



MINUTES OF THE IMPROVEMENT AND SERVICES COMMITTEE

**MONDAY, SEPTEMBER 10, 2018, 7:00 PM
CITY HALL, ROOM 310**

PLEASE NOTE TIME AND ROOM CHANGE

A. ROLL CALL.

All present except for Ald. Wery who is excused.

B. APPROVAL OF THE AGENDA.

Moved by Ald. Jesse Brunette, seconded by Ald. Brian Johnson to approve. Motion carried.
Yes- Andy Nicholson, Brian Johnson, Jesse Brunette, No- None, Abstain- None

C. APPROVAL OF MINUTES.

Moved by Ald. Jesse Brunette, seconded by Ald. Brian Johnson to approve. Motion carried.
Yes- Andy Nicholson, Brian Johnson, Jesse Brunette, No- None, Abstain- None

D. REGULAR BUSINESS.

1. Consideration with possible action on request by Richard Monfils to rescind the special charges of \$58.30 at 2931 Beth Drive.

Moved by Ald. Brian Johnson, seconded by Ald. Jesse Brunette to deny request by Richard Monfils to rescind the special charges of \$58.30 at 2931 Beth Drive. Motion carried. Vote: Yes- Andy Nicholson, Brian Johnson, Jesse Brunette, No- None, Abstain- None

2. Consideration with possible action on request by Pete's Annex, LLC to enter into an agreement

for Parking Division to manage and enforce parking in the BMO-Harris Bank Building parking lot located in the block surrounded by Broadway, West Walnut, Hubbard, and Pearl Streets (Lot BW).

Moved by Ald. Brian Johnson, seconded by Ald. Jesse Brunette to hold request by Pete's Annex, LLC to enter into an agreement for Parking Division to manage and enforce parking in the BMO-Harris Bank Building parking lot located in the block surrounded by Broadway, West Walnut, Hubbard, and Pearl Streets (Lot BW) until the September 26, 2018 Improvement and Services Committee meeting and staff to renegotiate the agreement whereby the profit left after all expenses shall be split 80/20 with 20 percent to the Parking Utility. Motion carried. Vote: Yes- Andy Nicholson, Brian Johnson, Jesse Brunette, No- None, Abstain- None

3. Consideration with possible action on request by On Broadway Inc. and Green Bay Metro Transit for a public trash can at the bus stop on the southwest corner of Dousman Street and Chestnut Avenue.

Moved by Ald. Jesse Brunette, seconded by Ald. Brian Johnson to approve request by On Broadway Inc. and Green Bay Metro Transit for a public trash can at the bus stop on the southwest corner of Dousman Street and Chestnut Avenue. Motion carried. Vote: Yes- Andy Nicholson, Brian Johnson, Jesse Brunette, No- None, Abstain- None

4. Consideration with possible action on request by Green Bay Metro Transit to place trash cans at the new transfer station in the 2200 block of Main Street, and have Department of Public Works add that stop to its collection route.

Moved by Ald. Jesse Brunette, seconded by Ald. Brian Johnson to approve request by Green Bay Metro Transit to place trash cans at the new transfer station in the 2200 block of Main Street, and have Department of Public Works add that stop to its collection route. Motion carried. Vote: Yes- Andy Nicholson, Brian Johnson, Jesse Brunette, No- None, Abstain- None

5. Consideration with possible action on request by the League of Wisconsin Municipalities to adopt the Strategic Transportation Aid Resolution.

Moved by Ald. Jesse Brunette, seconded by Ald. Brian Johnson to approve request by the League of Wisconsin Municipalities to adopt the Strategic Transportation Aid Resolution . Motion carried. Vote: Yes- Andy Nicholson, Brian Johnson, Jesse Brunette, No- None, Abstain- None

6. Consideration with possible action on request by Kerry F. Rathburn, doing business as Star Electric, to install and maintain groundwater monitoring well in public right-of-way.

Moved by Ald. Jesse Brunette, seconded by Ald. Brian Johnson to approve request by Kerry F. Rathburn, doing business as Star Electric, to install and maintain groundwater monitoring well in

public right-of-way . Motion carried. Vote: Yes- Andy Nicholson, Brian Johnson, Jesse Brunette, No- None, Abstain- None

7. Consideration with possible action on review and award of bids for rubber surfacing for the DOWNTOWN POCKET PARK project.

Moved by Ald. Brian Johnson, seconded by Ald. Jesse Brunette to approve as amended the award of bids for rubber surfacing for the DOWNTOWN POCKET PARK project with the option of 1/2-inch thick coating. Motion carried. Vote: Yes- Andy Nicholson, Brian Johnson, Jesse Brunette, No- None, Abstain- None

8. Consideration with possible action on request by Ald. Lefebvre to extend special assessment payments for pavement construction from 5 years to 10 years when requested by residents.

Moved by Ald. Jesse Brunette, seconded by Ald. Brian Johnson to approve request by Ald. Lefebvre to extend special assessment payments for pavement construction from 5 years to 10 years when requested by residents. Motion carried. Vote: Yes- Andy Nicholson, Brian Johnson, Jesse Brunette, No- None, Abstain- None

9. Consideration with possible action on request by Ald. Wery to review how sidewalk replacements are funded.

Moved by Ald. Jesse Brunette, seconded by Ald. Brian Johnson to hold until the September 26, 2018 Improvement and Services Committee meeting the request by Ald. Wery to review how sidewalk replacements are funded. Motion carried. Vote: Yes- Andy Nicholson, Brian Johnson, Jesse Brunette, No- None, Abstain- None

10. Consideration with possible action on request by the Department of Public Works on proposed 2019 Parking Division rates and fees report.

Moved by Ald. Andy Nicholson, seconded by Ald. Jesse Brunette to approve as amended the request by the Department of Public Works on proposed 2019 Parking Division rates and fees report to include a 3% increase for the long term parking rate in place of the proposed 2% increase. Motion carried. Vote: Yes- Andy Nicholson, Jesse Brunette, No- Brian Johnson, Abstain- None

11. Consideration with possible action on request by the Department of Public Works on proposed 2018-2019 winter contractor rates report.

Moved by Ald. Jesse Brunette, seconded by Ald. Brian Johnson to approve request by the

Department of Public Works on proposed 2018-2019 winter contractor rates report. Motion carried. Vote: Yes- Andy Nicholson, Brian Johnson, Jesse Brunette, No- None, Abstain- None

12. Consideration with possible action on a request by the Department of Public Works to reimburse Greenwood Hospitality \$30,000 for repairs to the Pine Street Ramp Skywalk in accordance with the provisions of the Hotel Northland Developer's Agreement.

Moved by Ald. Brian Johnson, seconded by Ald. Jesse Brunette to approve request by the Department of Public Works to reimburse Greenwood Hospitality \$30,000 for repairs to the Pine Street Ramp Skywalk in accordance with the provisions of the Hotel Northland Developer's Agreement. Motion carried. Vote: Yes- Brian Johnson, Jesse Brunette, No- Andy Nicholson, Abstain- None

13. Consideration with possible action on a request by the Department of Public Works to approve Amendment IX of the Brown County Municipal Recycling Agreement.

Moved by Ald. Jesse Brunette, seconded by Ald. Brian Johnson to approve request by the Department of Public Works to approve Amendment IX of the Brown County Municipal Recycling Agreement. Motion carried. Vote: Yes- Andy Nicholson, Brian Johnson, Jesse Brunette, No- None, Abstain- None

14. Consideration with possible action on request by the Department of Public Works to enter into an agreement for professional services for the Nitschke Bridge hydraulic pump replacement design in the amount of \$68,732.36.

Moved by Ald. Jesse Brunette, seconded by Ald. Brian Johnson to approve request by the Department of Public Works to enter into an agreement for professional services for the Nitschke Bridge hydraulic pump replacement design in the amount of \$68,732.36 . Motion carried. Vote: Yes- Andy Nicholson, Brian Johnson, Jesse Brunette, No- None, Abstain- None

15. Consideration with possible action whether a sanitary sewer credit / refund should be granted at 2355 Eastman Avenue.

Moved by Ald. Brian Johnson, seconded by Ald. Jesse Brunette to approve a sanitary sewer credit / refund at 2355 Eastman Avenue in the amount of \$2,025.64. Motion carried. Vote: Yes- Andy Nicholson, Brian Johnson, Jesse Brunette, No- None, Abstain- None

16. Consideration with possible action on the report of the Purchasing Manager to contract with Rotating Equipment Repair (RER) for the repair of two (2) pumps at the Harvey Street Storm Sewer

Lift Station for \$74,514.

Moved by Ald. Brian Johnson, seconded by Ald. Jesse Brunette to approve as amended the report of the Purchasing Manager to contract with Rotating Equipment Repair (RER) for the repair of two (2) pumps at the Harvey Street Storm Sewer Lift Station for \$74,514 to include an additional \$2,700 for pump delivery. Motion carried. Vote: Yes- Andy Nicholson, Brian Johnson, Jesse Brunette, No- None, Abstain- None

17. Consideration with possible action on request by Wisconsin Public Service Corporation for an Easement across City owned Parcel 7-741-1 for the N. Webster Avenue project.

