



Public Works Committee
Tuesday, March 8, 2022
6:00 p.m.
Community Room
Municipal Building -1st Floor
312 W Whitewater Street
Whitewater, WI 53190

MINUTES

1. Call to order and roll call

The meeting was called to order by McCormick at 6:00 p.m. The meeting was held at the Municipal Building in the Community Room on the 1st floor.

Present: Allen, Schreiber, McCormick
Others: Brad Marquardt, Cameron Clapper

2. Approval of minutes from January 11, 2022

A motion to approve the minutes from the January 11, 2022 meeting was made by Allen and seconded by Schreiber.

AYES: Allen, Schreiber, McCormick. NOES: None. ABSENT: None.

3. Hearing of Citizen Comments

There were no citizen comments at that time.

4. New Business

a. Discussion and Possible Action regarding award of East Main Street Reconstruction Contract 1-2022.

Marquardt stated they received four bids for the project and they were opened on February 23, 2022. The lowest bid was from Rock Road Companies at \$2,279,109.49. Marquardt stated Rock Road did the Clay Street project, which was a DOT project. Strand and Marquardt have no issues with Rock Road and therefore recommended approving and awarding the contract to Rock Road Companies. This item would then go to the full Council for action.

Allen moved to approve this recommendation and seconded by Schreiber.

AYES: Schreiber, McCormick, Allen. NOES: None. ABSENT: None.

b. Discussion and Possible Action regarding award of Yoder Lane Reconstruction Contract 2-2022.

Marquardt stated this was the second bid that was opened on February 23, 2022. They did the two bids together, so there was basically one package and the contractor could have bid on both of them. They even asked if there would be a deduct if they were low on both of them or if there was any advantage to them bidding on both of them. Only one company did do that option and it did not factor into the lowest bid. He stated they did have five bidders. The same four as East Main Street, plus RR Walton. This time the lowest bid was from Fischer Excavating at \$552,147.00. Marquardt stated they have done work in the

City before and have also worked with Strand in the past. Marquardt asked for approval on the project. He also wanted to mention the Yoder Lane project came in about \$10,000 over the budgeted amount. However, the East Main Street project came in about \$400,000 under budget. Therefore, since they are borrowing for both projects at the same time, the combination of the two will be under the total budgeted amount. Therefore, it fits with the overall budget. Marquardt stated again that he recommended the bid going to Fischer Excavating and this as well would then move on to Council for approval.

Allen made a motion to recommend the approval of the Yoder Lane project and seconded by Schreiber.

AYES: McCormick, Allen, Schreiber. NOES: None. ABSENT: None.

c. Discussion and Possible Action regarding approving contractor for Wastewater Influent Wetwell Coating.

Marquardt stated Reel reached out to three painting contractors for quotes. As Reel stated in the memo, maintenance has not been done since 1981. The coating would be for the concrete structure along with other items such as upgrading the stairs that lead down to the different levels and other structural steel. Committee members' packets show two quotes from contractors. Marquardt stated he received another quote after the packets went out for delivery, which was from Omni at \$259,000. The budgeted amount was for \$275,000. The quote received from Howard Grote & Sons was for \$184,138.00 and is well within the budgeted amount. Marquardt recommended moving forward with the Howard Grote & Sons quote to do this work. He did speak with Attorney McDonnell about this item and it is truly a maintenance project because of coating of the existing structure that is already there. Therefore, we do not have to publicly bid this project. Allen asked if it needed to be painted. Marquardt stated yes, it does need to be painted to keep the integrity of the concrete and the grating so it doesn't deteriorate over time. He stated especially with the concrete and the hydrogen sulfide gas, which provides for corrosive conditions. Allen asked if it was a special paint and Marquardt stated yes. Allen asked why no maintenance hadn't been done since 1981. Marquardt did not have an answer to that question. Clapper asked if the wetwell could be completely bypassed. Marquardt stated you can bypass the wetwell. He stated the project is being done above the water level, so they don't have to shut it down. There is no steel under the water level. It is just the concrete structure, which is in better shape because it's not exposed to gases. McCormick asked how much water is in the wetwell. Marquardt stated he did not know that answer.

AYES: Allen, Schreiber, McCormick. NOES: None. ABSENT: None.

d. Discussion and Possible Action regarding selection of 2024 construction projects for design in 2023.

