



MINUTES OF THE IMPROVEMENT AND SERVICES COMMITTEE

**WEDNESDAY, JANUARY 9, 2019, 4:00 PM
CITY HALL, ROOM 207**

PLEASE NOTE TIME CHANGE

A. ROLL CALL.

Present: Brian Johnson, Jesse Brunette, Chris Wery, Andy Nicholson arrived at 4:10 pm

Others present: Matthew Heckenlaible, Barbara Dorff

B. APPROVAL OF THE AGENDA.

Moved by Ald. Brian Johnson, seconded by Ald. Jesse Brunette to approve the agenda. Motion carried. Vote: Yes- Brian Johnson, Chris Wery, Jesse Brunette, No- None, Abstain- None

C. APPROVAL OF MINUTES.

Moved by Ald. Jesse Brunette, seconded by Ald. Chris Wery to approve. Motion carried. Vote: Yes- Brian Johnson, Chris Wery, Jesse Brunette, No- None, Abstain- None

D. REGULAR BUSINESS.

1. Consideration with possible action on request by Dorwin Tevebaugh to rescind the special collection charge of \$70.00 at 1370 Harvey Street.

Moved by Ald. Chris Wery, seconded by Ald. Jesse Brunette to approve the request by Dorwin Tevebaugh to rescind the special collection charge of \$70.00 at 1370 Harvey Street. Motion carried. Vote: Yes- Brian Johnson, Chris Wery, Jesse Brunette, No- None, Abstain- None

2. Discussion with possible action on report by Department of Public Works documenting areas of localized ponding, measures already undertaken to address ponding, and future implementation steps needed to alleviate ponding. This item addresses issues previously brought forward under the

following communications:

A. Consideration with possible action on request by Ald. Johnson to identify top areas of concern within the City that experience frequent and/or severe flooding and report Department of Public Works plan to rectify such concerns with short and long-term solutions (referred to staff at September 27, 2018 Improvement and Services Committee meeting).

B. Consideration with possible action on request by Ald. Nicholson to create a plan to help relieve water issues at Main and East Mason Streets and East Mason and Schwartz Streets (referred to staff at October 9, 2018 Improvement and Services Committee meeting).

Moved by Ald. Jesse Brunette, seconded by Ald. Brian Johnson to receive and place on file the report and have the Director work with the Chairman to draft a standing agenda item to report back progress on implementing the recommendations of the report by Department of Public Works documenting areas of localized ponding, measures already undertaken to address ponding, and future implementation steps needed to alleviate ponding. This item addresses issues previously brought forward under the following communications:

A. To receive and place on file the request by Ald. Johnson to identify top areas of concern within the City that experience frequent and/or severe flooding and report Department of Public Works plan to rectify such concerns with short and long-term solutions (referred to staff at September 27, 2018 Improvement and Services Committee meeting).

B. To receive and place on file the request by Ald. Nicholson to create a plan to help relieve water issues at Main and East Mason Streets and East Mason and Schwartz Streets.

Motion carried.

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

3. Consideration with possible action on the review and approval of the 2019 Department of Public Works service rates.

Moved by Ald. Brian Johnson, seconded by Ald. Chris Wery to approve the 2019 Department of Public Works service rates. Motion carried. Vote: Yes- Andy Nicholson, Brian Johnson, Chris Wery, No- Jesse Brunette, Abstain- None

4. Consideration with possible action of the 2018-2019 Early Mini-Storm Sewer Program.

Moved by Ald. Jesse Brunette, seconded by Ald. Chris Wery to approve the 2018-2019 Early Mini-Storm Sewer Program. Motion carried. Vote: Yes- Andy Nicholson, Brian Johnson, Chris Wery, Jesse Brunette, No- None, Abstain- None

5. Consideration with possible action on request by Department of Public Works to modify Section 6.35 GBMC relating to Underground Sprinkler Systems.

Moved by Ald. Chris Wery, seconded by Ald. Jesse Brunette to approve the request by Department of Public Works to modify Section 6.35 GBMC relating to Underground Sprinkler Systems. Motion carried. Vote: Yes- Andy Nicholson, Brian Johnson, Chris Wery, Jesse Brunette, No- None, Abstain- None

6. Consideration with possible action on request by Department of Public Works to modify Section 9.20 GBMC relating to Tree and Brush Trimmer License Required.

Moved by Ald. Jesse Brunette, seconded by Ald. Chris Wery to approve the request by Department of Public Works to modify Section 9.20 GBMC relating to Tree and Brush Trimmer License Required. Motion carried. Vote: Yes- Andy Nicholson, Brian Johnson, Chris Wery, Jesse Brunette, No- None, Abstain- None

7. Consideration with possible action on request by Department of Public Works to modify Section 9.21 GBMC relating to Right-of-Way Excavation and Occupancy.

Moved by Ald. Chris Wery, seconded by Ald. Jesse Brunette to approve the request by Department of Public Works to modify Section 9.21 GBMC relating to Right-of-Way Excavation and Occupancy. Motion carried. Vote: Yes- Andy Nicholson, Brian Johnson, Chris Wery, Jesse Brunette, No- None, Abstain- None

8. Consideration with possible action on request by Department of Public Works to modify Section 9.24 GBMC relating to Construction and Repair of Streets and Sidewalks.

Moved by Ald. Chris Wery, seconded by Ald. Brian Johnson to approve the request by Department of Public Works to modify Section 9.24 GBMC relating to Construction and Repair of Streets and Sidewalks. Motion carried. Vote: Yes- Andy Nicholson, Brian Johnson, Chris Wery, Jesse Brunette, No- None, Abstain- None

9. Consideration with possible action on request by Department of Public Works to modify Section 9.25 GBMC relating to License for Sidewalk Builders.

Moved by Ald. Chris Wery, seconded by Ald. Jesse Brunette to approve the request by Department of Public Works to modify Section 9.25 GBMC relating to License for Sidewalk Builders. Motion carried. Vote: Yes- Andy Nicholson, Brian Johnson, Chris Wery, Jesse Brunette, No- None, Abstain- None

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

A. Request approval to award the purchase of traffic signal equipment to TAPCO for \$40,330.

Moved by Ald. Jesse Brunette, seconded by Ald. Chris Wery to approve the report of the Purchasing Manager to award the purchase of traffic signal equipment to TAPCO for \$40,330. Motion carried.

Vote: Yes- Brian Johnson, Chris Wery, Jesse Brunette, No- None, Abstain- None

11. Consideration with possible action on the review and award of the contract RAY NITSCHKE MEMORIAL BRIDGE HYDRAULIC REPAIRS (held over from Improvement and Services Committee meeting on November 26, 2018).

Moved by Ald. Jesse Brunette, seconded by Ald. Chris Wery to receive and place on file the review and award of the contract RAY NITSCHKE MEMORIAL BRIDGE HYDRAULIC REPAIRS (held over from Improvement and Services Committee meeting on November 26, 2018). Motion carried.

Vote: Yes- Brian Johnson, Chris Wery, Jesse Brunette, No- None, Abstain- None

12. Consideration with possible action on request by KS Energy Services to renew the annual Hold Harmless Agreement for access to the City of Green Bay sewer system to conduct inspection of the sewer mains and laterals.