Moved by Ald. Brian Johnson, seconded by Ald. Jesse Brunette to approve request by Wisconsin Public Service Corporation for an Easement across City owned Parcel 7-741-1 for the N. Webster Avenue project. Motion carried. Vote: Yes- Andy Nicholson, Brian Johnson, Jesse Brunette, No- None, Abstain- None

18. Report of actions taken by Department of Public Works

A. Award of contracts

1. To approve to award contract PAVEMENT 3-18 (METRO TRANSIT DRIVEWAY) to the low, responsive bidder, Peters Concrete Co., in the amount of \$611,385.73.

2. To approve to award contract SEWERS 6-18 (INCLUDING WATER MAIN) to the low, responsive bidder, PTS Contractors, Inc., in the amount of \$2,124,144.

3. To approve to award contract SEWERS 7-18 to the low, responsive bidder, Wood Sewer and Excavating, Inc., in the amount of \$161,867.

4. To approve to award contract SIDEWALKS 2018 to the low, responsive bidder, Al Dix Concrete, Inc., in the amount of \$303,465.

B. Granting of Licenses

1. Tree & Brush Trimmer

- a. Bucklin Tree Service LLC
- b. Treeo's Tree Service, Inc.

2. Underground Sprinkler System by Irrigation Doctors

- a. Irrigation Doctors
- b. Fox Valley Irrigation Inc.
- c. 4 Season Landscaping Solutions LLC

C. Real estate acquisition for Webster Avenue

I. Agreement for Purchase (Parcel Number, Address, Owner Name, Amount)

14 714 N Webster Avenue, James Siudzinski, \$73,000
23 1000 Klaus Street, Avenue Investments, LLC, \$101,000

2. Relocation Payments (Parcel Number, Address, Owner Name, Amount)

2C 816 N Webster Avenue, Sherri King, \$8,000
3A 820 N Webster Avenue, Aaron & Kristin Vandermuss, \$23,500
6 1012 N Webster Avenue, Roger Delaruelle, \$1,140
6 1012 N Webster Avenue, Roger Delaruelle, \$625
13 1002 Harvey Street, Beverly Moeser, \$51,900
14 714 N Webster Avenue, James Siudzinski, \$8,000
20 1002 Reber Street, Crooked Wood Corp., \$2,800
22a 1005 Berner Street, Regina Donaldson, \$1,765
24a 1008 Vanderbraak Street, Don Lecher, \$33,832

3. Administrative Revision (Parcel Number, Address, Owner Name, Amount)

24 1008 Vanderbraak Street, Dale & Kathleen Kelsey, \$73,000

4. Deed (Parcel Number, Address, Owner Name, Amount)

71 Remnant 1030 Weise Street, Ed & Associates, \$32,970

Moved by Ald. Brian Johnson, seconded by Ald. Jesse Brunette to receive and place on file. Motion carried. Vote: Yes- Andy Nicholson, Brian Johnson, Jesse Brunette, No- None, Abstain- None

E. INFORMATIONAL.

I. Director's Report on recent activities of the Public Works Department.

Moved by Ald. Jesse Brunette, seconded by Ald. Brian Johnson to receive and place on file the Director's Report on recent activities of the Public Works Department. Motion carried. Vote: Yes- Andy Nicholson, Brian Johnson, Jesse Brunette, No- None, Abstain- None

2. The next Improvement and Services Committee meeting is scheduled for September 26, 2018.

F. PUBLIC HEARINGS.

G. ADJOURNMENT.

Moved by Ald. Brian Johnson, seconded by Ald. Jesse Brunette to approve. Motion carried.

Vote: Yes- Andy Nicholson, Brian Johnson, Jesse Brunette, No- None, Abstain- None

VERBATIM MINUTES

- Okay.
- We're recording.
- Excuse me. Spring Improvement & Services committee to order. Let it be recorded. Johnson, Nicholson, Brunette are present. Wery is excused. I need a motion to approve the agenda.
- So moved.
- Second.
- Motion by Johnson, second by Brunette. Under discussion. Hearing none, all in favor?
- Aye.
- Nays? Motion carried. Motion to approve the minutes?
- So moved.
- Second.
- Motion by Brunette, second by Johnson. Under discussion. Hearing none, all in favor?
- [All] Aye.
- Nays? Motion carried. Number one, consideration, possible action under request by Richard Monfils to rescind special charges, \$58.30, at 2931 Beth Drive. Director Grenier.
- I received a request from Mr. Monfils on July 24th. He's asking that charge be waved. There was a, I believe there was a sofa that was collected from in front of his building. He said he spoke to both of his tenants multiple times, and both insist that it was yard waste that was at the curb on Zelos Drive. It was not there. Based on his experience with the renters, he believes them. They also, both renters know that there's only a

spring and a fall collection. He's never had an issue. What we've got is yard waste in the curb line directly in front of the property, and, according to Mr. Monfils, somebody else from a different location came and dropped this off in front of this residence. He does have one prior, so because of the prior, we are not able to address that at a staff level, so we bring it before the committee today.

- When was the last prior?

- Prior was

- Within the year?

- 2012.

- How do you determine the cost for something like that?

- It's based on a minimum collection charge. When we, probably in November,

- Mhmm.

- October or November, we'll be bringing forward our annual service charges,

- Mhmm.

- And it falls within the service charge guidelines.

- And the minimum charge is basically 15 minutes of truck and employee.

- It's all labor, right? Basically labor?

- And a little bit of truck usage.

- Right. Okay.

- That's it? What's in the picture? See,

- That was it.

- Like, from the public's perspective, I can see how they would say that would take no more than five minutes for someone to come by, so you can see, not looking at the totality of a budget,

- Right.

- but understanding all the costs involved.

- Yeah, I think ours is based, I don't know if it's 15 or 20 minute.

- Might be 20, now that you mention it.

- 20 minutes, and that's supposed to include roundtrip travel plus time spent onsite.

- And then there's mobilization, too. It's getting equipment on the truck. Getting people in the truck. I would move to deny.

- Second.

- Okay, there's motion by Johnson to deny, second by Alderman Brunette. Under discussion. Hearing none, all in favor?

- Aye.

- Nays? Motion carried. Okay, number two, consideration, possible action, request with Pete's Annex that all see to enter in on an agreement for parking division to manage and enforce parking in the BMO Harris Bank building parking lot, located in the blocks around by Broadway, West Walnut, Albert and Pearl Street, lot BW. Director Grenier.

- We have provided you tonight, we did not have it ready for inclusion in the packet electronically, so we've given you a hard copy of a draft parking lot between the city and Pete's Annex through their agent, Andy Realty, LLC. What we'd be looking for is approval of the subject to some administrative revision. One of the things that we are still working on with Pete's Garage is whether or not it's gonna be Pete's Garage that signs the agreement or the property manager, Andy Realty, so those kind of minor revisions are still necessary here, but essentially, on the corner of Walnut and North Broadway, going back years and years ago, Valley Bank, the BMO Harris property, Pete's Annex has purchased that property, and there's a large amount of surface parking. They approached us several months ago and said, you guys deal with parking on a regular basis. We'd like to own the lot, but we'd like you to manage it for us, so what we're working on are the terms in here whereby we would put signs and pavement parking in there, we take care of sweeping in the non-winter months, general landscaping, lawn cutting around, directly around there, snowplowing, and removal within the lot, parking enforcements, and then rental parking administration, so we would have the ability to sublet within that lot, and I think what we're looking at is a combination of parking arrangements within the lot itself. They do have tenants. BMO still maintains presence in there, so we would be providing on-premises parking for their tenants. We've had a combination of some rental spots

- Correct.

- and then some metered spots, and then we'll work on the, do you have some draft language in there about the cost share, or?

- We worked out actual costs based on our best guess of realistic dollars, and there is a clause there and it says for the first year, it would be \$20,000 to manage it. Now, they stand to have a gross revenue of more than double that.

- So, city's not looking to make money necessarily on this. We're looking to make sure our costs are covered, and we reserve the right to renegotiate the terms and conditions to make sure that our costs are covered, but this is simply to help. We know parking, and this gives us the ability to help foster a cooperative arrangement where parking is very in demand, up and down Broadway. I think that holds true, and with a large surface lot like this, rather than have one person control the lot, and I'm not saying Pete's Annex is a bad landlord for parking, not in any way, shape, or form. They don't know parking at all, and we could wind up with a property owner in here who kind of holds that all captive and holds all the businesses for ransom, whereas Pete's has simply said, Green Bay, you guys know parking. We'd like you to administer the lot on our behalf, and whatever money we make, we make.

- Steve, how come we don't try to make something, some revenue, besides just covering costs? Why wouldn't we try to make some money?

- I suppose we could.

- Okay.

