

VILLAGE OF GRAFTON
BOARD OF PUBLIC WORKS MEETING MINUTES

AUGUST 8, 2011

The Board of Public Works meeting was called to order at 6:00 p.m. by Chairman Richard Rieck.

Members present: Richard Rieck, Sue Meinecke, Lisa Harbeck, Pat Murray, and Edwin Dietrich.

Staff/Officials present: Trustee David Liss, Village Administrator Darrell Hofland, Director of Public Works/Village Engineer Dave Murphy, Utility Director Tom Krueger, Utility Superintendent Tim Nennig, and Administrative Assistant Melissa Depies.

Others Present: Carrie Ann Hewitt from Bonestroo, and many concerned residents.

HEAR PERSONS REQUESTING TO BE HEARD

Bill Hass, 1226 Water Terrace, questioned the status of the Lime Kiln dam removal project in light of the remaining construction fence. Director of Public Works/Village Engineer Dave Murphy responded that Ozaukee County will be constructing a small bridge over the old raceway. The plans are going before Plan Commission for approval in August, the project will then proceed. The costs associated with this bridge are being funded by Ozaukee County/NOAA.

MINUTES

Motion by Mr. Dietrich, seconded by Mr. Murray, to approve the July 18, 2011, Board of Public Works meeting minutes. Approved unanimously.

PUBLIC WORKS

Bridge Street Dam West Abutment and Bridge Street Dam Reservoir Dredging Report
Director of Public Works/Village Engineer Dave Murphy stated that he would like to review the West Abutment and Reservoir Dredging Projects together as they go hand in hand. He explained that the Village needs to repair the dam and make it compliant with NR 333 and at the July 18 Board meeting the Board indicated their interest in dredging the accumulated sediment behind the dam. It would be most cost effective to install a gate for flood control as well as dewatering for dredging.

Director Murphy stated that during the July 18 meeting, he was directed to explore Option 1 with a small gate to allow dewatering of the reservoir enough to mechanically dredge the sediment and to inspect the dam. Option 1 is to replace the masonry wall with a reinforced concrete wall and reconfigure the observation area along with raising the river walk. Administrator Hofland recommended that areas 2, 3, and 5 be dredged since they directly benefit the downtown and are most visible.

Trustee Meinecke questioned if the DNR has made a determination on the permit for the fish passage project and east abutment repairs. Director Murphy responded that they have not.

Trustee Harbeck questioned where the figure of 90 percent came from in the sentence "This would be enough to allow visual inspection of 90 percent of the dam and expose all silted-in areas of the reservoir." Director Murphy responded that he determined that figure by calculating the water level with the gate size proposed. Ms. Harbeck stated that the report from Collins states that part of the dam investigation was done visually and part was tactile; are we sure that this size gate would expose 90 percent of the dam for inspection and who would then complete the inspections. Director Murphy responded that as the Village Engineer he could complete the inspections and sign off on them; however, he could not complete the underwater inspection. Inspections need to be done two times in a 10 year period by the Village and one time in a 10 year period by the DNR.

Trustee Harbeck questioned why Administrator Hofland was only recommending areas 2, 3, and 5 to be dredged. She also questioned if there had been any investigation on the costs of a bladder dam or coffer dam for dewatering the island area. Director Murphy responded that the bladder dam and/or Cofferdam has not been investigated as the dredging specifications would be written to allow the contractor to determine which type of dewatering technique they believe is most cost effective.

Administrator Hofland stated that he is only recommending dredging areas 2, 3, and 5 as these locations are in the downtown TID; therefore, the TID could fund the cost of the project. The TID cannot fund the areas further away from the downtown which do not directly benefit the downtown. Trustee Harbeck questioned if the TID fund had \$1,000,000 set aside for dam projects. Mr. Hofland stated that there is a project notated in the TID project plan that estimates the cost of repair of the dam and dredging. Money for any project would need to be borrowed in the future.

Trustee Meinecke questioned the condition of the masonry wall and asked if it absolutely needs to be repaired or replaced immediately. Director Murphy responded that Bonestroo has given various options for repairing and/or replacing the masonry wall. Option 1 was to remove the masonry wall and replace it with a concrete wall. The wall is secure for now; however, the repairs and/or replacement will need to be done in the near future.