Moved by Ald. Chris Wery, seconded by Ald. Jesse Brunette to approve the request by KS Energy Services to renew the annual Hold Harmless Agreement for access to the City of Green Bay sewer system to conduct inspection of the sewer mains and laterals. Motion carried. Vote: Yes- Brian Johnson, Chris Wery, Jesse Brunette, No- None, Abstain- None

E. INFORMATIONAL.

1. The next Improvement and Services Committee meeting is scheduled for January 23, 2019.

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

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

F. PUBLIC HEARINGS.

G. ADJOURNMENT.

Moved by Ald. Jesse Brunette, seconded by Ald. Chris Wery to approve to adjourn the Improvement and Services Committee meeting. Motion carried. Vote: Yes- Brian Johnson, Chris Wery, Jesse Brunette, No- None, Abstain- None

VERBATIM MINUTES

- Lock it, but set to enter.
- Alder Brunette, Alder Wery, Alder Johnson are present. Alder Nicholson is on his way. Call for a motion to approve the agenda.
- Move to approve.
- Second.
- Any discussion? All those in favor say aye.
- Aye.
- Opposed? Approval of minutes.
- Move to approve.
- Second.
- Any discussion? All those in favor?
- [Alders] Aye.
- Opposed? We now do item D, regular business, consideration with possible action on request by Dorwin Tevebaugh to rescind the special collection charge of \$70 at 1370 Harvey Street.
- Staff.
- Received a letter in December of Mr. Tevebaugh indicating that he received an invoice for \$70 for placement of a mattress at the curb. It's a bulk waste collection charge. He indicated that he has discussed the matter with his tenants, he's convinced that the material was dumped by somebody else at the curb in front of his rental property and asks for consideration in rescinding the invoice. However, going back and taking a look there are... Three early set-outs and two recycling violations dating back from 2018 to 2006. Because of the number of violations that existed on the property, we cannot do that at a staff level. This does have to be appealed to the Improvement and Service Committee. So, we did respond back to the property owner and made this aware. And he did request to be put on the agenda today. So, this is for a mattress set-out.
- Is there anyone here to speak on this issue?
- Okay, I'll to make a motion to open this floor to hear from interested parties.
- Second.
- Okay, all those in favor?
- [Alders] Aye.
- Opposed?
- 'Kay.
- If you'd like to step to the podium sir? And share your name and address please.
- [Dorwin] Dorwin Tevebaugh, 716 Columbia Ave, Green Bay.
- Okay.

- I guess, anything you'd like to share about the set-out?

- [Dorwin] I've spoken with both my tenants because they had had some problems in the past. I've worked on that with them. I've offered them free pickup service, which they have used. I'll take it to the, you know, sofas, stuffed chairs, things of that nature. I'll pick it up, take it to the Mason Street dump area for them, free of charge. I spoke with both of them regarding this, and it's my opinion, they've been with me quite a while, and it's my opinion that they're being truthful with me when they say they did not put it out there. I spoke to the neighbors on both sides of them, and... They state that it was obviously put out there late at night before the morning of the pickup. I normally keep a pretty close eye on that. I've been kind of sidelined with a broken heel for three months. Just now starting to get around, so, I wasn't there. But speaking with them, I trust them. They've been with me quite a while. Sincerely, this is the first time I've ever contested. I've paid penalties. I've been a landlord in Green Bay for 45 years. This is the first time I've ever contested that, because I sincerely believe that it was dumped there by an unknown person.

- Okay.

- Any questions?

- [Dorwin] And that's all I can say. I can't confirm it and who did it. I have no eye witnesses who saw it being dumped but I sincerely do believe both my tenants when they say no, they definitely did not dump it there. They offered to show me their beds. They've got the same, you know. I didn't inspect them, obviously but I do trust them. They're good, hardworking people. So that's really all I've got to go on.

- Okay. Any questions? Okay, thank you.

- Motion to return to regular order of business.

- Second.

- Okay, all those in favor.

- [Alders] Aye.

- All right.

- I'd like to make a motion to rescind the special collection charge of \$70 at 1370 Harvey Street.

- Second.

- Any discussion? Those in favor say aye.

- [Alders] Aye.

- Opposed? Motion carries. Alder Nicholson.

- If I could--

- Go ahead, Alderman Johnson.

- If I could let the gentleman know that this will go to the City Council on Tuesday.

- Oh yeah, so what the Committee decides today is advisory in nature. So this will go to the full City Council on Tuesday for a vote.

- [Dorwin] Okay.

- If anybody wants to pull it out and discuss it, they can, but otherwise it will be included our report as a recommendation to rescind the charge.

- Okay, thank you. Is that all you need from me?

- Yes, sir.

- Yep, you're free to leave. Or join the fun if you'd like.

- [Dorwin] I know how interesting this must be, but I must move on.

- 'Cause this one... When he gets one, if I send any.

- And the left one, we'll

- You got the new card. You need to speak with him?

- I'll try it.

- Go ahead, if you're willing to chance it.

- Go, right?

- No, I'm not prepared, yet.

- Item number two, discussion with possible action or report by Department of Public Works documenting areas of localized ponding, measures are already undertaken to address ponding, and future implementation steps needed to alleviate ponding. This item addresses issues previously brought forward under the following communications. Do I need to read these, Steve? Item number A, consideration with possible action request by Alder Johnson to identify top areas of concern within the city that experience frequent and/or severe flooding. Report the Department of Public Works plan to rectify such concerns with short and long-term solutions referred to staff at September 27, 2018, Improvement and Services Committee. And item B, we'll take these together. Consideration with possible action on request by Alder Nicholson to create a plan to help relieve water issues at Main and East Mason Streets and East Mason and Schwartz Streets. Referred to staff at October 9, 2018, Improvement and Services Committee.

- So, the two individual items were referred to staff for study. And Matt Heckenlaible, the Utilities manager has been working on a comprehensive report on high water conditions and street ponding, addressing both of these locations as well as some others around the city and we thought it would be best just to bring one consolidated report back to the Committee for your consideration. So that report was in the packet that was sent out last week and Matt is here to give you the highlights of what's in that report.

- [Matt] It's a lengthy report, I apologize. Well, I don't apologize for it because it is a overwhelming topic. I hope you'd had time to peruse it before today's meeting. But my intention is to kind of go over what we have done, what we are doing, and then review some of the items identified within the report as to potential causes of the localized ponding, flooding, especially during high-intensity, short-duration rain events. Some of the reasons that we have been experiencing, or the conditions that have been causing these conditions are a development in itself is a cause of flooding. If everything was left in a natural state, we wouldn't have as much run-off, so to speak. The type of development, residential versus industrial, commercial, or institutional, and that has an impact on the run-off coefficient or whether or not it's a hard pavement, a rough top, or a grassy area. And I'll get into each of these a little bit more as I go through it. The development has exceeded the original drainage basin boundaries. Climate change, nobody wants to admit it but we are in the midst of climate change. One of the reasons why we're having these mild, so-called mild winters are also producing these very short, high-intensity rainfalls where we're getting five, six inches of rain in one to three hours. The receiving water, so, the Bay, the Fox River, the East River, et cetera, the receiving water elevations are elevated. Which is creating submerged outfalls. So our storm sewer pipes are full of water before they even see any type of rain run-off. Topographic, topography of the land, in some areas we have filled in land, but the surrounding land still drains to these low areas. Prime example is the former slough, which is just north of the proposed shipyard area that runs up through Seymour Park and ultimately over towards West High. That area was all filled in.

- What's your password?

