



MINUTES OF THE IMPROVEMENT AND SERVICES COMMITTEE

**WEDNESDAY, JUNE 13, 2018, 6:00 PM
CITY HALL, ROOM 207**

PLEASE NOTE TIME CHANGE

Immediately following Park Committee which begins at 4 p.m.

A. ROLL CALL.

Present: Brian Johnson, Chris Wery, Jesse Brunette, Andy Nicholson

B. APPROVAL OF THE AGENDA.

Moved by Brunette, seconded by Wery to approve as amended. Motion carried. Discuss Item No. 1 for a short period then hold the item and finish the discussion after Item no. 5.

Yes- All, No- None, Abstain- None

C. APPROVAL OF MINUTES.

Moved by Alderperson Chris Wery, seconded by Alderperson Jesse Brunette to approve. Motion carried.

Yes- Andy Nicholson, Brian Johnson, Chris Wery, Jesse Brunette, No- None, Abstain- None

D. REGULAR BUSINESS.

I. Consideration with possible action on request by Ald. Dorff to craft a proposal to implement the Municipal Vehicle Registration Fee Program (Wheel Tax) (held over from the May 7, 2018 Improvement and Services Committee meeting).

motion discussed then put on hold to be discussed after item no.5

began discussion again at 6pm

Moved by Alderperson Chris Wery, Second Alderperson Johnson. Ammend motion to read, approve \$20 wheel tax with staff providing annual report status of funding with a five year project list that is reviewed annually with the committee; funds to be allocated to eliminate residential special assessments and reduce commercial assessments 50%; include \$1,675,000 for roads, \$250,000 for rail road crossings and \$175,00 for reduction of commercial assessments for a total of \$2,100,000 Motion carried.

Yes- Brian Johnson, Chris Wery, No- Andy Nicholson, Jesse Brunette, Abstain- None. Motion Failed

Moved by Alderperson Jesse Brunette, Second Alderpers Andy Nicholson to amend original to read, refer to City Staff to create three different proposals for instituting a \$10 wheel tax to completely eliminate residential assessments and include a sunset within five years as the City transitions to a plan of paying for street repairs and replacement from the general levy and bonding dollars.. Motion carried.

Yes- Jesse Brunette, No- Andy Nicholson, Chris Wery, Brian Johnson Abstain- None Motion Failed

2. Consideration with possible action on request by Ald. Wery to allow City Council members a second parking permit (held over from the May 7, 2018 Improvement and Services Committee meeting).

Moved by Alderperson Jesse Brunette, seconded by Alderperson Chris Wery to approve as amended. Motion included approving two parking passes for Alders contingent upon Personnel Committee approval adding the second parking pass to the Alder's benefit package. Motion carried.

Yes- Andy Nicholson, Chris Wery, Jesse Brunette, No- Brian Johnson, Abstain- None

3. Consideration with possible action on request by the Department of Public Works regarding approval of the annual Compliance Maintenance Annual Report (CMAR) and resolution for Wisconsin Department of Natural Resources (WDNR) sanitary sewer collection permit.

Moved by Alderperson Brian Johnson, seconded by Alderperson Jesse Brunette to approve as amended. Add authorize the Mayor and City Clerk to execute the resolution and allow the Director of Public Works to forward these documents to the WDNR. Motion carried.

Yes- Andy Nicholson, Brian Johnson, Chris Wery, Jesse Brunette, No- None, Abstain- None

4. Consideration with possible action on request by the Department of Public Works to authorize the Department of Public Works to execute contracts related to asbestos abatement and demolition of properties associated with the Webster Avenue project, consistent with the terms and conditions previously established for authorizing the Department of Public Works to execute other construction contracts.

Moved by Alderperson Chris Wery, seconded by Alderperson Jesse Brunette to approve. Motion carried.

Yes- Andy Nicholson, Brian Johnson, Chris Wery, Jesse Brunette, No- None, Abstain- None

5. Consideration with possible action on single source purchase of Warning Gates and Gate Arms from B&B Roadway in the amount of \$75,590.

Moved by Alderperson Jesse Brunette, seconded by Alderperson Chris Wery to approve. Motion carried.

Yes- Andy Nicholson, Brian Johnson, Chris Wery, Jesse Brunette, No- None, Abstain- None

6. Consideration with possible action on the report of the Purchasing Manager:

A. Request approval to purchase a Front End Loader with Bucket and Snow Plow from Airing Equipment Co. for \$181,835.

B. Request approval to purchase Variable Speed Drives from Graybar for \$21,685.

C. Request approval to award a contract for Masonry & Tuckpointing Repairs at four lift stations to R.J. Jacques, Inc. for \$19,439.

D. Request approval to purchase a new Hytera portable radio system from Nielson Communications Inc. for \$171,636.

Moved by Alderperson Jesse Brunette, seconded by Alderperson Chris Wery to approve Item A. Motion carried.

Yes- Andy Nicholson, Brian Johnson, Chris Wery, Jesse Brunette, No- None, Abstain- None

Moved by Alderperson Jesse Brunette, seconded by Alderperson Chris Wery to approve Item B.. Motion carried.

Yes- Andy Nicholson, Brian Johnson, Chris Wery, Jesse Brunette, No- None, Abstain- None

Moved by Alderperson Jesse Brunette, seconded by Alderperson Chris Wery to approve Item C. Motion carried.

Yes- Andy Nicholson, Brian Johnson, Chris Wery, Jesse Brunette, No- None, Abstain- None

Moved by Alderperson Jesse Brunette, seconded by Alderperson Chris Wery to approve Item D. Motion carried.

Yes- Andy Nicholson, Brian Johnson, Chris Wery, Jesse Brunette, No- None, Abstain- None

7. Report of actions taken by Department of Public Works

A. Award of contract

1. No bids received 2018 LIFT STATION REROOFING.

2. To approve to award PARKING RAMP REPAIRS - 2018 to the low, responsive bidder Central Restoration LLC, in the amount of \$455,850.

3. To approve to award SEWERS 4-18 (INCLUDING WATER MAIN) to the low, responsive bidder Advance Construction Inc., in the amount of \$1,037,554.50.

4. To approve to award SUPERIOR ROAD STORM WATER POND to the low, responsive bidder PTS Contractors Inc., in the amount of \$784,323.80.

B. Granting of licenses

I. Concrete Sidewalk Builders

- a. Blaser Construction, LLC
- b. Paul Conard Construction Co., Inc.
- c. Ramco Construction Services

2. Tree & Brush Trimmer by WB Tree Service.

3. Underground Sprinkler

- a. Lizer Lawn Care
- b. Conserva Irrigation

C. Real estate acquisition for Webster Avenue

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

- a. 3 820 N Webster Avenue Sheri A. Drummond \$93,000
- b. 18 1102 N Webster Avenue Cover Rentals \$70,000

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

- | | | | |
|--------|-----------------------|--------------------------|------------|
| a. 5a | 1003 Smith Street | Brian Kohls | \$2,200.50 |
| b. 8 | 1110 N Webster Avenue | Carol Petasek | \$34,752 |
| c. 9 | 1002 Berner Street | Molly Barron | \$5,625 |
| d. 14a | 1001 Day Street | Jenny Sill | \$1,200 |
| e. 4 | 1000 Smith Street | Reginald & Jean Doxtater | \$2,098.43 |
| f. 4a | 1000 Smith Street | Thomas Doxtater | \$21,027 |
| g. 7a | 1108 N Webster Avenue | Anthony Shea | \$1,550 |
| h. 14a | 1001 Day Street | Jenny Sill | \$6,800 |
| i. 14b | 1001 Day Street | Rebecca Eckhart | \$2,300 |
| j. 15 | 916 N Webster Avenue | Craig J. Process | \$55,000 |
| k. 15 | 916 N Webster Avenue | Craig J. Process | \$1,540 |

Moved by Alderperson Brian Johnson, seconded by Alderperson Jesse Brunette to receive and place on file Award of Contract Item No. 1. Motion carried. Yes- Andy Nicholson, Brian Johnson, Chris Wery, Jesse Brunette, No- None, Abstain- None

Moved by Alderperson Brian Johnson, seconded by Alderperson Jesse Brunette to approve Award of Contract Item No. 2. Motion carried. Yes- Andy Nicholson, Brian Johnson, Chris Wery, Jesse Brunette, No- None, Abstain- None

Moved by Alderperson Brian Johnson, seconded by Alderperson Jesse Brunette to approve Award of Contract Item No. 3 Motion carried. Yes- Andy Nicholson,

Brian Johnson, Chris Wery, Jesse Brunette, No- None, Abstain- None

Moved by Alderperson Brian Johnson, seconded by Alderperson Jesse Brunette to approve Award of Contract Item No. 4. Motion carried. Moved by Alderperson Brian Johnson, seconded by Alderperson Jesse Brunette to approve All Concrete Sidewalk Builders License applications. Motion carried.

Yes- Andy Nicholson, Brian Johnson, Chris Wery, Jesse Brunette, No- None, Abstain- None Moved by Alderperson Brian Johnson, seconded by Alderperson Jesse Brunette to approve Tree & Brush Trimmers license applications. Motion carried. Yes- Andy Nicholson, Brian Johnson, Chris Wery, Jesse Brunette, No- None, Abstain- None Moved by Alderperson Brian Johnson, seconded by Alderperson Jesse Brunette to approve Underground Sprinkler License applications. Motion carried. Yes- Andy Nicholson, Brian Johnson, Chris Wery, Jesse Brunette, No- None, Abstain- None

Moved by Alderperson Brian Johnson, seconded by Alderperson Jesse Brunette to approve Real Estate acquisitions for N. Webster Avenue. Motion carried. Yes- Andy Nicholson, Brian Johnson, Chris Wery, Jesse Brunette, No- None, Abstain- None Moved by Alderperson Brian Johnson, seconded by Alderperson Jesse Brunette to approve Relocation Payments for N. Webster Avenue. Motion carried. Yes- Andy Nicholson, Brian Johnson, Chris Wery, Jesse Brunette, No- None, Abstain- None

E. INFORMATIONAL.

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

Moved by Alderperson Chris Wery, seconded by Alderperson Jesse Brunette to receive and place on file. Motion carried.

Yes- Andy Nicholson, Brian Johnson, Chris Wery, Jesse Brunette, No- None, Abstain- None

2. The next Improvement and Services Committee meeting is scheduled for July 11, 2018.

The Chairman will confirm the time with all Committee members.

