



**CITY OF DELAFIELD
MEETING MINUTES
PUBLIC WORKS COMMITTEE**

Chair: Dan Jashinsky

Members: Art Baumann, Jim Behrend, Jacob Berg, Elizabeth Lloyd-Weis, Jack Demski, Mark Millot

Wednesday, January 5th, 2022

6:30 PM

City Hall, Council Chambers
500 Genesee St.

REGULAR MEETING

1. Call to Order

Chairperson Jashinsky called the January 5, 2022, Public Works Committee meeting to order at 6:31 PM.

2. Pledge of Allegiance

The Pledge of Allegiance was recited.

3. Roll Call

Present

Dan Jashinsky, Chairperson
Art Baumann
Jim Behrend
Elizabeth Lloyd-Weis

Absent

Jack Demski
Jacob Berg
Mark Millot

Also present

Mike Court, Engineer
Tom Hafner, City Administrator/Department of Public Works Director
Molly Schneider, City Clerk

4. Citizen Comments

Mary Daniel, 309 Wisconsin Ave., Delafield - spoke regarding item number 7A and 7C. Regarding item 7A, the 5-year capital improvement plan budget was listed as \$235,000 for this item, but the construction cost estimates presented that evening are \$159,480. Where does the \$75,000 difference go? Regarding 7C, how will residents who live on the streets know about the improvement plan once the plan is approved? Does the language in the bids state there is a penalty for projects not being completed by September 1. The City is forgiving when deadlines are not met.

Joann Genetti-Teeple, 34734 Delafield Rd., Summit – Genetti-Teeple owns Genetti Gardens on the corner of Bleeker St. at Wells St. and Main St. She has concerns regarding the road improvement plan. What is the start date for Bleeker, who is the contact? Where will customers be able to park? Dates are of concern as there are events scheduled. There is a major drainage problem on the north side parking lot. There are already two culverts. This is her livelihood from ground thaw to freeze. Would like to know where access will be and where customers can park.

5. Consent Agenda

- A.** Approval of minutes from the [11-03-2021](#) regular meeting

Motion by Behrend, seconded by Lloyd-Weis to approve the minutes as presented.

All in favor. Motion carried.

6. Unfinished Business

7. New Business

A. Discussion and possible action regarding Preliminary Design for the Nagawicka Road Path Project (from Waterleaf Path to Bark River Drive)

This will extend the section to the north that was completed a few years ago.

Court explained the plans are 30% complete based on previous discussions but some issues need to be worked out. There are right of way issues and bridge issues. Court explained that costs are developed early on and are fine-tuned based on the 30% plans. Engineering and contingencies were not factored into the construction costs that were listed but are part of the project capital budget. As plans are developed, the costs will be fine-tuned further. Hafner asked what the estimated engineering fees were. Court noted \$13,000 was budgeted last year and an additional \$22,000 to finish the design and manage the construction. Hafner explained excess is used to lower capitol borrowing in the following year, but often the over-under across projects end up balancing out from year to year. Court explained that it is very difficult to accurately estimate costs at this time due to economic uncertainties. Court noted substantial completion is often included in the project contract and there is language regarding liquidated damages that is included, but perhaps the enforcement could be stepped up.

The Public Works Committee discussed elements of the project design. At 3440 Nagawicka Rd, the plan at the fence location will stay within the right of way. The Faire Lakes Parkway area on the east and south on Nagawicka Rd. The slope is tough if the path stays within the right-of-way. A temporary construction easement could be negotiated. The rest of the way down to the bridge will have to add curb and gutter. The curb and gutter will have to transition to the bridge curb and gutter. The path will still be 6-feet wide. There is one area that might be wider due to a mailbox location. There is some pipework and a storm manhole that will be converted to an inlet. Just north of the bridge is a low point where a storm lead would need to go. Jashinsky noted that the storm water could be directed to the river. Court noted they might be able to tie into existing storm. Jashinsky noted that the road is wearing low here and this may be an opportunity to address the road problem. Court explained it is very tight next to the bridge with the guardrail. There was some crash data included that explained that the guardrail could be removed, as it isn't the right application for protection. Discussion occurred regarding what the issue with guardrail would be. It would be easier to remove it than to work around it, and curb and gutter would be appropriate for crash protection in this area.

