

PUBLIC WORKS COMMITTEE MEETING MINUTES
NOVEMBER 1, 2016

PUBLIC WORKS COMMITTEE MEMBERS PRESENT: Pitts, Shaw, LaPointe, Campbell, Haff, O'Brien, Fedler, Skellie

PUBLIC WORKS COMMITTEE MEMBERS ABSENT: Gang

SUPERVISORS: Henke, Hicks, Moore, Idleman, Hogan, Shay, Armstrong

Debra Prehoda, Clerk

Roger Wickes, County Attorney

Chris DeBolt, County Administrator

Al Nolette, County Treasurer

Steve Haskins, DPW Superintendent

Joe Brilling, Exec. Director Sewer District &

Todd Konifka, Deputy DPW Superintendent

Media & Public

AGENDA AS PRESENTED IN COMMITTEE NOTICE:

1. Call to Order
2. Accept Minutes – August 30, 2016 & Joint Meeting September 27, 2016
3. Department Reports/Requests:
 - A. Sewer District
 - 1) Request for Budget Amendment – O & M Shortfall
 - B. Department of Public Works
 - 1) 2016 Paving Project Updates
 - 2) 2016 Bridge Project Updates
 - 3) Request for Budget Amendment – Culvert Project Reimbursement
 - 4) Discuss White Creek Options
 - 5) Miscellaneous
4. Other Business
5. Adjournment

Chairman Pitts called the meeting to order at 10:00 A.M.

A motion to accept the minutes of the August 30, 2016 and joint September 27, 2016 meetings was moved Mr. O'Brien, seconded by Mr. Campbell and adopted.

SEWER DISTRICT– Joe Brilling, Executive Director Sewer District, addressed the following items:

- Budget amendment needed to cover budget shortfall for plant electric use. He plans to take the \$5,000 from fund balance to cover this expense through year end. The Treasurer asked if he also planned to address a budget amendment regarding the compost facility.
- Compost Facility Issue – Received a notice of violation for the compost facility. They have a backlog of material out there and having a problem passing the fecal coliform testing. The material is being hauled out estimating about \$100,000 worth of hauling. A response was due by the 28th and he has sent the response. It all depends if they allow them to take six months or so to get it out of there. It is cheaper to haul it to the Finch Pruyn landfill in Northumberland than to pay a trucking firm to haul to the Franklin County landfill. They prefer the cheaper option if they will allow them to do that. The backlog is failed product. Mr. Haff stated for this year it is about \$130,000 for bad compost and asked who is getting fired. Adding if this was a business someone would be getting fired. Mr. Shaw asked if DPW could haul and the revenue come to the County. The Public Works Superintendent stated that they do have two tandems with waste hauler licenses. Mr. Brilling stated they will talk if it comes to that. He stated they are constantly trying to remedy things. The lab testing being done is all over the place. The least expense of the three testing options is fecal coliform test 9222D. The data at the site has been reviewed and DEC has been on site. He has not discussed his response with the Sewer District Board of Commissioners yet. The only option when it fails is to haul it away to a landfill. Personnel has been changed at the compost facility and they are making changes as they can. The issue is the results coming off these piles. Currently, the Sewer District and Village of Lake George are hauling away the material. If DEC accepts his response then they will do the

hauling and not have to pay anyone else. If they have to hire someone to haul this material away, he estimates it will be about \$100,000 in tipping fees and trucking. The Treasurer stated we like to sell failing businesses around here. The backlog is inside and outside the building. Estimating a couple hundred truck loads. November 15th is probably the next Commissioners meeting. He stated there is time to address the \$100,000 cost to haul the compost. Mr. Haff asked who can be fired if they are our employees. A motion to fire Mr. Brillling was moved by Mr. Haff but did not receive a second. He stated this is not being managed and the buck stops at the top with Mr. Brillling. Mr. Campbell stated if we cannot make this right, we need to get out of the compost business. The Treasurer stated we should get out of this business. Mr. LaPointe stated it seems like we are getting the Sewer District problems before the Commissioners adding this is not the first instance; it has happened more than once. The compost facility is a Commissioners issue. Regarding the requested budget amendment to cover the shortfall for the electric at the plant, Mr. Brillling stated at the beginning of the year they had issues with the digester and did not generate much methane. They have a cogen at the plant when they generate methane they supplement the plant's electric needs. A motion to amend budget to cover shortfall for electric usage at the plant in the amount of \$5,000 was moved by Mr. Campbell, seconded by Mr. O'Brien and adopted.