Trustee Rieck questioned how long TID funding would be available for this project. Administrator Hofland stated that the TID was approved in 1999 and the Village has 26 or 27 years to use it. Trustee Rieck then commented that it would be possible to complete the dam repairs now and complete the dredging later. Director Murphy recommended not doing any work until a grant is received from the DNR and/or the fish passage permit is approved. Director Murphy commented that once the east and west abutment repairs are complete the dam should be good for 50 plus years.

Trustee Meinecke stated that the Village has until 2019 to become compliant with the dam repairs. She also stated that funding set aside in the TID fund has not yet been borrowed. Administrator Hofland confirmed.

Susan Borchardt, W4139 Center Street, Waubeka, WI, distributed material for the Board to review: 1) Wausau Whitewater; 2) Wausau Whitewater 2011 Season Program; and 3) Whitewater Park Sports New Kayak Center – Geneva benefits. She commented that she realizes that Option 3 was no longer being considered; however, she requested that the Board read the material and then possibly reconsider. The information from Geneva Kayak Center is filled with many positive comments on how it is good for the community. Trustee Rieck questioned if the dam needed to be removed to go with option 3. Director Murphy responded no, there are various ways to build recreational activities without removing the entire dam, but 20 to 30 feet would need to be removed. Director Murphy did note that at the July 18 meeting it was the consensus of the Board to keep the dam and impoundment looking the same as it does now without major changes.

Sue Hass, 1226 Water Terrace, commented that these discussions are very important and there is no hurry for the Board to make a decision. She questioned how much hydraulic capacity we would get and how much flooding of the river walk would be alleviated if we just remove the sill. Mrs. Hass stated that we need to have details as to what is actually on the table and what it is going to cost. Director Murphy explained that option 1 included raising the river walk and building an auxiliary spillway; the only way to add capacity would be to include a gate.

Director Murphy explained that there is time to make the repairs; the Village has 8 years before the work needs to be done. However, we need to have a plan to apply for a grant to help fund the project. Director Murphy suggested completing the plan and applying for a grant every year until the grant is successful. If the grant is not successful then we do not do the project at that time.

Mrs. Hass questioned the cost of a crest gate and what that cost included. Director Murphy stated that he was recommending a gate that was 6 feet deep by 20 feet long for a cost of \$165,000 – approximately \$120,000 is the cost of the gate and the remaining \$45,000 was for installation. The 4 foot by 20 foot gate would cost \$110,000 - \$80,000 for purchase and \$30,000 for installation. We are estimating \$50,000 for design of the entire project, and approximately \$28,000 for design of the gate.

Mrs. Hass then questioned what type of operating and maintenance costs will be incurred with a gate. Director Murphy responded that the maintenance and operation guide will come from the manufacturer, and the costs are unknown at this time.

Mrs. Hass stated that the DNR has more rules and requirements regarding the gates; she questioned if the DNR decides when the gate needs to be opened or closed. She also questioned whether installation of a gate will cause the dam to lose its barrier function. She stated we don't need a gate to be compliant with NR 333 and we don't need a gate for dredging. Director Murphy responded that the dam will not be as effective as a barrier with

the gate as compared to a dam without a gate; however, the DNR has indicated that certain species will be able to get passed the dam anyway.

Mrs. Hass stated that dredging south of WIS 60 does nothing for the dam and suggested we want to keep boats away from the dam anyway. She questioned what exactly are we trying to fix by dredging.

Mary Mulloy, 1110 Riverview Court, questioned if there was a net or mesh that would block evasive species when the gate was open. Director Murphy responded that there was no mesh or net and the velocity of the water would keep the fish from going through the gate during high flows.

Bill Harbeck, 907 17th Avenue, stated that the main thing driving this is costs. There are costs that need to be considered with the maintenance and/or operation of the gate. Director Murphy responded that those costs would depend on whether the gate is manual, hydraulic, or pneumatic. These costs will be determined once the Village determines which dam repair and/or gate will be selected. Mr. Harbeck requested a cost report supporting the prices for the gates as indicated earlier. Director Murphy stated that there was not a report per se however there are quotes from various manufacturers to back up the cost estimates.

