

Main Street/Public Works Joint Committee Meeting

March 9, 2016, 4:30 pm

Call to Order: The meeting was called to order by Public Works Chairman, Clem Gottsacker at 4:30 pm

Roll Call Officers: Officers present were Chairman of Public Works, Clem Gottsacker, Chairman of Main Street Committee Pete Anzia, and Trustee Josh Borden. Dale Pfeifer was absent. Also in attendance were Village Clerk, Julie Lesar, Village President, Vickie Boehnlein, Tom Lanser, Project Manager and Jeff Chvosta, Project Engineer, both from Gremmer & Associates, Jon Edgren, Highway Commissioner, Ozaukee County Highway Dept. (arrived at 4:45), DPW Director, Daniel Birenbaum, and several village residents.

Open Meeting Law Compliance Check: This meeting is in compliance with the Open Meetings Law of the State of Wisconsin.

Pledge of Allegiance to the American Flag, Moment of Silence: All in attendance stood for the Pledge of Allegiance and moment of silence.

Approval of Minutes:

- **Main Street Committee - May 18, 2015** – motion made by Gottsacker and seconded by Borden to approve the Main Street minutes of May 18, 2015. Ayes – Gottsacker, Borden, Anzia; Noes – none; Abstain – none. Motion carried. Because motion was seconded by non-committee member that was not present at May 18th meeting. Item will be addressed at future Committee meeting.
- **Public Works Committee – February 15, 2016** – – motion made by Gottsacker and seconded by Borden to approve the Public Works minutes of February 15, 2016. Ayes – Gottsacker, Borden, Anzia; Noes – none; Abstain – none. Motion carried.

Agenda items:

- **Discussion of Main Street Project as presented by Gremmer & Associates.** Tom Lanser introduced himself as the Project Manager and Jeff Chvosta as the Project Engineer and also stated that Jon Edgren, Ozaukee County Highway Commissioner would be arriving late. Purpose of the meeting is to update the village of current plans since the last informational meeting in May. At the first informational meeting several alternatives were shown and narrowed down to one plan based on input from the first meeting, public input and subsequent meetings held by the village. Gremmer & Associates displayed the current plans that will be presented at the Public Informational meeting scheduled for March 16, 5:30 to 7:30 at the Village Hall to give the Village an opportunity to view the exhibits, ask any questions, and go through the draft handout that will be shown. Lanser stated that all of this information is still a work in progress and may get tweaked based on tonight's meeting. Lanser went on to describe the current plans that were displayed in the board room. The two locations with respect to one-sided parking are West Village limits east to Elevator Lane and from Oak Street east to County Road LL are the two segments with parking on only the North side of the street. A typical section breakdown is 11 foot travel lane, 5 foot bike lane, 8 foot parking lane to face of curb and 5 foot sidewalk. For both locations the proposed center line will shift 3 feet to the south of the existing center line to equal out the green grass terrace on both sides of the road. Starting at Elevator Lane and going east, there is parking on both sides of the street to Oak Street. Eleven foot travel lane, 5 foot bike lane, 8 foot parking lane to face of curb, 5 to 6 foot sidewalk, minimum 3 foot grass terrace. Center lane shifts back to the same (current location) then shifts 3 feet to the south again after Oak Street. From Lar-Ann Street to County Road LL there is no parking with a 15 foot travel lane and 5 foot bike lane. Boehnlein asked why it was chosen not to have parking in this section. Lanser replied this was discussed at the first informational meeting. Alternatives were presented based on roadway standards, costs, and impacts and the Village selected the current alternative. Chvosta added that this block has internal parking available. Lar-Ann to Oak will have parking only on the North side. Public comment regarding a change in the