- It's just specifically, that's the way we've
- Right.
- operated parking.
- Well, I know, but I mean, I guess I don't see it that way. I would see the, because we could use some extra money, couldn't we?
- Yeah, and because parking is a special revenue fund, anything that we would make would go directly to the parking fund.
- Right. I'd like to hear from the committee members, but I'd like to enter into some negotiations where we'd make something. Go ahead, Mr. Johnson.
- So I'm the one that actually told Pete's to come talk to Director Grenier about this, simply because with their acquisition, that building would BMO Harris own that building. They were very lax with the parking lot and kind of just let it be used by anybody really without any enforcement. With this new acquisition, has it kind of created some pain points for parking in the district, and so, what we wanted to be able to do was, after talking with them and talking with some other tenants in the district, they'd still be able to maintain some public access to this lot. As it's pointed out, 118 stalls are a lot down in this part of my district, and we wanna be able to get, retain some level of access to that for all the small businesses and some of the restaurants and other places that have people coming and going. After looking at this and knowing that they have the potential to double that and that we have risk associated with this, meaning we say that, hey, if we're gonna lose in that first year, we reserve the right to renegotiate. Well, I think probably, knowing that we do have some inherent risk and that there is some, obviously, labor involved with us trying to manage this, I would support Andy Nicholson's, or I'll direct Nicholson's comment here about having more or less a management fee that kind of ensures some safeguard there. The other thing I would just point out is, Director Grenier, your comment about trying to determine if it's A&D or Pete's Annex, I would encourage us to do it with the owner, only because my concern would be, if Pete's Annex were to terminate its agreement with A&D for any reason, it could put this agreement in jeopardy.
- Well, generally speaking, we do, there are provisions within the agreement for all successors and assigns, so.
- Okay.
- I'm less worried about that, but I agree with you that I think it's more appropriate to have the agreement with the owner, and the owner can have an agent on his behalf.
- Okay. Anything else, other than Johnson?
- No.
- Brunette? I know back in, back when I was younger, we used to go down there quite a bit, and the West Picture Show was kind of a happening place, and I know that parking was very confusing, so,
- It's just kind of a free for all.
- A lot of times you, just park there, just assume that it was a private lot. In fact, I used to work at that BMO Harris Bank when it was M&I Bank, and even then as an employee of that bank, I was so confused, so I think there's gotta be some benefit to the city to have those public parking spaces available, so on the face of it, I kind of agree, but I fear, quoting Nicholson here, there's got to be some sort of profit or additional revenue to

the city. I don't know if the city wants to end the practice of providing services to a for-profit business without some revenue to the city, because it's our staff and resources making this happen, so I don't know.

- Well, where do we go from here? If we approve this, is this sort of that weird thing where we approve it and it still goes to the council, or?

- Yes, it'll still go to the council, and if you have a suggestion, and this is no way an endorsement, but, just something for consideration, if you have an endorsement like cover costs and any revenues above and beyond costs incurred to be split between owner and city at an 80-20 or a 90-10 or whatever kind of a ratio, we would definitely go back to the owner with that suggestion.

- Question, Steve. If they went with a different company to do the maintenance or, yeah, the maintenance, instead of the city, what would they pay roughly? We're gonna save them some money, aren't we?

- I would think we are because, with lawn mowing and sweeping maintenance, we're simply gonna add that as part of our rotation and pick it up while we're out doing

- Right.

- those activities, this would probably be winter maintenance by parking division.

- Yeah, almost half of the cost is expected winter maintenance cost.

- Okay.

- And that's done by, well, parking division will do the light stones, but the heavy stones, parking division contracts out, so that's already passed through council.

- So what kind of margin would you say we could make, and, in the meantime, still save that company money?

- Well, I haven't been involved directly in the negotiations operations Director Piernot has, so I'm not sure what that appetite

- Chris? they have, but

- You got a feel?

- Yeah, I'm waiting for them to call me back this weekend to talk a little bit more.

- Okay.

- They seem very amenable to the price that we propose. They didn't even really flinch.

- Okay.

- You know, a contractor has the cost, the time, material, plus the percentage overhead, so there's technical activity.

- I guess we have to get this to the council next week, or can we wait until the next meeting, until we touch base? Is this?

- I just wanted to keep it moving.

- We would like to have it done sooner rather than later, but I
- I would, too.
- I don't think it's gonna impact anything negatively if we
- Because we can
- If we have to bring it back to you on the 26th
- Yeah.
- In two weeks time. But is there some sort of a proposal that you'd like us to go back to offer to the owner?
- Well, what kind of margin, well, as much as we could get, but realistically, I guess, I would start at 20%.
- Okay, so suggest an 80-20 split and see if we can't negotiate that with them.
- So 20 plus our cost all covered?
- Cost covered and then any revenues above and beyond cost would be split 80-20 between, 80 to the owner, 20 to the city. This is a little bit foreign territory for us
- Because we've always done breakeven.
- Yeah.
- Right.
- All the years that I've been. I know, in the past, I basically disagree but I'm privy to a lot of that, but I always thought we could try to make something, not necessarily, you're the DPW. I remember talking to Jerry Hanson, his department. Sheriff, not sheriff, the police department, but anyway, so when you say 80-20,
- So let's say just for sake of discussion
- Give me an example, please.
- For the sake of discussion purposes, this brings in gross revenues of \$120,000 a year,
- Okay.
- and \$20,000 of that is our actual cost, so we get paid the 20 for actual cost upfront. That leaves \$100,000 of money that's above and beyond cost.
- Right.
- That \$100,000, 80,000 goes to Pete's Garage, 20,000 comes to the city. We'd split any revenue above and beyond cost at an 80-20 split, and I picked the 80-20 because 80-20 and 90-10 have been two of the numbers we've used on PAYGO tasks quite a bit, so those numbers kind of pop into my head right away.
- It's a start.

- And realistically, just FYI, my projected revenues, because they haven't started, so you don't know until you experience it, is gonna be a hint over 50,000 gross.
- So under an 80-20 split, we could expect to make about \$10,000 a year.
- I'd be more comfortable with a flat cost. It kind of cuts down the administrative trying to figure out what the profit is, the bookkeeping side of their operations, how much tenant pays per, it just seems like a lot, and we're taking that in. We take the money in and give it to them, so we can just
- Yeah, we're the ones who are collecting all the revenue from the lot. We do all the work.
- Okay, okay.
- So we're already doing the bookkeeping on it anyway.
- It seems like a reasonable place to start to me, and again, it's, if we don't manage it, they'll obviously manage it on their own and then we have potentially restricted or no access to public parking, and that would be my greater concern.
- Right, I agree.
- And so, to your point, if we can get 20% and then use that almost as a benchmark or a standard as we start to renegotiate some of these other contracts.
- Yeah, we'd be happy to go back.
- Let's try it.
- Okay.
- What are you looking for for a motion then?
- I think to hold for two weeks and then direct staff to continue negotiations with a, starting with a proposal of cost covered and excess revenues split at 80-20.
- You wanna make that a motion?
- I move that.
- Second.
- Johnson made the motion, second by Brunette. Under discussion. Hearing none, all in favor?
- [All] Aye.
- Nays? Motion carried. Number three, consideration of possible action by On Broadway, Inc., and Green Bay Metro Transit for a public trash can at the bus stop on the southwest corner of Dousman Street and Chestnut Avenue. Director Grenier.
- I'm gonna have, Chris Pirlot, take this one.
- Chris.

- I spoke with Brian, who had taken in some comments, suggestions from constituents, residents in the area. I talked with the transit director, Patty Kiewiz. She was not opposed to that idea whatsoever. Public Works does this for a living. We put out public trash cans and collect them, and if it's necessary and helps keep the area clean,
- Absolutely.
- It's a very popular bus stop
- Okay.
- and recent shelter, so people do congregate.
- Alright, it's a subway, right? Is that where
- Yeah, right by the subway.
- Yeah. Essentially it's a new bus stop and it's creating a lot of trash, you know, a place to go adventure.
- Entertain a motion?
- Move to approve.
- Motion by Brunette, second by Johnson. Under discussion? Hearing none,
- Aye.
- All in favor?
- Aye.
- Nays? Motion carried. Number four, consideration of possible action request by Green Bay Metro Transit to place trash cans at the new transfer station in the 2200 block of Main Street, and I have the Department of Public Works add that stop to its collection route.
- We put a transit hub over on the far east side off of the axis road, near Auto Plaza Way and Main Street on the south side of Main, so kind of in front of where the new
- Like Taco Bell? In there?
- Yeah.
- Okay.
- It's where Pizza Ranch and Taco Bell is.
- Yeah, Pizza Ranch, yeah.
- Okay, and because it's a hub, you no longer have to come down to the transit station to switch buses. You can get off one bus at that hub and pick another bus up, so it's kind of like a mini transit location. Those are awful busy and they do wind up generating a lot of traffic. People get on and off the bus, they've got stuff they wanna throw away, and they become a litter collection point, so rather than have the area look bad, Metro Transit and DPW agree that a trash can should probably be located here. They're willing to fund the can?

