



VILLAGE OF WAUCONDA VILLAGE SERVICES COMMITTEE MEETING

Tuesday, June 7, 2016

5:30 pm

Village Hall – Board Room

101 N. Main Street

Meeting Minutes

Committee Members: Chairman Ken Arnswald, Deputy Chair Barbini, Trustee Black
Staff: Administrator Maxeiner, Police Chief Wermes, Director of Public Works Fink,

1. **Call to Order** – Chairman Arnswald called the meeting to order at 5:33 PM. Committee members in attendance were Deputy Chair Barbini and Trustee Black. Also in attendance were Trustees Knight, Starkey, and Howe in addition to Village Administrator Maxeiner, Police Chief Wermes, Public Works Director Fink and Village Engineer Rickert
2. **Approval of Minutes:**
 - a. No minutes were presented for approval
3. **Old Business** – There was no old business to discuss
4. **New Business**

- a. **Discussion and Determination of Corrective Action on 2015 Street Resurfacing Program.** Director Fink recapped the history of the 2015 Street Resurfacing Program and the issues experienced with the microsurfacing on Sutton Circle. The final product was not satisfactory and the Village has looked at potential remedies for the work. Village Engineer Rickert, Director Fink and the contractor met on-site on a couple of occasions to inspect the work. Deficiencies were obvious. The contractor agreed to reinstall the deficient work.

Superintendent Pride examined some microsurfacing completed in southern Illinois and notice the pavement resulted in a much smoother finish and resembled traditional asphalt applications that the public is used to seeing. When investigating further, Superintendent Pride found out that steel slag was used in the microsurfacing application in southern Illinois as opposed to the limestone aggregate used here. The specifications for the steel slag were forwarded to our contractor for comment. The

steel slag makes the product a little more expensive than regular microsurfacing but still less than traditional asphalt overlay.

The contractor provided quotes on the steel slag based microsurfacing. With the discount for the remedial work to correct prior deficiencies, the quote was to completely redo the entire street on Sutton Circle for approximately \$31,000. Director Fink opined it was probably the best option for the Village to get a uniform surface and a cost effective price and it would be his recommendation to proceed with this strategy.

Village Engineer Rickert explained the difference between asphalt and microsurfacing and further expounded on the difference between limestone aggregate and steel slag. He mentioned that Lake County has been using microsurfacing for four or five years now. Other entities in this area have since started using the product. Initially, entities using the product can get some complaints because of its rougher initial surface. He supports Director Fink's recommendation moving forward.

Trustee Howe questioned what the difference is between the steel slag and regular resurfacing (limestone aggregate) we have been using and is there a durability difference? Village Engineer Rickert commented that the steel slag is approximately 30% higher than the regular limestone aggregate we have been using. In addition, there does not appear to be enough experience or studies with the product to determine if the steel slag will last longer or protect the structure of the road longer than regular aggregate. It appears that the attractiveness of steel slag is due to the appearance of the final product rather than durability at this point.

Trustee Howe commented that the 30% greater price for steel slag over limestone aggregate microsurfacing is a steep price for a product that does not last any longer. The additional cost apparently is only for aesthetics from what we know at this point. Director Fink stated that you may gain some rideability or smoothness from the initial application compared to limestone aggregate.

Village Engineer Rickert suggested that using the steel slag on Sutton Circle would amount to a test section to see how the steel compares to the limestone aggregate over time. Administrator Maxeiner reminded the Committee that even using steel slag, the Village is paying approximately 1/3 to 1/4 less than traditional grind and overlay applications.

Trustee Black questioned if there are any applications using the steel slag that have been completed for four or five years to see how it lasts? Village Engineer Rickert answered that this is a relatively new application and we're not aware of any sections using steel slag that have been completed for that long.

The contractor's proposal to fix the deficiencies was clarified. The contractor is proposing to fix the deficient areas at no cost to the Village. If the Village wanted to redo the entire Sutton Circle, it would incur a cost of \$31,000 for the Village. Staff reminded the Committee that reapplying only the deficient areas would result in a patchwork appearance that would not be popular either.

