



MINUTES

1. **CALL TO ORDER** 5:15 pm Bill LeClair called the meeting to order

2. **ROLL CALL**

Committee Members: Bill LeClair, Doug Brandt, Katherine Dahlke
Staff and Others: Matthew Heckenlaible, Scott Ahl

3. **REVIEW AND APPROVAL OF MINUTES**

Minutes from the April 1, 2026, Public Works Committee meeting

Katherine Dahlke made a motion to approve the April 1, 2026, Public Works Committee meeting minutes, seconded by Doug Brandt. Motion carried.

4. **PUBLIC INPUT**

A. Two Rivers resident Wayne Denfeld (2612 15th Street) expressed his displeasure with living on a gravel road for multiple decades, noting that the former City Manager had stated that all such roads would be paved before leaving office, which did not occur. During the winter months, snow plowing operations deposit significant amounts of gravel into adjacent grassy areas, requiring weeks of cleanup each spring. In addition, the annual spring grading operations loosen and overturn the gravel surface to prevent compaction, which he stated creates poor roadway conditions and an unsightly appearance. Mr. Denfeld requested that both dead end segments of 15th Street and 16th Street west of Buchholz Street be paved.

5. **ONGOING PROJECT STATUS AND ACTION, IF NEEDED**

A. **Sidewalk Replacement Program**

Correspondence with Safe Step LLC indicates that the company anticipates beginning sidewalk inspections in mid to late June, with work extending into July. The company typically schedules and performs work on a first-in, first-out basis.

B. **4-2026 Asphalt Resurfacing Project**

Staff is still working to fully assemble the contract documents and is also awaiting completion of work by WPS so that the Public Works can complete the necessary concrete curb and gutter, driveway approach, and sidewalk replacements prior to placement of the final asphalt pavement surface.

6. **DISCUSSIONS OR ISSUES ON HOLD, PENDING FURTHER INVESTIGATION – N/A**

7. **COMMITTEE AND COUNCIL MEMBER ITEMS FOR DISCUSSION, INCLUSION IN FUTURE AGENDA AND ACTION, IF NEEDED – N/A**

8. DISCUSS STAFF RECOMMENDATIONS (TRAFFIC AND PARKING CONTROL) - ACTION, ENDORSEMENT OR MODIFICATIONS, AS NEEDED

A. School Pedestrian Flashing Lights

Staff recently became aware that several locations near schools within Two Rivers that historically utilized flashing warning lights at high-volume pedestrian crosswalks are no longer functioning. It appears that some of these flashing light systems may have been inoperable for well over 10 years. Of additional concern, when staff inquired with the Electric Utility regarding the locations and status of these installations, the Utility was unable to provide a complete or accurate inventory of the flashing light systems and further indicated that electrical charges were still being incurred at certain locations despite the equipment no longer functioning.

Upon review of current standards, these older single-flasher style warning devices are no longer considered an acceptable traffic control practice. Staff is currently evaluating where advanced pedestrian notification signage may be required pursuant to Part 7 (Traffic Control for School Areas) of the Federal and Wisconsin Manual on Uniform Traffic Control Devices (MUTCD). This evaluation will determine whether standard school crossing signage alone is sufficient or whether supplemental flashing warning systems will also be required.

The following locations have been identified for further review:

- Lincoln Avenue / STH-42 near the high school – both units are solar powered
- Koenig School – three (3) flashers
 - 11th Street & Lowell Street – SE corner
 - 12th Street & Lowell Street – NE and NW corners
- LB Clarke School – two (2) flashers
 - 45th Street & Bellevue Place – NE and SW corners
- Magee School – four (4) flashers
 - 36th Street & Tannery Road – NW corner (disconnected)
 - 34th Street & Mishicot Road – NW and SE corners
 - 35th Street & Mishicot Road – SE corner
- Riverview Drive – southbound lane at the north City limits – single active flasher

B. Washington Street and Memorial Drive Pedestrian Crossings

Updated quotations were received from TAPCO, with the material cost increasing slightly from \$127,440 to \$128,012. At this time, the lead time for procurement of materials remains unknown pending acceptance of the quotation by the City. Anticipated primary funding sources for the project include one or two Tax Incremental Districts (TIDs) located within the project area. Staff is also working to initiate the permitting process with the Wisconsin Department of Transportation (WDOT).

9. OTHER ITEMS THAT MAY COME BEFORE THE COMMITTEE: CONSIDERATION AND ACTION, IF NEEDED

A. Staffing Update

We will have two new employees starting at Public Works on Monday, May 11th.

With the retirement of Steve Pagels, a long-time mechanic for DPW, at the end of the month,

the vacated mechanic position will not be refilled. Instead, the position is being reorganized to create the WDNR-required Collection System Operator position.

We do have an internal employee, James Anderson, willing to accept the Collection System Operator position. With this transition, another vacancy will be created within the department; however, we already have a candidate selected to fill that position.

Since the retirement of William Thiele on March 13th, we have not been able to fill the vacant Engineering Technician position. We have received very little interest in the position and, despite several creative recruitment efforts, have not been successful in filling the vacancy to date. We are currently exploring the possibility of hiring a recent college graduate as an entry-level engineer, although that process has only recently begun.