- Yes.
- So they'll buy the can, we'll take care of dumping it.
- Questions? If not, entertain a motion.
- Move to approve.
- Second.
- Motion to approve by Brunette, second by Johnson. Under discussion. Hearing none, all in favor? Nays?
Motion carried. Five, consideration of possible action and request by the League of Wisconsin Municipalities to adopt the Strategic Transportation Aid Resolution. Director Grenier?
- Included in the packet electronically that we submitted to you is a draft resolution that the Wisconsin, or League of Wisconsin Municipalities, has created that they are looking to have cities across the state adopt. I'm trying to, I apologize, I don't have a hard copy of the
- Take your time.
- [Kathy] You might as well read mine. Wanna read on mine?
- Oh, thank you! Okay, so the resolution says as part of the Just Fix It campaign partnership with the League of Wisconsin Municipalities, Wisconsin Counties Association, Wisconsin Towns Association, and the Transportation Development Association of Wisconsin, whereas local government of Wisconsin is responsible for about 90% of the road miles in the state, and whereas Wisconsin's diverse economy is dependent upon county and town roads as well as city and village streets and transit systems across the state, and whereas the City of Green Bay and other local governments across Wisconsin have been highlighting our unmet transportation needs in many different avenues, including events such as the historic Turn Off For Transportation event in September 2016, where local governments in every region of the state held simultaneous meetings calling on the state legislature to prioritize transportation and pass a sustainable funding package, and whereas the increase in transportation funding for locals in the last budget was certainly appreciated, many still aren't back to 2011 levels when you adjust for inflation, and whereas locals including the City of Green Bay continue to struggle to meet even the most basic maintenance needs for our transportation system, and whereas states surrounding Wisconsin across the country have stepped up with sustainable funding plans for their state and local roads, and whereas Wisconsin will be at a competitive disadvantage if it does not implement a revenue and spending plan that addresses both our interstates that were built in the 1950s and '60s and our local state roads, and whereas levy limits do not allow local government to make up for the deterioration of state funding, and whereas local governments would not be forced to turn to local wheel taxes or increased borrowing or exceeding their levy limits if the state would finally pass a sustainable funding plan for transportation, whereas the common council of the City of Green Bay recognizes that our state and highway interstate system is the backbone of our surface transportation system and plays a vital role in the economy of Wisconsin. Both state and local roads need to be properly maintained in order for our economy to grow, and whereas from a competitive standpoint, Wisconsin motor space significantly less than any of our neighbors when you combine the annual cost of state gas tax and vehicle registration fees. Now, therefore, be it resolved by the common council of the City of Green Bay, urges the governor and legislature to just fix it and agree on a sustainable solution, one that includes a responsible level of bonding and adjusts our user fees to adequately and sustainably fund Wisconsin's transportation system. Furthermore, the city council directs the clerk to send a copy of this resolution to our state legislators, Governor Scott Walker, and League of Wisconsin Municipalities. So, it's a resolution on behalf of the common council urging the state to provide a sustainable funding model to increase state funding on state and local roads.

- Any questions for Director? If not, I'll entertain a motion.
- Okay, comment.
- Yeah, Member Brunette.
- Many of these resolutions have come up all the time, county, city, I mean, is it gonna matter?
- I think this one will. When they reference the meeting that was held in September of 2016, that was held in approximately 80 locations across the state, and it was a livestream meeting that was held, and that generated a lot of interests, a lot of comment back from the legislators. Now, that was a first meeting, and it was the beginning of the Just Fix It Campaign, but not a lot's really been done actively since then. There's been a lot of talk and a lot of studies and things like that. This is the first real significant outreach from a coalition of those folks who created the Just Fix It program to actually call on the governor and the state legislators to come up with a sustainable funding plan, so I agree with you, I think there are a lot of these resolutions that kind of, it's a feel good kind of thing, but this one I think actually may have some legs to it.
- Is this a recent situation coming up where some federal funding is missing? Is this
- No, this is completely separate from that. We'll be talking about that in a director's report.
- Okay.
- But would it be accurate in here, it says that some communities haven't restored funding levels since 2011. Would that be accurate for the City of Green Bay?
- What they're getting at is the, I think what we're talking about is the state road aids have not been restored but back to 2011 levels, and I'm not sure exactly where we sit on that.
- Okay.
- 2011 predates my time looking at those kind of things, but we could definitely look into that.
- I'm just curious. I mean, it doesn't say that that's the case with Green Bay. It just says some communities or many communities.
- Right.
- I'm with you, I mean a lot of these are feel good things, but I don't think this does anything that hurts us. I mean, everything in here is accurate.
- And that's one of the things that we looked at before we even brought it to you. If it was something that was antagonistic or controversial or confrontational, then I wouldn't have supported it, but this simply says we, as the common council, encourage you to do something, come up with a sustainable road formula and help the locals fund their projects.
- The only that, and this might be a philosophical
- Sure.
- issue that I have is that safe city aid has done a great job in funding roads in the budget, and they're growing, and it's an attractive place to live, and community B, perhaps, also could attract the place over to live, but they

have neglected their roads. Why should municipality A, through the state taxes, pay for municipality B's neglect? That's, philosophically, where I struggle.

- Sure.

- But yeah, we can, I'll make a motion to approve.

- Motion to approve Brunette, seconded by Johnson.

- Second.

- Under discussion. Kathy?

- I approve of this because you can see all the different associations, too. It's not just the city itself putting forward to join those other groups and all these cities that are putting these same resolutions in, and it's showing our state that there's, you know, they need help. Collecting money coming in, you need to bring some back to the communities, share it out so that we can help with some of these road projects, and this also, being on the accounting board, is a big push for, maybe, that south bridge, too. How many years has that been in asking for that south bridge in the county? So, I think it's a good resolution to start saying, come on, you've gotta do something. Just fix it. That's what it says.

- Okay. Any other concerns? All in favor?

- Aye.

- Nays? Motion carries. Six, consideration of possible action request by Kerry Rathburn. Doing business at Star Electric to install and maintain groundwater monitoring, well and public right-of-way. Director Grenier?

- And again, here what we've got is, I believe this was up off of Belt Avenue. We have a known underground storage tank, or known environmental release, that occurred up there, and the contamination has migrated into the public right-of-way. The Department of Natural Resources, as part of their process, requires any potentially responsible party to define the degree and extent of contamination whether that crosses party lines or not, so Star Electric, who is the responsible party in this case, has approached the city. They would like to put a monitoring well in our right-of-way and determine degree and extent of contamination should that exist. This is a normal course of business. We encounter these quite often. There is a whole harmless agreement that goes along with this. The petitioner is then responsible for all costs associated with insulation of the well, all the sampling that goes along with that well, and then proper abandonment, and then filing all of the required reports with the Department of Natural Resources after the well is no longer needed. Because it occurs in a right-of-way doesn't make us a potentially responsible party, we incur no liability nor additional costs associated with this, except if we happen to be doing a utility contract or street contract, we'd have to encounter those contaminated soils or groundwater should they exist. We're responsible for those disposal costs, but that happens whether they have this well or not.

- Okay, questions or concerns?

- Move to approve.

- Second.

- Motion to approve by Brunette, second by Johnson. Under discussion. Hearing none, all in favor?

- Aye.

- Nays? Motion carries. Seven, consideration of possible action and review on a war of bids for rubber surfacing for the downtown pocket park project. Director Grenier?

- The pocket park is the one that's going along North Adams Street on the Bailey Civic Center project, or property. If you remember, we had this out for bid. It came in significantly overpriced, so the Parks Department has re-scoped this. They're doing a lot of the work with in-house staff, but one of the things we do have to bid on is the rubberized surface, so that was turned over to the Purchasing Department. The Purchasing Department went out. There were two quotes that were submitted back. The first from the low-responsive vendor is Northland Recreation, LLC. Total cost is \$31,743, plus a \$4,899 option that, due to the steep nature recommendation that the top coat be increased from a three-eighths-inch thickness to a one-half-inch thickness, so total cost of this purchase would be \$36,642, and this does carry an approval by the Parks Department. They are, they're good with this, this award.

- Any questions or concerns? If not, I'll entertain a motion.

- I move to approve with the recommendation of half-inch-thick.

- Rubber coat?

- Yeah, the coat, the half-inch-thick coating.

- Motion by Johnson to approve.

- Second. Second by Brunette. Under discussion. Nothing? All in favor?

- Aye.

- Nays? Motion carried. Eight, consideration of possible action request by Alderman Lefebvre to extend special assessments payment, special assessment payments for pavement construction from five years, 10 years, when requested by residents. Kathy?

- Yeah, this is for, especially for the, for my district, this street, and, I've seen George. They could not be put off till next year to take advantage of the wheel tax because they tie in, specifically, the sewer system into the Webster Street project so they had to go through this here, and as, and it would not be money to exempt them from those special assessments or from, it'd be hard with the wheel tax to take them up, so one person especially asked me could they extend the payments out, and I talked to Stephen, he, he agreed that that would not be a hardship, or even if some people did ask for that. Have I got that right, Steve?