Marquardt stated he heard from some contractors that there were going to be issues with being able to obtain water materials for construction projects this year. There is also going to be a flood of money coming out shortly for projects through the DOT for the next five years. Then, you include the ARPA money that cities have received and that brings a flood of construction projects out there. Marquardt's thinking behind this is the sooner we can have things designed and ready for bidding, the better. This year we bid in February but if we could bid in December it would be to our benefit. This would allow us to start the survey in 2022 and Strand could start working on the design over the winter of 2022/2023 and finish it in 2023. That way we could iron out any details ahead of time and have public information meetings and have the plans ready by November or December. That would allow us to bid out if it makes sense, at that time, and hopefully, get ahead of other cities and get contractors on board before they start filling up with other projects. Marquardt stated that was the reasoning for bringing up this item.

Streets projects for 2024 include: Ann Street (Fremont Street to Trippe Street), this will also include a portion of Fremont Street from Ann Street to James Street or the railroad tracks, Fremont Street (Starin Road to City Limits/Whitewater Creek), Putnam Street (Janesville Street to Walworth Avenue), Forest Street (Church Street to 4th Street).

The streets were selected based not only on the pavement condition, but the need to replace or upsize sanitary sewer and/or watermain. Another road to be looked at in 2026 would be Jefferson Street, from Main Street to Starin Road.

To go along with that, he mentioned there would be extra money coming out. There is the Bipartisan Infrastructure Law, know as BIL, that is the federal money that has been given to States for infrastructure. The DOT will be having a webinar to go over how cities can apply for this money. It would be through the Surface Transportation Program (STP) where cities would need to complete an application and it would get ranked among other projects. Those projects go through the DOT design process, much like Clay Street and it is a period of time to get through the design and all of the extra paperwork that is involved. Those projects would be paid at 80% from the DOT and 20% from the City on stormsewer and street work. Any cost associated with sanitary sewer and water main is still 100% on the City because it's utility work. In order to be eligible for the program, the street has to be a collector, or a minor or major arterial in the City. Some eligible streets would include Main Street, Walworth Ave., Janesville Street, Fremont Street. Therefore, he will be looking at projects and possibly submitting the paperwork through the STP application process. After the webinar they will have an internal meeting and will then reach out to the DOT to get additional information regarding the streets they would be looking at. He would then bring back the information to the Public Works Committee. Applications are not due until June 3, 2022. The STP monies would be for 2022 – 2027. McCormick asked if any type of action was needed for this item. Marquardt stated as long as there is no objection he will move forward with starting the process to get some tasks orders going and working with Strand. Allen said kudos to Marquardt for getting a jump start on this program.

e. Discussion and Possible Action regarding 2021 DNR Sanitary Survey Report for the Water Utility.

Marquardt stated the Sanitary Survey Report is done every three years. The sanitary survey evaluates the system's source, facilities, equipment, operation, maintenance, and management as they relate to providing safe drinking water.

The survey identified no significant deficiencies, two deficiencies, three recommendations and no non-conforming features. The two deficiencies include the lack of adequate 24 mesh stainless steel screens and inadequate separation of discharge piping. Marquardt stated those two items have already been taken care of and were submitted to the DNR. One recommendation included adding orthophosphate for corrosion control, which they will probably not do at this time. It would just be another chemical they would have to purchase for no reason. Another recommendation was to continue to monitor screens covering chemical vents, air vents and overflows. The last recommendation was to conduct an emergency "table-top" exercise to practice emergency situations. Marquardt will talk with Bergner about looking in to this recommendation.

Marquardt stated there is no action needed on this item. He just wanted to make the committee aware that this is done every three years. Our facility is in very good shape and being taken care of. The work the operators are doing shows in this report.

McCormick asked if the orthophosphate is the same phosphate they are trying to eliminate. Marquardt stated yes and that would add phosphorus to the system, which ultimately ends up in the wastewater plant.

f. Discussion and Possible Action regarding approval of Strand Task Order 22-03, 2022 Street Maintenance.