F. PUBLIC HEARINGS.

G. ADJOURNMENT.

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

Yes- Andy Nicholson, Brian Johnson, Chris Wery, Jesse Brunette, No- None, Abstain- None

VERBATIM MINUTES

- Burnette, Johnson, Wery, and Nicholson are present. I need a motion to approve to the agenda.
- So moved.
- Motion by Johnson, second by?
- Second.
- Wery, enter discussion.
- Question.
- Okay, Alderman Brunette.
- There's a little discrepancy, I think, at what time the meeting were to begin. I was under the impression six, and my fear, the biggest agenda item, as far as I'm concerned from what I've heard that's in the interest of the public would be the wheel tax discussion. So if I could just amend the agenda to maybe put that a little further down the agenda in case people were to show up to speak to that item.
- Okay, any questions? I don't have a problem with that, we can do that. Mayor, then Dorff.
- [Mayor] I would like to comment on that, I'm wondering if you could maybe hear my comments and then take it up again, or take mine out of order. I have people coming over to go to a university band concert together.
- Can do whatever we want, basically.
- It's just a couple minutes. I would like to go earlier than after six, I have to go home at six.
- Point well taken, Alderman Dorff.
- I do have someone here that has prepared something to speak, and he has to leave for a banquet, for an athletic banquet, could he also speak, please?
- Yeah. We can do that. Is that okay, Alderman Burnette? We can hear some testimony, some information, and we can hold it and bring it back later in the meeting. If you want to make a, Vanessa.
- I just want to make one clarification, because I do realize that we noticed that there was a discrepancy on the agendas earlier. So I just want to, on the record, so that you guys don't have any issues with the tape later on, it does say that at six o'clock on the main website, but the agenda itself does say note the time change. So we are within compliance, so there is no issue, but I think it's totally appropriate for you to wait 'til six o'clock to take the remainder of it up.
- Okay, thank you. Okay, with all that, all those facts, Alderman Burnette, you want to make a motion to that effect?
- I motion to amend the agenda, but first to hear comments from Mayor Schmitt, and the member

of the public identified by Alder Dorff. And then move that to after item five on the agenda, I think that would be sufficient.

- Okay, motion to that effect by Alderman Burnette, Do I have a second?

- Second.

- By Wery, under discussion. Hear none, all in favor.

- Aye.

- Aye, this motion carried, let's move on. Okay, approval of the minutes.

- Motion approved.

- Motion by Wery.

- Second.

- Second by Burnette, under discussion, hear none, all in favor.

- Aye.

- Aye, this motion carried. Okay, regular order of business, number one, consideration of possible action and request by Alderman Dorff to craft a proposal to implement municipal vehicle registration fee program, wheel tax, held over from May 7, 2018, improvement services committee.

- Do you want me to do my part now?

- It's up to you, it's your communication. I'm gonna address you first, but you can give it to the mayor, or the the person who has to go to a banquet.

- I think my motion maybe was out of order, but it was to hear from the mayor, and then the member of the public.

- And then I'll do my part later.

- Alright, sounds good, Mayor.

- My part is brief. I'm just here asking for some action on this wheel tax user fee vehicle, whatever you want to call it. It's a \$20 tax fee per vehicle that we need. This was a holdover, I think, from a couple meetings ago, but it's, Mr. Chairman, the memo that you got from Steve and from me was dated June 14th, so it's a year ago tomorrow, and I just want this to get some action, yes, no. And I don't want this delayed, 'cause Director Grenier is not here, that's why I'm here. I know he's not here, he's registering his kid for school. Jim Burnette can answer a lot of questions, but conceptually, this hasn't changed. This is a, when you register your vehicle, it would be another \$20, and that money would come to the city of Green Bay, and it's a designated fund. I know some aldermen said, oh, it's gonna be used for this or for that, or it's just it's not. It's a designated fund. It's got some flexibility depending on how much we assess. So the number-one priority is to relieve the property assessments. I got a \$2,300 assessment last year, I didn't like it, but then you hear some assessments that are much larger, and then there's some smaller assessments in neighborhoods where they can't

afford that, they don't have \$800 or \$1,500. So that would be the number-one priority, and then after that is, and we know that years ahead what the assessments are going to be, once those are taken care of, the remainder is up to you what we do with that. And it can be used for, there's a variety of things. It could be used to do more resurfacing. It could be used to do some alleys. But you see that in February when you get the capital improvement project. And people who say we don't have one, that's just not true, we do have one, and you approve it every year. So in October we'll go over the budget, which you'll approve, and then in February you'll see the capital improvement plan, and those are two opportunities where you'll be seeing the DPW budget, and we're looking at the revenue that's coming in, and how it's being used. This is a good plan, and communities have picked this up in the last year, and I think the public is on our side, it's not the easiest thing to do publicly, but I think it's the right thing to do. I know some of us want to see the resurfacing program double, I'm one of those people, I also think we have some demanding needs that have to be taken care of, and I think that's why we have committees, that's why we have a director, and I think we can talk about it. And whether it goes to bridge maintenance or it goes to resurfacing Clay Street or something, the stuff needs to get done. And what I don't want to happen, Mr. Chairman, tonight is to have this held 'cause Steve Grenier's not here. I'm here to say if you have any questions that you would ask Steve, or Director Burnette, I think that can be handled tonight. And I would like to see this go toward City Council, and if it gets debated, or held there, or referred back or something, but I don't see a reason for that anymore. We've been at this for some time, we talked to other municipalities, this is just something I'd like to see move out of committee tonight. That's my goal.

- Thanks, Mayor. Any questions on any of that? Okay, is that you, Dan?

- Yep.

- First, I need a motion to open the floor for interested parties. Motion by Johnson, second by Burnette, under discussion here, none, all in favor.

- Aye.

- Aye, this motion carried. Just state your name and address for the record, please,

- Dan Theno, 621 Schwartz Street, Green Bay. Mr. Chairman, members of the committee, I gave you a written statement, but let me point out three things in that statement, because of time constraints, both mine and yours. First of all, according to the American Automobile Association, the average cost of owning and operating a vehicle is \$8,500 a year. We're talking about \$20 a year investment to protect someone's \$8,500 investment in their automobile. That comes to .002% for providing safe, reliable transportation in the city of Green Bay. The second point I'd like to make is that I think it's very important that we get rid of the special assessments. It is patently unfair to charge thousands of dollars to people living in residential areas of the city of Green Bay so that hundreds of other people can use the street in front of them as they pass by somebody's home that has paid for the street. That is just patently unfair. Thirdly, and lastly, I'd like to just point out that I think it's politically naive to assume that people are going to object no matter what the fee is. I was a city mayor for two terms, I served four terms in the Wisconsin state senate. I know a little bit about politics. It doesn't matter if the fee that you impose is \$2, \$20, or \$200, the same people are gonna complain. And those same people are gonna be the ones that call their aldermen first and say, I want the pothole in front of my house fixed. Go for the \$20, it might even be a little bit low, but please, pass this out of committee, I beg of you. As a resident of the city of Green Bay, I'm very actively involved in civic affairs, I'm chairman of the Green Bay Neighborhood Leadership Council and I'm president of the Oak Grove Neighborhood Association, I can tell you that neighborhood presidents

throughout this city, they're hearing loudly and clearly the need to have this funding to support the resurfacing and reconstruction of the streets throughout the city of Green Bay. Mr. Chairman, I'd be happy to respond to any questions.

- Any questions? If not, we'll move on.

- Okay.

- Thanks, Dan.

- Thank you.

- Appreciate it.

- Motion to return to regular order.

- Motion to return to regular order of business.

- Second.

- Motion by Burnette, second by Wery, under discussion, hear none, all in favor.

- [Group] Aye.

- Vanessa, to suspend this or hold this until later in the agenda, what's the proper motion?

- I would say that I would recommend just holding it until six o'clock.

- Do we have to vote on it, or I can just make a determination on that?

- You've already technically amended the agenda.

- So it's already there.

- Yeah, but if you just say

- So we move on to two then.

- That you're gonna hold it until item number five, and then you'll retake it up then, that's appropriate.

- Okay, so at this time we're gonna be holding up this issue until, what, after agenda number five.

- Yes.

- Okay.

- Should be right around six o'clock, so we're gonna move on. Number two, consideration of possible action by Alderman Wery to allow city council members a second parking permit, held over from May 7, 2018, Improvement Services Committee meeting, Alderman Wery.

- Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I think you'll attest to this, I've been on the council since 2002 except for a two-year period. We've always been given how ever many passes we need, because some of us have two or three vehicles. I mean, I have two in my family, wife and I, and your pass might be in one. When you get here, it might be in the other vehicle. You don't want to have to get a ticket voided, it makes no sense. So it's not really maybe a second pass, it's really maybe just a duplicate, it could even say City Hall only, have your plate number on it, City Hall only. So that way if you have your second vehicle, and it just has the City Hall only on it, you can zip in, you're not gonna get a ticket and have to get it wiped out. It just seems strange that we're changing it now after all these years when there was never a problem with it. So I'd be interested to hear from the committee, but my motion would be to issue a duplicate pass or a second pass to aldermen who request it.

- Okay, motion on the floor by Alderman Wery to add additional parking passes for aldermen only, correct?

- Right, and it would be just a second, unless you think more is necessary. I think a second is--

- I said additional, so, okay, do I hear a second?

- Second.

- Okay, second, we're in discussion. Alderman Burnette.

- I believe the motion that I made at the last committee was to hold until Director Grenier could comment on it. Obviously, he's not here. I'm sure Jim or Chris, if you wanted to comment for the director.

- Attorney Chavez is here to speak about it today.

- So I looked into, I was asked whether or not it's something that could be done by the council, and the answer is yes. The council can allow members to have additional items, or additional parking passes. The only caveat is that it would be considered a benefit, so it would need to be referred to personnel after this so that the benefits packages can be amended to allow for that, since it's not something that's readily available to either the public or other appointments.

- Is it currently in our benefits package that we have a parking pass?

- I'm not sure.

- I don't believe so, I'll come with a pass, it's always been allowed, and now all of a sudden this year, to only have one.

- I can't speak to what's happened in the past, I can only tell you that it has not come up since I've been here, and I'm not sure it's ever been referred to law. When I was asked to look into whether it's something they could do, they said yes, it can, it's just that because it is a special benefit, it is considered a benefit, and so we're trying to keep things above board, and make it part of your benefits package so that you're not being scrutinized by receiving a benefit that you shouldn't technically be entitled to otherwise.

- Who would scrutinize us?

- The public.

- Really, the public would scrutinize us because we have two parking passes?
- I'm just trying to keep you guys above board, that's all I'm doing.
- I'm just trying to think about that one, okay. Anything else, Chris?
- Yeah, I was just curious, since you're up here, why did the policy change, or when did it change?
- I don't even know that there was a policy. Again, this is the first time it's come to law.
- So you have no knowledge of why it changed or when it changed?
- Correct.
- Thanks.
- Jim, do you have anything, anything from your office?
- One of the things that was brought up was a duplicate pass, and one thing that I was just asking Chris, I don't think we can do duplicate passes because of the automatic parking system, because if both passes happen to be used at the same time, not to say it'd be done on purpose obviously, that may create some issues for the park system. So that's something that Chris will have to talk to the parking manager about and see how that would all work. 'Cause it may end up having to be two separate passes.
- I just have one question, are we only talking about the hang tags for the vehicles, we're not talking about the little, white cards for the parking access to the ramps?
- No, I was just talking about
- Do we get those?
- Coming to a meeting.
- Do we get the little cards for the ramps?
- City Hall employees have that as part of their benefits package, and they're only allowed one. And that's a checks and balances, because only one can be used per account at any one time. So that was an item of clarification, I just wanted to know.
- Never had one of those
- So if I could, Chris, city staff, certain city staff have that parking pass coming to and from?
- If they work in City Hall, they are allowed to park in the Cherry Street or Pine Street ramp with their personal vehicle.
- With the tag.
- During the regular business, no, it's a white card.