- Correct. This really would only apply to those payment projects that are in the current 2018 year. Anyone who had a project prior to this either has paid their assessment in full or is already on a payment plan, so it would be difficult for us to go back and redo that, so it's really only those 2018 projects that kind of got caught in the middle when the wheel tax was being discussed. It's a little bit of a cash flow. It really boils down to a cash flow question for us, and given the fact that the project was substantially smaller this, or the program was smaller this year than it has been in prior years. We would be able to handle that cash flow upfront. When we built the Capital Improvement Program, we're counting on getting those revenues in. We simply need to carry that as a 10-year, if requested, we'll carry it as a 10-year accounts payable as opposed to a five-year, but again, because the program was smaller this year, what could've been kind of a significant hit for us I think is manageable, so we would be okay with this.

- Any questions or concerns? Johnson?

- How many assessments are there in 2018? Who should be eligible for this?

- Off hand, I don't know.
- 100? 200?
- We're less than 200.
- Okay, and is it, is five-year the default?
- Yes.
- Upfront or five years
- Correct.
- at this rate.
- Okay, and so would we notify those individuals that they have a 10-year option, or would they have to know to come to us?
- I guess we would leave that at your pleasure. If you wish us to, we have the mailing list from everybody that we sent out because we had to notify them of the public hearing, the assessment hearings, so it wouldn't be a very big deal for us to go back and say common council has taken this action should you desire to exercise that option that's available to you.
- And do they pay the same rate, the interest rate to cover the bond expense if I recall correctly? Is that the same for 10 years versus five?
- Yes, it would be because you're paying the interest rate based on the bonding rate that we took out.
- Okay.
- So once we establish that rate for that payment schedule, that interest rate stays effective. As a matter of fact, the Finance Department computes what the total cost would be, similar to what you do on a mortgage. They know the interest rate. They compute the 10 payments, and then divide it equally by 10, back calculated to what your annual would be.
- Isn't that something we already do, 10 years? I mean, by special request?
- Only for commercial, or others and residential. This would
- Got it.
- This would make this available, and because commercials, they pay a higher rate than residential assessments do, and a lot of times we wind up small businesses that don't have the wherewithal to pay that assessment within that five-year period, we have historically allowed them to go on a 10-year plan.
- Thank you.
- Kathy?
- And also, there will be people that pay it in full.
- Absolutely.

- So, you're not gonna be doing that, and some people will just take five years instead of 10 years, so you're not probably gonna have all of them saying, well, we wanna do it 10 years.
- And oftentimes what we find out is, once they find out that there is interest associated with it, they tend not to wanna pay that 10-year plan.
- Brunette?
- I'm fine with it. I think reduces the sting for folks who have to pay a special assessment the same year we establish a wheel tax, so I don't know if the appropriate motion with just a simple move to approve?
- Yes.
- Of course, I'll figure out that.
- There's a motion to approve by Brunette.
- Second.
- Second by Johnson. Under discussion. Hearing none, all in favor?
- Aye.
- Nays? Motion carried. Nine, consideration of possible action request by Alderman Wery to review of how sidewalk replacements are funded. Can we hold this up until Mr. Wery's at our next meeting?
- Absolutely.
- Move to hold.
- Motion to hold by Brunette, seconded by Johnson. Under discussion. Hearing none, all in favor?
- Aye.
- Nays? Motion carried. 10, consideration of possible action and request by Department of Public Works, proposed 2019 parking division rates and fees report. Director Grenier.
- We have provided you tonight with a hard copy of this year's proposal for 2019 parking division rates and fees, and I am going to have Chris Pirlot give you the overview on what we are talking about.
- Basically, all we do is rate analysis versus upcoming proposed operating budget for the upcoming year every late summer, August, June through August, and then we come up with a proposal, because we've gotta balance the budget. This part, we can stand alone. Based on what we saw and what we have seen in the past, we have not increased rental rates for the last two years, so, and obviously we've gotta keep up with our own expenses, because it's parking and stand alone not funded by the tax levies, so we're proposing to increase rental parking rates by 2%, which is pretty typical maximum. It would not change any rates that are currently being charged in the Adams Street lot. Ad parking meters are in the river ramp. We would propose to increase parking rates in the ramps from 75 cents per hour to 85 cents per hour, then they would be the same as our parking meter rates. So parking meter rates are already five, but ramps are behind them. We didn't do anything with ramps for, I don't know, I think it's been three or four years. There's an attachment, I can tell you exactly how many years. No change in parking citation rates. We adjusted those with a couple different ones over the last couple years. They're pretty consistent as to what's happening in the region in the state. We

would continue to accept credit card payments with no extra charge. The parking patrons, they don't, parking division just absorbs the fees associated with that. There was some discussion upfront, and the reason I put that up there to affirm that was for some discussion and question. Should we add that on? Because that kind of makes parking division go backwards, but believe it or not, and I'm sure it's easy to believe, since we started accepting credit, the payments, it seems like there's a little bit more revenue generated. You know, people don't carry change in their cars to pay meters. They deal with passport parking, you know, like with the apps, and then pay their citations online. You have less delinquency. It just works out, so the fees that we pay minimally, it's far outweighed by the benefits that we've seen.

- The police towed my car with quarters in.

- Yeah.

- And just for clarification, under item 1B, rental rates, that's where our long-term or monthly partners,

- Right.

- So that would be not only at the ramps but also in the surface lots area of this parking lot that we manage.

- And then the last thing, many, many moons ago when I started with the city, parking was no charge for the first 15 minutes of each hour, so you'd park for or reserve a 15 minutes. Basically, back then, there was a mall downtown. The idea was, the first 15 minutes, something goes in, they drop off their kid or their spouse, because they're working at J.C. Penney, circulate back out of the ramp. Yep, go on, take your parking fees for that. You're just getting into the front door. Well, now everything is long-term parking. There's really not a lot of, it's mostly for business, daily parking, and if you're going to, say, see a business or a lawyer for an hour or whatever, you're gonna pay that hourly fee, so we would like to get rid of that first hour free and go back to that first 15 minutes free, and that's the way it was up until 2001 when the rebate gold program started, which has now been rescinded or has been changed because it kind of teetered out, so that's the last of the proposals is that we go back, first 15 minutes, no charge. You know, when someone comes in and says, aww, this ramp is too full, I'm gonna get confused and lost, it gives them a chance to get out without incurring any fees.

- And we do actually see people attempting to game the system who will pull into one facility, park there for 45 minutes, go out and move their car into a different zone and try to capitalize on that first hour free.

- And by reducing it, that eliminates some of this shuffling of cars, if you will.

- Chris, now what has increased 2%? What lots?

- That would be the long-term parking in the three main ramps, Pine, Main, and Cherry. That's when you pay a monthly fee.

- Right.

- And then if you have a pay monthly fee for a surface parking lot. That proposal is for increasing 2%.

- But we didn't do anything last year.

- No, we did not.

- So, it's basically 1% every year.

- Correct, right.

- Okay. I don't know, I think it should be a little more than 2%. That's my opinion.
- It probably is, though, because they round up the dime.
- And actually the bottom line, it's my responsibility as general manager of the parking division to make sure that parking stays solid into the future, and we look at that, and at the end of the year, assuming everything pans out, and I try to budget conservatively, especially for reference. You don't wanna say, oh, we're gonna make a quadrillion dollars, and you only take in a million or whatever, so there's some conservatism built in, but at the end of the year if everything pans out as projected, based on what we know, there's still going to be a decent amount of money put into the capital reserve for parking, so parking is not hurting.
- Well, what about the parking ramps? I mean, we have debt on that, don't we?
- Parking does pay back the bonds to the city. The cities pay the bonds, and then we pay them back. There is debt retirement. That's all built into the operating budget, and there's still money being put into capital.
- Right, but I remember
- Right now, there's still some debt service associated with Cherry Street ramp, and I believe within the next one to three years, I can't remember exactly.
- For some reason, I'm thinking there might have been 400,000.
- We should, yes, it's a little bit north of \$425,000 a year that we're paying off for that, and that debt will fall away, then what we'll do with that debt service payment that's currently in the parking budget is that will go into a capital fund to help build up reserves for the next, we've got a ramp coming. We just ran the numbers. With some of the patrons we've got coming online, with Humana moving out but Imperial moving in, now that Schriver's is fully staffed with associated, with Foxconn coming into the Watermark Building, with Metro being fully occupied, City Deck Land being occupied, we are currently operating Main, anytime that there's an activity at gat conventions that our Main is overflowing and we've got spill back into both Pine and Cherry, and that happens, you know, it's a good problem to have. That means KI Convention Center is working. Our monthly passes at Cherry, well our daily occupancy
- Is about 600.
- Physical fixed count, we are over 75% occupied in Cherry every day.
- The Cherry Street stalls, so, it would start to close up on the extras, extra space.
- And we don't have Foxconn in here yet. That's 250 people, plus we got ISG coming on the third floor of the Watermark. That's gonna be another 50 people looking for parking.
- We still have debt.
- We have about one to three year's worth of debt left, and again, that's already in our budget.
- It's built, yeah.
- And then once that debt has fallen off, then we will take that debt service payment. We will stockpile that for future needs, but the future needs are always more imminent than we may think.