- [Matt] But the surrounding areas, the topography was never changed so the ground, or the water still drains to those low areas. In which case, that's where we're seeing some of the significant flooding occurring yet. Prior to 2001, we did not have a stormwater management program ordinance. So back then, prior to 2001, the stormwater management was, get the water off my property as quickly as possible. I don't wanna deal with it. Since 2001, that has changed but people have to manage their stormwater on new development and redevelopment. Old engineering design assumptions are no longer valid due to some of the items above. Something was originally assumed to be residential in nature and now it's primarily commercial or institutional so that's gonna create more hard surface which is gonna allow the stormwater runoff to come off that property more quickly and cause impacts to the downstream sewers. Different design storm criterias, the city of Green Bay has one criteria and we adopted or annexed the town of Preble back in the '60s. They had a totally different design criteria, so that has impacted some of our East Side sewers. And then ultimately the sewers themselves weren't constructed as designed. So those are some of the highlights of why we are seeing some of this flooding. So getting back into the report a little bit, back in 2015, Council directed us to... Do a comprehensive study of all the flooding areas within the City of Green Bay. We presented that at a January, 2016 INS and subsequent Council meetings. Within that report, it identified that the city is broken into 315 different drainage basins. Of that 315, 113 of those basins had some sort of flooding or high-water condition, whether it was in the street or within a private property. We identified that there was at least nine of those basins had reoccurring, significant flooding. And we selected those nine to do additional analysis and engineering designs. On the second page, there's a map of the report. The basins highlighted in pink were the original nine basins: 106, 108, 116, 130, 309, 162, 231, 417 and a portion of 235. Subsequently, additional requests came in for this current flooding that occurred. That included the two light blue areas within the map, which would include the East Mason corridor and the Locust corridor, over by Mason Manor. So... One thing I wanna kinda note is that stormwater runoff exceeding the capacity of the storm sewer is not necessarily always flooding. Excessive runoff that is retained within the public right-of-way and does not result in property damage is considered to be a short-term nuisance pond. And then, some allowances for these conditions must be tolerated. Our efforts will be confined to areas where excessive runoff has potential to extend beyond a right-of-way, resulting in property damage. We had two significant storms in this year, the August 28th storm and the September 17th storm, both of which had excessively high-intensity rainfalls in a short period of time. The City of Green Bay's storm sewer is designed to what is known as a 10-year, 24-hour storm. What that means is we'll have about three point inches of rain in a 24 hour period. So roughly 3/16 of an inch of rain per hour would be a consistent, 10-year, 24-hour rain event. What we were seeing on those other two rain events were upwards to three to six inches in one to three hours. So that exceeds the, in some cases, the thousand-year rain event, what is known as the thousand-year rain event. So, that was, one of the topics was climate change, short-duration, intense storms. It's not matching up with our storm sewer design criteria. The type of development, the impervious areas, hard surfaces, again, allow that runoff to more quickly come off the sites, get to the storm sewers and impact downstream sewers. As I've mentioned, today's stormwater management requirements require property owners, developers, to manage the stormwater on their site, to slow that water release to help normal storm events or larger storm events be managed by the existing downstream infrastructure. I'd mentioned submerged outfalls. What that is, is the Fox River has, the Fox River and the Bay, the elevation has risen to a point where some of the pipes are now underwater. There is, in some cases, the storm sewer in the downtown area will be impacted for upwards to six, seven, eight blocks away from the river. And that'd be fully submerged. So that means there is no room in that pipe to accept new water. So, the only way to accept new water is to allow the water to pond on the street, push down on that existing water in the storm sewer and try and push it out. So, in this case, ponding is good because it is getting the water out and ultimately with all of these instances, we had the stormwater, in most cases dissipated within a couple hours after the rainfalls had subsided. A lot of the sewers have been designed more than 50 years ago, so the design assumptions that were made were primarily being a residential type development. In the East Mason, Main Street corridor, again, that storm sewer was designed on the basis of a totally residential area. The Main Street corridor itself is primarily commercial. Then you have the East Town Mall area, what is now the U-Haul, Rogan Street or Rogan's Shoes. You have the Shopko development, Gandrud Auto, that's all hard-surface imperviousness. So, that ultimately allows that water to get into the storm sewer quicker which has an impact on the quantity of water that discharges into the storm sewer system. Talked about the deference of ponds, so, I'll now go through some of nine drainage basins that were previously identified, kind of on a basin-by-basin basis and basically give a overview of what's the problem and what has been done, if anything, in those basins. So the first one that will be addressed is basin 309. That's primarily the Lombardi Avenue, Ash, Oneida Street area, and ultimately flows out through Liberty Street at the Fox River. We primarily have seen flooding on Lombardi, within Oneida Street, and then on some of the inner residential streets of Kenwood, Thorndale, Carroll, et cetera. This drainage basin, it's not included in the report. I just found this out recently. The original drainage basin was designed for 350 acres of land development, that included the original Lambeau Field area and they accounted for a lot of impervious nature up there. The designers of that time said, well the rest of the design basin, or drainage basin, was going to be very low, residential development, large lots, a lot of green space. And we know that the Lombardi Avenue corridor, and south of Lombardi Avenue, is very commercialized. So, that assumption has failed. The other item is, again it was originally designed for 350 acres, the total drainage basin to date is closer to 500 acres. Based upon the original 350,

the design worked. Based on the 500 acres, the designed storm sewer system does not work. With the expansions of Lambeau Field, we have required the Packers to do some stormwater management. Two years ago, three years ago, they built a large, underground storage tank. It's about the size of a football field, about 15 feet deep. I haven't heard of any significant flooding recently on Oneida, or the Oneida-Lombardi intersection since that tank has been installed but that is one of the projects that has gone into trying to relieve some flooding in that area. Where all this information has come up again is with the Brown County Expo Center. I have had some recent discussions with Village of Ashwaubenon staff to make sure that they require some stormwater management meeting the city's requirements to try and reduce the amount of water coming from the Resch Center, Expo Center areas because we do accept some of their stormwater into our storm sewer system.

- Would that basin also contain Gross Avenue?

- [Matt] Portions of Gross, yes.

- Okay, so for what it's worth, there has been flooding on Gross. So, just anecdotally, if you could please keep that in mind so when you are working with the county, that that's information that you have handy.

- [Matt] Where on Gross?

- Towards Lombardi, I think.

- [Matt] So, what? I mean Gross is at the intersection of Lombardi as well as Holmgren. So, a trotting on comes up and yeah, would drain that whole kind of quadrant. Basically it's from Liberty to the south city limits, the Fox River, hit and miss up to Oneida Street. Plus the Lambeau Field area is kind of the general drainage area. So, and, again, I mean, that adds into the Thorndale, Kenwood, Carroll, and that Gross is right in that area as well, so.

- Yeah, let me hear it. We need to it.

- That's really why we're here.

- Repeat that.

