

Public Works Minutes: 10-12-16

All members were present

Meeting called to order by Lynn Green at 5:30pm.

Agenda: *Motion to approve the agenda was made by Genrich/Matuszek – approved*

Approval of Minutes: *Motion by Genrich/Matuszek to approve the minutes with the addition of correcting the spelling of Clarence's last name. Approved*

Old Business:

#3: Proposed County/Municipality Agreement for Joint Projects.

Craig gave an update as to where we are with the proposed agreement with the County/Municipal Agreement for Joint Projects. The area PW Directors will be meeting with Brown County Highway Public Works Director, Paul F. next week. The 2 areas of which might need further discussion would be the sidewalk policy and bike lane costs. Currently beginning asked is that the cost is shared 50/50, however it is possible that the County may propose a 25% cost share as in the former agreement.

#4: 5-Year Street Reconstruction Plan

Berndt presented three Street Improvement Plan options; Option 1 is approximately \$4.0 million in improvements every 2 years with a goal of completing 75-80% of the needed streets within 8 years; Option 2 is between \$2.5 and \$3.2 million and would allow for 75-80% of the needed repairs to be completed in 10-12 years; Option 3 is between \$2 - \$2.5 million and would allow for 75-80% of the needed repairs to be completed in approximately 16 years. The drawback of extending the timeframe beyond Option 1 is that additional funds are need beginning in 2027 to provide reconstruction of other streets not completed in the initial major projects to continue to complete all street and utility reconstruction needed long-term. This means that Option 3 will see a future increase in needed funding beginning in 2027 which will be in the range of \$1.0 million alternate years.

Discussion: What is the rule of thumb when it comes to the cost to pave a road? A million dollar a mile is what is used and \$2 million for reconstruction. This is only a rough guideline. Allouez project costs are based on preliminary design of needed construction and recent bid prices for projects. The estimated costs are more accurate that the rough guideline and are reliable actual costs.

Motion by Clarence/Lynn to recommend that the Village Board approved Option 2 for the first project list with a borrowing of \$2million and the additional \$500,000 to be from the Stadium Tax Fund for a total project cost of \$2.5million and then follow Option 3 for the remainder of the projects. Approved.

#5: Bicycle and Pedestrian Plan.

Craig gave an update on the maps created for the Bike/Ped Plan. Two items were brought to the attention of the committee; sidewalk/trail using the State ROW along HWY172 from Webster Ave. to East River Drive and bike lanes on Riverside Drive.

Motion by Jim R/Jim G. to recommend removal of the bike lanes on Riverside Drive as the Village Board has already stated their opposition to having bike lanes on Riverside Drive. Approved

#6. Pedestrian Crossings on Riverside Drive.

See the attached memo.

#7: Adjournment: *Motion by Clarence/Rick to adjourn at 6:40pm. Approved.*

VILLAGE OF ALLOUEZ

Allouez Village Hall • 1900 Libal Street • Green Bay, Wisconsin 54301-2453
Phone No.: (920) 448-2800 • Fax No.: (920) 448-2850

 **DRAFT**

Department of Public Works

STREET AND UTILITY RECONSTRUCTION PROJECTS OPTIONS

Program Goal

The goal of the Street and Utility Reconstruction Projects is to complete roughly 75% of the needed street and utility replacements by the end of the major project work, and then continue with smaller reconstruction projects on a longer-term continuing basis so that remaining streets/utilities are reconstructed going into the future.

The longer-term smaller reconstruction project costs are estimated at \$1.0-\$1.5 million every two years because there are many streets have been deferred to the future and current streets that continue to age and thus require reconstruction. These are the remaining 20-25% of the reconstruction streets that remain to be reconstructed at the completion of the major projects.

Street and Utility Reconstruction Options

Option One:

Reconstruct streets in four approximately \$4 million projects from 2017 to 2023 and one smaller project of about \$1.9 million in 2025. After this period, reconstruct approximately \$1 million projects every two years to continue to complete the remaining streets and utilities. This option is an aggressive approach that completes the major work in about 8 years.

The \$1 million long-term reconstruction projects should begin in 2027.

