

**Minutes of the Public Works Committee
January 31, 2008**

Chair Ken Herro called the meeting to order at 8:31 a.m.

Committee Members Present: County Board Supervisors Ken Herro (Chair), Karl Nilson, Dave Swan, Dennis Farrell, Fritz Ruf and Joe Marchese. **Absent:** Supervisor Peter Wolff

Also Present: County Board Chief of Staff Lee Esler, Highway Operations Manager Peter Chladil, Business Manager Betsy Crosswaite, Budget Management Specialist Linda Witkowski, Director of Public Works Rich Bolte, Buildings Operations Manager Mark Keckeisen and Legislative Associate Karen Phillips.

Correspondence

- Milwaukee Journal Sentinel article regarding Menomonee Falls water contract
Esler spoke further on the subject of the recent discontinuation of bus route 9 mentioned in the article.
- Letter from Delafield City Administrator regarding Resolution 2008-03, requesting a speed study
- Letter from Chenequa Village Administrator/Police Chief regarding new parking ordinance creating no parking zones
- Letter from WisDOT regarding the Final Calculation for 2008 General Transportation Aids
Esler explained the details of this item to the Committee members.

Ruf arrived at 8:33 a.m.

Future Agenda Items

- Herro stated he would like to discuss/develop specification for a regional mall
- Swan would like to further discuss the possible expansion of Halquist Stone and the County's involvement in regard to the intersection of Maple Avenue and Highway K.
- Herro requested an update on the front door security issue.
- Herro stated he would like Gary Evans explain the County road plan for Janesville Road

Approve Minutes of November 29, 2007, and December 13, 2007

MOTION: Ruf moved, Farrell second, to approve the minutes of November 29, 2007. Motion carried 6-0.

MOTION: Ruf moved, Farrell second, to approve the minutes of December 13, 2007. Motion carried 6-0.

Executive Committee Report

Esler stated the Committee reviewed the following items:

- Non-Departmental Audit
- Proposed Scope of Audit for Health and Human Services Intake/Shared Services Division
- The County Board and Committee Calendar (April-December 2008)

Status Update and Tour of the Relocation Area of the Facilities Management Division Staff in the Courthouse and Administration Buildings

Keckeisen explained that the Facilities Management offices are moving for the purpose of improving its operational efficiency. This move will consolidate staff, materials, parts and supplies in one area rather than scattered in many different County locations. IS will take over Facilities vacated space, as they are

very crowded in their present location. ADRC is moving to the HHS building, vacating their offices in the Administration Center. Keckeisen explained ADRC's vacated area would be used as a swing space for his department while their new location is under construction. Their new location will be utilizing part of the Records Management area and adjacent space near the loading dock area. He handed out a diagram of the proposed relocation plan.

Swan asked how much money was spent in the 2007 budget to acquire the carpenter, move the fire alarm and purchase materials. Keckeisen stated the budget was reviewed in 2007 and purchase orders were created for the needs of this project. He stated the dollar amount spent was approximately \$50,000. He stated that, basically, walls are being constructed within the space to make it conducive to their needs. Room G06 will be a shared conference room for Facilities and Records Management. Keckeisen stated most of the work would be done in -house. The new space will accommodate all staff and will enable a much more efficiently run operation. He stated it is important to have more "face time" with staff to maintain good working relationships and long-term efficiencies.

Esler stated that the walking tour will provide for an easier visualization of the proposed plan. The Committee, with the exception of Marchese, then toured the aforementioned areas slated for the relocation project. Keckeisen and Bolte answered the questions raised by the Committee members during the walking tour.

Discuss and Consider Ordinance 162-O-092: Modify The Transportation Fund 2007 Budget For Additional State And County Highway Maintenance

Bolte began by introducing Chladil, a 20 year veteran of the department, who was promoted to Highway Operations Manager in November.

Bolte stated there were much higher than average snow removal requirements in December on State and County highways. This ordinance is being presented to basically "clean-up" the Highway Operations budget without a draw on the contingency fund. He explained that while a significant amount of money was spent on the County side, a sizable amount of money was made on the State side, balancing the expenditures for the County with the revenue from the State.

MOTION: Nilson moved, Farrell second, to approve Ordinance 162-O-092.

Crosswaite stated similar ordinances have been done in the past, most recently in 2005. This ordinance appropriates additional expenditure authority totaling \$885,000 in the Public Works Transportation Fund 2007 budget for both State and County Highway Maintenance operations costs within the County. She stated the additional expenditures will be funded with additional revenue reimbursements totaling \$795,000 for work performed on State highways and additional revenue over budget of \$90,000 from the sale of salt to municipalities. The State revenue reimbursements, which have been earned primarily in the month of December, are for labor (including overtime), materials, equipment charges and administrative costs.

Crosswaite reviewed some of the specific expenditures, stating that the actual overtime costs in December were over \$186,000 for the State and County roads. Bolte added that a whole winter's worth of salt was used in December. Crosswaite explained stated that \$1.2 million was spent on road salt for the calendar year for the County; the State salt usage is not run through the County's budget.

Ruf left at 10:05 a.m.