- All sewer rates for 2017 will stay flat.

DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC WORKS – Steve Haskins, Superintendent of Public Works, addressed the following items with the committee, packet of handouts distributed, attached:

- 2016 Paving Project Updates – This year's paving projects are currently at 81% complete; 23.11 miles out of 28.65 total miles, handout attached. They should be finished by early next week. The Treasurer stated now that the paving is almost complete how are they with the budget. The Superintendent anticipates they will be over budget and the reason is Co. Rts. 18 and 21.
- 2016 Bridge Project Updates – The latest updates are noted in green on the attached handout.
- Budget Amendment – Culvert Project Reimbursement - DPW received a payment on a grant regarding the Hudson River watershed erosion elimination project in the amount of \$47,500 for culvert pipes installed on Co. Rt. 113 in 2015 and some in 2016. A motion to move revenue to appropriation line to buy more culverts in the amount of \$47,500 was moved by Mr. LaPointe, seconded by Mr. Campbell and adopted.
- Discuss White Creek Options – Distributed a copy of the alternatives provided through the study. Chairman Pitts stated taking the deck off was not a very popular idea in Salem. What can be done with the \$193,000 in remaining funding to mitigate the flooding throughout the village. The Superintendent noted that the study indicated that no matter what is done there is no way to mitigate a moderate to heavy flood. You cannot eliminate it, only mitigate it to a point. So the focus of the study became how to mitigate the one, two, five and up to ten year events. Under the upstream alternatives he would look at Alternative #1 and #2 as far as improving the downstream hydraulic opening not the replacement of the Beatty Hollow Bridge. The second page deals with the Salem Village alternatives. He received an extension until December 31st of 2017 to use this funding. When looking at these alternatives, he was looking for the best long term results. Landowners should be approached to determine if there is any resistance to options that require going on their property. The Superintendent questioned if this was a DPW task or Soil and Water Conservation. The County is the lead agency with the funding. Mrs. Fedler questioned if FEMA mitigation monies might be available and has that been looked into. Chairman Pitts has been in contact with FEMA. Mr. Shaw stated we need to

know if the landowners are willing to make changes. Mr. Skellie stated the landowners have very negative ideas on what will happen. If someone could go in and take the berms out and guarantee them that when it floods it does take a ten feet deep twenty feet wide patch down their field, they might consider it. They are worried that once it starts flooding the fields, they will be ruined. The Treasurer stated there is a significant County in-kind match to this grant. On the handout, upstream alternatives that are strictly County and do not involve landowners are #2, #3 and # 6 and Salem Village alternative #2a deepening of the channel. Chairman Pitts and Superintendent Haskins will get together and come up with a plan for next month's meeting.

OTHER BUSINESS:

Budget – Mr. Haff stated the County Administrator is requesting a full time Secretary to the County Administrator and Public Works is requesting a full time Secretary to the Superintendent and asked if they could share this secretary representing a savings of +\$32,000. Those departments need to get together and discuss this. Mr. Campbell stated they have tried that in the past and it has never been successful sharing between departments. It is getting the employee to adapt to working in two different departments. Mr. Haff stated we need to come up with reasons to try these things not reasons to not do these things. Mr. Campbell stated they are taking a comprehensive look at the configuration in the County Administrator's Office and it may take a whole different look and then it may not work.

A motion to adjourn was moved by Mr. Shaw, seconded by Mr. LaPointe and adopted. The meeting adjourned at 11:02 A.M.