With the continued vacancy in the Engineering Technician position, other tasks and projects are not being completed as timely as we would like. Staff are focusing on the most critical and high-priority items, with lesser priority tasks being addressed as time permits.

B. How Residents Request Infrastructure Improvements

In recent years, DPW has received inquiries from property owners requesting public infrastructure improvements adjacent to their property and neighboring properties. My past practice has been to require the requesting property owner to contact all potentially impacted property owners and obtain signatures on a petition formally requesting the improvements, with the understanding that the benefiting property owners may ultimately be responsible for all or a portion of the improvement costs.

Within the past two months, additional requests of this nature have been received. As a result, I would like to establish a formal process that the Committee agrees with, including determining what portions of the improvements should be considered a private responsibility versus a public responsibility.

While this may appear to be a simple process on the surface, implementing it consistently and fairly in practice has proven to be the challenge.

With the verbal request by Mr. Denfeld, several process concepts were briefly discussed to aid in developing general guidelines for handling future infrastructure improvement requests. Topics discussed included:

1. DPW receives a written request/petition
2. How many adjacent property owners need to agree to these improvements as there will be a financial impact on them.
 - a. All property owners
 - b. Just the original requestor
 - c. Some number in between, such as 75%
3. For these petitions, how much is public vs private cost?
4. Follow formal assessment policy
 - a. 25% City / 75% Private – Policy
 - b. Or via practice 75%+/- City / 25%+/- Private
5. Timing of implementation
6. Work into already tight City C.I.P.
7. 31 Streets with approximately 8,800 feet of centerline that are gravel roadway surfaces
 - a. Average roadway width of 32 feet - $\$155/\text{ft} = \$1,364,000$
 - b. C&G cost - $\$28/\text{ft} = \$492,800$
 - c. $\$1,860,000+/-$

8. 10 +/- unimproved road rights-of-way that have limited infrastructure improvements (curb & gutter, pavement, etc.) 5,500 +/- feet
 - a. Much more expensive with the inclusion of sanitary sewer, storm sewer, water main, laterals and services along with other private utilities would need to also be included along with the building of the gravel roadway base.
 - b. Easily could be in excess of \$3M in improvements

For this particular request, DPW-Engineering will distribute a postcard survey to the property owners immediately adjacent to 15th Street and 16th Street west of Buchholz Street. The survey will inform property owners that a request has been received for roadway paving improvements and will explain that all costs associated with the proposed improvements would be 100% assessed to the adjacent property owners.

Property owners will be asked to respond either in support of or opposed to the proposed project. A non-response will be considered an affirmative response. The Committee indicated that at least 50% of the affected property owners would need to support the project in order for it to move forward. However, if advanced for annual budgeting or the formal assessment process, the project could still ultimately be postponed or canceled by action of the full City Council.

C. Right-of-Way Permit Discussion

Recently, it was brought to DPW's attention that a private utility company had been placing notification markers within the public rights-of-way. These types of markers are typically used in more rural areas and are generally not utilized within urbanized areas.

As a result, DPW will be revising the right-of-way permit conditions to include a requirement prohibiting the placement of these types of private utility notification markers within the City.

D. Sidewalk Shoveling Appeal

1. Taylor Zalewski - 2534 45th Street

DPW received a request from Taylor Zalewski, 2534 45th Street, seeking to lower or rescind a snow sidewalk removal invoice related to the February 6th snowstorm event.

Upon review of the request, it was noted that the quantity of sidewalk reported to Engineering as having been cleared is not consistent with the available photo documentation, which shows that a portion of the sidewalk had, in fact, already been cleared by the property owner.

The property frontage is approximately 100 feet in length. Based upon the photographs, it appears that approximately 47 feet (+/-) of sidewalk had already been cleared, leaving approximately 53 feet (+/-) that were subsequently cleared by Public Works street crews.

At the established rate of \$1.25 per foot, the adjusted sidewalk snow removal cost would total approximately \$66.25.

E. Discussion regarding a potential future request from Cozy B's to install a handicap accessibility ramp within the public right-of-way.

Director Heckenlaible stated that a request to encroach into the public right-of-way may be forthcoming and that he is awaiting further discussions with the Commercial Building Inspector regarding the matter.

F. Special Events / Parades

Director Heckenlaible provided a brief update indicating that DPW, along with other departments, may become more involved in helping to establish a safe experience for both participants and spectators at community events. This could potentially include the use of larger DPW vehicles within parade routes and at stationary events to serve as protective barriers and create a more comprehensive safety perimeter.

10. SET DATE, TIME, AND LOCATION FOR NEXT COMMITTEE MEETING

Proposed for Wednesday, June 3, 2026, at 5:15 pm

11. ADJOURNMENT : 7:19 pm

Doug Brandt made a motion to adjourn the meeting, seconded by Katherine Dahlke. Motion carried.

Respectfully submitted by: *Matthew R. Heckenlaible*

Public Works Director/City Engineer