

City of Washington
Public Works Committee
Monday, November 2, 2020 – **Minutes**

Location: Five Points Banquet Room D

Present: Alderman Mike Brownfield, Alderman Dave Dingledine, Alderman Lili Stevens

Also Present: Mayor Gary Manier, Alderman Daniel Cobb, City Administrator Ray Forsythe, Planning and Development Director Jon Oliphant, City Engineer Dennis Carr, Utilities Superintendent Brian Rittenhouse, Exec. Administrative Assistant Maureen Lyons, John and Sharon Amdall, Case Pudik, the Montgomery's

Absent: Alderman Brett Adams

Alderman Brownfield called the meeting to order at 5:00 p.m.

1. Alderman Wishing to be Heard on Non-Agenda Item:
 - A. None
2. Citizens Wishing to be Heard on Non-Agenda Item:
 - A. John and Sharon Amdall - First, we want to thank Dennis Carr and Jon Oliphant for providing conservative estimates on this capital project for the City of Washington. We continue to appreciate these conservative approaches. The estimate for Washington Estates Flood Mitigation Plan to be funded by BRIC includes \$400,000 for purchasing property easements, which is more than 20% of the total project cost. We probably do not fully understand this situation, but on the surface, it appears that the beneficiaries of the Flood Mitigation Plan, rather than facing a special assessment to solve a site-specific problem, are in fact on a path to receive well over \$1 million in publicly-funded infrastructure improvements, plus a payment for property easements.

Our suggestion is to ask each of these property owners to sign a property easement agreement at no cost or nominal cost before the City of Washington proceeds with this Flood Mitigation Plan. If property owners are unwilling to sign a property easement, then we are certain that the City of Washington has other pressing infrastructure needs where \$1,800,000 could be spent to improve the City of Washington. Again, we probably do not understand the situation, so we would appreciate hearing some specific discussion about the property easement purchases during the decision process on whether to proceed with Item F on tonight's agenda.

3. Approval of Minutes: Alderman Dingledine made a motion to approve the meeting minutes from October 5, 2020. Alderman Brownfield seconded the motion. All approved. Motion carried and minutes were approved.
4. Business Items:
 - A. **Valve Assessment Bid Award** - The City has close to 1,440 water supply valves throughout the city. Of these, the city has the size recorded for 1,364 of these. This leaves 73 valves of unknown size. During IEPA's last inspection, they informed the City that their current practice should be to exercise each valve once per year. The city has not been exercising the valves due to a lack of manpower and manual valve turning program.

An initial valve turning program was placed out for bid. The bid requires the contractor to create a GPS layer with sub foot location, valve characteristics, and a surroundings assessment of the valve

box. This layer will then be used to help adjust our current GIS data to more accurately display our water system.

Fiscal Impact: \$81,999 to assess the 1,364 valves that we show a size for. We are also looking for an additional 8,000 that will account for the 73 unknown valve diameters that will be priced once diameter is determined. Staff budgeted \$82,000 in Account # 500-00-510-9000. The additional \$8,000 will come from the savings on the water filter replacement project. Staff requests that the Public Works Committee move the approval of \$90,000 for the assessment of 1,364 know valves diameters, 73 unknown valve diameters, and for any unforeseen issues to tonight's City Council meeting for approval.

Comments: Mike Brownfield asked for reassurance that turning valves wouldn't break during process. While there is not guarantee, Dennis Carr assured that they have informed the contractor to not force turn.

Is this a \$90,000 cost every year? Dennis Carr said that the City may be able to cover most of the cost by doing the program inhouse and on our own in the future. Dennis has had conversations with Morton and they have a sole employee that does the turning program and he can inquire as to the cost. Dingledine says that once we get the valves moving, the labor to get valves moving in the future is not nearly as extensive.

Alderman Dingledine made a motion to recommend approval to the City Council, Seconded by Alderman Brownfield. All approved and motion carried.