- That's what they gave us.
- Okay.
- Did they pay for that?
- No, that's part of the benefits package that goes back years. It was a negotiated item many, many years ago.
- Is that different than what we were issued? We were issued the little hanging tag.
- It's a thing that goes on your roof, and where that's a completely different process.
- Okay, so we don't have that.
- Let me clarify, Chris, you're just asking for--
- The hanging tag.
- Can't they just write something out on, like they usually do, or what they did in the past, they would just write it out.
- Mr. Chairman, if I could, what I've done, I had one from the years past, those little cardboard ones, and I just flipped it around and wrote, parking pass, Alderman Wery, and I hung it on there, and it's been working, so.
- Strictly speaking on the program, it can be a duplicate, it could be a printed duplicate. The only thing I would, just for clarity is, you just wanna have some kind of check or balance that two aren't being used at the same time for the one pass holder, just to be consistent through the system.
- My wife will never come down, you couldn't drag her down here.
- It could be City Hall. It could work. If it's only the hang tag and not the pass card, it's a lot easier to manage.
- We don't have pass cards.
- Alderman Burnette.
- Yes, if I could. At the last meeting, the reason why I referred it, or held it, for a month or so was because the parking employee who enforces this law or ordinance, I asked her a question, has there historically been council members who have violated this benefit, if you will, or ability to have this parking pass. And I didn't ask for names, and she didn't offer 'em, but she said historically, yes, there have been aldermen, and/or women, my words, not hers, that have violated this. So for the sake of being transparent to the public, and to make it appear, rightfully, that we are no different than the city staff that the city employs, I do recommend that we follow Attorney Chavez's advice and send this to the personnel policy, just so we're not appearing to the public that we're looking for any additional benefit or right that city staff does not have. So my motion, if I could, I don't know if a motion's on the floor, but if I could make a motion to approve that--

- No, there is a motion on the floor.
- Is there, I thought so.
- We're under discussion
- That's right, I'm sorry.
- To approve additional passes for aldermen only.
- If I could amend that, I still approve that motion, but amend it to send to the city personnel committee for their approval or input.
- So you're basically saying the motion is to pass it, approve it at INS, and refer to personnel for them to continue.
- Contingent on the approval of the personnel committee.
- And if it doesn't pass at personnel, then what?
- It dies.
- It dies?
- Then it dies.
- I would rather have the full city council, I don't want the personnel committee to determine what we are trying to--
- Well, it'd go in the report, right, and if you pull it out, all that--
- Okay, then we can look at it, get council.
- I agree with you completely, my point is that,
- Can I get clarification on that? If you have a contingent on a different committee, I mean, do they have the absolute authority, or is that will be another recommendation to the council.
- It's another recommendation to council.
- Okay, alright, okay.
- That's it?
- Yeah.
- Alderman Johnson.
- I don't know, I mean we're responsible for bringing our paperwork, our pens, our notepad, bring your parking pass. Sorry, Chris.

- I will say that having a two-driver household for myself, I was at the point this morning, dropping off kids, picking up, I'm like, oh shoot, I have a meeting downtown and I have my wife's car, is the pass in there? And I know what you're saying, Alderman Johnson, it is difficult, though, dropping at a dime, trying to figure out what car, and so two would benefit me for the sake of convenience greatly, 'cause I don't know who's gonna have what car at what time. It's easier to leave it in the car, but if it's an issue of a little more personal responsibility for each alderperson to have it with them with their agenda packs, I could see that case, too. I don't have no strong opinion either way, my strong opinion is I don't want it to appear to the public that we're separating ourselves from the city staff, that somehow we're more entitled, or that we should have something that they're not entitled to, or deserving, or needing.

- Anything else?

- I think Alderman Burnette summed it up pretty well. I think most families have more than one car, and this has been a policy forever. We're the Board of Directors and we're trying to make it more difficult for us? This is such a paltry thing that the public does not care about, they want us to get here. I mean it's almost always in my one car. If I have the other one, then I use my little homemade jobber, and it seems to fly.

- Anything else, Chris, Alderman Johnson.

- Paltry except for the fact that I think we did have city staff that testified that it is a thing that had been abused, and so, that is a problem, because it's people who are skirting the parking meter fees. And so, again, she didn't say who it was, or the nature of it, so unfortunately we're lacking those details, but that to me is the concern is that we're basically spending taxpayer money by not forcing people to pay the fee. If, in fact, that can be validated.

- Right, that's the kicker.

- Anything else, Alderman Johnson? Anything else? Okay, we have a motion on the floor, all in favor.

- Aye.

- Aye, nays?

- No.

- Do we have to vote on our pad, Jim?

- No.

- We don't?

- Just announce and I'll just record it.

- Johnson.

- No.

- Johnson was a nay.

- Now if I can, I should have done this before the vote, but the clarity on that is that the motion was to approve. Was there was a contingent on the input or approval of the personnel,

- I believe so.

- That's with the motion, do I have a second on that, though?

- Do we have a second on his amendment?

- I didn't hear it, so I couldn't know.

- No, it was just we voted on Chris's motion to approve of the additional parking passes for aldermen only.

- I think the nature of it, it still has to go to personnel now.

- Is that correct?

- [Vanessa] It kind of does, unless they can find a way to issue without it, which it doesn't sound like they've been able to, it needs to go to personnel to amend the benefits package.

- Okay, sounds good, let's move on. Number three, consideration of possible action at the request of the Department of Public Works regarding approval of the annual compliance maintenance annual report and resolution of Wisconsin Department of Natural Resources sanitary sewer collection permit. Staff, someone want to handle that?

- Each year, DPW is required to submit the ECMR and the Compliance Maintenance Annual Report. There's two parts of that report. Basically what this is doing is reporting to the DNR the sewer utility is functioning. There's a financial aspect, and then there's an actual maintenance aspect to it. In the financial section in 2017, we received an A rating for how we're being funding, in funding the utility, being able to take care of projects, having enough to take care of emergencies, and enough to have contingency funding available for those emergencies. The second section is the sanitary sewer collection system maintenance section, and with that one, same thing. The CMAR is actually like a living document where every year depending on how your system grows, change, modifications made to it, we keep on reviving this document on the different maintenance aspects that we need to do. We also received an A rating on that. Just to give you a little example, I've got a chart in the paperwork that you guys should have in your packet, I believe, goes back to 2006, and at that time we had 207 backups, 323 complaints, in '17, that's been reduced to 174 complaints, with only 11 backups and zero of the sanitary sewer overflows. So the program is making great progress, and that's being recognized by the DNR and the EPA. What we're asking for tonight is for the committee to adopt a resolution approving the Wisconsin Department of Natural Resources and our 208 Compliance Maintenance Annual Report and authorize the mayor and city clerk to execute the resolution and allow the director to forward these documents to the DNR.

- Any questions for staff? Hear none, entertain the motion.

- So moved.

- Motion by Johnson to approve, second,

- Second

- By Burnette, under discussion. Hear none, all in favor.

- Aye.

- Aye, this motion carried. Number four, consideration of possible action and request by the Department of Public Works to authorize Department of Public Works to execute contracts related to asbestos abatement in demolition of properties associated with the Webster Avenue project, consistent with the terms and conditions previously established by authorizing the Department of Public Works to execute other construction contracts.

- Again, that's me. As part of the North Webster projects, we are purchasing 24 homes on the east side of the street. The gross number for the real estate acquisition cost was in the budget, and in the capital improvement program that was approved. Breaking down that number in the CIP program, that item did not give you much for details on where that money is going. Part of the demolition cost for removing these homes is we need to go through and do a check for asbestos, and if there is asbestos there, we have to remediate it. And so essentially that was already in the cost for acquiring that real estate and razing the homes. It's just we wanted to bring it forward and let you know that that's part of that budget planning. So we would recommend approval of this item, so that as we get going with the acquisitions, we go ahead and get the asbestos out and raze the houses.

- Questions or concerns for staff? If none, I'll entertain a motion.

- Move to approve.

- Motion to approve by Wery.

- Second.

- Second by Burnette, under discussion. Hear none, all in favor.

- Aye.

- Aye, this motion carried. Okay, five, consideration of possible action on single-source purchase of warning gates and gate arms from B&B Roadway in the amount of \$75,590, staff.

- Okay, again, that's me. Part of the maintenance that we're doing on the Nitschke Bridge this year is we're gonna be replacing some of the warning gates and the gate arms. Right now, the vendor that we wanted to use, that's why this is a single source, would be the vendor that's provided the original equipment. It just so happens that, coincidentally, someone ran into one of the arms before we were able to get these ordered and replaced. So that'll be part of this order. The cost for the gate that was hit in that accident will be covered by the other party's insurance. So we recommend approval of this item in the amount of \$75,590.

- Okay, any questions for staff?

- Move to approve.

- Motion to approve by Burnette, second by,

- Second.

- Wery, under discussion. Hear none, all in favor.

- Aye.

- Aye, this motion carried. I have six o'clock, so let's go back to number one with Alderman Dorff's proposal to implement the municipal vehicle registration fee program, wheel tax. Barb.

- Thank you.

- You got the floor.

- Thank you.

- You're welcome.

- Oh, back whenever this was, I think it was February, I brought a list of ideas that I put in a communication, and among them, to eliminate the special assessments, that was number one for residential, to increase the amount of road construction, to increase the engineering capacity, either through additional staff being hired or contracting out, to prioritize streets on which lead service replacement is needed so that we don't tear up the street and then have to fix it again in a few years, prioritize the streets that are going to be torn up already for the lead replacement. To build on DPW's home building practice of providing an annual plan and report to INS, and all members of the city council, which compares proposed work with actual work completed, so we can see this is what was proposed to be done this year, here is what we have completed. They already do a report very similar to this. So this is just building on what they already do. To manage the funds collected in a segregated account for proper tracking, and I think by law, these monies have to be in a segregated account, but I just put that in there because that is something that was important to me, that we can track exactly how these monies are used. And then last, to consider at some point making recommendations to change the current bonding practice to ensure the success of resurface and reconstruction, because Director Grenier was never able to know exactly what would be bonded for year to year. Now if we have this program in place and the assessments are enough, we maybe don't even have to consider number seven. In talking with Director Grenier over the last couple of months, what I would like to do instead is go back to the original proposal that you were sent, I think, this week earlier Celestine sent that out to you. I think that what Director Grenier has here is a good place to start, and in my opinion to finish. I think he has an excellent proposal here, but it's some place to start so that if there are some ideas that you felt needed to be added or taken out of this proposal, this is much more comprehensive than a list of things, and that's what I had, just a list of things asking DPW to come up with a proposal, this is really a very good proposal just the way it is. Any questions?

- Any questions for Alderman Dorff? No questions, thanks Barb.

- Thank you.

- Okay, anybody else from the committee, or from the City Council? Nobody from City Council? Okay, I'll entertain the motion to open up the floor for interested parties, motioned by Brunette, second by,

- Second.

- Johnson, under discussion, hear none, all in favor.

- Aye.

- The motion will carry. Okay, the floor is now open. Please, just raise your hand, I will recognize you. When I recognize you, just come up to the podium, and state your name and address for the record, and we'll just move forward. This gentleman already spoke, and we'll go with this gentleman right here.