On the path south of the bridge the suggestion is to add barrier curb and to remove the guardrail there also. The curb would go from the path south of the bridge to the waterleaf path which would be about 100 ft. of curb. There is an issue with a low spot which would be another inlet and some storm sewer at station 53-50. A big road patch might be a better solution. Hafner asked if the guardrail issue was addressed on page 11 and 12 in the packet and if the issue was blunt ends. Discussion occurred regarding the fact that the rails are outdated, but still crashworthy. Court noted that the bigger point is that the data came back stating that the guardrail was not necessary if replaced with barrier curb. Baumann noted that the caveat is that this is the side someone might go off the road on due to the curve direction and the guardrail does protect drivers in that event and also to prevent drivers from ending up in the river. Court noted the barrier curb might prevent accidents from becoming more severe. It was suggested to bring the curb and gutter in farther down and leave the guardrail up around the bridge.

Jashinsky asked about the fence area and an obvious kink in the grade. Court explained this would be addressed.

Behrend asked about the relocation of the Utility poles. Court will coordinate with the utility companies regarding relocation. He is hopeful to get these set back on 34-10 rather than 34-40. Also, a telephone pedestal must be addressed.

Motion by Baumann seconded by Jashinsky, to approve proceeding to the draft plans subject to the comments expressed in discussion relating to the extension of the curb and gutter and guardrail issue, drainage and storm sewer comments, station 53 comments, utility issues, and further investigation of the approaches.

All in favor. Motion carried.

B. Discussion and possible action to set a date for the Public Informational Meeting for the Nagawicka Road Path Project.

It was suggested to have this as the first agenda item at the February 2nd Public Works Committee meeting. Adjacent property owners should be notified. Hafner noted that generally notifications were made to property owners directly adjacent. It was suggested to send out to owners on both sides of the street as well as the homeowners association.

Motion by Jashinsky seconded by Baumann, have the Public Information Meeting as an agenda item at the February 2nd, 2022 Public Works Committee meeting.

All in favor. Motion carried.

Behrend noted he would be out of town. It was suggested to pre-determine a quorum.

C. Discussion and possible action regarding the 2022 City of Delafield Street Improvement Program.

Court explained that the program plan is just starting to get going. The projects in the bid would include Nagawicka Path to get continuity in the Roads Improvement Plan. Court summarized the projects proposed. He explained that SEH is the consulting engineer for Summit and the City is working on a joint agreement for Mill Road. It was coordinated to have this paved as one project; it makes sense to have this bid by one municipality. If Mill Road is included, the cost would be close to the one million dollars.

Court explained that Road projects typically start when school is out in early June through the end of August. For these types of roads, the projects go relatively quickly. The removal is about one day, and then within seven days the paving happens, which takes a day or two. The actual disruption to traffic is typically three or four days. If there are specific events, the City can do their best to work with businesses, but it is dependent upon the contractor. Notifications generally occur about a week prior.

Court noted the drainage in the area of Genetti Gardens would be looked at. Hafner noted one of the reasons this project was selected was due to the drainage issues. A culvert is part of the plan and this is the ideal time to address this issue. A site visit was recommended.

For Oneida, plans included some of the parking in the right of way that would need to be redone and this increased the costs. Jashinsky asked about the stop sign and if this was the time to address adding a raised island at this location for the stop sign. Court explained that this would interfere with parking. If sidewalk is extended that might be the time to address it.

Court noted that by Sun Valley Dr and Heritage Dr, some night paving had been done. It worked out well. Might be considered for this project.

Jashinsky asked about the miscellaneous road patches and if there are specific areas planned. Mike O'Brien and Robbie Mahlzan will determine areas for intended improvement.

Court went over the timeline for the bid. Bid opening is planned for February 24th with the recommendation ready for the March 2nd Public Works Committee meeting and the agreement ready for the March 21, 2022 Common Council meeting. The Common Council approval could be shifted out.

Motion by Berend seconded by Lloyd-Weis, to have Court proceed to draft plans for February 2nd, 2022 Public Works Committee meeting.

All in favor. Motion carried.

8. Reports of City Officials

A. Director of Public Works

Hafner noted that Hendricks would be starting soon and there will likely be significant disruptions with truck traffic, noise, etc. Hendricks is supposed to be putting up a website. Baumann asked about construction traffic damage. Behrend asked if there was an official route out of town.

B. City Engineer

C. Traffic Staff

D. Clerk

E. Public Works Committee Meeting Dates & Deadlines

1. Next Meeting: February 2, 2022

2. Meeting Submittal Deadline: January 18, 2022, at noon

F. Correspondence

9. Adjournment

Having no further business, the January 5, 2022 Public Works Committee Meeting was adjourned at 7:32 PM.

Respectfully Submitted,

Molly Schneider
City Clerk