Marquardt stated this would be tied to their annual Street's Maintenance Program. They try and do some improvements to some of the streets surfaces where the curb and gutter are in good shape and there is no stormsewer work and the sanitary sewer and water is in good shape. This year, they are looking at placing an asphalt surface over the deteriorated concrete on Janesville Street, from Walworth Avenue to the railroad tracks. Marquardt stated this is one of the streets he will be looking at for applying for the BIL funding. He said he is looking at a temporary fix to buy us some time. There is nothing stating that

we will get any money from the BIL, so we need to maintain the streets. Also, they are looking at repaving Newcomb Street, from Milwaukee Street to Clay Street, and Bishop Street, from Newcomb Street to Clay Street. Additionally, staff is planning on chip sealing Caine Street, Gault Street and Clark Street, and placing an asphalt sealer on Center Street, Boone Court and Summit Street.

The task order is for Strand to help put together the plans and the specifications and contract documents so we can publicly bid this job out.

McCormick asked when this job would take place. Marquardt stated it would happen this year. They would try and get it done over the summer when school is out. McCormick stated it was very confusing based on the information listed on the document. Under Schedule – services will begin upon execution of this Task Order, which is anticipated the week of March 14, 2022. Services are scheduled for completion on December 30, 2022. Marquardt stated that sentence is just for their services. To go along with this, they do review pay requests. Just assuming there is an outstanding item, they took it through the end of the year for their services. The actual construction work will more than likely take place over the summer.

Allen asked if we do Janesville Street in asphalt as a temporary solution can we come back and put in concrete? Marquardt stated that would be one of the decisions that, if approved for reconstruction, they would have to investigate as to whether it should be concrete or pavement. That decision would ultimately be brought back to the Public Works Committee for determination. Allen commented that it takes a lot of beating from trucks and it should be cement. Marquardt stated it is very possible that is what it could turn out to be.

McCormick asked if a recommendation was needed. Marquardt stated he needed approval from the committee to approve the Strand Task order. A motion was made by Schreiber and seconded by Allen.

AYES: Allen, Schreiber, McCormick. NOES: None. ABSENT: None.

g. Discussion and Possible Action regarding 2021 Municipal Separate Storm Sewer System (MS4) Annual Report.

Marquardt stated that every year the City is required, by the DNR, to submit an Annual Report for the City's Municipal Separate Storm Sewer System (MS4) Permit by March 31. Information required for the permit consists of: Public Education and Outreach; Public Involvement and Participation; Illicit Discharge Detection and Elimination; Construction Site Pollutant Control; Post-Construction Storm Water Management; Pollution Prevention; Storm Sewer Map; and Fiscal Analysis.

The first portion of the report asks about:

1. Public Education and Outreach – the City of Whitewater is part of the Rock River Storm Group comprised of about 10 other communities. Creative marketing students from UW-Whitewater help the organization put together information for public education outreach. Each month they do something different where they post to social media or a website. They do an excellent job on the topics that have been chosen to meet the City's permit.
2. Public Involvement and Participation – the Rock River Storm Group is also involved in this area as well to help us meet this requirement.
3. Minimum Control Measures – Marquardt stated there are 83 outfalls within the City. Routine inspections need to be done on these on a regular basis and that is on the list for this year to improve upon. They did five last year and they need to be done in dry weather, which would have been an excellent time to do them last year with the dry weather. The weather conditions last year did allow for other work to be done by the street's crew. They just simply ran out of time to complete the rest of this project.

4. Construction Site Pollutant Control – this requires regular inspections on sites over one (1) acre. Last year there were five sites of one (1) acre or more that were on going.
5. Post-Construction Storm Water Management - between Marquardt and our municipal zoning inspectors (from Neighborhood Services) erosion control inspections are done and tracked. They also track any warnings they issue, such as verbal warnings and written warnings, which are emails that tell the developers there are issues that the City sees that will need to be corrected.
6. Pollution Prevention - asks how many stormwater management facilities the City had and there are currently 18 of them. Marquardt stated that five of them were inspected and they did maintenance on four of them. Maintenance entailed cleaning out woody vegetation that should not be in detention ponds. They also had to make sure the outfalls were clear and that there was no structural damage to the integrity of the bases. Marquardt stated they do have two Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plans (SWPP). They are at the City garage and at the compost site. They just need to make sure and look for run off from the sites, which could be oil or grease. Our street sweeping program estimated the removal of 5 tons of material from our streets last year. It was reported that 319 catch basin sumps were cleaned in 2021. Of that, 36 tons of material was collected. The leaf collection program collected leaves for one week in October and two weeks in November. Therefore, we get credit for phosphorus removal for the collection of leaves. The report does ask how much salt, sand and brine we put down. This information was not yet completed at the time of the meeting. He is waiting on updated information from Freeman. It also asks for how much education has been done for staff. A few crew members from the Streets Dept. have attended some classes on salt training. They try to send a few people each year.
7. Storm Sewer System Map – it asks for an updated storm sewer map and it also asks for our expenditures that we do on our storm water, which comes from the Stormwater Utility. Marquardt stated there is a lot of paperwork they started tracking about three years ago, which is making it easier to report to the DNR.