Mr. Harbeck stated that one of the reasons to install the gate is to dredge the areas around the dam. He questioned the cost of a bladder dam and whether that option had been investigated. Director Murphy stated that there is a cost in the dredging report, and indicated that it was about \$50,000. This cost however includes the Cofferdam and dewatering. The dredging contractor will determine what method is most cost effective for dewatering and noted the Village is not going to specify a certain kind of portable dam like the bladder dam. Carrier Ann Hewitt, Bonestroo, explained that there are various options for coffer dams. It is best to let the contractor decide the best way to approach the work.

Trustee Meinecke questioned Mr. Harbeck if he was suggesting that the Village purchase a bladder dam. Mr. Harbeck responded no, the contractor would rent the bladder dam.

Mr. Harbeck noted that the area at River Island Park is getting worse every year and definitely needs to be considered for dredging. It is more cost effective to dredge all areas at one time, rather than do a some now and then do more areas later.

Les Blum, 1108 Sunset Court, questioned if all gates loose 2 feet, meaning the 4 foot gate reduces the water level by 2 feet and the 6 foot gate reduces the water level by 4 feet. Ms. Hewitt responded that is what they were finding in their analysis. Mr. Blum then questioned what type of invasive species we were looking for. Director Murphy indicated that the DNR will be doing some testing up stream to determine if the invasive species have already passed the dam; therefore, we are unsure at this time.

Mr. Blum indicated that a temporary or portable dam may be the way to go if we only have to dredge every few years. It needs to be determined which type of gate is more effective.

Ed Mulloy, 1110 Riverview Court, questioned if anyone has looked at dredged material and the trucking cost to get rid of it; he further questioned if anyone has investigated whether topsoil companies might be interested in the material.

Mr. Mulloy stated that he has been using this river for 33 years and the River Island Park area is now a shame.

Trustee Harbeck questioned if we have determined what we are going to do with the material. Director Murphy stated that the high school will allow some of the material to go onto their property; however, this may not be large enough for all the material. If the Village Board makes the decision to dredge, disposal of the material will part of the specifications.

Mr. Harbeck stated that he has talked to several farmers and some have indicated that they may be interested in the material. He has also talked to a topsoil dealer who had indicated that they would be very interested in the material as well. Director Murphy noted that due to the type of material being hauled, modifications may need to be made to the hauling trucks so material does not leak out.

Trustee Rieck questioned where the Board members stood on the matter so a recommendation could be made to the Village Board.

Trustee Harbeck indicated that she was undecided about the gate for several reasons. The gate is not needed for dredging or for NR 333 and she is concerned about invasive species getting up stream.

Mr. Murray stated that he was in favor of the gate; Mr. Dietrich and Trustee Meinecke both were not in favor of the gate; Trustee Rieck was in favor of dredging but not in favor of the gate.

Tara Wisdorf, 1232 Water Terrace, indicated that the referendum was to save the dam, not to open it with a gate. The initial choice was to save the dam – not change the dam, and repairing the dam as is, would be the least expensive option.

Trustee Meinecke questioned if we could recommend the design with the gate and then based on the level or lack of funding, remove the gate from the project at a later time. Director Murphy suggested completing the grant application including installation of the gate, and then determine the actual project design after the grant is awarded.

Ms. Hewitt stated that she recently applied for a grant on another project and the scope of the project changed causing the project cost to be reduced. They are however, still receiving the grant funding so applying for the grant to include the gate and then deciding to eliminate the gate should not be a problem.

Motion by Mr. Murray, seconded by Mr. Dietrich, to recommend the Village Board proceed with design of the west abutment of the Bridge Street dam per Option 1. Approved unanimously.

Trustee Rieck questioned the thoughts of the Board members for dredging.

Mr. Murray was in favor of dredging areas 1 through 4, and favored inclusion of the River Island Park area.

Trustee Harbeck would like to see River Island Park included in the dredging, depending on what happens with the gate or what can be done with a Cofferdam. She agreed that areas 1 through 4 should be dredged.

Mr. Dietrich stated that only area 1 should be dredged.

Trustee Meinecke stated that dredging all areas would be nice if there was funding; however, since this is an aesthetics issue we should wait for money to become available.

Trustee Rieck agreed with dredging areas 1 through 4.

Trustee Liss questioned why we would leave area 5 out of the dredging areas, he noted that it is the most noticeable area and needs the most attention. It is the area where logs and debris are getting stuck.