- [Matt] Basin 417. It's the former area of 2,400 block of the former University Avenue where the new Festival and Kwik Trip have gone up. That area was continually flooding along the former University Avenue. Part of the redevelopment in that area, we required the developer to upsize the storm sewer and put in some stormwater management devices in that area. They did some underground detention and some biofiltration for additional storage. The only place I am aware of some flooding right now is at the actual intersection of Sturgeon Bay Road and University, right by the signals there and that's because it's a flumed inlet or flumed outlet, off the road into a grassy area to a shallow inlet. And the pitch on that ditch is very flat so any time we get any type of ice accumulation right now or any type of debris build up it's holding the water back into the road. It's a maintenance issue. One of the things we're going to do is see if we can lower that inlet and create a deeper pitch, a steeper pitch, on that ditch to get the water to drain into the storm sewer system there. So, basin 231, which is the Elizabeth Street corridor, from Main Street to University Avenue, and then University Avenue from Elizabeth to Acme Street by American Foods. Both Elizabeth and University in that area have been known for significant flooding. That was part of the former town of Preble and that was identified in a study with in the, known as the Preble Study back in the early '90s. And so it was on our list to do some upgrades on. We finished up that project this summer, at a cost of about \$1.1 million to upgrade the storm sewer for that corridor. Basin 162 is an area bounded by the East River up to Eastman Avenue from Webster to St. George. We saw a lot of flooding in the 1,100 block of Smith Street and then along the Webster Avenue corridor. We knew this has been a problem area. It is controlled by a storm lift station. The 1,100 block of Smith is actually one of the lower areas within that area. The storm sewer within Smith Street itself was undersized and so we had a consultant take a look at that and make recommendations. We started implementing those recommendations; reconstructing Smith and St. George this summer and then part of the DOT contract for North Webster Avenue is to continue upgrading or upsizing the storm sewer within North Webster, along with creating a boulevard section that is lower than the road that will act as a detention area in that area. So, that should mathematically, take care of the flooding in that area. So we have gone and proceeded with that. Basin 108 is a very small drainage basin, which is primarily in the 500 block of South Broadway.

- Nothing, to me.

- [Matt] It deals primarily with the Our Family Restaurant, South Broadway, which is continually flooding. We originally were going to propose replacing the existing storm water lift station in there. Due to poor soils and other factors, the price of that project kept escalating. We cut the project off at \$1.5 million and said we can reallocate those funds to redoing a storm lift station what is being referred to as basin 110, which is gonna be a lift station within the shipyard, proposed shipyard development. Basin 110 is primarily a storm sewer that runs up Clinton Street from the former slough and ultimately then collects water from the Oneida-West Mason corridor which continually floods over by our West Side Garage, by Culver's, some other residential streets in there, et cetera. The original lift station that is at Clinton and South Broadway was put in in the 1980s to address dry-weather conditions to keep South Maple and Clinton Street dry. It was never intended to take on or be a mechanism to keep the whole entire drainage basin dry, so we are proposing to put in a brand new lift station. The pumps have been approved to be ordered. We are working on the design of that and that should alleviate a lot of the flooding in that area. And what we will do then is tie in the small basin 108, add about 300 feet of storm sewer, and connect it into basin 110. Basin 106, which is approximately 250 acres, ultimately discharges to the Fox River at Howard Street and will take the corridor that services Seymour Park, Shawano Avenue near West High and Hazel that constantly floods, along with South Maple, et cetera. This goes back to the topography issue. There's a little map. We have a old plat map from the 1882 that shows where the slough is. And I kinda marked on that map where Seymour Park would be located approximately where fire station number three is located and those areas are right where the slough ran and those are areas that are seeing flooding today. And so, again, what's happening is the topography is allowing the water to drain to these low spots, pond until the storm sewers can catch up. We also, then, in 2016, hired a consultant to computer model these drainage basins of 106, 108 and come up with recommendations. One of the recommendations that the consultant came up with for basin 106, the Shawano, Seymour Park area is to upgrade about 50% of the storm sewers in that area along with putting in a large storm water detention pond within Seymour park. We had discussions with the Parks Department about doing a pond there and without any surprise, they said, absolutely not, we need our park, which, we kinda figured. So, another alternative is redoing some of the storm sewer, revising the storm lift station at Howard and Pearl, and still looking at some sort of detention system. So, what we are proposing right now is looking at underground detention within Seymour Park, significantly upgrading the stormwater lift station at Howard and Pearl, and then putting in large storm sewer from the intersection of Howard and Pearl, all the way up Howard, to Oakland. And when I say large, I'm talking seven foot by seven foot box culvert buried about 20 feet deep. That will address some of the flooding in that area. We haven't remodeled with this alternative to see how it ultimately impacts. Hopefully by doing just up to Ashland, Oakland area, we don't have to do any additional storm sewer upgrades further to the west. Basin 116, 130 is in the downtown area, basically from Walnut Street south towards Stewart and then from the Fox River. Originally, it was east of Monroe. The original drainage basin was actually only up to Madison Street, but again, development crept. Had the demand that the storm sewer system be extended further to the east, beyond Monroe Avenue. Engineering staff recognized that prior to the reconstruction of Monroe Avenue in 2014. So, when Monroe Avenue was reconstructed, we required that the storm sewer down Monroe Ave be upsized to include areas east of Monroe and try and make the drainage basin of 116, 130 smaller. I don't know if that has had a significant impact. I'm still hearing of flooding by the YWCA primarily, along with some other areas over by Green Bay PD and some of those other areas. So, we still have work to be done there. The storm sewer going down Stuart Street is a 36-inch brick sewer that was constructed prior to 1920. The recommendation by McMahon and Associates, our consultant, was to basically replace all the storm sewer within those two drainage basins and upsize it. That outfall, again, is significantly submerged, so it will not accept additional water coming off of the roadways without doing some ponding. Basin 235 is primarily the Main Street, East Mason corridor, east of Main Street. It's originally, was originally designed for about 1,900 acres. The current drainage basin is just shy of 1,800 acres and again, was all originally designed as residential development. A good portion of the drainage basin lift, then, there, again, is former town of Preble, which has a differing design storm. Primarily, that design storm criteria for the town of Preble was managing the two-year storm, not the 10-year storm. So there's significant deficiencies within the former town of Preble area. Within that 1,800 acres, again, it was primarily residential design. There is over 430 acres of commercial or institutional development that has occurred within that drainage basin. What that does, is almost doubles the flow rate coming off of that drainage basin, which subsequently makes the storm sewer system undersized. So, development in itself is a culprit. Back in the late '60s, early '70s, the Ellis Creek corridor was filled. That's where the primary storm sewer system is located. Again, the primary topography of the area has never changed, even though the creek was filled, the topography of the adjoining land continues to drain to these areas and the area where the new revised Pick 'n Save, the Familia Dental, the Arby's, the Dollar Tree that has experienced recent flooding is the low areas of the normal topography. So, stormwater management requirements were put into play when these areas were redeveloped but the normal topography of these areas, if you would drive by these areas, Pick 'n Save is below the Main Street corridor and the storm sewer actually runs through the Pick 'n Save parking lot. That storm sewer's already a 84-inch diameter storm sewer, so upsizing that would be to more significantly sized pipes or culverts, or whatever would be decided. In 2009, Public Works contracted with AECOM to take a look at this whole corridor as the Ellis Creek Drainage corridor, and we identified four potential areas to do some possible stormwater facilities. One is what is referred to as the Mill Street area. The second would be just south of Deckner