Marquardt stated he did not need any motion on this item. It was just for discussion purposes.

h. Discussion and Possible Action regarding change in downtown decorative street light design.

Marquardt stated in 2018, the City replaced 56 of the old decorative street lights on Main Street, Center Street, 2nd Street and 1st Street. The lights were purchased from Sternberg Lighting. The remaining 112 old street lights were approved in the 2022/2023 budget for replacement at a cost of \$364,000. The recent quote they received from Sternberg Lighting came in at \$446,600.

The City also received a competitive quote from a different light supplier, Sun Valley, at a cost of \$278,800. The style of the light matches relatively closely to the style previously used for the first 56 lights; however, the base and the light fixture are slightly different. The number was based off a quote received from Sternberg Lighting in the fall of 2021. The verbal quote from Sun Valley could save the City approximately \$40,000 - \$60,000. They are working on getting updated written quotes from both suppliers.

Staff is seeking a recommendation from the Public Works Committee if they are comfortable going with a different supplier to save money even though the design is slightly different. Staff does not believe the difference is noticeable enough. If the Sun Valley design is selected, the lights would not be immediately adjacent to a Sternberg light. The Sun Valley lights would be on different streets or starting across an intersection from the Sternberg lights.

McCormick asked if the base coating from Sun Valley will be better than Sternberg? Marquardt thought that is one of the reasons why the lights were updated to avoid further corrosion.

Marquardt asked for a vote to proceed with this item. The committee agreed to move forward with the alternate company.

AYES: Schreiber, Allen, McCormick. NOES: None. ABSENT: None.

i. Discussion and Possible Action regarding update to Phosphorus Compliance at Wastewater Facility.

Marquardt stated that Reel gave this committee an update at the January 2022 meeting regarding phosphorus compliance. It was noted that the Wastewater Facility did submit a Multi-Discharge Variance application to the DNR and it was denied. The next alternative was to do what is called a Discharge Variance Self Directed Project. They were looking at converting two agricultural field, located adjacent to the Wastewater Utility, into a conservation tall grass prairie, which will eliminate run off from the fields into nearby waterways. The fields were tested and had enough phosphorus to give them credit. Reel received verbal approval from the DNR that this project would be acceptable and would help us meet our compliance. Reel and Marquardt are in the process right now of finalizing the application with the DNR. This includes going through the final checklist and submitting everything that is required. Marquardt stated one of the things they would like to start doing to comply is to be able to seed the two fields in May or June of 2022. This would help them get an extra year of compliance. Reel has received two quotes so far and they are both under \$10,000. One quote was in the \$8,000 range and the other quote received (from EC3) on March 8, 2022 (not included in the packet) was in the \$6,000 range. Marquardt stated what they were looking for from the committee was their approval to continue with this agenda item. They feel it is in the best interest of the City, at this point in time, and has the least amount of financial impact to the City. It is under \$10,000 and they won't have to make any improvements to the plant. They would also not have to make any payments to the County for work that would be done outside the City, since the two fields are part of the City. There will be some maintenance to the fields over time that will have to be done to keep them in the state of prairie grass. Long-term it will still be better for the City. Marquardt believed it was a 10-year agreement with the DNR. After the 10 years, they will have to see if they can continue the project.

Marquardt stated again he was looking for approval from the committee to continue working on this agenda item and move it on to Council. He would like the full draft agreement sent to the full Council, assuming the Public Works Committee agrees to continue. Allen stated he thought this was a great solution and McCormick said definitely a cost savings for sure.

AYES: All via voice vote (3)

NOES: None

5. Future Agenda Items

There were no future agenda items at that time.

6. Adjournment

Schreiber moved to adjourn the Public Works Committee meeting at 6:57 p.m. and seconded by McCormick.

AYES: All via voice vote (3)

NOES: None

Respectfully submitted,

Alison Stoll, Administrative Assistant
Department of Public Works