- The proposed 2019 parking budget with the debt already as a line item in the operating budget, they're still projected almost 400,000 going into capital, which is that rainy day savings account, so we're doing okay.
- Yeah, okay, but I think we can do better. I mean, that's my opinion. I'm just looking out for the citizens of Green Bay. I don't like giveaways. So I'd like to hear the opinion from the committee.
- I have to, whenever I go to Appleton or whatever, I don't really notice parking meter rates or parking ramp rates unless they're crazy amounts of money like Madison or Chicago or something like that. Where are we at regionally?
- We're on the low end. We're in the zone, but we're toward the low end of, say, the median area. I don't have the data with me, but Appleton, I believe, is, I think they're a dollar per hour, the rates.
- They are.
- Are you sure?
- And we're proposing going up to 85 right now
- Yeah.
- From 75.
- Let's say, from my time on the council previously, I've always felt that the parking division was well ran, and obviously they're looking over the best interest of everyone involved. I do think we could probably increase it just a little more rather than more than what you've already proposed because then, a year from now, two years, we inch it up five cents, 10 cents a year rather than make one substantial, a little more than maybe 90 cents rather than inching up a little bit each year.
- Yeah, 85 makes the budget solid, and then we'd put money away. 90 would not hurt my feeling. This is just, it's more revenue and more money that's gonna help balance all the parking.
- Alderman Johnson, do you have an opinion?
- So I just wanna understand how this operates. I mean, the parking division is completely self-sustaining?
- Correct.
- So if there is an overflow, does that money stay within the parking division as what grows the capital funding?
- Yes.
- And if there's a deficiency, does that come out of the capital funding?
- That comes out of a rainy day fund.
- Okay. Do you recall the last time that we've seen a deficiency? Has it been a long time?
- Not in all my
- Ever.
- years really.

- There were years that matter where we cut in, but
- Three years ago, we ran in the red.
- Okay.
- We're about a three-and-a-half million dollar a year fund, and I think three years ago we ran about 10%, \$350,000, give or take.
- Okay, so pretty much that capital improvement fund, is that predominantly earmarked for like that service on parking ramps?
- Is that the
- It has been used for, some of that was used for, to help offset the cost of implementing the automated parks, parking access and revenue control system. We've used that money for lighting improvements. We've used that for physical improvements that are necessary at surface lots and ramps.
- So there's not like an imminent need other than, hey, if we have it, spend it? There's not an imminent need, I guess, to increase beyond that, because, while we say 2%, in reality, because we round to the next dime, I mean, we're looking at 10 to 15% with this increase.
- Well, I would say that we do have an imminent need. We will be looking to add another ramp sometime within the next, I'm guessing, absolute top end, we're looking five years that we're gonna need another ramp downtown.
- Okay, so there's an imminent need, I guess my question is why aren't we asking for that right now rather than us saying hey, let's rent more? I mean, no pun intended, I don't necessarily feel comfortable nickel and diming people if we don't have a need for it. Sure, if we've got the revenue, we'll spend it, but I don't necessarily think that should be the approach. If we've got a need for it, then I'd be more inclined to support it, but if it's just, let's add a nickel on there just so that we can get more revenue, I don't particularly feel comfortable about that.
- Yeah, we do the operating budget. First, split the operating budget together and say, okay, well we need 3.44 million for the, to operate the parking division for 2019, then we go back, like, okay, what are the revenue projections gonna be with this year's revenues, and then do some sensitivity analysis in Excel, spreadsheets, and come up with a proposal, palatable, I try to propose palatable rate changes as opposed to, you know, about 75, let's ask for a dollar 10. It's not big jumps, something that's more, you know, easier on the patron, but it's still, it keeps parking division solid and helps build the future capital fund for our future needs.
- And we're doing that at 2%, and again, when we talk about nickel and diming, the people we're nickel and diming are probably predominantly the residents of Green Bay, who are paying that fee and so, if 2% is what's needed to keep the budget balanced, then we're inclined to support the proposal as opposed to tacking on an additional fee.
- Alright, I guess I disagree. I guess it's a matter of opinion, nickel and diming. We do have a need, don't we? We have a ramp coming in five years.
- Well, there will be a
- There's a need out there for us to start planning now.

- I've been in business for a long time. You gotta plan down the road to see what the heck's gonna happen. You need money in case there's a problem with your building or infrastructure, so, I guess I disagree with the comments of Mr. Johnson. I think we should increase it, so. Where does the 20% come in? If we're increasing at 2%,

- But rounding off

- Round to 20?

- What that means is, let's say a monthly rate in a lot or ramp would be \$50. You increase it 2%, that's \$1. It goes to 51. But let's just say the math comes out to \$51.23. We round up to 51.30.

- And the 10 to 15% is definitely more relevant to the meter rate.

- Oh, okay, I was

- The parking stall rate.

- I was just

- Apologies for the confusion on that.

- Well, and the, the meter rates are not changing. The rental rates, the long-term rental rates are what are going up by 2%. I believe our base rate is around 64.80. That number

- Yeah, it's right on there.

- And see if it was 3%, would it be at 90 cents then?

- If my memory is right and our base rate at the ramp is \$64.80,

- Right.

- a 2% rate increase brings us up to 66.09 cents, which would then become 66.10, so if we go 66.1,

- Yeah, it'll come up to .02 or

- .1 divided by 64.8. It comes out to 1.02006, so I mean it is six-thousandths over 2%.

- I guess I'm so confused. If you say 2%,

- Well, it comes out to \$66 and 9.6 cents, so we take that 9.6 cents and round it up to 10.

- At what?

- Well, at 2%, so it comes out at just a hair over two. The 2%,

- Then at 3%, what is that, then?

- Well, if we were to go 64. Again, assuming this is 64.80 is the right number.

- Number 60 cents.

- It would go, instead of being 66.10, it would be 66.75 a month. It would add 65 cents per month to a parking pass.
- I'm sorry, how many? 70 cents, is that what you said?
- About 65 cents.
- 65 cents.
- Right. Per month.
- And it still helps the city, doesn't it?
- Again, what we would do is, as Chris indicated, we cover expenses first, and we actually start with the expense side of the equation, figure out what our expenses for the year are, compare that against our anticipated revenue stream, and that's what this represents is us balancing revenues
- Right.
- and expenditures. If there are monies where we have revenues that exceed expenditures, that goes into our reserve fund.
- Well, I don't think that's too much to ask. Kathy?
- I think the question to ask that you were talking about another ramp, are you ever gonna be able to have enough by charging to pay the full rent? No, right,
- No.
- because the cost is so
- The new ramp, we are anticipating, is gonna run somewhere around \$33 million, not including land acquisition.
- Right, so, you could put, yeah, money aside, you are, but you're never going to be able to charge enough to the people to pay for the next ramp.
- Right.
- It's just not feasible.
- We would hope to have
- Well, I'm just saying, you wanna, you know, get more revenue, but,
- Yeah, and we're helpful to
- That's fine, but do you wanna have it so high that some people are gonna say no.
- Like I said, I don't like giveaways, I like to ease the burden of the public.
- Four or five blocks away, they'll park all they want.

- Mr. Brunette, Alderman Brunette.
- Nothing. Well, I need a motion.
- Well, I'll make a motion to increase to 3%.
- To approve with the increase of 3%?
- Right.
- I second that.
- Okay, there's a motion by Nicholson, second by Brunette. Under discussion. Any concerns or questions? Comments? If not, all in favor?
- Aye.
- Aye. Nays?
- Nay.
- One nay, Mr. Johnson. Okay, moving forward. Number 11, consideration of possible action in request by Department of Public Works on proposed 2018-2019 winter contractor rates report. Director Grenier.
- Each year, we contract with local contractors to help supplement our winter maintenance snow removal activities. We do use the WisDOT Bureau Highway Maintenance Manual. We classify equipment rates as a baseline for which to help set our rental rates. So what we're looking at is the state equipment rates plus the cost of \$22 per hour for the operator that we round up, or round to the nearest half dollar, so what we have is a grader or a loader with a wing and the operator rolling steady at \$105 per hour, a small loader and operator so if something has less than three cubic yard capacity. Last year, we were at \$68.50. We are proposing we go up to \$82 per hour for that. A large loader, again, both of these loaders assume no wing, just the plow blade or a bucket, so a larger loader with an operator, no wing greater than or equal to three cubic yards, goes from 83.50 to 88.50 per hour, and then the hourly rate just for the operator to attend safety meetings or required meetings with staff goes from \$20 to \$22 per hour. The research that we've completed actually indicates that the greater the loader with a wing, the rate should actually be going down this year based on state equipment rates. However, those are valuable pieces of equipment, and we have a tough time getting people at the level five rate to start with. I would recommend not decreasing that cost, because those graders and loaders become invaluable during the winter. That's the only thing that we have that's able to generate down pressure for scraping, and loaders and graders really do a number. They move a lot of snow on our streets.
- Okay, any questions or concerns? If not, entertain a motion.
- Move to approve.
- Motion to approve by Brunette, second by
- Second.
- Johnson. Under discussion. Hearing none, all in favor?
- Aye.