- Good evening, my name is Gary Christens, I reside at 2805 Classic Drive. I'd like just to make a few comments about the wheel tax. First of all, the wheel tax is a regressive tax. And to kind of explain a little about what a regressive tax is, a regressive tax is a tax that charges a higher percent to a lower, in this case, property owner than a higher property owner. And let me give you an example. If you're talking about a \$20 wheel tax on a \$100,000 home, the normal way that would be stated is that's 20 cents per 1,000 property tax. If you have a \$400,000 home, and you charge that same \$20 tax, that's only a five cent tax. Now while this might be great if you have a higher-value home, for those alderpeople that are representing districts that have lower than average homes in the city of Green Bay, their residents will pay more on a regressive basis. Secondly, the wheel tax attacks people that register cars in the city of Green Bay. It doesn't address businesses, so there will still need to be an assessment process for businesses. When you take a look at the 2016 annual report published by the city of Green Bay, Baycare Aurora LLC had the highest assessed property value in the city of Green Bay. They also are listed in that report as having 2,009 employees in the city of Green Bay. Whether those employees live in Green Bay, they need to get to the facilities in Green Bay, the patients need to get there, businesses need the streets. For anybody that remembers the Military Avenue reconstruction process, it went on for months and months or arguing about the street being shut down, and people not being able to get to the businesses of Green Bay. So now you have a plan where some of the roadwork will be paid for from the \$20, but some will still have to be assessed. Also consider a small business owner. I go to a very small place to get my hair cut, I'm sure if street work was done in front of that business, they would be in here complaining that they can't pay for it, as well. Don't plan for it, it would be an expense that they weren't ready for. Third item is that in one of the television interviews I saw a city employee stated that people on the east side of town do not want to pay for the street improvements out on the far west side of town. Well, that's city government. All of the discussions of improvements in this city, all the discussions of the Colburn Pool, were gonna be spread across all the citizens of Green Bay. I realize that if a park on the west side of Green Bay is going to be improved, as a citizen of the east side of Green Bay, that's gonna be part of my property tax. So I'm here to ask you, let's get away from the special assessments, but let's do street improvements as part of the normal budget process. Have the street department come in with a budget, streets involved, have them develop that budget, include it in the budget, include it in property tax, you now take care of, all the residents is paying for it, as well as the businesses paying for it at the same time. You don't have a dual system, you don't have excess funds, you don't have to segregate funds, it's all done as part of a property tax system, that should be fair and equitable. And if our property tax system isn't fair and equitable, you're charging me a lot of money right now that maybe you shouldn't be. So I will not benefit from this. I do have a home that is above the average for the city of Green Bay, but just from a fairness, from a good tax policy standpoint, let's include it in the city budget. Let's make the people responsible for maintaining it to be in the budget. Let's not do this as a regressive tax that will beat up on the lower property owners. Any questions?

- Questions for the gentleman? I believe there isn't any, so thank you very much.

- Thank you.

- Floor is still open. Yes, sir.

- I'd like to address the point the gentleman just made about regressive tax on property values.

- Can you state your name and address for us?

- Chris Wilson, 1248 Hillcrest Drive.

- Thank you.

- We fought against the special assessments, because we have large properties that you can't really do anything with. And across the street from me is, I don't know, a three- or four-acre piece of swamp that would've gotten the same \$42,000 special assessment for the road. I can't imagine that that cost of that road is equal to somebody's house that only has 60 feet of frontage. The tax that, the wheel tax, has nothing to do with whether or not a home is \$100,000 or \$400,000. It doesn't make a difference, it's about frontage.

- Sir, can you just address the--

- Sorry, if I have a

- Thank you.

- And I'm sure without having researched it, I am sure that there are half a million-dollar homes in the city of Green Bay with 100 feet of frontage, that puts it at more than my house is worth, puts it more than the property that has absolutely nothing on it, 'cause it's swampland, is worth. But they will get a bill of \$42,000, and that half a million-dollar home is only gonna get a bill for its 100-foot frontage, which is what, 7,500 bucks. So, that was just in regards to a regressive tax, thank you.

- Okay, thank you. Anybody else? Yes, sir.

- Thanks for taking time tonight. Wally Walsing, 3248 Westwick. I do have a couple questions about where our money goes for taxes, first of all. Looking for a wheel tax, we should have a budget somewhere out there for that, correct?

- Correct.

- And, as the gentleman who spoke before, some of the businesses pay a little more taxes than that, so where, is there a layout or any kind of a budget that can show us, that you guys can show us, what we spend?

- Do you want it now?

- Well I figured that if this was part of the wheel tax, you guys would have that.

- Bill, do yo have anything?

- You know, you would be prepared that people were gonna ask questions about how many people are in Green Bay that were licensed vehicles.

- I have that information.
- That I can answer. There's, with the program that Alder Dorff had talked about, we're anticipating roughly about 105 to 106,000 vehicles would be involved. 'Cause you have to remember that the wheel tax only applies to vehicles that are less than 8,000 pounds.
- So it's not gonna be on commercial, cause that was the question I was gonna ask, also.
- Correct.
- Is it just gonna be below that, so it's under 8,000. A lot of people, was there a budget, was there anything handed out for anybody tonight? Is there anything that anybody could have to show all that?
- I didn't receive a handout. Anybody here get a handout?
- I mean something that you would have written out for 'em to look at.
- It was sent out to all the alders in our email, so we got that earlier this week, so I printed mine out.
- I guess that there's gonna be a lot of questions people are gonna ask about, one thing is a commercial. 'Cause businesses have a lot of companies, trucks and stuff, therefore put in there. So could you answer me what the budget is for fixing the roads of our taxpayers' money?
- Bill.
- Right now, the special assessments historically have brought in about \$1.1 million a year. And with the \$20 wheel tax that's proposed, we'd bring in roughly 2.1.
- So that would be a total of 2-point-some million a year that we bring in with the wheel tax and the--
- No, we would look at, the budget would be with the wheel tax, would be the 2.1, because the residential special assessments then, as part of this package, would go away. The commercial special assessments would, one of the proposals would keep that in place. It would depend on which proposal council would decide to go with.
- It would reduce it by 50%.
- And now, putting on a \$20 tax, I mean, another question, is that, I mean, after time there would be quite an amount of money in there, correct?
- No. Would you like me to explain some of the details? I didn't explain it, because I knew you guys had them, but I could.
- I'd be fine with.
- Can you explain it, Bill I mean could our staff explain it?
- Because after so many times I would think that that would be able to decrease if that's the case.

- I mean, can our staff explain it?

- I'm fine with it.

- Go right ahead and explain it, I'm sure we have the exact same document.

- I'd rather have staff--

- You would rather have staff.

- Just one second, Alderman Dorff, I'd like to have staff just explain it. If there's any discrepancies, then Barb, I mean, you can entertain the information, thank you.

- Basically, the program that was proposed had a couple different options. One would be for removing the residential special assessments, and leaving the other assessments in place. One would be removing the special assessments for residences, and reducing the commercial by 50%. And the other one was for another option. And basically the proposal here, what it does is it spells out where that different money would go.

- What was that other option?

- [Female] You can have my copy of it.

- Basically, you can look at page two, the back of page two. But as part of the proposal, what we would do is, every year when we bring our capital improvement program forward, we would create the line item budgets for each of the different segments. For example, those items would be elimination of the residential special assessments, reduction of non-residential special assessments, alley reconstruction, bridge maintenance, maintenance programming, rail crossing repairs, and then program expansion-slash-reduction in borrowing. And every year, because for example, with the number of rail crossings, we'd be aggressive at doing the rail crossings in the beginning, and as that would go on, the number of rail crossings needing replacement would decrease, so now we'd be able to allocate that money to other portions of the project.

- Does the railroad pay for some of that? I think they do, actually, right?

- The way the rail crossings work is by statutes the rail is supposed to take care of all the maintenance for the crossings. Now, they have two different programs for that. If you wait for them to do it, that part of their budget is very underfunded and they're way behind. Chances are, you'll never see anything done. The other option is is they have a special program that's funded better, where if the municipality where the crossing is chooses to participate at 50%, there's more funding in that program, and that's the program that the city of Green Bay has worked for the last couple years with with the railroad. That's why we've been getting, I mean we've got three more crossings that'll be done this summer. So in the last couple years, we would have done, I think, the number's like five or six, some of those.

- I have some friends that work in the railroad, and I know that they fix a lot of them up with the budget on that they have fixed up. Well, thanks for that. I guess going back to the taxes. Do we really need a wheel tax versus the taxes we pay towards fixing the roads in Green Bay? Either, east side, west side, I guess this is gonna be for everybody in Green Bay. I mean, there's not enough money, is that why we're going for a wheel tax?

- That's a good question, yeah, Barb.

- I think it was mainly to get rid of special assessments. Because the harm that that was doing to the homeowners. So people that had, suddenly get a \$42,000 bill to pay for, so I think that was the number-one reason that I brought it forward, and there are other things we'll be able to do then with the funding, as was just stated.

- But the special assessments shouldn't really be there, because everybody around Green Bay really doesn't have special assessments, they might have some, but not the fixing roads, and I guess that's what I'm, and hopefully you guys can answer the question for, not must myself, but other people. Like for road repair and stuff, Ashwaubenon actually has a fund that they fix their own roads.

- Well, you're right, and so does Thomas, so do other places, but we do not, we have special assessments. So this was my proposal to eliminate special assessments.

- One thing I'd like to point out is that some of the other communities in the neighboring Green Bay area, the assessment rate varies from 100% of the cost to about 35% of the cost. There are neighboring communities where the residents pay 100% of a paving project.

- What one is that?

- I believe that's Bellevue.

- Oh, yep, you're right, actually. I think that's the only one I did get. But otherwise, everybody else, actually Bellevue and Green Bay are the only two that don't really fail to pay. I guess as a city taxpayer, as for everybody else, we just want to make it fair for everybody, too, elder, young, people that have bigger houses, and that's why we hire you guys to do the job for us, and not to, and to really be on the ball. It's a tough job you guys have to do, and hopefully we can, It's hard to get everybody happy, but I think we can with your experience and us paying taxes. It keeps you guys employed, so thanks for your time, and hopefully it'll all work out.

- Thank you.

- Thanks.

- Anybody else from the audience? Yes, sir.

- Patrick Buckley, 3249 West Point Road, Green Bay. So we've outlined a number of uses for the money, you were just going through a number of them. Is that money currently being taken off the levy right now? For all these projects? So the money that we're funding right now in the current budget, where would that money go if we're gonna pay for it out of the wheel tax?

- Essentially, let me use an example of alley reconstruction right now that's not funded. So this will give us funds to actually fund that money. Right now, most of these projects are funded with bonding.

- Bonding?

- Yeah.

- Okay, and how much of the budget for public works is actually streets, I'm not talking about the special assessments, goes towards repairing the roads?

- That number I do not have with me.

- Do you know what percentage of the budget it is?

- No.

- So we're gonna put in a tax on the wheel tax, and it includes late commercial, smaller vehicles?

- Yes, anything under 8,000 pounds.

- Anything under 8,000 pounds, but we can't sit here and talk about, 'cause we don't have the information, about what we're doing with our existing money, and how much it is that we are actually currently spending on roads?

- I apologize for that, I'm sitting in for the director today.

- It's fine, I understand, but I guess where I'm going with it is what percentage of our current budget in the city of Green Bay do we put towards roads now? Does anybody, Barbara, would you happen to know?

- I can speak to, I met with Director Grenier yesterday. Currently, out of the levy, the city only budgets approximately two to \$250,000 per year, which is essentially enough to cover potholes. Everything else for road reconstruction is bonded. And the amount of the bond can vary from year to year depending on what's approved in the overall bond request. So that can obviously, that bond request can include more than roads.