Respectfully submitted,

*Debra Prehoda, Clerk
Washington County Board of Supervisors*

Washington County Department of Public Works
2016 Road Projects

10/31/2016

County Route	Project Limits	Miles	Status	
113	Cheese Factory to General Fellows	3.49	Complete	FDR w/Calcium, Binder
113	General Fellows to NYS 29	0.88	Complete	FDR w/Calcium, Binder
16	Cathrine Street to West Road (S)	1.1	Complete	FDR w/Calcium, Binder
16	Evans Lane to 1.3 mile S of West Road (N)	1.3	Complete	FDR w/Calcium, Binder
18	US 4 to CR21	2.92		Mill, Crack & Seat Conc., Pugmill Binder, Hot Mix Overlay
18	CR21 to Hickey Road	2.26	Complete	FDR w/Calcium, Binder
28	CR31 to Button Road	1.45	Complete	FDR w/Calcium, Binder
78	NYS22 to NYS22	0.36	Postponed	HMA Overlay
10	CR9 to .3 Mile past East Bay Road	0.86	Complete	FDR w/Calcium, Binder
21	US4 to CR18	2.26		Mill, Crack & Seat Conc., Pugmill Binder, Hot Mix Overlay
113	CR54 to Ferry Lane	2.81	Complete	Top Course on Binder placed in 2015
23	NYS40 to Guildler Hollow	2.32	Complete	Top Course on Binder placed in 2015
31	Big Birch to Button Road	1.45	Complete	Top Course on Binder placed in 2015
47	CR 30 to CR48	1.05	Complete	Paver Placed Surface Treatment
64	Woodcock to Perry Hill	1.78	Complete	Micro Surfacing
64	Jackson/Salem Line to CR61	0.97	Complete	Micro Surfacing
48	East Lake Rd to CR47	1.39	Complete	Paver Placed Surface Treatment

Total Miles 28.65 23.11 Completed Miles
81% Complete

	Total Cost	Unit Cost	
WCDPW self perform unit cost per ton of dense binder course Peckham In-Place Bid, Type 3 Binder, April 4, 2016 Fort Ann	\$ 254,522.66	\$ 52.89	CR 16 Cathrine to West Road North Peckham hauled a majority of the asphalt
Difference		\$ 58.50	
		\$ (5.61)	Savings of \$26994.59
WCDPW self perform unit cost per ton of dense binder course Peckham In-Place Bid, Type 3 Binder, April 4, 2016 Whitehall	\$ 121,309.03	\$ 57.35	CR 10 CR 9 To East Bay Road Peckham hauled a majority of the asphalt
Difference		\$ 62.50	
		\$ (5.15)	Savings of \$10893.13
WCDPW self perform unit cost per ton of dense binder course Peckham In-Place Bid, Type 3 Binder, April 4, 2016 Hebron	\$ 150,023.32	\$ 55.94	CR 28 Button Road to CR 21 Peckham hauled a majority of the asphalt
Difference		\$ 62.00	
		\$ (6.06)	Savings of \$16253.47
WCDPW self perform unit cost per ton of dense binder course Peckham In-Place Bid, Type 3 Binder, April 4, 2016 Easton	\$ 418,142.09	\$ 55.63	CR 113 Cheese Factory to General Fellows Peckham hauled a majority of the asphalt
Difference		\$ 58.25	
		\$ 2.62	Savings of \$17287.76
WCDPW self perform unit cost per ton of top course Peckham In-Place Bid, Type 6 Top, April 4, 2016 Easton	\$ 350,306.64	\$ 58.27	CR 113 CR 54 to Ferry Lane Peckham hauled a majority of the asphalt
Difference		\$ 62.25	
		\$ 3.98	Savings of \$23541.26
WCDPW self perform unit cost per ton of top course Peckham In-Place Bid, Type 6 Top, April 4, 2016 Granville	\$ 252,286.20	\$ 64.05	CR 23 SR40 to Guildler Hollow Road Peckham hauled a majority of the asphalt
Difference		\$ 63.75	
		\$ (0.30)	Additional Cost of \$1,181.65
WCDPW self perform unit cost per ton of top course Peckham In-Place Bid, Type 6 Top, April 4, 2016 Hebron	\$ 139,891.85	\$ 60.61	CR 31 Button Road to Big Burch Road Peckham hauled a majority of the asphalt
Difference		\$ 66.00	
		\$ 5.39	Savings of \$12,440.39
WCDPW self perform unit cost per ton of top course Peckham In-Place Bid, Type 3 Binder, April 4, 2016 Hampton	\$ 288,558.21	\$ 58.64	CR 18 CR21 to Hickey Road Peckham hauled a majority of the asphalt
Difference		\$ 63.00	
		\$ 4.36	Savings of \$21454.34