Board members agreed and it was the consensus to have all five areas dredged.

Mr. Murray questioned how deep the water will be after the dredging is complete. Director Murphy responded that the water is anticipated to be approximately 4 feet deep.

Director Murphy noted that area 5 would not need to be dredged if the fish passage is approved by the DNR.

Administrator Hofland noted that dredging all 5 locations will total approximately \$1,428,000.

Trustee Meinecke stated that some of these areas are in the TID; therefore, some of the dredging costs can be funded by the TID.

Motion by Mr. Murray, seconded by Trustee Harbeck, to recommend the Village Board to dredge areas 1 – 5 as indicated in the Bridge Street Dam Reservoir Dredging report, as presented. Motion carried 4 – 1 (S. Meineckey).

Bridge Street Dam Grant Application

Director of Public Works/Village Engineer Dave Murphy explained that the DNR is accepting grant applications for dam removal and repair projects. Director Murphy

received a proposal from Bonestroo to submit a grant application on the Village's behalf for a fee based on time and materials not to exceed \$2,200.

Director Murphy stated that in addition to the motion to allow Bonestroo to apply for the grant a motion to adopt a resolution authorizing participation in the grant program must also be approved.

Trustee Harbeck stated that she reviewed the grant application and it appeared to be pretty straight forward and questioned what the \$2,200 fee covered. Ms. Hewitt responded that this is a time and materials proposal not to exceed the \$2,200. The charge out rate is approximately \$125 per hour and the application must include a report that shows that NR 333 requirements will be met.

Motion by Trustee Harbeck, seconded by Trustee Meinecke, to recommend the Village Board approve a contract with Bonestroo for writing the grant application on a time and material basis not to exceed \$2,200. Approved unanimously.

Motion by Trustee Harbeck, seconded by Mr. Murray, to recommend the Village Board adopt Resolution No. XX, Series 2011, authorizing the participation in the Department of Natural Resources Municipal Grant Program. Approved unanimously.

Major project updates - DPW

Street Reconstruction: Project is complete.

Sidewalk Replacement Program: Project is going well with approximately one-half of the poem stamps completed. Entire project should be complete by the end of next week.

Trustee Harbeck commented that the new concrete sidewalk on the northeast corner of the Washington Street bridge turned out very nice. Director Murphy noted that this concrete work was done by Village crews.

Report of benchmark measurements-Public Works

The Board reviewed the benchmarks report.

Director of Public Works/Village Engineer Dave Murphy stated that the average days to complete work orders has increased from approximately 8 days to 13.5 days. Good news is that the work orders are still getting done, bad news is that it is taking longer due to limited staff.

Director Murphy also noted that the road rating number reflects 2009 numbers as staff is still working on the reporting for this year's inspections. These inspections are done bi-annually.

WATER and WASTEWATER

Garage/Vehicle storage facility planning update

Utility Director Tom Krueger explained that he has been working with Kueny Architects to complete a preliminary design layout for the Utility garage/storage facility. The preliminary design phase includes a comprehensive site plan that addresses future needs of the Utility including a provision for a future automated septage receiving station and an automated bulk water supply station as well as a design for controlled site entry directing public traffic away from utility truck and contractor vehicles.

Mr. Krueger stated that preliminary construction costs range from \$1,325,000 to \$1,660,000 which he plans to include in the 2012 Utility budget.

Trustee Rieck questioned if the project costs included razing the incinerator building. Mr. Krueger responded that the price does include this. The incinerator building does not need to be razed for the new garage; however, it will need to be removed for the future automated septage receiving station.

There was discussion on the automated septage receiving station and bulk water supply station. Mr. Krueger will complete a construction cost versus payback time analysis to determine if it is beneficial to complete this portion of the project now or in the near future.

Trustee Rieck questioned how this project would be funded. Mr. Krueger responded that the Village would need to borrow funds on behalf of the Utility. The loan payment would come entirely from the Utility, with no cost burden to the Village general fund or taxpayers. Director Murphy stated that as long as the area is under construction the Utility should complete all projects at the same time including the automated septage receiving station and the bulk water supply station.

It was the consensus of the Board of Public Works to include the automated septage receiving station and the bulk water supply station into the project.