- B. **Morton Building Pay Request** - Council will remember approving Morton Building for replacement of the roof on the east building of the street department shop in August of this year. The City is in receipt of pay request number two in the amount of \$22,061.00 for the completion of the roof repairs.

Staff recommends payment to Morton Building in the full amount of \$22,061.00, but will expect reimbursement for the amount of \$5,910.00 from Seven Brothers Painting.

Staff would like to move to Council to approve full amount.

Comments: No questions. Brownfield to make motion to approve and move to council. Seconded by Dave Dingledine.

C. **Stratford Change Order #2 and Pay Request #5** - At the January 6 ,2020 council meeting, City Council awarded the construction of Stratford Drive Bridge to N.E. Finch for a price of \$572,949.80. There had been one previous change order for an additional \$26,763 that brought the contract to \$599,712.80. This change order is for \$5,368.36 which would bring the contract to \$605,081.16.

This change order is to add the cost of the City's decision to shut the project down during the initial COVID lockdown. The contractor had excavated down to the watermain and found that the watermain was transite. This finding was going to require the city to shut the water off to this section of town which was undesirable during the initial COVID lockdown. The city has also received the fifth pay estimate for a total of \$238,541.16.

Pay Request 1 - \$25,322.50

Pay Request 2 - \$32,851.00

Pay Request 3 - \$77,996.48

Pay Request 4 - \$44,718.70

Pay Request 5 - \$238,541.16

Total Contract Remaining - \$185,651.32

The work has been completed and staff recommends payment to N.E. Finch in the amount of \$238,541.16.

Comments: No questions. Motion to pass onto Council for pay of change order for \$5,368.36. Brownfield first. Dingledine second.

D. Lawndale Pay Request #6 and Change Order #3 - In a past council meeting, City Council awarded the construction of Lawndale to Stark Excavating for a price of \$1,798,518.76. There have been two change orders for an additional \$49,552.42. This brought the contract to \$1,848,071.18. This change order is for \$22,042.40 which would bring the contract to \$1,870,113.58.

The increase in asphalt and curb was from the adjusted sideroad limits that arose from the location of the sanitary laterals of all the homes in the SSA. The plan limits were going to stop the project short of a few of the homes' service and that was not the intent of the project. The tree removal was an oversight of the designer. The tree was within 8 inches of the existing driveway, but the change in driveway slope caused this tree to need to be removed.

The city has received the fifth pay estimate for a total of \$247,547.50.

Pay Request 1 - \$74,241
Pay Request 2 - \$328,235.00
Pay Request 3 - \$472,041.92
Pay Request 4 - \$283,324.20
Pay Request 5 - \$249,402.00
Pay Request 6 - \$247,547.50
Total Contract Remaining - \$215,321.96

The work has been completed and staff recommends payment to Stark Excavating in the amount of \$247,547.50.

Comments: Alderman Dingledine to motion to take to City Council. Brownfield seconded motion. Everything looks awesome. Has anyone opted out of SSA? Forsythe said there was not opt out option but he did not have any objectors.

E. Construction Standards Review - The last pdf file of the City's Construction Standards I found while going through Ed's files was a from 2008. The set has a standard that has been marked removed and some language that is redundant. The standards are still in pretty good shape design wise, but I would like to recommend some tweaks.

The most common recommendations are as follows:

1. The existing typicals show a 1/4" per foot slope on sidewalk. This equates to 2% which is the absolute maximum allowed per ADA requirements. I recommend that we change 1/4" to 3/16" which would adjust the slope to 1.5%. This minor adjust will make inspection a lot easier and reduce confrontations for when sidewalks forms are set at 2% but the finishing creates a 2.1% slope which needs to be removed.
2. IDOT's minimum lift thickness for the state specified IL 19.0 Binder course is 2 1/4". This minimum thickness is based off the nominal diameter of the aggregate to help prevent fracturing of the aggregate while being compacted. A few of the city typicals show 1 1/2" of Binder Course which should be increased or the asphalt type changed. For these standards, the City can do one of the following: a. Reduce the surface lift thickness to 1 1/4" which is the minimum for IL9.5 and increase the binder thickness to the minimum of 2 1/4"; or b. Replace the Binder Course with a 1 1/2" lift of surface course. *For a 1000 ft by 36 ft wide road, option 1 is \$8,000 cheaper but is also 1/2" thinner.
3. The existing typicals show the aggregate subbase as only being underneath the asphalt. I would recommend that this aggregate be extended under the curb as well as added under the

