

Board Members Present: Enburg (arrived at 6:20 PM), Geller, Duerst, Maxwell

Staff Present: Wright and Arnold

Also Present: See sign in sheet

Absent: Dreger

1. **Call to Order/Approval of Agenda**

Mark Geller called the meeting to order at 6:15 PM. Motion by Duerst to approve the agenda; 2nd by Maxwell. Motion carried.

2. **Approval of meeting minutes from May 13, 2016**

Duerst moved to approve the minutes of May 13, 2016; 2nd by Geller. Motion carried.

3. **Discuss Results of Soil Boring Adjacent to Manhole #10 Conducted by CGC, Inc.**

Wright reported that dewatering estimates of the preliminary quotes he collected constitute approximately sixty percent of the total project cost of about \$40,000 (this assumes the manhole will continue to settle and will need to be replaced). Wright stated he reviewed Well Constructor's Reports filed with the Wisconsin State Board of Health in the Goose Lake, Pheasant Lane, and Tonto Trail area. A parcel that shares the same soil type (Batavia Silt Loam, Gravelly Substratum) to the east of the manhole has a stable formation of sand and sandstone with a water table lower than originally assumed by contractors contacted because of the manhole's location between Goose Lake to the east and a wetland scrape to the west. Wright assumed a soil boring next to the manhole would yield similar results and reduce quote amounts greatly because of the stability of the soil and lower water table. Chair Geller approved the \$993 expense for CGC, Incorporated to conduct a single Standard Penetration Test on June 2, 2016 immediately to the west of manhole number ten within Utility District #1. The report that included recommendations from the engineering firm was presented to the group in advance of the meeting.

Wright summarized the findings: the first two feet was mostly clay with some sand and concrete fragments. Below that level to the twenty feet tested, the soil progressively was dominated by fine sand, which when compacted is a good base for the manhole. Sandstone was not reached within the 20 foot deep Standard Penetration Test. The engineer who reviewed the results of the test concluded that the manhole likely settled to its current location shortly after its installation 47 years ago due to insufficient dewatering and compaction. The engineer outlined two possible methods to correct the situation: re-core the existing manhole and relay the affected ingoing and outgoing sewer pipe to maintain the original slopes or remove and replace the original manhole. Either method will require some dewatering, but less than the preliminary estimates mentioned above assumed. The first option would likely be well below the \$25,000 threshold that requires a formal bid process; whereas the second option would exceed that threshold, requiring a more formal and expensive process.

4. **Consideration of Action to Seek Proposals for Repair or Replacement of Manhole 10 Based upon Conclusions from CGC, Inc.**

Member Enburg stated that he prefers the less invasive process of re-boring the existing structure and relaying the pipe. He fears that replacement of the structure could further aggravate the stability of other nearby infrastructures. Enburg also thought MSA, the Town's contracted engineering firm, could define standards that all quotes should conform to, as the standards defined by Strand Engineering in 1969 are no longer current. After brief discussion, Chair Geller recommended that Wright seek proposals that assume retaining the existing structure. Each firm, Geller reasoned, can define their own strategy and standards for resolving the problem; these can be reviewed by this body after the deadline date. Duerst moved for Wright to contact the interested firms (who previously indicated to Wright that they have the expertise to take on this type of job) to request proposals to remedy the existing conditions without replacing manhole 10 and based upon the findings and recommendations outlined in the CGC, Incorporated report; 2nd Maxwell. Motion carried. Once Wright establishes a deadline in September for proposals, a meeting of this body will be scheduled to determine the solution and cost that is the best fit for the Town. It would be ideal if the project could be completed by the end of October so that grass seed has the opportunity to germinate before the winter of 2016.

5. **Adjourn the Commission Meeting**

Duerst moved to adjourn at 6:32 PM; 2nd by Maxwell. Motion carried.

*The Town Board of Supervisors serves at the Utility District Board

Approved: 8/24/2016

John Wright
Clerk/Treasurer, Town of Verona