- Correct. At what point in time is this pointing toward? Is there a sunset on this, or is this just?

- No, nothing's been passed yet. This is the proposal.

- No, the proposal, right.

- The proposal is for \$20 a year. There has been no talk of a sunset. In casual conversation, we've discussed that if there is a sunset clause, for five years we have this, oh, and oops, the next year your house is up, now you have to pay an assessment again. I don't think that's fair, and the alders I have talked to do not think that's fair. So we've not talked about a sunset clause. The main reason for this is to eliminate special assessments. We may be able to do some other things if it's the \$20, such as the railroad crossings, and the alleys, things we aren't able to do right now.

- And I can appreciate that. But as we know, in government, we have a lot of fees, and a lot of other taxes within the government that each year tend to creep up. So is this a locked in stone, is it \$20, period, unless--

- As long as we, as the City Council, choose to make it \$20, it'll be \$20. If there is some desire to put a deadline on it, for the next five years, for the next 10 years, then we look at it, that might be part of the proposal, of the final proposal.

- And have we exhausted all the means, let me just back up on that. My concern on this is each year

we're gonna use the wheel tax to balance the budget, to get that little extra so now we can fund a certain part of public works, and we can take the money that we were spending on public works, and use it in some other part of the budget.

- You mean, oh, but never a wheel tax, you could never use the wheel tax.
- You could use the wheel tax, you got a pretty wide range of things you're using it for within the Public Works Department, right now, it's pretty broad. Based on what you're saying is, this could be changed on a yearly basis what you're using it for, correct?
- Within the scope of what we decide it can be used for. The ideas in here cover some of the needs of the city right now.
- But each year, the aldermen could vote to change where the money goes towards, correct?
- Well, I suppose we could do anything.
- The state sets the parameters.
- The money specifically needs to be spent on transportation.
- Right, but it could go to offset the Public Works budget, correct? Or it could, you could actually put it towards some of the bonding, I guess where I'm going with it, my concern is that we put this in place, similar to like we put a lot of other fees in place, and each year they keep creeping up. And a lot of times the fees are crept up so that we can balance the budget. So, I do have a concern that, similar to like the half-percent sales tax for the county, these are the projects we're gonna do with it, we have a list of projects we're gonna do with the wheel tax, or they're open-ended?
- I think we have a list of projects we're gonna do, I think it's stated in there.
- What streets?
- What streets, I'm certain that Director Grenier has the long-term plan.
- Basically, Mr. Buckley, what ends up happening is every year we will end up bringing forward a list of streets that we're doing as part of our capital improvement program. So you will know those years, what streets will be done that year, and we're in the process of generating a five-year CIP. So, what will happen is it'll just be a progression of keep going through those lists.
- Well, as a taxpayer, I believe, right now, the city of Green Bay gets a lot of tax revenue, one of the higher ones in Brown County, and now we're gonna put yet another tax on, and my concern is that it's gonna go other places other than just for roads. It's gonna end up using it to backfill the budget, like a lot of other fees end up doing. So, as you proceed forward with this committee, I would ask that you take some of those considerations and maybe, if it's gotta be renewed each year, where it's going to has to be renewed. But I would hope that the aldermen in the entire city have gone through the whole budget, and had the opportunity to say there's absolutely no waste in the city government, and we need more money, because if you live in the city of Green Bay, and you pay city taxes, they're not cheap. And I quite think for a city this size, we could do better planning. So thank you.
- Thank you. Anybody else from the, Alderman Vander Leest.

- Thank you. My thoughts are that the city of Green Bay has not done a great job as far as budgeting to repair our roads. I think enacting another tax, I think is not really the answer. I think we have enough money come in, we bond for a lot of different items. We bonded for five million dollars for Bay Beach for swimming, for the project out there. And we bonded for \$900,000 on decorative lighting. I think that if we're looking to generate two million dollars a year, I think that two million dollars a year is in our budget, within our budget range. We take in about \$107 million, I'm not, don't quote me exactly on that figure, but I think that if we're looking for two million dollar revenue generated through the wheel tax, I think that we can find that right in our budget right now. We're talking about a lot of different projects, and I feel that whatever we have to budget for the roads, we've not done a great job. We've only budgeted a small amount of money towards the road improvements, and we don't have a set pattern on what we're budgeting for as far as the roads, it's minimal. I think that we can increase what we can, with the money that we have, we don't have to enact another tax, I think we can budget it, and planning, I think, is what we've been lacking on getting it done as far as roads. And that's my thoughts on it, and myself, I do not support the wheel tax for that reason. I think it's just another form of taxation, we've got enough of it already. Every time we buy gasoline, you know, we're paying what, 50, 60 cents a gallon for road repairs, anybody that buys gas understands that. And I think that, we gotta take another look at enacting a wheel tax, I think we gotta look at our budget, and that's where it's gotta come from, right out of the money that we have right now. I think that's my thoughts on that, and I thank you.

- Thanks, John. Anybody else from the audience? Mark Steuer.

- Thank you, Chair. This has been a long, drawn-out project, if you will, a process. I guess one of the questions that I would have of Jim, the fact that, okay, we some years ago it seemed like road repairs were taken care of in the budget. And when did that change for the city? Any idea when that was lessened, if you will? 'Cause I believe--

- In the two and a half years that I've been here, it's always been the same.

- I think that's one of the concerns. I agree a little bit with Alder Vander Leest as far as the fact that it should be, I feel it should be a line item eventually in our budget. I also am really against some of these special assessments that are so high, that seem to be inappropriate for some of the folks. There's gotta be a happy medium somewhere. I think one of,

- Excuse me. Barb, could you take it outside, please?

- I'm staying here.

- Okay, thank you. Continue, Mark.

- Where was I?

- Special assessments that you were not happy with.

- Some years ago, I paid for my road, it was about \$800, and I think they gave me three years to pay it. I dealt with it, and that was fine. I think a lot of times when you live in a city, there's a whole situation where, okay, we pay public school taxes, well, I don't have children in public school, but I still pay that tax. I think folks need to understand that if you live in a city that there are gonna be certain things that you're gonna have to deal with, and that's just one of those things. Some of the things that Alder Dorff brings up, I think are great. I guess the one thing that, the question I have is

the sunset. I think anytime you put a sunset clause in something like this, then it's like, well, we better hurry up and get everything done. We do, what, 2%, one and a half to 2% of our roads a year. My thought is if we could do three to 4% a year, over a 30-year period you could do the entire city. So if there was a way that we could bring this back into the budget, I think that would be very important. So I'm still a little torn as far as the parameters of the \$20 tax. I personally would do it. I don't have a lot of money, but I would personally do it. There are some folks that would not. I think there's gonna be some discussion on this, also at City Council. At this time, I feel that we need to do something. We've waited 10, 12 years, and it's backed up on us. So now we're at a point where, the state, is the state helping us out, not a lot, we don't have any other alternatives. What are the other alternatives? So I think we're kind of between a rock and a hard place with this. I'm leaning toward it right now. I was against it before, but I feel that we have to do something. I think we might have to discuss the whole thing with the sunset clause, I mean my feeling is that if we bring it forward, it'll be there in perpetuity for 10, 12, 14 years, maybe longer, and that could be an issue, as well. My feeling, though, is if we can do our roads, if we could do three to 4% a year over a period of 30 years, we'd have the entire city done, and I think that's the goal we need to look at, however we do it. At this time, I'm leaning toward it, but there's more discussion to be had. Thank you.

- Thanks, Mark. Okay, anybody else from the audience? Anybody else, don't be shy. One more time, anybody else? Alright, entertain a motion to return to regular business by

- Moved.

- Burnette, second by,

- Second.

- Wery, under discussion, hear none, all in favor.

- Aye.

- The motion carried, we're in regular order of business. What are the wishes of the committee, concerns? Any comments or concerns?

- I think we all have comments.

- Jump in, Alderman Johnson.

- I'll start with some questions maybe for staff. And a number of my questions were answered by Director Grenier, which I'll reserve for commentary. Just for clarity's sake, I mean, the state sets the parameter on some of these, and you alluded to the fact, Jim, that 8,000 pounds is the limit that is set by the state, is that correct?

- Correct. And the other thing on that, too, is there are some plate types that are exempt from the wheel tax, as well.

- And the reason that's a relevant question, of course, is the discussion around business exemption. You know, do we do exemption, do we do 50%, do we do 100%? I'm gonna talk about levy limits a little bit right now, and I mean, right now, 'cause part of the talk was why don't we just pay for this through our budget? I wish Diana was here, I saw her here before, but she left. I mean, the state really restricts us on the amount that we could even raise taxes. Do you have any additional information on what those numbers are?

- I don't have any numbers on that, but the program that you're referring to is the expenditure restraint program, where the city is limited on how much it can raise. Expenses versus revenues, I believe it is, there's some ratio out there, and you're only allowed to stay within so much, or you lose your state aid.

- Right, and it's my understanding that, if we were to try to pay for this through our general levy, we wouldn't be able to do that, it would risk that.

- Correct.

- Is it possible for individuals who have had assessments, say, I'm arbitrarily throwing out a number, in the last five years, is it possible to exempt them from the wheel tax?

- That is something that you as a committee and council members will have to decide.

- But administratively, would it be possible to do so?

- I think that would have to be crafted into the ordinance.

- Does the city have, I know that we talk about how the city has a reconstruction plan. Our streets are graded, correct?

- Correct.

- And how does that grading system work?

- Basically, the streets are graded with a system called the PASER system. It's a grading system from zero to 10, 10 being the best streets, and one basically being a really bad street. Essentially, every odd year we have someone go around and we assign a rating to every stretch of street in the city of Green Bay.

- Okay, and do you know how many, or what percentage of those streets are in need of immediate reconstruction?

- I don't have that percentage off the top of my head, no.

- When I'm looking at this plan that's in front of us, the different uses, one of the uses that's called out is program expansion, or a reduction in borrowing.

- Correct.

- What I want to understand from that, is are we reserving the right, I mean, \$425,000 is what's allocated in that, and I understand that's just the first-year proposal, that could change in subsequent years, but we have \$425,000 allocated to that field. My question for that is if we choose one or the other, meaning program expansion, reduction in borrowing, if we chose reduction in borrowing, does that mean that those improvements are now not being made to our streets?

- If that goes to reduction in borrowing, yes, that would go right to debt service.

- And we're not repairing streets then.

