that language to reflect future replacement and maintenance costs.

Mr. De Angelis will amend the language, send it to Mr. de la Mora for review, then will send it back to Brookfield for their review of the amendments.

7: Update on PP I/I

Mr. De Angelis informed the committee that MMSD has reviewed and approved the work plan for the relays and pipe bursting options for replacement/repair of the laterals and the director has approved the \$15K further investigative camera work for the handful of residences that need to be completed and that agreement would be on the upcoming Board agenda. He also indicated that the rehab work project has also been approved by the district and the agreement is currently being reviewed and may also be on the next Board agenda. Once the reinvestigation had been completed, final docs can be put together for bidding. Mr. Koleski confirmed that lining the laterals was not something that MMSD would approve. Mr. De Angelis confirmed that MMSD would not pay for any lining but the Village could if they wanted to without MMSD’s funding.

8: Update on Streambank Stabilization Project

Mr. De Angelis informed the committee that the project has wrapped up for the winter, but will resume in spring with the plantings. Mr. De Angelis also added that he just received an e-mail detailing a small punch list that the contractor had to take care of before the end of the year.

Photos of the project can be viewed on the Village’s website.

9: Update on Public Works Projects

Mr. Paul explained that all went well for the last snow storm and salt reserves are still in order. Mr. Paul also updated the committee on the difficulties and challenges with ordering new truck chassis’ for the upcoming planned replacement for 2024 and 2026. At this time, if we place an order now, we will not receive it until 2026 either way. It would behoove the Village to put orders in promptly for these cab/chassis units as all that is required is a signed LOI and PO. These units would have a Cummins Diesel that is currently used in our patrol trucks. However, due to emissions standards changing for 2027, there is no guarantee that Cummins and other manufacturers will be able to meet the new 2027 standards or timeline for a diesel and therefore it may not be available, and even if it was, being a first or second model year is not conducive to reliability in most cases which is why it is best for the Village to move forward immediately with the LOI and PO. If for some reason things change, Lakeside International said they would purchase the chassis for their demo equipment.

Also the upfitting (dump body, spreaders, plows, etc.) require a 25% down payment to hold

items for the build as soon as the cab/chassis unit arrives. The Finance Committee will have to discuss whether or not they would like to move forward and determine if it is in the best interest of the Village to purchase now or see if the cost of these components will drop as the steel market fluctuates. If the Village decides to move forward, the upfitting components will be stored at no charge in Appleton.

10: Other Business

Ms. Coffey inquired what would happen if the Daylighting project did not pass referendum even though the DNR requires the project to happen in the future. Mr. De Angelis explained that if the state requires the work to be done but a referendum does not pass, then it will end up in court and a judge may then order the work to be carried out.

12: Adjourn

Mr. Koleski motioned and Mr. McNamara seconded to adjourn the meeting at 6:52 pm Motion carried 6-0.

Respectfully. Submitted

Richard Paul, Jr.
Public Works Director

DRAFT