- Nays? Motion carried. 12, consideration of possible action under request by Department of Public Works to reimburse Greenwood Hospitality \$30,000 for repairs to Pine Street ramp skywalk in accordance with the previous, or the provisions, of the Hotel Northland Developers Agreement. Director Grenier.

- When we entered into the developers agreement with Hotel Northland, one of the provisions in that was to provide parking services, and then there is a skywalk from our third level that connects to the second floor of the hotel that goes back to the days of Port Plaza Towers when that was an assisted living facility, and they needed the ability to get people from the ramp into the facility without bringing them outside. Obviously, the front door is not ADA-accessible, so bringing them in at the second floor and getting access to an elevator is how they did that. As part of that developers agreement with the hotel, there was a provision in there that says that we are required to bring that back up to a current condition because it has been left largely vacant since Port Plaza Towers has been empty. What we have come to, what we are working to as part of this development agreement, in order to get that back into a usable condition, we would ultimately, we would talk to the contractor who's already over there where we don't have mobilization costs and things of that nature. We did get a quote from, from Ganther, which we've included as part of the electronic packet, approximately \$30,000, well it was 29,000 and change, like 29,400, I believe, for them to complete the work while they're over there. One of the things we are trying to do, that's our responsibility either way, okay, so because that was not an expense that we identified in the capital improvement program, we do need to get approval from the common council to expend that money. What I can tell you is, as part of negotiations with the new owners and Greenwood Hospitality, what we are attempting to do is inform them that, with this expenditure, we have made that ramp current, and we would like, the only reason that that skyway exists is to get people in and out of the hotel. The ramp functions perfectly fine without it, so if you folks would like to keep that skyway, we're gonna make this investment. We said we would and that we're gonna turn it over. We're actually gonna quick claim it over to the developer. It's gonna be his responsibility from this point on, but again, this was an expense that was in the approved developers agreement. It does exceed 25,000, so we do need your approval.

- Okay.

- Where's that money coming from? Alderman Johnson?

- That will come out of the parking

- Okay.

- Raising the incline.

- Alright.

- This has been known for quite some time. This isn't something that's,

- We have

- no offense to you, but kind of being slipped

- Nope, we have been, we have been working with the contractor who's doing the work on the hotel probably for the last eight months or so, saying, guys, we need to do this work. We need you to get me a price. I need you to get me a price. I need you to get me, and they have, in their defense, they have been concentrating on getting the hotel done, and now we're in the home stretch of the hotel and they turned around and came back and said, okay, this is our expectation of what it's gonna take to fix the skywalk, so we took the quote and went over and did a physical inspection on the skywalk ourselves and went, yep, they're right. That's all it's gonna cost. So we agree with the costs, and we agree it's our responsibility. It's just, these fit and finish things are the last things that get done.

- So it goes from the Pine Street ramp?
- Correct. There is an alley that runs between the edge of the Pine Street ramp and the hotel, and if you look up, there's a skywalk there.
- Yeah.
- So it's only about 12 feet long.
- Yeah.
- 14 feet.
- Does this proposal for the funding also include the quick claim deed for
- Nope, that's something we're negotiating anyway. This is something we're responsible for as part of the developers agreement.
- Move to approve.
- Second.
- Motion by Johnson to approve, second by Brunette. Under discussion. All in favor?
- Aye.
- Aye.
- And I'm gonna be a nay, so it's two to one. 13, consideration of possible action under request of the Department of Public Works to approve amendment, is that an I?
- I.
- Yes. Of the Brown County Municipal Recycling Agreement. Director Grenier.
- This is a, we entered into an agreement nine years, or 10 years ago, so this is, I mean number nine, we had the base agreement and I invited them since, whereby we designate Brown County to act as our agent, become the responsible unit of government for recycling, and then we get whatever revenues or costs come along with that. It's been very beneficial, mutually beneficial agreement. It's worked very well for both parties, so we recommend approval.
- Questions? Concerns? If not, entertain a motion.
- Move to approve.
- Second.
- Motion to approve by Brunette, second by Johnson. Under discussion. Hearing none, all in favor?
- Aye.

- Nays? Motion carried. 14, consideration of possible action under request of the Department of Public Works to enter a new agreement for professional services for the Nitschke Bridge hydraulic pump replacement design in the amount of \$68,732.36. Grenier?

- Okay, we have, the way the bridge works, it's an electrohydraulic design, so electric motors ride hydraulic pumps. There's some rather large hydraulic subs in the bridge, and the hydraulics actually operate the lift gear, as well as, there's hydraulic brakes that control the bridge on its descent. The hydraulics system has been largely in operation and functional since 1998 when that bridge was constructed, and that bridge, we own that, but the maintenance, we're reimbursed for maintenance by the state of Wisconsin, because it goes across a navigable waterway on a commercial port on a state drawn highway, so it's a little bit of an odd duck. I'll be honest with you, when we got that bridge in '98, we really didn't get a whole lot of training on what we should be doing, so we've been doing the annual greasing and taking care of the lot pens and things like that, but the hydraulics system itself, we didn't have any experience with and we didn't get a lot of good instruction, so last year, John Miller of the Special Projects Division started doing some investigation and found out that we should have been doing some routine maintenance and upkeep on the hydraulics system, so we drained all the oil, did a scrub of the hydraulics system, found out that, after operating the thing for 20 years and really not maintaining it, we've gotten very, very lucky. We could've had some bad failures on the hydraulics, and we just didn't, so. We did a lot of cleaning, got some things taken care of, and the consultant has told us that we've got some pumps and hydraulic motors that are past their useful life. So the control systems in there, it's a 20-year-old bridge, it's time for these things to start going out. It's no different than, you know, you get 15 years on a car, you gotta put brakes into it. Okay? So we're not building a new bridge to the tune of \$30 million, but we do have to replace hydraulics system to the tune of a half million dollars kind of thing.

- Any questions or concerns?

- So, what we're doing is we're engaging the services of AECOM, which is a large, multinational engineering firm on office here in Green Bay. That's the old SES consultants, who have experience in designing these systems, because our staff doesn't.

- Okay, any questions or concerns?

- Budgeted?

- Alderman Brunette.

- Yes, this budget is perfect.

- Okay. Move to approve.

- Motion to approve by Brunette, second by

- Second.

- Johnson. Under discussion.

- Aye.

- Hearing none, all in favor?

- Aye.

- Aye.

- Aye. Nays? Motion carried. 15, consideration of possible action whether a sanitary sewer credit refund should be granted at 2355 Eastman Ave. Director Grenier.

- We had a situation where the resident at 2355 Eastman Avenue discovered that he had a large usage on his clear water meter. Technically, what had happened, and we don't do this very often anymore, but back years ago, folks who had a need for, you know, folks who did lawn irrigation, or if you have a large swimming pool, they used to put a deduct meter in, or a clear water meter, and this resident went back and started looking saying, God, I got a lot of usage on my clear water meter. Turns out both the clear water meter and his regular water meter, he was being charged both water and sewer on both meters, so we actually were double dipping him for quite some time. It appears this goes back many years. However, statutes limit this to a six-year recovery period. We feel justified in reimbursing from the sanitary sewer fund this individual for the last six years.

- At the price of?

- That's what I'm looking for here.

- 2,200, I think it was. What's that?

- Like 2,200.

- Okay. \$2,025.64, so thank God it was on the clear water meter.

- Yep.

- Okay, any questions or concerns?

- Move to approve.

- Motion to approve by Alderman Johnson, second by

- Second.

- Brunette. Under discussion. Hearing none, all in favor?

- Aye.

- Aye.

- Motion carried. 16, consideration of possible action under report of purchasing manager to contract with rotating equipment repair for the repair of two pumps at Harvey Street. Storm sewer lift station for 74,514. Director Grenier.

- Again, we have two pumps at our Harvey Street, Harvey Street lift station that do need repair. RER is the contractor who, RER does a lot of our storm pumps, and I think we may have talked about this at a previous meeting. Very few repair companies can cross over multiple pump manufacturers. Based on the pumps that we have, RER is a licensed distributor for those pumps and actually came up with a lower cost than the pump manufacturer itself, so we have been sole-sourcing a lot of our pumps back to RER. What they have is they gave us back quote \$74,514. However, we also need \$2,700 for the shipping of the motors to and from RER, so the actual cost should show up as 77,214.