Bolte explained the budget year for salt runs from about October to March/April of the next calendar year, so one winter season runs over a portion of two County budgets. Marchese asked Bolte to clarify how much additional salt will need to be purchased. Bolte stated 4,000 tons, which could be needed for just one storm. He stated the currently a sand/salt mixture at a 3:1 ratio of sand to salt is being used due to the dwindled salt supply. Due to the lack of availability of salt from the contract supplier, additional salt must be purchased and shipped from Minnesota at two times the price.

Ruf returned at 10:08 a.m.

Bolte explained the State revenues are primarily for December events. He said there is not a budgetary control from the State; the State will pay for whatever work is done.

Bolte continued by explaining that alternatively, an ordinance could have been proposed which would put the State revenue in Fund Balance, and on the County side tap money from the Contingency Fund.

Esler stated the core issue is that, in getting almost \$900,000 in State revenue, the majority of it is going to the County Highway Operations. It works because the State Highway Operations budget was set conservatively; the County Highway Operations budget is set more generously. The State revenue is used to pay for State expenses that we bill them for, and the rest of the State revenue is applied to County expenditures. Esler said the mystery in the Fiscal Note is that while the revenue is from the State and the sale of salt, the bulk of it is applied to the County Highway Operations.

Bolte explained the reason is that if less State work and more County work is done, there is no County revenue to back that up. In that case, some may question why each month we are not making the State revenue we expected, because that has a negative impact on the County. There is no money to back it up, and no room for error on the County side. Herro asked Bolte if that meant that revenues from the State are under budgeted, hoping we get more. Bolte stated everything possible is done to earn the minimum of State revenue put into the budget.

Motion carried 6-0

Discuss and Consider Ordinance 162-O-093: Modify The 2008 Capital Budget To Create Project 200827 State Salt Shed And Appropriate WIDOT Funding

MOTION: Nilson moved, Farrell second, to approve Ordinance 162-O-093.

Bolte began by explaining that the State would like a salt storage facility built at their expense. He said the State has wanted this for some time, and though resisting in the past, he has now agreed to create this project. The State has provided the County with \$500,000 in funding to construct the additional shed. This would allow for the construction of a 10,000 ton storage capacity salt dome on the grounds at the County Highway Operations facility.

Herro asked why the State wants their own storage shed. Bolte explained that the State has a policy of keeping their salt undercover, with a goal of storing 130% of the average annual usage amount of 25,000 tons. Bolte said that currently we do not come even near that amount.

Bolte stated there are three possible locations at the Highway Operations Facility on Woodburn Road, in the vicinity of the existing dome. Sketches of the site with three proposed shed locations were distributed. Bolte said this would be the most convenient location, since that is primarily where the staffing, brine making system and fueling stations are located.

Esler asked how the County benefits from this project. Bolte stated the County does not benefit. Esler inquired why, then, are we doing this? Bolte stated because it was requested by the State, and we maintain their roads and make money doing so. He added that he could not identify a reason not to go ahead with this project. Bolte added that the county residents would get better maintained highways. There will be far less likelihood of running out of salt, as well as providing the State the ability to buy salt less expensively in the beginning of the season and store it.

Esler questioned whether this dome would be larger or smaller than the existing one. Bolte stated it would be larger. Esler asked if the additional shed could be built at another location in the County. Bolte stated that yes, it could be, but it is most practical at the Woodburn Road location, and there is room for it there.

Esler asked if a permit would be needed from the City. Bolte stated it most likely would. Herro questioned if there is an aesthetic concern with the City. Esler agreed, stating it could be considered an eyesore. Bolte stated he did not know of any such concerns at this point.

Esler asked if there is a land lease cost to the State. Bolte stated there is not. He stated the salt shed will be on County property, and the State will own the shed and will be responsible for the maintenance of it. Esler questioned whether this is a universal policy throughout the State, in other municipalities. Bolte stated that yes, it is. Esler then questioned Bolte what his rationale was for refusing this in the past, and what made him decide upon it this year, when the State has wanted it for years. Bolte answered that perhaps he had been obstinate in the past, and he is accepting and open to it now.

Motion carried 6-0.

Status Update on Public Works Capital Projects

Herro asked if there were any updates to present at this time. Bolte stated he will prepare a report and go through the projects systematically at a later date.

Esler asked for an update about the Janesville Road project, being that it was the topic of recent newspaper articles. Bolte stated the City of Muskego is trying to create a sense of downtown, and discussed some possible options including the possibility of roundabouts. Bolte stated he informed City officials he is willing to work with them, but in the end, this is still a major County arterial highway. The City's plan is for the road to go around the city center.

Esler stated the Highway P issue will go before the Transportation Improvement Planning Committee on February 7, and they will act upon whether or not Highway P will be included in the plan. He stated he would guess there may be some opposition to it, and if it is not approved, it cannot be built using Federal funds. Swan stated he would like to see it done, because it will be needed at some point in the future and the cost will be much higher.

Public Works Committee
1-31-2008

MOTION: Ruf moved, Swan, second, to adjourn the meeting at 10:57 a.m. Motion carried 6-0.

Respectfully submitted,

Joe C. Marchese
Secretary