size of the sidewalk was made. Birenbaum stated that the size of the sidewalk was determined at the May 18, 2015 Main Street meeting. Public comment also asked why we cannot get parking on both sides of the street. Chvosta stated that it is possible and that both alternatives were shown at the last public information meeting. Based on collective public comments input from the Village the current plan was chosen. There was also some discussion regarding the placement of the bike path as presented. Chvosta explained that it is a standard setup for a bike lane with parking. Public question asked if the reason for no parking on both sides of the street on the east end of the project was to allow for the bike lane. Chvosta again stated that parking alternative was presented at the first meeting and because of costs and impact, the no parking option was chosen by the Village. Continued comments of disagreement with the presented plans. Jon Edgren explained that the final decision is up to the Village Board. If the Village would like to have the plans changed this can be done. He added that there would be additional costs to widen the road and that studies show that wider the roads, faster the traffic goes. Chvosta explained that if the Village would like to show another alternative at the March 16 Public Meeting, then this should be decided at this meeting tonight and explained that a change in plans could set the schedule back. Village President, Vickie Boehnlein, introduced herself and asked if Public Works/Main Street Committee has ever voted on the current plan that was presented at tonight's meeting. Borden and Gottsacker stated that they did not. She also added that the full Village Board has not officially voted on the plans also. This is of concern. She stated that at some point Gremmer was told to go ahead with the plan. Boehnlein stated that she is quite sure where the approval of the plans came from and that it was not of the authority of the board. This will need to be fixed by the Village Board. The Board will need to move forward and do what they need to do. Gottsacker pointed out that we are still in the planning stages right now. Lanser pointed out that the planning stage is 45% complete. If the Village Board wants to go in a different direction then they should give Gremmer that direction. He also pointed out that there would be costs associated with that. Edgren added that just as he is the speaker for Ozaukee County, the Village President is the speaker for the Village of Belgium. Whether or not that was Rich Howells acting out and sending off e-mails without getting confirmation from the Village Board, he does not know. What Edgren is saying is that the Village Board needs to provide direction at this point. Lanser then asked if the Village wants two alternative plans made and presented at the public information meeting scheduled for March 16. Birenbaum pointed out that from the beginning, when plans were first started in 2011 with McMahan and Associates, parking was on both sides of the street in the middle section and one side on the east and west sections. Continued discussion on the options that were presented and other options that are available. Lansers pointed out these options are all possible. A public meeting is scheduled for the 16th. We can do a couple of things. We can cancel the meeting, we can have some discussions, and then we can reschedule the meeting. Or we can go ahead and have the meeting on the 16th, the Village can tell Gremmer what they want presented at that meeting, if they want two alternatives, Gremmer will accommodate what the Village wants to present at the meeting on the 16th. A question was asked regarding the width of the street from curb to curb in the section between Oak and Lar-Ann. Chvosta responded that the existing width is between 44 and 46 feet. The proposed plan for one-sided parking is 42 feet and 48 feet is needed for parking on both sides. An additional 6 feet is needed to add a parking lane. Birenbaum asked if there is enough room to install street lights. Chvosta confirmed that there would be. The minimum clearance is two feet. He also stated that a 3 ½ foot terrace creates a very sharp driveway approach. Continued discussion regarding the present parking that takes place on Main Street. Edgren pointed out that tonight's meeting is a local, official meeting which is the second meeting that Gremmer is available to explain what they were going to be presenting at the next public meeting. He stated that the Village needs to decide what direction they want to go so that Gremmer knows what to present at the March 16th meeting. Lanser stated plans can be changed. Gremmer is required to have two informational meetings before they submit their information to the state. Once submitted and approved, the harder it is to make changes. Boehnlein asked what impact it would have to change the plans at this point. Lanser replied that a change in plans is not where the impact would be, but in the scheduling and cost of construction. Because of current historical properties, plans need to be approved by the State Historical Society which originally took five months. A change could add a year in construction planning and additional construction costs. Boehnlein then advised the committee to make a recommendation to either proceed with the plans or make changes. Borden added that someone must have Okayed these plans and that the village should move forward. Gottsacker added that if we go with wider streets and more parking that will increase taxes. *Borden made a motion to proceed with the current plans to present at the public*

informational meeting on the 16th. Motion seconded by Gottsacker. Ayes – Gottsacker, Borden, Anzia; Noes – none; Abstain – none. Motion carried.

Lanser made a clarification that per state requirements, parking is not allowed on either side of the road near the railroad crossing gates and signals. Boehnlein asked about grass growing in a 3 ½ foot terrace. Chvosta responded that is one of the drawbacks of having parking on both sides, you will be giving up terrace space and it is hard to have anything but weeds growing in such a narrow space. You do lose aesthetic appeal which was why the one-sided parking was chosen. Birenbaum asked if the two-sided street parking could be moved west one block to Victory Street to accommodate Lanser Towing. It was explained that because of no terrace available in this block, it would mean homeowners would have to give up private fixtures that are located in a public right-of-way. Lanser replied that this is a design change that can be worked through if that is what the Village wants. Lanser also stated that there are a few portions of the plan in which the Village will need to acquire temporary easements from homeowners. The Village will need to work with a real estate company to do this. Lanser talked about the options for street lighting. The DOT will cover the cost for the standard issue lighting which can range from \$390,000 to \$400,000. If the Village wants to upgrade, they would need to cover the difference. The first upgrade would be a black painted pole with a price range of \$430,000 to \$440,000. A third upgrade would be a more decorative lighting with a price at \$550,000 and over. These would be municipality owned poles. Gremmer would like to know from the Village their final lighting choice by August 1, 2016 at the latest. Preferably a month or two prior to that. The cost to bury the utilities cannot be determined until WE Energies has the final street plans from Gremmer which would be by August 1, 2016. The cost to run storm sewer to individual property will be about \$150,000. Edgren stated that the county needs a commitment from the Village if they will be completing the storm water pond as originally designed and provide a connection of the storm sewer along County Highway D. Birenbaum asked if the sewer can be designed so that a lateral can be stubbed in at a later date. The Village will communicate with the county regarding these final plans. Edgren brought up the funding information. The county's application to the DOT was for a \$4.2 million project. Gremmer came out with a +30% estimate for \$6.9 million. He believes we can come down from that. Edgren submitted the plan for \$6.9 million to the DOT and is waiting for a reply before the public meeting. There are three reply options from the state: #1 - they don't reply, option #2 - agree to up to \$6.9 million for the project, in which case he needs approval from the county and the village that their cost went from \$400,000 to \$600,000 or option #3 – funds are not available. In which case, we need to determine what the options are. Chvosta pointed out that the cost is for an asphalt roadway. Changing to concrete would be an upgrade cost of \$1 million plus. Estimate completion date is fall 2018. Project will provide access to business at all times during construction. The more restrictions the Villages puts on the contractor during construction, the more the cost of the project will go up. The Village should let Gremmer know of events that would need to be accommodated for. Post office boxes will be relocated during construction.

Motion to Adjourn: A motion to adjourn at 6:00 pm was made by Gottsacker and seconded by Borden. Ayes – Gottsacker, Borden, Anzia; Noes – none; Abstain – none. Motion carried.

Respectfully submitted,

Julie Lesar
Village Clerk
Approved 3-30-2016