Avenue, right behind some of the businesses where there is still a ravine. A third would be in and around the Hillside Lane area, which is near the Gagnon Park, and then up near Auto Plaza, within the existing Ellis Creek open channel area. The recommendation was to move forward with the Mill Street pond area, which we ultimately built in 2012, and to take a look at the Ellis Creek corridor, whether or not we could make improvements within there. The long story short on the Ellis Creek corridor is the DNR and Army Corps of Engineers are, in 2000, in 2009, and as recently as last year have said, no, no, and no, because of the navigability of that waterway, and the environmental impacts it would have on the natural habitat. Even though we would propose to make it better, they said the initial impact isn't worth the price in the long run. So, out of four potential projects, we were left with one. The two middle ones, the Melon and the Hillside Lane area, the consultant basically said we wouldn't get enough bang for the buck. And ultimately, if we did something there, it would just have an immediate impact on the immediate downstream storm sewer and nothing significant in Main Street or where we're seeing the significant flooding. So, where does that leave us in basin 235? There isn't a lot of open green space that we can tap to create additional ponds in this area, so we are extremely limited in options. We have come up with a couple other options that we are mulling around. And one potentially being some underground storage within the East Town Mall parking lot. We have yet to have discussions with the current owners of those areas, but potentially capturing the runoff from those developments, existing development, putting in large-diameter pipes, and trying to store the water underneath those parking lots to try and minimize the impacts to the existing infrastructure. That idea or concept could also possibly be looked at in the U-Haul/Rogan's parking lots as well. So those are some options, but there is not a lot of viable, cost-effective options out there. We did take a look briefly at what it might take to upgrade the storm sewer system all the way from Baird Creek all the way up to Ellis Creek. And that's basically redoing about 19,000 lineal feet of large-diameter storm sewer that is within conservancies, within existing roadways such as Main Street, and the utility coordination basically would've priced us out of any previous considerations. Right now, one of the options is to strongly look at these underground detention systems. Basin 560, which is the East Mason corridor, again is primarily within the old town of Preble area. It is listed within the Preble Study and the recommendation within the 1991 Preble Study is for a total remove-and-replace of the storm sewer from the outfall at the East River, near Amy Street, all the way up to Abrams, to East Mason, East Mason all the way up to Laura Street. And that would be upsized in nature and that would bring that storm sewer up from a five-year design up to the current 10-year level. With that, there is also the possibility of doing a stormwater pond in the open green space where the radio antennas are located, between Victoria and Heyrman. So, again, we have not contacted any property owners to see if we can do a pond in that area or not but that's something that is on our radar. And then, finally, basin 957, which is our Locust Street storm sewer line. Primarily runs from North Locust, north of Donald Street in the industrial commercial area, south all the way to Colburn Pool, or Colburn Park. That design was done in the late '50s, with the pretext that, again, this area was completely residential. The West Mason corridor is primarily commercial or institutional and has, as such, created more runoff than the storm sewers are capable of handling. Under a normal residential design, the storm sewer from Colburn Park down to Western Avenue is designed appropriately, can handle all that flow. It's when we start adding the commercial aspect onto it that we start seeing some minor impacts to that section with a storm sewer. The biggest impacts, there's a map of this drainage basin, and the storm sewer's highlighted in pink. In some of those areas, the storm sewer was not constructed per plan, per design. As such, the storm sewer was flatter, and does not accept as much water as designed. The water backs up there, and as such, backs up further upstream and impacts, in this case, the Locust Street area near Mason Manor. So we're looking, potentially, at 5,500 lineal feet of pipe that would need to be upsized, upgraded. Other option that we are considering, again this corridor does not have a lot of green space that is available for a traditional wet-detention pond. Engineering had considered putting a wet-detention pond on the north side of Colburn Park. Sounds great, we have a lot of green space. We haven't talked to parks yet, but it's also at the furthest-upstream reach of the drainage basin, so it really doesn't have any significant benefit. So as such, we're kind of dismissing that as a significant viable alternative. The alternatives that we are considering is possibly looking at some underground detention within the Notre Dame practice field. Don't know how much benefit that will provide. We have not done a lot of analysis on this but it's something that is conceptual in nature and as such, since that's an area that continually floods, it may be a lot of bang for the buck. Again, we have not talked to Notre Dame Academy to see if they are interested in partnering with the city to do so, but it is something that is on the table. Another area that gets flooded is just to the north of that in some apartments and some private residential properties, whether or not to consider doing, again, some underground detention underneath the apartment parking lot. So that's something that is out there as options. There's a section in the report called Preble Study Outstanding Improvements. The map there pretty much identifies the sewers that were discussed in the 1991 report. The green line segments identified our sewers that have been upgraded. The red lines are pipes that still need to be upgraded.

- Do you have a pair of clunky shoes?

- [Matt] What does this all mean financially? It means a lot. In the section of cost implication, throughout the report I've put in some quick estimates, so to speak. And under the Cost Implication area, there is the table that discusses what it

might cost to do some of these improvements. The bottom line is... What we have spent in the last three years on stormwater management is just shy of \$6 million.

- Oh, okay, what do we do, Andy?

- [Matt] A guesstimate to address some of the remaining sewer upgrades to bring us to a 10-year design storm level would be about another \$67 million dollars. To do the remainder, utilizing the 1991 Preble Study, and bringing those costs up to date, to do those remaining projects there would be just over \$22 million, for a total of about \$95 million dollars. That deals with some of the flooding issues within the city. That deals with just quantity. The EPA and DNR have also tasked the city to deal with water quality. We had a study recently completed by Brown and Caldwell, which identified some projects within the city that would be required to be implemented to deal with trying to remove additional sediment and phosphorus from our stormwater prior to being discharged out to the East River, the Fox River, the Bay of Green Bay. They identified 18 projects within that study with a cost estimate of \$100 million. Those 18 projects only get us half way to our water quality criteria, provided by the EPA and DNR. So, that deals with stormwater. We then have a whole sanitary sewer system that we're spending roughly \$3 million, presently spending about \$3 million a year on to make improvements and to keep the sanitary sewer system functioning properly. Long story short, we have a large infrastructure need. That's been identified, or have been commented on, a lot. The question is, where do we go from here, and how do we pay for it? So, I guess I'll leave it open for questions. I know I rambled on. Again, it was a large topic, large discussion.

- Alder Nicholson, you have a question?

- Matt, thank you for the report. Can I get a hard copy of that, please?

- Yeah, I--

- And then, also, oh, go ahead.

- I would like one, too.

- And I may as well, please. If you have one.

- [Matt] It is included within the packet, but if--

- It's not a hard copy.

- Our packets are--

- We don't get packets anymore.

- I notice each of you have a hard copy.

- [Matt] I printed off and I made highlights to talk from, so. I can get, I will send out to all Alders, a hard copy of this and put it the interoffice mails.

- Thank you. I mean, you identified there's an infrastructure need in all these basins, correct? I mean--

- These are just the... 11 basins, 12 basins that I looked at. There are additional needs, additional areas that experience high-water condition that are not addressed in here at all.

- Right, okay.

- [Matt] So, that 100 million for stormwater quantity just deals--

- Right.

- [Matt] So, our need is significantly more.