Location	Status
CR 6B	Will set deck on remaining portion Tuesday 06-28-16; Mud wall will be formed and placed 06-29-16; Rail install and open to traffic two lane 06-30-16; Asphalt pavement after Labor Day. Tentitive schedule 09-07. Paved 10-25.
CR 31	Started demolition 06-13-16; structure is removed, we are forming footers and tying rebar; scheduled to be complete by 08-08-16 Paved Base, Binder, Top on 08-29 & 08-30, scheduled to open 08-31-16. Opened to traffic 08-29
Church St	Begin mobilization week of 07-05-16 for Phase 2 work; Repairs expected to start 07-11-16 on the underside of the arch and take approximately four weeks depending on the number of repairs identified by GPI. Repairs were more involved then originally thought, anticipating completion of Phase 2 work, week of 09-12-16. Completed 09-29.
CR 45	Multi-plate culvert; scheduled to start 2nd week of August detour will be posted approximately two week period Began excavation 08-23-16, anticipated to re-open 09-07-16, paving week of 09-26. Reopened 09-08 and paved 10-17.
CR 21	Multi-plate culvert; scheduled to start 1st week of August detour will be posted approximately two week period Began excavation 08-03, reopened to traffic 08-18. Asphalt pavement week of 09-12. Paved 10-11.
CR 30	Two bridges near Gristmill campground; tentivly scheduled to start third week of August and expected to take 8-10 weeks to complete detour will be posted anticipated completion week of 10-17-16. Road closed August 29. completion estimated week of 10-24-16 Completion is estimated the week of 11-17. Precast slabs to be installed 11-02. Road work to follow.

White Creek Watershed, Rupert, VT & Salem, NY
Recommended Projects to Protect Infrastructure, Residences,
and Businesses from Future Flooding
May 26, 2016