Chairman Arnswald asked if anyone in the audience would like to comment. Chris Casey from 1471 Sutton Circle addressed the Committee. She asked if the Board was going to use this technique for the entire Village? Director Fink answered yes, that it is staffs' intent to comprehensively address all city streets using this application in addition to a number of other techniques including crack sealing, patching, and mill and overlay. This technique is used to extend the life of roads in situations where it is applicable. Ms. Casey asked about the technique and how well researched the process is. She commented that you can see through the new application to the old surface in some areas and asked what the point is if it is only going to last a year. A discussion ensued about the contractor workmanship. Ms. Casey asked about a small cul-de-sac adjacent to Sutton Circle and the differing pavement aesthetics. She asked if the plan included completing the cul-de-sac to make it uniform in appearance. Director Fink responded that it is not currently planned to address the cul-de-sac.

The consensus of the committee was to recommend to the Board that we proceed with using the steel slag microsurfacing to reapply the entire Sutton Circle job at a cost of approximately \$31,000. Ms. Casey asked for the timeframe on completion. The schedule would be based on the action taken by the Board as well as the contractor's schedule.

- b. **Discussion of the Red Light Camera Program and Action on a Staff Recommendation to Reinstall a Camera at Bonner and US Route 12.** Chief Wermes opened the discussion by elaborating on his reasons for supporting the replacement of the camera at this location. The data he shared with the Committee showed that when the camera was removed for a construction project in 2011, the accidents increased 90% in the first year following removal. Rear end collisions at this intersection showed a 55% increase.

Trustee Howe commented that the small sample size of the accident data makes the causality look higher than it may actually be. He also commented that if we are proposing this for additional revenue, then let's just state that rather than trying to use statistics to justify reinstallation.

Trustee Black asked about the mechanics of how the cameras operate and what they will actually record.

Chairman Arnswald stated that he would like to know what type of pedestrian and bicycle traffic we have in this area. He also stated that red light cameras only affect those that break the law. Chief Wermes described the ticket review policy resulting in approximately 25% to 33% conviction rate. Trustee Knight spoke about the quantity of bicycles at this intersection on the weekends.

A discussion ensued about the speed of traffic at this intersection. Chief Wermes stated that red light tickets in Wauconda are extremely well vetted.

Trustee Starkey asked what the future of red light cameras are in Illinois? Administrator Maxeiner commented that legislation had been proposed several months ago that would prohibit red light cameras in the collar counties. That legislation never made it

out of committee. As a consequence, as of today, red light cameras are still viable traffic enforcement mechanisms in Wauconda and Lake County.

Administrator Maxeiner commented that the additional camera would probably generate approximately \$50,000 based on prior experience. He also commented that our conviction rate would suggest that the Village is not in this to make money. He stated that the impetus for this request is behavior modification of the motoring public. He stated he is unsure if there is a correlation between accidents and red light cameras but he is absolutely sure that behavior changes we the cameras are installed and active.

Discussion ensued about the additional data needed for the Board before a final decision is needed. Chief Wermes discussed the process to evaluate locations for red light cameras. Administrator Maxeiner stated that he thought there is a review period after installation to see how many violations are recorded and if the camera is justified. It was also mentioned by Chief Wermes that there is no cost associated with the cameras. The expense is born by the vendor.

Discussion ensued about the opinion of the Committee toward the red light camera. Trustee Howe stated that he is not opposed to red light cameras but that he sees municipalities trying to justify the cameras based on safety when it is obvious that it is a revenue mechanism for them. Wauconda's conviction rate would suggest that the cameras are not strictly for revenue.

The consensus of the Committee was to collect additional data and forward the matter to the Board for consideration.

5. **Public Comment.** Trustee Howe stated that he had been asked by the Township for Public Works assistance on their electronics recycling event. Public Works had stated that the Village was not going to pay overtime to send someone over. Trustee Howe stated he encouraged them to approach the Village Board if they were requesting financial assistance from the Village even it is in the form of overtime for employees assisting for the event.

There were no additional public comments.

6. **Adjournment.** The meeting was adjourned at 6:15 PM.

Submitted by:

Village Administrator