- Correct, but on the other hand, if you look at we're taking in about 1.1 in special assessments now, so if we do put that towards additional program expansion, that kind of gives you a magnitude of how many additional streets we'd be able to do.
- And so to the comments that I made earlier as a point of clarification, right now, the city basically bonds for all of its street reconstruction, with the exception of some, again, pothole repair, which is in the levy. The amount of bonding can fluctuate from year to year, do you know, and I understand you may not have this number, but do we have any historical knowledge about how much we bonded from year to year? Has that number gone down, has it gone up?
- It fluctuates, and one of the reasons it fluctuates, too, is the cost of construction continually goes up, so you're gonna see some of that. But it does goes up and down from year to year.
- And that's a good point. So Steve made that comment to me that last year construction costs alone rose 27%. So all things equal, we've repaired 27% less streets. And constructions costs, I presume, have been steadily growing the last few years?
- It's actually leveled off a little bit these last couple years, but three, four years ago, we were seeing some pretty large increases, yeah.
- I think that's what I've got for questions right now, I'll have commentary later, but I'll let these other guys ask questions.
- Thank you, Alderman Burnette.
- Thank you, Jim. Kind of contradiction, at one point you said that construction costs went up 27% last year, I thought I heard, and then you just said that it stayed stable the last few years.
- I'd have to get those actual numbers for you to be specific, Jesse.
- So there was a huge climb--
- I guess what I'm trying to say is that there is a general fluctuation from year to year. For example, right now, we have pretty constant oil costs. So the cost of asphalt stays pretty steady. But with that being said, sometimes you start seeing with a spurt in growth, now you see a large demand for concrete products, so concrete prices may be going up. You see some of those normal business fluctuations, as well.
- And one question, too, I had is that you said that there are some plates that were exempt from the wheel tax.
- Yes.
- What do you mean by that?
- Well, for example, is you got antique plates, you've got some, there's like six or eight different categories of plates. I don't have the list with me of what's exempt and what's not, but we can get that for you.
- One question then, this would be important for the area that I represent, someone floated the

idea up there, I don't know if it's true, but they said that tribal members would be exempt from paying, Oneida tribal members?

- That's probably true.

- If you could get that answer, that would be very important for me. Alright, that's the only question I had at this point.

- Okay, Alderman Wery, you have any comments or concerns?

- I have some comments, I think, most of our questions have probably been answered in the last 12 months. I think we all know our streets are getting done about 1.5%, and looking around the area, and around the state, with those who are doing 3%, and everybody acknowledges that three or more, I think that should be the goal. I'm really not interested in the wheel tax unless we double our road work. I think I've mentioned that every time. If we double our road work, we don't want to stay even with the wheel tax, we want to get ahead, aggressively ahead. And so to do that, I'd be interested in actually reducing or eliminating some of these line items that are proposed, like the alley reconstruction, bridge maintenance, maintenance programs, and railroad crossings, because those were all coming from other sources. We budgeted for railroad repairs and maintenance programming, if we take it out of here, now it's gonna be totally out of the budget. Like, it should stay in the budget, and we put more money towards doing the roads, doubling our road work or more, because we are woefully behind. Now as part of this, too, we need some oversight and some accountability. So we'd have to have some kind of annual report to the Improvement Service Committee, here's our five years of projected roads, this is exactly what we want to do, and here's what we did in the last five years. So everybody can know, I know that was a big deal with people out in Hillcrest. A year ahead of time, they were like, you were doing your road, I think people should know years ahead of time. They might not have to pay for it, but we should let them know around the radar. Interested in exploring the idea of maybe sunseting it. I don't know, we'd have to somehow agree as a council to work in X amount every year into the budget, whether it's a quarter million dollars, in eight years, we've replaced it and we sunset it. You know, those are all ideas, it's easier said than done, you've gotta find that pocket to put it in, but that's intriguing. I like the idea of somehow exempting those who've paid their assessment in the last however many years, maybe exempt them for a while on the wheel tax, 'cause that gets asked a lot. People will say, well, I just did my road last year, and now you're putting this in. They want that part of the discussion, whether it goes anywhere or not. That's all I have right now. I'm willing to start things off with motions, but I don't know if anybody else has comments or questions.

- Thank you, Alderman Wery. Any other concerns or questions? If not, I'll entertain a motion.

- I do have one comment.

- Okay, Alderman Burnette.

- I don't think we, in government I think we have this tendency, especially on the federal level, to come up with comprehensive things. Like, it's gotta be comprehensive or it's just not gonna work, everything's gotta be comprehensive. There's no problem, as far as I'm concerned in piloting something to see how is this going to work for the next two years or three years. I don't think you want to tie it in to an election cycle of the City Council, because as we've seen, I'm not pointing fingers, but I think some people might be less inclined to make a decision, because they're fearful how the voters would respond to that. Let's be real, that's just the real world of government and politics. So if we piloted something, perhaps, \$10 rather than this \$20, that removes special

assessments on residential properties, that's what I'm most concerned about, quite frankly. This idea that we're gonna go to residents a couple weeks or months before the road is set to be replaced, and say, here's an assessment for 13,000, 20,000, 30, 42, that's the type of thing that people say is not right, it's not just, it's not fair, we gotta do differently in how we notify the public that the roads are going to be on the list for repairs in the future. So, we don't need to have this \$20, all or nothing, forever and ever, this is gonna be part of our tax revenue we generate in this city. I don't think that there's anything wrong with piloting something, see how this goes in three years, and you need to hold, and again, with great sensitivity, 'cause I don't want this to be viewed as a criticism towards our staff or administration, but if we say to Public Works, for \$10 wheel tax for the next year, year two, year three, you're gonna get revenue according to what my figures say if we had a 10-year, \$10-a-year wheel tax, and there are an estimate of 105,000 cars registered in the city of Green Bay, that is revenue of over a million, and then there's a 17 cent fee for the state, the state collects 17 cents per car registration. So that would be revenue of over one million dollars. \$1,032,000, so \$1.03 million. The special assessments charged to residents, residential properties is \$750,000. So the amount that you collect on a \$10 wheel tax is sufficient to remove residential assessments, and then we can talk about what rate do we reduce that for commercial, or non-residential properties. Say if we were to reduce that by half, which is one of the scenarios listed here, that would still give the city \$107,000 per year to kind of play around with, assuming we don't do the other things on this wishlist. It's just to remove residential assessments, and to reduce non-residential assessments, we still have a buffer of \$100,000. So, I honestly am not prepared to make a motion, 'cause I don't even know how I would put that in a motion, but we don't have to do this all-or-nothing residential, here's all the projects we're gonna knock out. We could try something for a year, or two, or three years, if it doesn't work, Public Works isn't doing what the revenue is specified for, then we can revoke it, and we don't have to worry about, I think the public would be okay with that. People I've heard with, and this is before the Hillcrest issue that came up in my district, out campaigning, knocking on doors, I was more against than I was for a wheel tax. Talking to people, hearing their input, it was like 70-30, 70% were in favor of a wheel tax, I don't think most people know as in depth as what we have in front of us as a council, and maybe 30 were dead set against it, many of which were against it for the reason Alderman Johnson indicated, that, hey, I just paid for a special assessment, it's not fair to then charge me a wheel tax. Those are concerns. So I'm not gonna make any more comments other than we don't have to do this all-or-nothing, comprehensive, \$20, over two-million dollar in revenue, when the main thrust, the main thing that I want to accomplish is to remove the residential assessments.

- Okay, anything else, Jesse?

- No.

- If not, Alderman Dorff.

- I just want to point out that that would not allow us to do additional roads. That's something that, so maybe \$15, but if we just did 10, we're not gonna be able to get any higher percentage of roads done this year. So I just want to make sure you understand that.

- I do, and one thing, and again, this is why I was kind of on the fence, because I think that the city should, through all the development and growth that we're initiating and endorsing, and giving tax incentives and tax increments, and all that, we're doing that for a reason, we're doing that to generate growth for the tax base. So if that doesn't come to tax rolls eventually, 15, 20, 30 years, then why in the world are we doing all these tax-increment districts, other than improving blighted parts of our city, or cities that haven't seen development in years. So part of this pilot project is to then slowly, so we don't exceed what the state allows us to exceed in spending, gradually, say over

the next three years or five years, we're going to budget more from levy to support the expansions. So there's got to be that sunset that I heard about, not sunset for the sake of sunsetting, because it's a false promise, but sunsetting for the sake of saying that this city government is going to do better with the money that we're generating from economic development and growth. And I think going door to door, talking to people at length, and hearing their opinions, that's what I hear. Why in the world is the city not budgeting for these things out of their general revenue? Why are we growing our downtown if we're never gonna see that money for the rest of the city? So anyway, thank you for your comment, that would be my response to that.

- Thank you, Alderman Burnette. Any concern, Alderman Johnson.

- I don't hate the philosophy, actually I like the philosophy behind what you're talking about. I guess, what I would say then, is why implement a wheel tax, at all, because to me it just confuses people if you come out with 10, we're gonna do it for two years, and in two years, maybe we come out with 20, maybe we eliminate it. I would say just bond the 750,000 then, eliminate it, and pilot it that way, and avoid the whole hassle of doing a wheel tax in fielding those types of issues. But I think, I'll be honest, when I talk to people about this, I wasn't a huge fan of the wheel tax, either. I wanted to figure out a way that we could pay for this through the general levy. And through the process and educating myself on this, one of the things that I've learned is that we do have restrictions, unfortunately, and we do have the inability to do certain things. And one of those is we really don't have a strong ability to raise taxes, at least at the amount that would be required to properly fix the roads. We can increase the bonding, of course, but when you increase the bonding, you're increasing your debt service, which you're paying for it through your budget, which you can do, but, I think, it's my understanding that our bond rating has been hurt, or has been downgraded because we are bonding too much. And so, I question whether or not bonding more is the right practice or policy. From what I understand, a very significant percentage of the city's overall budget is salaries. Of course, we can have that debate, do we cut staff, do we cut, but that's a much bigger discussion, that is a discussion beyond what we're gonna have here at INS. That's a discussion, I think, if we're gonna say, how do we start paying for these things through our annual budget, that's a finance committee discussion, and in the meantime, our roads still need attention. That's where I think I come to a head on this. And so Alderman Wery brought up, hey, some of these things on here, we could do without, that's actually one of the things I want to discuss. Look, if we move forward with a \$20 wheel tax, I'm not a fan of reduction in borrowing. I think that's gotta go, because people wanna see streets, they don't want to see us paying back that. So if we're gonna tell them we're passing the wheel tax, because we're gonna improve streets for you, we're gonna make more streets, but by the way, all that money's gonna be used for a reduction in borrowing for maintaining bridges, for maintenance programming, we're gonna fix some railroads which should be fixed by the railroad companies. Now that said, I'm more of a fan of the railroad piece, because of the match program and knowing that the railroads are a big problem, and we've got to do that. Alley reconstruction and resurfacing, I don't know that that's our highest priority and need right now, when you drive down some of our city streets and you're dodging potholes. I think I'm leaning more and more towards the wheel tax. I don't think it should be a forever tax, I don't think I would support imposing a sunset, however. I think the council and our leadership at City Hall needs to have the courage to be able to pull the wheel tax when it's time, and I think it should be a phased approach, and maybe that's the way we go about this discussion. We say, you know what, it's, and I don't know how you tie these two together, I'm open to that discussion, but we're gonna do a wheel tax so that way we can make progress on the roads right now, while having this goal or expectation that we are gonna start budgeting for streets out of our annual budget within the next, say, five years. I'm making that number up, but I think that's a reasonable approach.

- Anything else, Alderman Johnson?

- Nah, I got a whole bunch of--

- Alderman Steuer.

- I threw out one idea before, and it was some people said yes, some said no, but the thought would be over a five-year period if we did this tax, collect 20, next year is 16, 12, eight, and then four. Decrease it over a period of five years, and then segue that into our budget somehow, so that it's not all 20, 20, 20, all the way across. Just something to think about, and if it's feasible, great, if not. But that is just one thought that I had. I'm not sure how that would exactly work with the numbers, but like Alderman Johnson mentioned, we are limited as far as how much we can raise our taxes. And I think, you know, what Alder Vander Leest said, as well, the fact if we could put it back on our budget, I think that would be great, but I think we're limited. The state can't help us out either, so we gotta get creative. Alder Dorff has her, talked about the \$20 all the way across, maybe not a sunset, as well. But I was thinking about something where it would be progressively less each year over a five-year period, and after that time period, then you could slowly bring that back into our budget. So that's just another point of discussion.