sidewalk. The aggregate gives a nice working platform as well as allows any water that gets to the subgrade to drain to the back of curb instead of the edge of pavement. The aggregate under the sidewalk helps prevent some heaving that can be caused by water washing out the fines of the bare earth underneath the

4. The callouts for the asphalt and aggregate call out "Compacted". The general notes say that everything is to be constructed in accordance with IDOT's standard specifications. The IDOT specs are very clear in what percent compaction needs to be achieved for each material.
5. The minimum width for sidewalk to meet ADA requirements is 4 ft. IDOT recommends 5 ft wide sidewalks and sidewalks along the back of curb should be 6 ft. This additional width is to accommodate for any type of intrusions into the accessible window (planter edge, bush, handrail extensions). A standard for sidewalk that shows slope, depth, and aggregate for sidewalks at back of curb and with greenspace would help. Could give all jointing notes and expansion at property lines note on this sheet.

Discussion. Direction to move forward with standards.

Comments: Dennis Carr would like to increase thickness. Carr suggest 2 ¼ in this case. Dave will back Dennis 100% as he is more knowledgeable.

Dennis asked Kevin about the reasons the Cotu withdrew the concrete option. Concrete is more expensive, less maintenance and more people do concrete than asphalt. Brownfield said about eight years ago a few streets used concrete and issues arose.

Brownfield doesn't have problem with concrete being put back on after asking Public Works. Since this is a change in standard, the discussion doesn't have to be taken to City Council.

F. Possible Washington Estates Flood Mitigation Grant Project (BRIC) - FEMA has a grant program, Building Resilient Infrastructure and Communities (BRIC), that can be utilized to assist with any priority flood management projects. This is funded on a 75/25 basis. A pre-application form was submitted to IEMA by a September 30 in order to be eligible for the program. The actual grant cycle opens on September 30 and must be submitted by January 29. Staff just received approval of the pre-application by IEMA, which has now requested that a sub-application be submitted by November 20.

This project is estimated at \$1.857M. This includes the replacement of the existing culvert at Business 24, tributary channel improvements (plus easement acquisitions), and land acquisition and earthwork associated with the aforementioned upstream detention basin. This does not include the possible completion of a Letter of Map Revision (LOMR) to determine the whereabouts of the 100-year floodplain along and near the tributary. This area was not subject to floodplain mapping in 1986 by FEMA because Washington Estates was not annexed into the city at the time. The most recent FEMA floodplain map modernization project in 2017 did not include any new survey data to determine new areas of floodplain or the revision of existing mapped floodplains. A rough cost for that would be \$50,000.

Based on the current project construction improvements and LOMR, the City's 25% local share would be \$476,813. This is not included in the FY 20-21 budget and would need to be accommodated for in order to consider the project.

Comments: The Committee is supportive of a project to address the flooding in Washington Estates but the City would need to determine how the local share would be paid. It would be beneficial to see how many of the subdivision residents would be interested in paying for a portion of the project. Staff will schedule this for further discussion at Monday's Committee of the Whole meeting to gain final direction on a potential BRIC application.

5. Staff Updates:
 - A. Road Salt Update
 - B. Huber Step Screen Update
 - C. APWA Winter Operations Training Update
6. Other Business:
 - A.
7. Adjournment: Alderman Dingledine made a motion to adjourn at approximately 5:30PM. Alderman Brownfield seconded. Meeting adjourned.