Option Two:

Reconstruct streets in seven separate approximate \$3 million projects from 2017 to 2029, and then continue with smaller approximately \$1 million projects every two years to continue to complete the remaining streets and utilities. This option completes the major reconstruction work in about 12 years.

In this option the future long-term reconstruction projects must begin in 2027 to continue to maintain our streets. This means adding these long-term reconstructs to the major project in 2027 and 2029 thus increasing the reconstruction project cost to \$4 million in these years.

Option Three:

Reconstruct streets in nine approximately \$2.0-\$2.5 million projects from 2017 to 2033, and then continue with smaller approximately \$1 million projects every two years to continue to complete the remaining streets and utilities. This is an approximate 16 years to complete the major reconstruction projects.

The smaller long-term reconstruction projects begin in 2027 at about \$1 million per two years to continue to reconstruct the remaining streets. This results in increasing the approximate \$2 million per two years for major reconstruction to about \$3 million per two years beginning in 2027 and continuing to 2033. Option Three pushes some of the reconstruction costs into the long-term future but this is after a large amount of bonds are retired.

Financial Impacts

The following summarizes the estimated financial impacts of the three reconstruction plan project options. The rate increases do not include inflation or other costs-only project construction costs.

DRAFT

	Utility Bill Increase		Tax Levy Increase	
	<u>2018</u>	<u>2020</u>	<u>2018</u>	<u>2020</u>
Option One (\$4M/2 yrs)	\$1.20/month	\$3.4/month	\$6/year	\$20/year
Option Two (\$3M/2 yrs)	\$0.90/month	\$2.85/mos	\$5/year	\$15/year
Option Three (\$2M/2 yrs)	\$0.60/month	\$1.90/mos	\$4/year	\$10/year

	Bond Borrowing		
	<u>Borrowing to 2024</u>	<u>Borrowing Ceiling</u>	<u>Available</u>
Option One (\$4M/2yrs)	~\$16 million	~\$46 million	~\$4 mil
Option Two (\$3M/2 yrs)	~\$12 million	~\$46 million	~\$8 mil
Option Three (\$2M/2yrs)	~\$8 million	~\$46 million	~\$12 mil

Summary

The following summarizes the options and borrowing.

1. The need for reconstruction of streets and utilities is important for improving the significant number of streets in poor condition, replacing sanitary sewers that are in failing condition, and replacing old water mains that experience a number of breaks and leakage. Replacing the sanitary sewers and water mains reduces the GBMSD sewer charges and the cost of purchased water from the CBCWA.
2. An on-going continuous street reconstruction and utility replacement program is necessary to reduce long term operating and construction costs and adequately maintain the sewer and water systems.
3. Option One completes the initial 75% reconstruction in the shortest time period, which is likely most desired, but approaches the bonding capacity of the village at 2024. However, a significant debt retirement occurs in 2024 (drops by about \$22 million).

4. Option Two completes the major reconstruction work in about 12 years and remains well below the bond borrowing limit. This option seems a reasonable approach to continuing a strong effort to improve village streets and utilities.
5. Option Three is a lower annual cost for the first 8 years, with the additional long-range smaller reconstruction projects beginning in 2027 resulting in a \$3 million per two year cost thereafter.

VILLAGE OF ALLOUEZ

Allouez Village Hall • 1900 Libal Street • Green Bay, Wisconsin 54301-2453
Phone No.: (920) 448-2800 • Fax No.: (920) 448-2850

Department of Public Works

STATUS OF RIVERSIDE DRIVE PEDESTRIAN CROSSINGS October 12, 2016

The following is the current status of the pedestrian crossings on Riverside Drive.

August 25th Meeting with WisDOT (full minutes attached)

1. A pedestrian crosswalk installed at this time must include an overhead signal system due to the traffic volume and speeds. Safety considerations require the flashing beacon or hybrid beacon signal.
2. WisDOT feels that this location will not meet the traffic warrants requirements for a crossing (number of pedestrians per hour required to justify a ped crossing) but will approve the Sunset crossing because of the village sidewalk project/public input/the village need.
3. The pedestrian crossing must be designed to DOT standards and must be a hybrid signal (Hawk) signal due to the traffic volume.