- Now, the storm sewer lift station, it helps with flooding?

- Yes. Anytime that we have storm water, this helps lift that up and get it to an elevation where we can just turn it into a surface water body.
- How can we get one over on Shorts and Mason Street? Because that was one of the designated areas, and we had that map about two years ago.
- Right, we're working our way through it. Right now, we were doing, the project has been going on all summer on Elizabeth.
- I guess where's Shorts on the list?
- That I would have to check with, with that van Hecken I want.
- Okay. Alright, any other concerns or questions?
- Move to approve.
- Motion to approve
- Second.
- by Johnson, second by Brunette. Under discussion. Hearing none, all in favor?
- Aye.
- Nays? Motion carried. 17, consideration of possible action under request by Wisconsin Public Service Corporation for an easement across city-owned parcels, 7-741-1, for the North Webster Avenue project. Director Grenier.
- What we have is a very small sliver of land that's on North Webster immediately north of where the East River crosses underneath, so that would be up by the
- Coast Guard Station.
- But that's up by the AFG's clinic.
- American Foods Group put that new clinic in,
- Right.
- So we got that lift station up there, and Wisconsin Public Service is part of their utility improvements associated with the North Webster corridor. They're looking for a 12-foot wide utility easement across property. 12 foot is the customary to have as a utility easement in the front yard of any property, so the staff supports this and recommends approval.
- Okay, questions or concerns? Second?
- Second.
- Oh, Johnson, do you make a motion?
- I did, sir.

- Alright, motion to approve by Johnson, second by Brunette. Under discussion. Hearing none, all in favor?
- Aye.
- Nays? Motion carried. Okay, number 18. I'm just gonna read it out as report of actions taken by Department of Public Works, and if anybody has any questions, just please speak up. Everybody okay with all of it? Okay.
- The report will give us a chance to play this out in court.
- Okay.
- Does anyone have a question?
- Yes, Johnson?
- How many more properties do we have left to acquire over there?
- Full acquisitions.
- I think it's three or four.
- That's all that's left?
- Yeah, for the full acquisitions, but we've also, we probably have another 15 or so of the small strip takes or property corners or vision corners or TLEs or things like that.
- Okay, so we're close?
- We're doing very well on it.
- Good.
- In fact, the contract for taking down the first group of nine is going out the door, hold tight.
- Will that have to come here as well?
- For the first time today.
- All 24 houses will be on the ground by March.
- Okay, so that's gonna go along.
- We're gonna keep doing that to the letter.
- Alright.
- Yeah. They're demolishing it.
- Move to accept?
- Motion to receive a place on file by Johnson, second by
- Second.

- Brunette. Under discussion. Hearing none, all in favor? Nays? Motion carried. Director's report. Director Grenier.

- Okay, just a couple of things for you tonight, first of which is the rental station, real estate acquisition on Webster is progressing very nicely, and I was gonna give you the numbers, but we just did that.

- Mhmm.

- We are in our third bolt collection for the year. This is also an overflow week, so if your constituents are asking you, this is the week to do it. Snowplow Rodeo. The City of Green Bay will host the annual American Public Works Association Snowplow Rodeo this Thursday at the parking lot at Lambeau Field. We're hoping for a repeat of last year when one of our staff actually won the state-wide competition then went on to participate in the national competition in Loveland, Colorado, so, it's a lot of fun if you get a chance to come out and take a peek at things Thursday morning and watch the guys going through the paces. It's pretty interesting. There's a written exam that's involved, and there's a, the truck, there's a truck that has 10 things wrong with it. We call it disabled vehicle test, and on your pre-trip inspection, the driver should be able to diagnose any of the, you know, all 10 of the things that are wrong and make the correct, at least identify what corrective action needs to be taken, and then there's a physical obstacle course that the drivers have to drive on, and it is timed, so, last year, last couple of years, we've had about 140 participants across the state go through the full exercise and compete in the rodeo, so a lot of fun. And then the last item I have for you tonight is relative to Gray Street, which Alderman Brunette have brought up. There's just a lot of confusion statewide. We don't exactly understand what it means, which is why the questions. The state, there's federal money that comes in from the Federal Highway Administration through the surface development, or Surface Transportation Block Grant, STBG program, and those funds pay for projects like Webster Avenue and Mather Street and Gray Street, and it used to be funded on a five-year cycle, and Brown County's MPO, or Municipal Planning Organization, we are an entitlement at the 105, I think, entitlement MPOs in the state, so we have a set funding distribution, and that comes on a five-year cycle, so about three-and-a-half million dollars, give or take 17-and-a-half million dollars for the five-year funding cycle. They informed us in June that it was only a four-year funding cycle looking forward, and there just seems to be some mass confusion between the DOT and the MPO over exactly what that means, but we were anticipating a funding availability of this much money, and in reality, there's only, there's three-and-a-half million dollars less than what we had anticipated, so the MPO had to make some adjustments, and there were three projects that were potentially impacted, one in Ashwaubenon, one in Bellevue, and Gray Street in Green Bay. Not because it's in Green Bay but because of how the timing on various components of the project work, there was no way to meet the deadlines that are imposed by the DOT and keep Gray moving forward with the move from a five-year cycle to a four-year cycle, so the federal funding on Gray is no longer there. We're still going forward with the project. It's simply gonna be a locally funded project instead of the federal funding, and one of the things that I have said, and this is not any disrespect to the Wisconsin Department of Transportation, the way the DOT projects go, especially when you're doing a local project like a Webster or a Gray or a Mather, they have their facilities development manual, and the FDM is a wonderful tool if you're doing high-speed rural, but when you get into low-speed urban settings, some of the reports that you have to do and the reporting requirements and all the hoops you have to jump through, it gets really, really onerous for us to do that, which is why we hire consultants, and the overall project cost is significantly higher than what we pay to do the same project if it was a locally run project, but with that much federal funding coming in, sometimes you're willing to bite that bullet and go through all the, jump through all the hoops to get the federal money. If the federal money's not there, we're gonna take the project back, but we're gonna do it our way, and we will likely, very likely, okay? I'm very confident we're gonna be able to do it at a substantially less cost, overall cost, total cost of the project than what the states would be able to do with the federal funding. As a result of that, because we still have local funding cost share associated with the project when it was federally funded, and the federal funding is capped, okay? We did those cost estimates that qualified for the funding back in 2014. Those funds do not index with respect to inflation, so you're doing your best to guess five years prior, actually, in this case, it would've been seven years prior, project was not due to be constructed until 2021, there's a very good

possibility it happened on almost every project we've done with the state so far, that once we actually get the construction, the total dollar value that we're, the total dollar value of the contract exceeds what we had anticipated when we entered into the agreement, and because the federal funds are capped, we pick up 100% of that excess, so our cost winds up being much more than the 20% that we anticipate going in. The overall effect to the taxpayer is not gonna be an 80% increase in cost. We think we're probably gonna come out closer to what we have paid under the same contract anyway, but, it's just information. There's really nothing we can do. The goal line changed, I guess, is the best way to look at it. It's a four-year program instead of a five-year program, and when we looked at everything, we couldn't meet the program requirements.

- And WBAY, their report made it seem it might've just disappeared as if it was diverted somewhere else, and that's,

- Well, I worked with that reporter pretty extensively to make sure that we got an accurate report, and at the time that the report ran, at the time that we did the interview last Thursday, there were a lot of unanswered questions, and I think if you go back and re-look at that interview, that's exactly what I'm saying is, we don't know what this means. Somebody please explain it to us. They simply said, here's the funding that was there, and here's the funding that there is now, and there was one year's worth of funding that's not there, so we're asking where'd the money go. If it was here last year and it's not here now, what happened? What we're hearing from the state is we're dealing with a planning cycle, so there's not actual money. It's anticipated money, okay? And if you're anticipating money five years out, and now you're only anticipating money four years out, well, yeah, there's a year gap in there. If it was that, if it was that cut and dry, we'd just, we wish the state would've told us that. It would've saved a lot of confusion.

- Well, you know, the public's looking for scammers.

- Absolutely. So I think that, unfortunately, the way you explained it was perfect.

- That's the best information I have at this time based on what I'm hearing from the state today. Again, go back to last Thursday and that's all we were asking for. Help us understand what happened. All you told us was, last year in October, there was this much money, and this year in June, there's this much money, and okay, there's 43-and-a-half million dollars locally, 46 million dollars across the state. Where'd it go? It didn't go anywhere. The money never existed. It was on paper.

- I need a motion to receive a place on file.

- So moved.

- Motion by Brunette.

- Second.

- Second by Johnson. Under discussion. Hearing none, all in favor? Nays? Motion carried. Motion to adjourn?

- So moved.

- Second.

- Motion by Johnson, second by Brunette. Under discussion. Hearing none, all in favor? Nays? Motion carried.

- [Kathy] I see you're going back to your Wednesday meeting.

- Sounds like it.

- [Kathy] Yeah, I do have a concern that