- Thank you, any other concerns or questions? Alderman Dorff, and then Mr. Christens.

- I just wanted to reemphasize the point, Brian, that I'm glad you did make about our bonding, because our bond rating is in jeopardy. We have our debt service is too high. As chairperson of the finance committee, I've been trying to get more and more familiar with where we stand budget-wise, and where we stand with our debt service. So increasing our bonding is not something that we can do as you said, without potentially harming our rating. In that case, we pay more interest. In that case, it costs us more. So it's all being paid for eventually by the taxpayers. Thank you.

- Open up, I need a motion to open up the floor for interested parties.

- So moved.

- Second.

- Motion to open up the floor by Johnson, second by Wery, under discussion, hear none, all in favor.

- Aye.

- The motion was carried. Okay, the floor is now open. Say your name and address for the record.

- Gary Christens, 2805 Classic Drive. Just wanted to make a comment. This wheel tax started off to get rid of special assessments. So after discussion tonight, we're talking about \$750,000 that we're trying to take off the residential property tax from being in that special assessment. Based upon the 2016 budget of approximately \$162 million for the city of Green Bay, \$750,000 is less than one half of 1%, should be able to find that some place. So if your concern is getting that residential 750, gosh, I hope the aldermen of this city are smart enough to find 750,000. The other thing is, we keep talking about collecting two million to offset 750,000. So this isn't about getting rid of special assessments, this is about finding more money, which I want everyone in the city of Green Bay to realize that. You're gonna sell this as getting rid of special assessments, and don't talk about \$20 that will raise two million. And my last comment is, if you want, maybe I can remember my last comment, but, I really think you need, oh, I'm sorry. My last comment is the other thing that I keep hearing is we're gonna get rid of the residential special assessment, and then we'll think about maybe

reducing, by 50%, the commercial. Well, if the commercial people have a car less than 8,000 pounds, yes, they're gonna pay the wheel tax, but most commercial, I can tell you, Baycare probably doesn't have any cars at all. And so now you're going to take some of the wheel tax that I'm paying and give it to the commercial so the residential are now going to start funding the commercial side. This thing has a lot of holes, and it needs to be tightened up if you're gonna go forward with it. Thank you again.

- Thank you, anybody else from the public? State your name and address for the record, please.

- Patrick Buckley, 3249 West Point Road. To the previous gentleman here, if I'm not mistaken, Chris, did we used to spend about 3% of the budget on roads, years back, but now we're down to about 1%?

- Jim, might be able to speak to--

- That would be great, 'cause it's my understanding we used to spend about 3% on the roads, and now we're down to 1%.

- I think that was the percentage of the roads being repaired, not a percentage of the budget.

- Oh, there was a percentage of the budget that was put towards repairing the roads, not everything was always bonded for. So, I think that's one point. As far as the commercial goes, there's a lot of commercial facilities that aren't much different from residential as far as how they pay, or how they should have to pay. They're no different, I think we look at commercial as always a large employer, if you want to use Aurora, but there's a lot of small mom-and-pop commercial establishments, and you know what, they may only have two employees, three employees there, how much of that road are they really using, too? So they can reapply with commercial, too. I appreciate Jesse's comments on the, how much do we really need. If we're really about the special assessments, then we should talk about it, but when you look at the document, I apologize, I just got this shortly after we were trying to come up with some information, and so, I think, looking at it there's a line under each scenario, amount left over for other programming. It appeared to be a very large number compared to what you're actually putting towards, or offsetting in the residential assessments. So, that's where I worry that we're using this more as a slush fund to help fund other things, where we're just gonna divert money throughout the budget into other areas, or other shortfalls. I would hope that before this even gets to the City Council that this would get sent back to staff to come up with maybe a couple of different options that are more clarified on what the money's actually going towards. And if it is truly going towards roads, then let's name the roads that they're going to, and that it's only for road construction. It's not to supplement the six guys we have out there filling cracks, not to supplement their pay, it's actually being paid out as road reconstruction. And we probably wouldn't need 20 or \$30 a vehicle. So again, I would encourage you to just send it back and get some more clarification on this. Thank you.

- Alright, thank you, anybody else from the audience? Okay, entertain a motion to return to regular business by,

- So moved.

- Second.

- Johnson, second by Wery, under discussion, appear none, all in favor, aye, the motion carried. Okay, we're back in regular order of business, which is concerns, questions, comments from the

committee.

- I make a motion.

- Okay, Alderman Wery.

- Just to get it started, we can amend it or kill it, do whatever, but it'll get to Council, and we're gonna have a much more intense conversation. I'm sure Barb has more to say about it, and others. I'll make a motion to approve the \$20 wheel tax, with the allocation not as listed, but I'll list how I'm gonna start it off. I would generate the 2.1 million, correct, the number we're going off of. I would have 1.675 going towards streets, that doubles the amount of street work we do, and it allows some room, because I hear we might need some engineering help, and we might have to go outside for that, it allows a little room for that. 175,000 stays in place for the non-residential. I think the discount of half is reasonable based on the information we have. Some small businesses, yes, they're gonna get hit twice. They're gonna get wheel tax and assessed, and so that's pretty cruel. And then I would increase the railroad crossings to 250,000, because that, I think, I know Alderman Vander Leest, you bring it up a lot, we get a lot of complaints about our railroad crossings, there are a lot of them in horrible shape. And that's something once you address them, they're gonna slowly fade away, but those have been a bugger for the last five, six years. And so that's what I'm gonna propose, and the reason I took out some of those, alley restructuring or reconstruction, we get out of our federal, it's CBGB money, we pay for that out of our federal money.

- This would be alleys outside of that program. Those alleys that have not been funded in the past.

- The maintenance is already in our budget, so I took that out, we should leave that as a budgeted item, I don't want to start lowering that amount. So this at least gets us started. There's a lot of other topics, and we can pick it apart, but I'll see if there's a second for that, and we can move forward.

- Okay, the motion on the floor, is there a second?

- Could I offer a friendly amendment?

- Yeah.

- It sounds like your proposal, as it stands, would leave special assessments in place.

- No, it would eliminate it. That's the whole purpose of the wheel tax, yes, is to eliminate special assessments for residential.

- Okay, because you said 1.675 towards streets.

- That's how much money's generated. I was looking at it that way. The only purpose for the wheel tax would be to eliminate the residential assessments. And so now I'm looking at the income side of where it's gonna go.

- So we'd be looking at, I just want to be clear, we're generating 2.1, you're eliminating, taking 750 off for special assessments, you're going 250 for railroad, 175 for commercial, and the balance would go to additional expansion.

- Yes.

- Okay, I would second that.
- Okay, second by Alderman Johnson. We're under discussion, Alderman Johnson, do you want to--
- Yeah, I would actually like to add, I would like to propose an amendment, and that amendment would be passage of the program contingent upon delivery of a five-year reconstruction plan that specifically identifies which streets will be repaired.
- I would concur with that, actually. I have that in my notes here to have an annual report to INS.
- I'm looking for more than an annual.
- Well, let's do the, okay, go ahead Johnson.
- One suggestion I would make is that if you look at the last paragraph of the memo, each one of these uses would be reviewed annually as part of the CIP. So, I would make the suggestion of adopting the program as listed in the memo, and then you have that opportunity to change these budgeted amounts every year when we bring our CIP forward. And obviously this would be talked about more at Council, because these ones are the ones that are listed today. Tomorrow, there may be other items that as we move forward, you find other categories that you may want to include. That's only a suggestion I have.
- So, Jim, the way that I understand that is we pass this today, we're not, I mean in theory, a plan is still gonna come forward yet with how much needs to be spent.
- Correct.
- Making our dicing up of this probably irrelevant, I guess.
- Yeah, every spring we bring forward our capital improvement program, typically about the end of February. Just like the mayor stated in his initial opening statements is in August through October, when you guys are looking at the budget, you see DPW's budget. Then, in addition to that, you see our bond request in spring, which is referred to our capital improvement program. And in there typically is a list of all the streets, all the programs, all the subdivisions that are going, the bridges that we're working on, and those types of details. Steve's intent with this memo would be to take the money generated from the wheel tax and now determine these allocations on a yearly basis. So I don't think you need to go through and determine those allocations tonight.
- Anything else, Jim?
- No.
- You still want to pursue an amendment?
- I think, I mean it's Chris's motion, so he would.
- I'm gonna leave it as is, because I think it's important, I'm only gonna back the wheel tax if we do double or over it.
- Well, and actually my amendment is the one that's up for discussion right now. So I'm saying a five-

year plan. I understand that we come forward every year with here's the streets we're gonna do. And I understand that if we come forward with a five-year plan it doesn't mean that it can't change, priorities change, roads, the condition of 'em can change. But I don't think it's unreasonable for us to say, you know what, if we've got the roads graded right now, I don't feel like it's unreasonable to say if we're gonna give you X amount of dollars every year, then we can tell you for the next five years, this is the order they're gonna go in, and every year, we can reevaluate that order based on changing conditions in the road work. Because at least that's one of the concerns that I hear a lot of times, and what I think we visibly saw when the special assessment debate came up is we had individuals that were being given two months notice about a 30, 40, \$50,000 assessment, and if we have a long-term plan, why is it that we're only able to give people two months' notice? And so maybe that's a policy adjustment, but I sure, again I go back to, if we've got a five-year plan that we can put in front of people and say, these are the streets we're going to fix, subject to revision every year. So that's the amendment, that's my argument on it.

- Do you mind if I put in your more formal wording? 'Cause I wrote it out actually, 'cause I think it's-

- You're more experienced at this, Chris, go for it.

- While it's in the memo, I think it's important for the public to know this is part of it, this is something that we want.

- Okay, just one second, Alderman Wery. He made a motion for an amendment. Okay, and what you're gonna do is drop your motion, and have a new one?

- No, the main motion's in place, we're discussing an amendment to it.

- It's in place, but we didn't vote on it yet. So with the amendment, why don't you just start over. Why don't we just end your motion, let's clean this up so it's crisp and clean. So basically, there is no second on the amendment, it dies, and do you want to take your motion off the floor, and create a new one?

- Make a motion to approve the \$20 wheel tax with some caveats, that staff annually present to the improvement service committee the status of the wheel tax funds, with a five-year projection of road projects, and a report of projects completed in the previous five years. And that the committee review and approve allocation of amounts or percentages to what road priorities they wish done.

- Second.

- That kind of encapsulates the oversight and accountability.

- There's a motion to that effect by Wery, second, do you have more?

- No, I just wanted to repeat the other part that,

- Okay, you have the floor, and I'll recognize the second when you're finished.

- The allocation part would be the reduction, elimination of all residential assessments, and the reduction of the commercial by half, as proposed by staff. So that would generate \$2.1 million, of that 1.675, approximately, we're just saying we're doubling our road work, we want to get back to

3% or more. I know there's a written change, but I'm just trying to get that out there. The 175,000 is to offset the commercial. 250,000 towards the railroads, I'm just repeating what I said before.

- Jim, do you have that?

- I do now.

- Get ahead on the railroads, get ahead on the roads, that's what people want to see.

- Done.

- Yeah.

- Okay, motion, second by Johnson, under discussion. Alderman Johnson.

