

**City of Portage  
Ad Hoc Canal Committee Meeting  
Monday, July 14th, 2014, 3:30 p.m.  
Municipal Building, Conference Room One**

Members: Fred Galley, Chairperson; Chris Arnold, Ron Dorn, Marianne Hanson, Doug Klapper, Bob Redelings, Jesse Spankowski (citizen member), Mayor William Tierney ex-officio, Destine Udelhoven

Others present: Jill Fehrman, Scott Inman, Jeff Melville, Shawn Murphy, Karen Richardson, Darren Fortney, Steve Galarneau, Ryan VanCamp, Bill Welsh and Jen McCoy

**1. Roll Call**

**2. Discussion and possible action on minutes from 5/19/14 meeting.**

Motion by Dorn, second by Klapper to approve the minutes. Motion passed unanimously.

**3. Sediment and water sampling update (Scott Inman, DNR)  
Discussion and possible action on the contaminate determination from the Dept. of Health.**

Mr. Inman indicated the Dept. of Health reviewed the sampling data and performed a health consultation (Human Health Risk Assessment). The health consultation was submitted to the Agency for Toxic Substance and Disease Registry (ASTDR). However, review and approval by the federal government may take up to 12 months. The State will be releasing an update to the fish consumption advisories statewide, part of which, will include the samples and advice for the fish collected from the canal. The update will occur in about a month. Following the fish consumption update, the Department of Health will meet with the committee and discuss the conclusions and recommendations before approval of the document.

He also provided an update on the Feasibility Study RFP. The DNR Secretary required a least cost option to be included in the scope of services which is scheduled to be issued in September. A pre-proposal meeting will occur followed by a 3 week period for consultants to submit proposals. Once a consultant is selected, a work plan will be developed.

The Burnham Canal in Milwaukee was discussed briefly because of the contaminant capping being employed there. There are some differences between the two projects. The Burnham Canal is a deep channel, previously used for navigation. Mr. Galarneau indicated it is a Superfund project that has an identified responsible party who will be paying for a portion of the clean-up costs. Mr. Inman noted that because the Portage Canal is so shallow, capping material in-place would reduce the water depth even further.

Mr. Inman also mentioned that the DNR was concerned about the proposed pedestrian bridge (at Hamilton St.) in segment 2. If the bridge were constructed first, it may impede the DNR's remediation efforts.

#### **4. Discussion and possible action on Contract scope with SEH.**

Ms. Fehrman mentioned the meeting with the Management Consultant and City staff that resulted in a change to the process. For various reasons, a two phase approach is being chosen. The first contract would concentrate on the conceptual plans and take the project through to obtaining an approved Environmental Document. In this way, effort won't be spent on alternatives that wouldn't be approved. Ms. Fehrman's general concept for the first contract is summarized in the attached email and would include examining 2 reduced canal width alternatives in addition to the previously approved canal cross section.

It was mentioned that a sloped wall would be safer and more environmentally friendly than a sheet pile wall. Upon an inquiry by Dorn, Mr. Inman indicated that a sloped wall would likely be compatible with capping of contaminants when combined with a permeable cap and a geotextile fabric.

Ms. Fehrman's proposal was to perform extensive surveys of segment 2. However, after some discussion, it was suggested to utilize the data obtained by the DNR as a result of their sampling program. As part of the program, the DNR employed LiDAR data which Mr. Melville suggested would be adequate for the conceptual alternative analyses.

Ms. Fehrman indicated that the work in the first contract would all be conceptual – no stormwater or lighting plans would be developed at this point. Also, soil borings wouldn't be needed because the bridge lengths wouldn't be known.

Prior to an approved environmental document, a 4F analysis would need to be performed because the canal is on the State Historical Register and doing anything would be considered having an adverse effect. Mr.

Fortney said that avoidance alternatives need to be shown and how effects would be minimized. Ms. Richardson indicated that even though segment 1 employed a programmatic analysis, segment 2 would need to be an individual 4F analysis.

Ms. Fehrman said a key coordination effort would be with the railroad as the trail passes under the bridge. It was mentioned that the design would not need to provide for utility vehicles, but the underpass should provide 8 feet of clearance for pedestrians.

It was also agreed that the first contract would still provide 2 public information meetings.

#### **5. Update on DOT and DNR funding issues related to remediation and restoration.**

Administrator Murphy provided a 2 page Memorandum (attached) describing status of funds and the inevitable loss of funding due to timeline constraints resulting from Act 20. The memo states that communities losing funds as a result of Act 20 will be given priority if they reapply for funding.

Mr. Melville indicated that upon completion of the conceptual plans for segment 2, a Memorandum of Agreement should be developed which addresses potential funding mechanisms and a logical termini for a stand-alone construction project.

Hanson and Arnold left the meeting.

#### **6. Update on E. Wisconsin St. – DeWitt St. reconstruction project**

Redelings indicated that one signalized intersection alternative and one round-about alternative have been identified for the East Wisconsin St. – DeWitt St. intersection.

For the ice age trail to pass under the intersection, it was suggested that a minimum clearance of 6 feet be provided for pedestrians.

#### **7. Set Next Meeting Date**

Ms. Fehrman will contact Redelings following the revised scope development to establish a meeting date.

## **8. Adjournment**

Motion by Klapper, second by Redelings to adjourn. Motion passed 6 to 0 on call of the roll.

The meeting concluded at 5:08 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Robert G. Redelings, P.E., City Engineer