Summer sprinkling credit elimination

Utility Director Tom Krueger stated that one of the Utility's cost saving initiatives for 2012 was to eliminate the summer sprinkling credit that is currently given to all residential sewer customers during the second and third quarter billing periods, which runs from April 15 to September 15.

The calculated sewer use volume for billing during these two quarters is based on the average water usage measured during the two winter quarters rather than the actual metered water volume; therefore, every residential customer that uses more water during the summer receives the sewer credit. In 2009 the sewer credits totaled \$93,281 and in 2010 they totaled \$73,299.

Mr. Krueger also noted that Grafton has endorsed the Regional Water Planning Study prepared by SEWRPC which requires the Utility to promote water conservation. It was his

belief that elimination of the summer sprinkling credit was a way to promote water conservation and adhere to prescribed reductions in peak water demands.

Trustee Harbeck questioned if the customers could install a separate meter to register the water that does not go down the sewer. Mr. Krueger stated that this is called a deduct meter and it would remain an option for customers. There is a fixed quarterly fee of \$7.65 to have the meter, and typically it is not cost effective for the resident to install. Director Murphy noted that you need to have a licensed plumber install the meter which also increases the cost of this option.

Mr. Krueger noted that elimination of the summer sprinkling credit will help with the 2012 budget as well as defer a rate increase.

Motion by Trustee Meinecke, seconded by Mr. Dietrich, to recommend the Village Board approve elimination of the Utility's summer sprinkling credit effective in 2012 and for 2012 budgeting purposes. Approved unanimously.

Second Quarter Safe Drinking Water Act compliance results

Utility Superintendent Tim Nennig highlighted the Safe Drinking Water Act compliance results.

Mr. Nennig noted that Well 4 showed an exceedance for trichloroethylene and Well 5 showed an exceedance in trichloroethylene and dichloroethylene in the raw water samples only. Wells 3 and 7 remained free of any VOC contaminant detects.

Mr. Nennig explained that every 3 years the Utility is required to sample for Synthetic Organic Compounds (SOCs) which are man-made contaminants such as herbicides, pesticides, and other chemicals that come from agriculture or urban storm water runoff. The Utility found no detects in any of the Village's six wells.

Since Well 3 was rehabbed in 2007 the Utility is required to annually complete a radioactivity analyses on an entry point sample on this well. The analytical results came back very positive with little or no detects of the contaminants being monitored.

Utility Project update

Ultraviolet Light Disinfection Project: Project is moving forward.

Tower No. 1 Renovation Project: There have been a couple of issues with the contractor and the workmanship, however final steps are in process to place the tower back in service.

Water System Leak Detection Survey: This work is scheduled to begin the week of September 26. It is anticipated that it will take up to two months to complete.

Regional Lake Water Supply Study: Proposals from consultants are due back by August 16,

WWTP Anaerobic Digestion Study: An initial project meeting is scheduled for August 9. A project schedule and anticipated completion date will be discussed.

Utility budget dashboard measurements update

Utility Director Tom Krueger indicated that these are budgetary benchmarks that are provided monthly for Board information.

Report of benchmark measurements – Utility

The benchmark report was reviewed by Board members.

Utility Superintendent Tim Nennig commented that the Utility has only had one water main break and zero sanitary sewer mainline back-ups to date.

Mr. Nennig listed the benchmark goals already completed this year as well as the goals likely to be completed in the next month or so. He also highlighted the August activities for Utility staff.

OLD BUSINESS

None

NEW BUSINESS

Director of Public Works/Village Engineer Dave Murphy commented that it has been past practice to complete a tour of projects. He suggested scheduling the tour prior to the September meeting so Board members could see the proposed project site planning at the Utility as well as the proposed street projects for the next 3 years. It was the consensus that the tour will begin at 5:00 p.m. and the meeting will begin at 6:00 p.m. on September 12.

Trustee Liss stated that at the intersection Keup Road and Bobolink Avenue there is a manhole where the road seems to be dishing out from around the manhole causing a big dip in the road. This needs to be looked at and repaired. Mr. Krueger will have his crews take a look at it.

ADJOURN

Motion by Trustee Harbeck, seconded by Trustee Meinecke, to adjourn the meeting at 7:44 p.m. Approved unanimously.