- Basin 235, you stated, I just wrote down sewer. I believe it was sewer under size. That's the Preble area?
- There are--
- Have we done any improvements since the '60s?
- [Matt] Oh yeah, yeah.
- Okay. Did you address that? I mean I might have missed it.
- [Matt] It didn't.
- You said they were undersized. Have we...
- As we reconstruct or resurface roads in that basin, we are sequentially doing
- Okay, I remember you mentioning that before, Steve.
- We're trying to coordinate that effort on replacing the pipe with a road project whenever and wherever we can. That maximizes the amount of impact we can get with minimizing the amount of financial outlay. If we have to go out and just do, like Matt was talking about with the Elizabeth Street sewer, we replaced all that sewer and then we didn't do a road project associated with it so, the sewer came out and then we had to patch the road. Whenever we can, we try to co-locate projects so we're upgrading the sanitary, the storm, the water main, and the pavement all at once. Or at least as many of those as we can, so as we are doing road projects within any basins, but 235 specifically, we're doing upgrades at that time.
- Well, what upgrades have we done in basin 235 with our road projects in the past? Do you have examples?
- I'd have to go back and pull the streets that we've worked on.
- I would like to see that. If we could have that at our next meeting, Steve?
- [Matt] Within the hard copy there is a map.
- It's in there?
- [Matt] And you can see a green map, or green lines and red lines within the study.
- Right.
- It also identifies basin 235 and it'll show you the streets or the areas that have been improved or improvements have been made with the Preble Study. With the Preble Study in '91, the Council decision was originally, set up a systematic approach on how to knock out all these sewers, roughly 22 miles worth of sewer upgrades. After the third year of the program, Council said, whoa, this is getting expensive. And they came back and said, DPW, any time you are now making improvements to the road, make improvements to the storm sewer. So they, again, trying to get the most bang for the buck. If not, what was happening is, as Steve identified, we'd make improvements to the storm sewer and put a patch in the road. By doing it with a resurfacing program or a reconstruct program, we're getting the storm sewer, the sanitary, the water, and the pavement, and combining all of that, because Elizabeth Street, between Main and University, the stormwater utility picked up the total cost for the storm sewer and the pavement replacement.
- So, for--
- [Matt] Now if we have to do sanitary work or water work, that comes back and now we'd have to patch the road again, so it's a second time we'd have to pay for that pavement.
- Okay, so that specific example, Matt, has that improved?
- [Matt] We just finished up the storm sewer, I'm gonna say just before the September rain event--

- Okay, so we don't know yet?
- [Matt] I am not aware of any flooding that occurred on University avenue--
- Well, it's winter.
- or Elizabeth Street at the September--
- I guess we'll find out during the summer then.
- [Matt] So, yeah.
- Okay. Right.
- [Matt] That's the best answer I can give. In theory, yes, it should.
- Well, I guess Mr. Chairman, I mean it's a big investment but it's infrastructure, and I mean, I guess, what does the Committee want to do in the Council? I mean, what's the recommendation we'd like to give to the Council? I mean, I would like to invest in our infrastructure. I mean, it's needed. It's identified as a need and it's not a want. I feel strong about this subject, 'cause I think this the third or fourth time I put something through. Matt, I met with you over by Mason Street and Schwartz and we had a little, I mean, basically we have a different identifier over there because that one piece of property loaded up with dirt. I mean, raised their property, I believe, probably in the '90s, I mean, way before my time. And that's one of the issues over there but I believe that. I mean, that's part of basin 235, correct?
- [Matt] No, that's actually part of that East Mason corridor.
- East Mason, okay. But I mean, that's another area that needs to be addressed. I guess I would like to. I mean, in my opinion, but I wanna hear from everybody, that I would like to move forward and at least invest something into our city with, to take care of this issue. So, that's what I have for now, Mr. Chairman. Thank you.
- All right, thank you Mr. Chairman. Thanks, Matt, we can tell you know it inside-out, you barely looked at your notes. He knew all the numbers and... Obviously we've identified pretty well the high water issues and the water quality issues, which we've barely even kinda touched on, but it sounds like equally as daunting of a task. But have you as a staff already kind of identified a 10-year plan, 20-year plan? I mean I don't wanna go out too much farther than that but--
- [Matt] Right now we haven't gone much beyond the reporting of potential ideas or concepts until we get further direction from Committee and Council because the big hurdle that we have to overcome is money.
- Well, now would probably be the time to start looking at what staff thinks is a feasible plan. You know, 10, 20, 30, whatever you think is a workable plan 'cause you need the crews and the, you know, you need all of that to be able to do it as well. Start looking at that and potential funding sources. You know, prioritize all of these needs, the water quality and the high water. I think that's probably the next step, is to see a couple different options. You know: 10-, 20-, 30-year plan, what it would cost each year and then some funding sources. We have to start on it.
- The water quantity is largely tied together with our reconstruct and resurfacing programs. So, staff is in the middle of working out a five-year program that's gonna be presented. Anything beyond a five-year plan...
- Did you say the water quality or the water quantity?
- Quantity.
- The one we're going over right now?
- Yep.
- Quantity is largely tied together with our resurfacing and reconstruct because you've replace that pipe. You do upsizing, when you do a road project. Quality is largely driven by other than just upsizing pipes so, that's when you have detention

basins, or ponds, or one of the things that we have started giving a lot more, a lot more emphasis or taking a second look at, are some linear underground detentions. So what we can do is, if the storm sewer in that area only needs to be a 24-inch diameter pipe to carry the volume of water, what we can do is we can upsize that to a 72 and that'll create an underground detention basin. It's basically like making a swimming pool with a lid on it or just a holding tank underground. But we can make it out of the sewer itself as long as there's a way to go in there and clean it to get the sediments that are settling out. So we're taking a look at a couple of those kinds of options. The quality type projects, the ponds, the settling basins, things like that, are often looked at independent of road projects because they don't always line up with where a road is. So, those projects are independently being programmed on their own five-year plan. Again, we can start taking a look at what it's gonna take on a average annual basis in today's dollars, but anything out beyond five years really starts getting sketchy at best as far as our ability to deliver that because a combination of change in priorities, regulatory oversight, which has been a big thing for us to have to deal with. As we get a plan, you're laid out there X number of years into the future, this is where we're going and then we get a new director from the EPA and that forces us to go back and reshuffle the deck.

- In excess

- So, generally speaking, a rolling five-year plan is about the best we can provide any kind of accuracy on.

- Well doing that, how many five-year plans would it take to knock out that list of \$94 million worth of projects? I think that's what we wanna know. It's tough to go back to people and say, well, what's your plan to fix all these? Well, you know, we kinda handle it on five years at a time, and we're not sure where you fit in the priority. We could be in this five year. It could be in the fourth five-year plan. I think we need to say, here's our priorities. We're gonna knock this out, we're gonna knock this, this, this, this. And then--

- It depends how much money we wanna give them.

- Let's fight. I don't wanna hear--

- [Matt] On a fiscal basis, I'm saying you're looking between 20 and 40 years.

- All right, well then that's--

- [Machine] Find out caller.

- That's good to know.

- [Matt] And that again is just dealing with the quantity side. So... We only have so much bonding capacity on a city level, so, everything can't go towards the storm sewer quantity. If not, we could knock this out, in theory, in 10 years. That leaves no other bonding capability for roads, or sanitary, or water quality. So, it's probably gonna lean more closer towards that 40-, 50-year implementation. The problem didn't happen overnight, the solution isn't gonna happen overnight.

- Do we have any other funding sources available? I mean, some of the different fees that we assess as far as stormwater?

- That's how it's currently funded, the stormwater fees that you pay on your water bill.

- Have you explored that?

- I looked at--

- Adjusting that to repair? I mean, people understand. They know the flooding in Green Bay. They'll understand if that has to increase to repaired. It's either that or borrowing, or both. It's gonna be both.

- [Matt] I took a look briefly, and I don't remember the numbers off the top of my head but to look at an additional \$10 million of bonding per year on the stormwater utility rate, I believe would raise. The current rate is around \$80, \$85 per ERU, per household, standard household. It would take that \$85 and I believe it would raise it almost to \$180, per year. So, there's a significant impact on the stormwater utility rate.

- That's all I have for now.

