

CITY OF VERONA

MINUTES

PUBLIC WORKS/SEWER & WATER COMMITTEE

MONDAY, APRIL 22, 2019

1. The meeting was called to order by Mr. Touchett at 5:21pm.
2. Roll Call: Present: Evan Touchett, Chad Kemp, and Sarah Gaskell. Also present: Theran Jacobson, Public Works Director; Jeff Montpas, City Engineer, AECOM; Adam Sayre, Interim City Administrator; Carla Fischer, AECOM; Bill Dunlop, JSD; Tomas Toro, JSD; Fred DeVillers, FDG.
3. MOVED by Touchett, seconded by Kemp, to approve the minutes of the April 8, 2019 meeting of the Public Works/Sewer and Water Committee. Motion carried 3-0.
4. Mr. Jacobson stated that Construction Related Services for transportation improvements adjacent to west side Verona High School campus was outside of the staff ability for the City to handle, and that the City would contract this out and act as a pass-through for this project, and pass the costs along to the VASD. Mr. Jacobson detailed the research the city has done to review the possible contractors and recommends KL Engineering. Mr. Jacobson informed the VASD last month and previous Friday that the City would be contracting this out, and he had not heard back from VASD regarding this.

MOVED by Gaskell, seconded by Kemp, to recommend approval of professional services agreement for Construction Related Services for transportation improvements adjacent to west side Verona High School campus with KL Engineering, contingent upon legal review by the council, and not to exceed \$293,884.00. Motion carried 3-0.

5. Mr. Jacobson listed a review of past discussion items concerning Whispering Coves Subdivision, including minimum right-of-way widths, school site location/traffic and road adjacent to the school and storm water management facilities.

Review of most current submittal from Mr. Dunlop:

- Only one retaining wall SE corner near pond between Kettle Creek North
- Working with landowner to south to combine basins
- East 40 basins resized larger to handle events so there is no requirement for individual lots; volume control, treatment and infiltration for back-to-back 100 year events can be handled by the basins
- Likely basins will be combined to circle the conservancy
- Includes control for school site and east 40
- Pump station operations three modes:
 - Continual flow to have an amenity.
 - Need for infiltrate because of a storm event, pump either into that amenity which would run through different infiltration ponds or into a specific filtration pond through valving. Valving would be controlled from the panel at the pump station.
 - After catastrophic event, after infiltrate for 48 hrs, give the basins a rest and pump excess to west to the dry trib.
- Currently doing a sensitivity analysis to determine how much of the development they can construct without having to construct a force main to the west
- Experience in Stoughton: they were able to do phase I and II before needing the emergency element
- No sense putting force main in before needed

Mr. Touchett: Will you cover insurance policy for basements that flood after first two phases are built?
Mr. Dunlop: The analysis has been done that shows basement elevations are two feet above back-to-back 100 year events. Stoughton example increases confidence. Sensitivity analysis will provide force main construction information.

Mr. Jacobson: What storm event will get to within two feet of freeboard requirements without pumps? 4"?

Mr. Dunlop: We will do that sensitivity analysis with pumps running and with pumps failing.

There were several continued questions and clarifications by Committee members on timing.

Mr. Touchett: What's the impact on the Backus property? Will that be part of analysis?

Mr. Dunlop: Yes, that analysis has already been done and Carla Fischer can talk to that. Both 100 year event and back-to-back 100 year events stay under elevation of existing property.

Continued discussions on 500-year or worse events, number of pumps, pump noise levels. Public Works Committee indicated they would likely not support channel and continuous pumping. Costs of additional wear and tear on pumps and lift stations for a visual amenity should not be supported by rate payers.

Mr. Jacobson: In order to meet infiltration requirements, developers will have to move water around on-site.

Mr. Dunlop: Yes, we will have to. Eastern 40 of residential area drains to basins and there is no soil there that can infiltrate. We will have to pump it up to infiltrate.

Ms. Fischer: How big will the main infiltration basin have to be to meet the requirements without re-circulation? 4x? 2x?

Mr. Dunlop: Physically I don't see how that's going to work. If I remember from Cory's analysis, it's a function of topography of the lot and there's not enough area of soil to do what you want to do, and everything to the east is already downstream of that spot, so we already have to pump it there anyways just to get the infiltration requirements for that portion, which is roughly 80 acres.

Mr. Toro: What we are trying to do here is use a resource that we have that would otherwise be dry. Once a storm is over, the water that would naturally reach that area will dissipate, and instead of pumping excess water elsewhere to the dry trib, to pump it here instead.

Continued discussions on environmental waste of constant pumping, and not using more natural draining processes.

Ms. Gaskell: Amenity not needed. No need for the City to set a precedent of coming to an agreement with a developer for having an amenity.

- School road width did not change, right-of-way to stay within 66' minimum. School site is still in limbo.

Ms. Gaskell: From the trail perspective, can we run it from where it's popping into the school site on the north there, out to McKee as well?

Mr. Dunlop: There are some significant grade issues there, we could not get it ADA accessible. That's why we show the path along the roadway, the grades even out. It would be a more suitable route.

Continued discussion on switchbacks and kids on bikes, snowplowing operations, pathway networks, sidewalks maintained by PW must be at least 6'.

- Mr. Jacobson: Intersection approaches are still showing sweeps, that's a racetrack. Design standards that the FDM has that Montpas can provide, there should be a 13 degree skew
Mr. Dunlop: We are trying to keep that feature in there to keep the traffic flowing.
Mr. Jacobson: We use the standards on urban streets in Verona, and they slow people down. No one

will yield otherwise. It will accommodate pedestrian crossings.

Ms. Gaskell: We are more concerned with safety than keeping traffic moving, especially near schools. I have no problem with people stopping there.

Mr. Jacobson: I still don't like the geographics of these intersections, I'd rather see less of a skew. This is probably more like 40 degrees. Less will slow drivers down.

No action taken. Touchett left the meeting at 6:00pm.

6. MOVED by Kemp, seconded by Gaskell, to adjourn at 6:16pm. Motion carried 2-0.