- Before I'd offer up a second, I just want clarity.

- I just recognized that second. You don't want a second now?

- I want clarity on the motion, is it--

- First of all, I recognized the second, we're under discussion, do you want your second, or do you want to withdraw the second? 'Cause I need a second to continue with his motion.

- I'll second it for discussion.

- Okay, there's a second by Johnson, we're under discussion, Alderman Johnson, you have the floor.

- So I didn't catch the tail end of the railroad piece that you were talking about. Are you getting into-

-

- Yeah, I was just roughly laying out where it should be.

- But you're not, your motion does not include us dictating how this funding will be spent other than elimination of assessments and 50% reduction on commercial?

- Well, it did the first time, and it did the second time. I understand it could be changed later, but it's my goal out of the chute to double our road work. That's why I put it in there.

- Council's gonna eat this up anyway.

- Okay, anything else?

- I'm just trying to get something to Council.

- Anything else, Alderman Johnson?

- No.

- Okay, any other concerns or questions? Alderman Burnette.

- So, I'm gonna vote no, and it's not because I don't support the overall concept of a wheel tax. You're right, Alderman Wery, and the others, the Council's gonna really pick this apart, and it's gonna be a process. I still think that we can accomplish the removal of special assessments on residential properties if we institute a \$10 wheel tax, and make a plan, and a commitment, of sunsetting that within five years so that all roads are done through general levy and bonding, I think that's the direction I'm headed. So my vote for many of the constituents here, who I represent, my vote is not an outright denial of the concept of the wheel tax, I just think that we can do it without the \$20, and we can be a little more firm with the city and those in government to say, enough is enough, we have to develop a plan to pay for roads out of our general tax levy and bonding.

- Okay, any other questions or concerns, if not, we're gonna take the vote, all in favor.

- Aye.

- Nays?

- No.

- No, motion fails. Does anybody want to entertain another motion, or should we just send no recommendation to Council?

- I have a motion, and it's up to the Council,

- Alderman Burnette.

- So I have a motion to refer to city staff a request to create three different proposals for instituting a \$10 annual wheel tax to completely eliminate residential assessments, and which sunsets within five years, as the city transitions and commits to a plan of paying for street repairs and replacements from general levy and bonding dollars.

- Okay, motion to that effect, Jim, you have that? You wrote it down, okay. Is there a second? Is there a second? I'll second it for discussion, we're under discussion. Any com-, Alderman Johnson.

- I think the only comment that I would make on it is, well, we're talking about special assessments, and I think that's definitely been a motivator, and a lot of the dialogue, My objection I guess, again Jesse, just like you, I support the wheel tax concept, my objection to this proposal is it doesn't fix more streets, and you talk about a five-year time, and maybe that's an artificial number, but for us to say that we have to figure out how our budget works, and it's gonna take us maybe up to five years to do that before we can fix more streets, I think that's why I'm gonna vote on no this one, because when I vote for the \$20 wheel tax, the special assessment is a piece of the dialogue for me, the bigger piece of it for me, though, is fixing streets.

- Okay, anything else? Comments, concerns, if not we'll take a vote. All in favor?

- Is there a second, I don't know, did somebody second--

- I seconded for discussion, we're under discussion at this time. I'll just say, any more concerns or questions, if not, we're gonna take a vote. All in favor.

- Aye.

- Nays.

- Nay.

- No, okay no recommendation. You want to try one more motion, gentlemen? If not, we're gonna move on with no recommendation to the Council. It looks like we're moving on. So we're at number six, consideration of possible action on the report of the purchasing manager. Jim, do you have any concerns that you want to address to us with these four issues?

- Yeah, I'll just go through 'em real quick.

- Alright, well let me read 'em for the record then. Six-A, a request for approval of the purchase front-end loader with bucket and snowplow from Aring Equipment Company, 181,835, Jim.

- Okay, this one, purchasing went out and did bids for this, we had seven individual vendors come in with proposals. Staff had reviewed the proposals, and what we discovered was the four lowest vendors did not meet the criteria that was put on the proposal as far as safety requirements. So what we're recommending is going with vendor, the lowest vendor number five, which is Aring Equipment Company, in the amount as listed. They met all of the standards and the safety requirements as looked at by staff.

- Alright, any questions or concerns, if not, I'll entertain a motion.

- Motion to approve,

- Pardon.

- Is it to approve?

- Motion to approve, correct, by Burnette, second by,

- Second.

- Wery, under discussion, hear none, all in favor.

- Aye.

- Aye, this motion carried. B, request approval to purchase variable speed drives from Graybar for 21,685. Any concerns, Jim?

- No, this one was we got two proposals back, this is to replace some drives at an existing, I believe it's a sanitary lift station. We recommend going with the low vendor, which is Graybar.

- Okay, entertain a motion.

- Motion to approve.

- By Wery, second by,

- Second.

- Johnson, under discussion, hear none, all in favor.

- Aye.

- Aye, this motion carried.

- C, request approval award a contract for mason, reed, and truck painting repairs at four lift stations to Jakes Incorporated for 19,439, any concerns, Jim?

- No, again, two bids were received, the numbers were good, we recommend to award to the low response.

- Entertain a motion.

- So moved.

- Motion by Johnson to approve, second,

- Second.

- By Burnette, under discussion, hear none, all in favor.

- Aye.

- Aye, this motion carried. D, request approval purchase a new Hytera portable radio system from Nielson Communications Incorporated for 171,636. Any concerns, Jim?

- Chris will talk about his one.

- Okay, any concerns, Chris?

- No, no concerns, it was a single source vendor, because we've already started building a digital radio system based on the digital Hytera system, so it makes it consistent. We don't have to integrate any extra equipment, it's all--

- Sounds good, entertain a motion to approve.

- So moved.

- By Burnette, second by,

- Second.

- Johnson, under discussion, hear none, all in favor.

- Aye.

- Aye, this motion carried.

- Number seven, report of actions taken by Department of Public Works, word of contract, what happened to my computer here? Oh I see, okay. Okay, number one, no bids received, 2018 lift

station re-roofing.

- That one we're going to re-bid, it's back on the street, purchasing put that back out there, so they use a different group of contractors than what DPW does for opening bids on that one,

- Right, you're looking for an approval, what are you looking for?

- That could be received in place of file.

- Motion to receive in place of file.

- Second.

- By Wery, second by Burnette, under discussion, hear none, all in favor.

- Aye.

- Aye, this motion carried. To approve to award parking ramp repairs 2018 to the lower responsible bidder, Central Restoration LLC, in the amount of 455,850, Director Burnette.

- That one again we had, I believe it was three bids, and we recommend going with Central Restoration, they're the ones that are doing the work currently.

- Entertain a motion to that effect.

- So moved.

- By Burnette, second

- Second

- By Johnson, under discussion, hear none, all in favor.

- Aye.

- Aye, this motion Carried. Three, to approve to award sewers 4-18 to the lower responsible bidder, excuse me, Advanced Construction Incorporated in the amount of 1,037,554.50, Director Burnette.

- Again, this one we had four bidders, the bids were all competitive, was within the budget, we recommend that we award to Advance in the amount of 1,037,554.50.

- Move to approve.

- Motion to approve by Wery, second by,

- Second.

- Johnson, under discussion, hear none, all in favor.

- Aye.

- Aye, this motion carried. Number four, to approve to award Superior Road storm water pond to the lower responsible bidder, PTS Contractors, in the amount of 784,323.80, Director Burnette.

- Again, three bidders on this one, the bids were all competitive, we recommend awarding to PTS in the amount of the 784,323.

- Need a motion.

- Move to approve.

- Motion to approve by Burnette, second by

- Second.

- Johnson, under discussion, hear none, all in favor,

- Aye.

- Aye, this motion carried. Granting license, concrete sidewalk builders,

- We can take these all in one--

- I was just gonna say is there any concerns, if not, let's take an approval, I'm guessing staff's recommending approval to Blazer Construction, Paul Cooner Construction, Ramco Construction Services, motion to approve by Burnette, second by,

- Second.

- Wery, under discussion, hear none, all in favor.

- Aye.

- Aye, this motion carried. Okay, tree and brush trimmer by WB Tree Service, any concerns, Jim?

- Nope, we're good with them.

- Entertain a motion.

- Move to approve.

- By Burnette, second by

- Second.

- Wery, under discussion, hear none, all in favor.

- Aye.

- Aye, this motion carried. Let's look at underground sprinklers, concerns with these two, Director Burnette?

- No.
- Okay, entertain a motion for, is is Lizer?
- Lizer, yes.
- Lizer Lawncare,
- Move to approve.
- And Conserva Irrigation, okay. Motion to approve by Burnette, second by
- Second.
- Johnson, under discussion, hear none, all in favor. Aye, this motion carried. We are at real estate acquisition for Webster Avenue. Number one, agreement for purchase parcel address, okay, the first one is A 20 North Webster Avenue, 93,000.
- No, we recommend that one and B, the 1102 North Webster Ave., for a rental payment for 70,000.
- I will entertain a motion to take A and B as an approval by
- So moved.
- By Wery.
- Second.
- Second by Burnette, under discussion, B is 1102 North Webster Avenue for \$70,000, we're under discussion. Hear none, all in favor.
- Aye.
- Aye, this motion carried. Number two, relocation payments.
- Essentially item under number two there's a list of relocation payments that you see there. Those apply, I'll just go through them really quick. You have parcel five-A, parcel eight, parcel nine, parcel 14A, 15, four, four-A, seven-A, 14A, 14B and 15 for the amounts listed that you see there. And we'd recommend approval on these, these are all--
- Okay, there is a recommendation from staff for an approval of 1003 Smith Street, 2,200.50. I'm gonna read 'em for the record. 1110 North Webster Avenue, 34,752, 1002 Burner Street, 5,625, 1001 Day Street for 1,200, 1000 Smith Street, 2,098.46, 1000 Smith Street, \$21,027, 1108 North Webster Avenue for 1,550, 1001 Day Street, 6,800, 1001 Day Street, 2,300, 916 North Webster Avenue, \$55,000, and 916 North Webster Avenue, 1,540. Question, Jim, why is, if it's the same parcel, same address, where's the, why is there--
- What you need to look at, Andy, is sometimes, like, for example, the 1001 Day Street, you have a Jenny Sill and a Rebecca Eckert, you have two different tenants. And sometimes with the relocation

costs, what we do is we end up reimbursing these people as they're making the move, so we don't know some of these costs ahead of time. That's why you may see these people on the list multiple times, for example, closing costs might be one of the first relocation costs that we cover, now they've closed, now they have the opportunity to move, but we don't know the moving costs until they actually move. So then that might end up being on a list separately. So there's multiple times we may see these folks. Okay, I need a motion to approve.

- So moved.

- Second.

- By Wery, second by Johnson, under discussion, hear none, all in favor.

- Aye.

- Aye, this motion carried. Informational director's report, Director Burnette.

- There is no director report tonight.

- Okay, take a motion to receive in place of file. By Wery, second by Burnette, under discussion, hear none, all in favor. There we go. Number two, looks like staff is looking at July 11th, I'll confirm with everybody if that's okay, and then we'll move forward on that. So, public hearings.

- Don't have any.

- Motion to adjourn.

- Motion to adjourn by Burnette.

- Second.

- Second by Johnson, under discussion, hear none, all in favor, aye, this motion carried. We're adjourned.