- Okay. Well, you know and I kinda brought this forward as well and in addition to Alder Nicholson with some concerns in his area and I think for us to do nothing is not an option. And it's not to suggest that you guys aren't doing anything. I know you're doing what you can with the resources you have. And that's where we come into play. I think we've got this information. This is very valuable, I thank you for that. This is far more robust than I expected and this is great. So, I think now we're at the now what stage. And that's where I think the Council comes into play, and the flooding has been in discussion. Streets and infrastructure has been in discussion. Police and fire and restoring those back to appropriate levels has been in discussion. And these are basic services that are currently under-funded and I think we have to figure out how we're gonna do this. And INS can't be the committee that exclusively services that. At least in my short time on Council, I have not heard of a comprehensive five-year plan that addresses how we're gonna handle all those things, in addition to debt reduction and how that works with bonding and other fees that are assessed for different services. And so, this is maybe the inexperience coming out, but does it make sense for us to refer this to Finance Committee, with the request to come up with a five-year plan for all of these needs?

- Finance already has that.

- They do?

- Yep. That's a communication from Finance Committee, I believe, and correct me if I'm wrong, looking to Alder Dorff, was there or was there not a request at Finance to have the Finance Department spearhead a effort on behalf of all city departments to put together a comprehensive five-year program?

- There was.

- Okay.

- It's not done.

- So, that's our mail.

- So Diana is working on that?

- She should be.

- That's already being worked on, correct.

- And I presume then, Director Grenier, that that's taking into account, for the scope of this Committee, taking into account all of your needs from a public infrastructure?

- That will be taking our five-year program into account as well, yes.

- Okay, so if that's in progress then perhaps just receiving and placing in file is the appropriate action right now.

- No, I disagree with that.

- No.

- Oh no.

- I guess I'm open to your recommendation. What--

- I want this to be on the, I want some type of update, so it just doesn't fall to the wayside, Alderman Johnson.

- Okay.

- Really?

- I'm sorry for interrupting--

- No, dump it.

- But this is a huge project, a huge investment. And we have an issue, and I don't want receive and place on file. I mean, that's just my opinion. We should just keep this in front of us. Either some type of update or just on the agenda so we're familiar with it and it doesn't go away. That's my opinion. I just wanna ask Steve, that to keep this moving forward, what do you recommend for a proper motion, because I believe from Mr. Johnson and Mr. Wery, and I don't know about Mr. Brunette, but we want this to move forward, once we have all the facts.

- Well what I can tell you is, regardless of what action the Committee takes regarding the report, the findings of the report will continue to move forward. This forms the basis of how we're structuring our input for the storm sewer portion of our programming, our five-year programming. So the recommendations that we've come up with, or at least the concerns that we've identified, we will continue to use this data. We're not only gonna use this data, periodically, we do go back and we have the consultants come back in and we have 'em refresh the data to make sure that what was a priority three years ago continues to be a priority or have we found other areas and other complaints pop up. We continuously use this information to help select those projects that go into our programs. So, if you recommend that staff use this information to help drive your five-year program, that's would be, that would be, but that's what we're doing already. If you tell us to implement the recommendations of the report, that's what we're doing already. That's how we put our five-year program together. If you say this was a great report, received and placed on file. We're still gonna do what's listed in this report, because that's how we build that five-year plan.

- Okay, I understand that, I just don't care for received and placed on file.

- No, I understand that.

- I would like to--

- As far as reporting out our actions, as far as what projects we did, that's our annual report. The DPW Annual Report, that's where that information is found. About the only thing that hasn't really been in there, we haven't, if we've done a storm sewer project, we haven't necessarily identified the storm sewer basin. If you'd like, we could tie those back together. If there's a storm sewer project that's done or a stormwater quality project, we can let you know what basin that ties to it and that will tie back.

- That would be beneficial. I think the Committee would like that.

- Sure.

- Also, when Diana is finished with her, I don't know. What do you call it, a report or a study?

- It's basically gonna be a comprehensive kind of a program.

- Comprehensive plate? When she's done with that, can that come back? I want that to come back here when it's done with Finance.

- Well, I know that it was put through the Finance Committee, so that's where she's planning on bringing it back.

- Okay.

- But that will be shared with everyone. That's not a big deal. And we're gonna bring our portion of that in front of INS as well.

- Oh, okay. Okay, that's what I was getting at.

- Yeah.

- So we are also involved?

- The Public Works portion, you'll still see. And then all departments, the entire city's five-year program's going to Finance.
- All right.
- Ours will be a part of that.
- How long has she had it? It's already gone through Finance?
- No, no, no, no. The departments are working on pulling and working on that.
- They're working that. I mean, what time frame are you looking at? Six months?
- I have no idea. No, I think it's supposed to be quicker than that.
- Okay.
- I think they want it.
- I could call her and find out.
- Presumably I think they want it in the first quarter of 2019.
- Okay. All right.
- Some of the mayor candidates might pull out
- Well, I still would like to have this still on the agenda. And we can at least talk about it.
- Vote on it and we can hold it.
- I mean, really, it's not wasting any paper.
- Well, all right.
- It's still on the, I mean, that's what I would like.
- Report back in 60 days?
- Would that be fair?
- Well I can tell you in 60 days, not much relative to this report's gonna change.
- [Matt] Well, as far as what's being worked on right now within the report?
- Right, right.
- [Matt] Basin 110, 108 is moving forward. So as far as lift stations are being designed for implementation in 2019. Basin 106, which is the Shawano Avenue, Seymour Park project, what we are looking at doing is upgrading the storm lift station at Howard and Pearl. There is a private development that we are potentially going to be partnering with, to deal with, which doesn't address in this report, possibly relieving some of the flooding at Military and Shawano. Right now, we've met with a developer. All signs said yep, they're willing to partner with the city on doing some underground detention--
- That's good.
- [Matt] On a redevelopment project in there. The Webster Avenue project is moving forward. So that should relieve the flooding up in that corridor. So, we are implementing parts of this report as we speak. Again, working with the Village of Ashwaubenon to try and relieve some additional relief on that Lombardi Avenue, Liberty Street line with the proposed

Expo Center. So trying to minimize the amount of water coming off that, those projects. So again, as Director Grenier stated, we are implementing recommendations within the report. We have not talked to the East Town Mall people. We have not talked to Notre Dame. We have not done a lot of additional engineering work beyond potential conceptual ideas on some of these other basins. So the locus, the 235 area. Within our 2019 resurfacing program, we're addressing some of the Preble storm sewers in and around the South Abrams, Laura areas sort of north of Debra. So, again, working on those projects as they come through.

- Matt, you mention 235, I mean, when can you approach East Town Mall properties? Can we do that soon?

- Ultimately, I mean if this is a direction that Committee and Council ultimately wants us to pursue, and I mean, basically I'm waiting for marching orders.

- Okay, well, I mean that's great that we're addressing a lot of those basins. I know there's, I mean basin 235 needs attention. I was just wondering if we can move forward on just contacting East Town Mall and see what options we need there?

- [Matt] There is--

- I mean, that's what I would like to see.

- That's easy enough to do.

- Okay.

- We know the current owners. We know who the proposed developers are.

- That would be great.

- As part of those discussions, we can definitely talk to them.

- And that's the part I'd like to, that's why I want to keep this item on the agenda so we can have updates on basically, on all the different basins that you already addressed that are moving forward and the ones that are on standby.

- Thank you Mr. Chairman.