Legend		
●	Effective	
◐	Limited	
○	Ineffective	

Project	What is At Risk?	OBJECTIVES				FEASIBILITY				Comments
		Reduces Flood Risk ¹	10-year Flood Level Reduction in Village	Reduces Erosion Risk ²	Protects Businesses, Infrastructure, and Property	Ease of Implementation	Implementation Cost Range	Estimated Time for Implementation	Permitting Jurisdictions	
Upstream Alternatives										
Alternative 1: Floodplain Reconnection Upstream (East) of Blind Buck Road	Businesses, Residences, & County/Town Infrastructure	●	0.5 - 1ft	●	●	Difficult	\$100K-150K	2-3 years	NYDEC; USACE	Berms along both banks restrict access to floodplains on both sides of river during 10-year floods and greater. Approximately 33 acre-ft of floodplain storage could be reconnected for moderate floods. Berm removal would require excavation of approximately 1,800CY of material along the banks, with some tree removal likely. Temporary and permanent easements with farm owner would be needed.
Alternative 2: Beatty Hollow Bridge Retrofit or Replacement; Improve downstream hydraulic opening	Businesses, Farms, Residences, & County/Town Infrastructure	●	N/A	●	●	Difficult	\$500K (replacement); \$10K-\$15K (improve opening)	2-3 years (replacement); <1 year (improve opening)	NYDEC; USACE	Widening clear span to predicted bankfull width of 65 feet (from USGS regression) and realigning opening would lower flood depths during large floods by 3 feet or more, reducing risk of overbank flow across Rt 153 and the railroad and into the Village from the north and west. A temporary solution to increasing capacity involves removing a downstream constriction caused by existing bank riprap projecting into the channel (approximately 60CY).
Alternative 3: Unstable Embankment along County Road 153 near Braymer Road	County Transportation Infrastructure	○	N/A	●	●	Moderate	\$60K-\$75K	1-2 years	NYDEC; USACE	The well intentioned Irene recovery work to reconnect an abandoned meander made the Rt 153 embankment more vulnerable to erosion by increasing floodwater velocity over the upstream diversion weir. Embankment armoring and grade control with large stone (approximately 220CY) would protect the roadway during future flood events.
Alternative 4: Floodplain Reconnection Downstream (West) of Chambers Road	Businesses, Farms, Residences, & County/Town Infrastructure	●	0.5 - 1ft	●	●	Difficult	\$250K-\$300K	2-3 years	NYDEC; USACE	Berms and the abandoned railroad bed east of the Creek restrict access to floodplains during 10-year floods and greater. Approximately 12 acre-ft of floodplain storage could be reconnected for moderate floods. Berm removal would require excavation of approximately 8,600CY of material, with some tree removal likely along the banks. Temporary and permanent easements with farm owner would be needed.
Alternative 5: Floodplain Reconnection Upstream (East) of Railroad Bridge #4	Businesses, Farms, Residences, & County/Town Infrastructure	●	0.5 - 1ft	●	●	Difficult	\$150-\$200K	2-3 years	NYDEC; USACE	Berms along the west bank restrict access to floodplains during 10-year floods and greater. Approximately 32 acre-ft of floodplain storage could be reconnected for moderate floods. Berm removal would require excavation of approximately 4,000CY of material along the banks, with some tree removal likely. Temporary and permanent easements with farm owner would be needed.
Alternative 6: County Route 153 Bridge Upstream Constriction	Businesses, Farms, Residences, & County/Town Infrastructure	◐	N/A	◐	◐	Easy	\$5K-\$10K	1 year	None	An old laid up stone abutment upstream of the Rt 153 bridge constricts the channel, aggravating out of bank flows and flooding of adjacent property during large floods. There is good access to remove the stone (approximately 90CY) from a private gravel road west of Rt 153. A temporary easement from the landowner would be needed as the stone is likely outside the road ROW.
Alternative 7: Lowering of Railroad Bed and Removal of 30-inch RCP at Lenhardt Residence	Farms and Residences	◐	N/A	○	◐	Moderate	\$15K-\$20K	1-2 years	NYDEC; USACE	During large floods water is diverted out of the bank in West Rupert at the rail trail bridge and gets trapped on the east side of the rail bed. Ponded water south of the Atwater farm cannot easily return to the White Creek channel after the floodwaters recede due to limited capacity through a 30-inch culvert. Lowering a portion of the rail bed around the culvert will provide additional relief back to the Creek.
Alternative 8: Replace Undersized Railroad Bridge #5	Farms and Residences	●	N/A	●	●	Difficult	\$150K-\$200K	2-3 years	NYDEC; USACE; VTrans	The rail trail bridge in West Rupert is severely undersized and poorly aligned, and contributes to out of bank flows during large floods. Floodwaters get trapped on the south side of the rail bed and cannot return to the Creek. The current bridge span is 23 feet. The bridge span should be at least 50 feet to match the channel bankfull width.

¹Reduces Flood Risk - The proposed project/strategy lowers the flood level.

²Reduces Erosion Risk - The proposed project/strategy lessens the vulnerability of a location to erosion.