September 13th Meeting with WisDOT

This was a final meeting to cover the design aspects and approval of a Hawk crossing south of Sunset Park.

1. DOT recommended that this installation, after completed, be turned over to WisDOT to maintain. This is recommended.
2. There are some additional permits required for this project which WisDOT will approve.
3. Only one Hawk crossing is approved at this time.
4. If a second Hawk crossing is desired it must meet traffic warrants to obtain approval and permits. It was suggested that the village evaluate a location and identify the pedestrian counts/time/dates for a field evaluation, and WisDOT will do the field evaluation. This will determine if a Hawk (or any crossing) will be approved. The suggestion was a Saturday in spring or some other peak hour usage at the selected location.

Path Forward

1. Proceed with design of the first Hawk crossing. This is underway with Mead & Hunt.
2. Engineering to evaluate other Riverside Drive locations for a second Hawk, and conduct preliminary field pedestrian counts. Use the police department to assist as well. When this information is obtained determine if a second location might meet warrants.
3. Request WisDOT to evaluate warrants if crossing is feasible.

VILLAGE OF ALLOUEZ

Allouez Village Hall • 1900 Libal Street • Green Bay, Wisconsin 54301-2453
Phone No.: (920) 448-2800 • Fax No.: (920) 448-2850

Department of Public Works

Memo: Meeting with Bob Schuurmans, WisDOT regarding pedestrian crosswalks and signals on Riverside Drive.
Present: Bob Schuurmans, Brad Lange, Jeff Piette, Craig Berndt
Date: August 25, 2016

The meeting summary is as follows:

1. Placing a pedestrian crosswalk only, or on an interim basis, is not recommended due to safety concerns. Adequate signaling is required to improve pedestrian safety. A crosswalk only is not feasible.
2. Based on Bob's research a rectangular rapid flashing beacon (RRFB) signal is not applicable to a high traffic roadway such as Riverside Drive. The DOT would prefer that this signal not be used in this application, though it is a lower cost to install.
3. Based on Bob's discussion's within the DOT, the hybrid beacon (Hawk) is the preferred signal. Several comments about the hybrid beacon are as follows:
 - a. The Sunset Circle area would not meet traffic warrants (minimum number of pedestrian crossings) to meet the MUTCD requirements, but the DOT would still approve it because this information is not available at this time. Sort of a "if you build it they will come" situation.
 - b. The cost of a hybrid beacon installation, based on a recent DOT project in Milwaukee, is likely to be about \$120,000. The concrete foundation and the superstructure is expensive.
 - c. Allouez would have to pay for the installation, but it could be turned over to WisDOT after complete for DOT maintenance of the signal system. This would be a good idea as accidents causing damage or signal maintenance/programming would be a DOT responsibility.
 - d. Bob is going to check on making this project a fundable project under the future Riverside Drive reconstruction project. This could be a credit to Allouez against the future CSS costs. This is very preliminary at this time.
 - e. This project will require a contractor such as Bodart Electric to do the work. It requires a 42" diameter 14 ft deep concrete base on each side of the roadway for the pole base. Bodart has the equipment to do this. Bodart may be the only or one of the only contractors that is qualified to drill the foundation and to tension the bolts for installation of the overhead posts. They also have a big backlog of work so getting them on-site will require some effort.
 - f. The concrete base may be difficult to install due to the poor soils. It may be necessary to sheet the boring with a steel casing to prevent cave-in. The close proximity to sidewalk/curb and private property may require the sheeting. This should be evaluated during design.

- g. Craig commented that an engineering proposal for design of this crossing will be requested as this project includes electrical, structural, and DOT highway design aspects.
- h. DOT will limit the number of pedestrian crossings that include a hybrid signal. Not all crossings, outside of the stop light intersections, would include this signal. This is a cost limitation on the future project.
- i. We discussed the village reviewing the number of crossings and defining which crossings would actually be a hybrid signal. This is a task we will undertake.
- j. The DOT will place the standard signage on the project (signs on posts).

Bob will be getting us some additional information.

We will proceed with getting an RFP to a consultant for assistance.

C. Berndt