White Creek Watershed, Rupert, VT & Salem, NY
Recommended Projects to Protect Infrastructure, Residences,
and Businesses from Future Flooding
May 26, 2016

Legend		
 Effective	 Limited	 Ineffective

Project	What is At Risk?	OBJECTIVES				FEASIBILITY				Comments
		Reduces Flood Risk ¹	10-year Flood Level Reduction in Village	Reduces Erosion Risk ²	Protects Businesses, Infrastructure, and Property	Ease of Implementation	Implementation Cost Range	Estimated Time for Implementation	Permitting Jurisdictions	
Salem Village Alternatives										
Alternative 2: Remove Berms Downstream of Salem Village	Businesses, Residences, & County/Town Infrastructure		0 - 0.5ft			Moderate	\$40-50K	1-2 years	None	Project involves coordination with landowner (Woody Hill Farms) to remove berms along farm fields for approx. 1,200 linear feet. Total volume estimated to be 1,000-1,400 CY. Berms create minor tailwater in small to moderate floods and affects the western edge of the Village.
Alternative 2a: Remove Berms Downstream of Salem Village; Deepen Channel	Businesses, Residences, & County/Town Infrastructure		0.5 - 1ft			Moderate	\$50K-\$80K	1-2 years	NYDEC; USACE	Deepening the channel from the Route 22 bridge through cross-section 7117. Channel has aggraded approximately 1-2 feet compared to pre-Irene conditions. Some minor bank shaping may be required. We estimate that approximately 3,000-4,000 CY of material would be removed over the 2,200 foot length of channel.
Alternative 3 & 3a: Remove Archibald Street Bridge or Install an Overflow Box Culvert to North of Existing Bridge	Businesses, Residences, & County/Town Infrastructure		1 - 1.5ft			Moderate	\$50K (removal); \$250K-\$350K (overflow culvert)	2-3 years	SEQR; NYDEC; USACE	For removal option, the south abutment would be left in place to accommodate a future pedestrian crossing, but the north abutment would be removed to widen the floodway. Overflow box culvert (20ft span, 5ft height) would be installed on the north bank and would require an easement from the property owner to create an overflow channel.
Alternative 4: Remove Berms Downstream of Salem Village; Remove Archibald Street Bridge	Businesses, Residences, & County/Town Infrastructure		1 - 1.5ft			Moderate	\$80K-\$100K	2-3 years	SEQR; NYDEC; USACE	See above comments. The combination of berm removal with bridge removal (or overflow box culvert) provides only marginal improvement over Alternative 3.
Alternative 5: Remove Berms Downstream of Salem Village; Deepen Channel; Widen Channel with Flood Benches	Businesses, Residences, & County/Town Infrastructure		0.5 - 1ft			Difficult	\$250K-\$350K	3-5 years	SEQR; NYDEC; USACE	Widening of the channel without Archibald Street bridge removal (or overflow culvert) provides only limited flood reduction, as the bridge constriction remains severe. This is not a viable alternative considering the high costs and limited benefits.
Alternative 6: Remove Berms Downstream of Salem Village; Deepen Channel; Widen Channel with Flood Benches; Remove Archibald Street Bridge	Businesses, Residences, & County/Town Infrastructure		1.5 - 2ft			Difficult	\$400K-\$500K	3-5 years	SEQR; NYDEC; USACE	Easements would be required on approximately 14 properties to excavate the flood benches, primarily along the north bank in between Route 22 and Archibald Street. Many large trees lining the north bank would need to be removed. A revegetation plan would be required as part of the final design and permitting.
Alternative 7: Remove Berms Downstream of Salem Village; Deepen Channel; Widen Channel with Flood Benches; Remove Archibald Street Bridge;	Businesses, Residences, & County/Town Infrastructure		1.5 - 2ft			Difficult	\$500K-\$700K	>5 years	SEQR; NYDEC; USACE; FEMA	See above comments. The Fleming house (41 Archibald Street) would be bought-out and demolished to allow for the re-establishment of a floodplain on the north bank.

¹Reduces Flood Risk - The proposed project/strategy lowers the flood level.

²Reduces Erosion Risk - The proposed project/strategy lessens the vulnerability of a location to erosion.