- Yes, Alder Brunette?

- Yes, thank you Chair. Now, Alderman Nicholson, you're the chair of the Committee. That that was my suggestion, I'd recommend that you put this as a standing agenda item and just change the language to update with possible action on the so and so. And the reason I say that is--

- You mean basin 235?

- The whole thing.

- The whole thing?

- Take that off the agenda?

- Yep.

- This would be separate than the director's report and the reason I say that is that we are accountable to the public as is Department of Public Works and we are close to spring, close to a lot of snow melting close to a lot of rain events and I think the public will need to know that if there is a situation where there is a substantial rain event or flooding that occurs in the next month or two, or three months, or six months, that we can say as a Council, as a Committee, we have been discussing this, this is ongoing. That we're not just talking about it in January and then four months later it pops up again.

- I agree.

- So a standing agenda item with an update from Public Works. And I know, Matthew, your time is valuable so I wouldn't expect you to be here at all those meetings but you know, prepare a short report to the Public Works Director or staff and update the Committee as a separate agenda item. Then we can act on it. We can act up, keep it as a possible action item so we can take action if we need to. So that's what I would recommend. I don't think we need a motion for that necessarily.

- You need a motion for that, Steve?

- Well are you gonna keep this report active? Is that what you'd like, or? I guess, when I look--

- When you say report, you mean Matt's report?

- The report that we just discussed, yeah.

- Right.

- When I tend to look at the process of government business, how we do business as an entity, there's something about handling this report and then if you want updates to potentially have a new communication, requesting, or accept this report and request updates as a standing item.

- Sure.

- But...

- That makes sense.

- Having some finality or having some closure on an individual item, especially if we're gonna have something moving forward, to receive and place on file or accept the report, or what have you and then have a new action item coming forward for a standing agenda item.

- Sure.

- And I'd be happy to sit down with any of the four of you to craft an appropriate communication to go in to generate that new standing item for update on, you know, an informational update, or discussion with possible action regarding updates on storm sewer and stormwater management activities undertaken by the Department of Public Works for the time period of, and identify the period.

- I can make a motion affecting this.

- All right, make the motion.

- Make a motion to accept the report of the Department of Public Works, documenting areas of localized ponding, measures already taken to address ponding, and future implementations steps. You know, basically to receive and place on file the report and direct Director Grenier to work with Alder Nicholson to create a standing agenda item for future Public Works meetings.

- Second.

- Or future Improvement and Service Committee meetings.

- Okay, with motion, Alder Wery seconded but I know Alder Wery wanted to speak yet.

- Thanks, yeah, perfect motion. Mr. Heckenlaible, do you mind if your second call after East Town Mall is to Notre Dame? At least broach the topic with them.

- Yep.

- I don't think they're gonna ever want to give up that field 'cause they use it for football, lacrosse, soccer, I mean.
- All public.
- But maybe they want to enhance it someday.
- The intent's not to ask them to give it up. What we'd be looking at is an underground facility so we'd take it temporarily out of service, but it would be right back for their use.
- They might be looking at upgrading it anyway which
- Sure.
- Would be a perfect time to take it out of service. But at least get the conversation started.
- [Matt] Yep.
- Thanks.
- Just one more question, then, too before we conduct that vote. Is there anything else outside of the motion from a policy perspective that council can do to help you?
- At this point I don't think so. This is something that I think we are going to be talking about again. It's all going to come up with the discussion relative to comprehensive five-year plans because... We do have some limitations that are in front of us. There are the financial limitations on what we can afford to spend as a city. There are manpower limitations. I know as far my staff, we are currently stretched beyond the breaking point. I lost another engineer in December who wound up going to the Department of Natural Resources. I've had one out for almost two months on medical leave. When you're only dealing with four or five staff engineers to start with, losing two of them is pretty catastrophic. So there's a limitation on how much we can physically get designed during the course of a year. And then the other very real issue that we're gonna have to talk about as it relates to infrastructure has to do with our contractor capabilities and we can design and bid everything under the sun but if we don't have contractors out there to build it, it's not gonna do us any good. And there's more than just the City of Green Bay out bidding things right now and the number of contractors who do the type of work that we need them to do in our local area has gone down over the past number of years. So, I think what we have seen, especially during certain parts of the year, we have seen that lack of available contractor manpower reflected in bid prices where either we don't get people bidding on our projects, or the bids come in and the costs are just astronomical.
- But I hope Alder Dorff with Finance Committee, that that's something your committee takes into consideration, is sort of the ebb and flow of I guess supply and demand of contractors. I just look at the influx of school referendums that occurred this past spring and think, boy, costs just went up with that many new construction projects. So if there's an opportunity, obviously, in that five-year plan, do account for, you know, like I said, just, I mean, swings, where we might be able to get 10 to 20% more work out of the same dollar. by being able to shift where our priorities are. I just encourage you to think about that.
- [Barbara] I just emailed Diana and asked for an update.
- Okay, thank you. Any more discussion on this issue?
- Yeah, so, I mean, you brought up some issues now that was beyond the scope with contractors. I think that's a separate item because I'm receiving a lot of complaints from contractors. They don't wanna do business with the city and that's why they're staying away from the city. So we have to, I'd like to clear that up sometime, but not at this time because I'm more focused on trying to invest in the city and help with the issue we have. So Steve, with this communication, where are we at, then?
- Where we're at--
- Are we moving forward?

- We're at a receive placed on file with the report. And then, I will sit down with you as the chair of this committee to craft a standing agenda item for updating the committee on various projects.

- Okay, do you actually need me to craft that communication?

- Well, no, no. I will put the language together.

- Oh, thank you.

- It doesn't necessarily have to come through a communication in Council

- I wouldn't know what words I would have to, in alderman.

- Well, as the chair of this Committee, you'd have the right to set the agenda. So what I can do is, I'll sit down, craft something.

- Okay.

- You and I will work through it together--

- All right.

- Once we come to agreement on the language it will simply become a separate agenda.

- Thank you, all right. I gotcha. I'm on board. All right, that's all I have, chair.

- So we have a motion by Alder Brunette, a second by Alderman Wery. All those in favor say aye.

- [Aldermen] Aye.

- Opposed? Motion carries. Alder Nicholson?

- Thank you.

- Item number three.

- Consideration with possible action on a review and approval of the 2019 Department of Public Works service rates. Director Grenier.

- We have provided to you the memo that we send out this time of the year relative to our service rates for various services: bulk collections, appliances, purchase of recycling and trash carts, improper cart storage, weed cutting, early set-out charges, asphalt pavement repair, and snow and ice control. As we have in prior years, we provided you with the prior year rate and what our proposed rates are for 2019. There are a couple of items in here that definitely bare some short discussion. Relative to bulk collections, bulk collections were set at \$70 for three yards, \$140 for three to 10 cubic yards, and \$210 for anything over 10 cubic yards. That rate was established back in 2010 and that was kind of a blended average based on some, on the size of some loads and what the tipping fees were at the time. We have not touched that rate since 2010, while tipping rates at the landfill have continued to escalate throughout that entire time. So, this year, and you're gonna hear this consistently on some of these where we're going up in cost. With a new financial supervisor in the Department of Public Works, we've actually gone back and done some cost accounting based on what it's actually costing us to preform some of these services, what equipment's used, how many bin, things like that, and refine some of these things to be more accurate for 2019 dollars. So, what we are recommending is taking the rate up from, for less than three cubic yards up from \$70 to \$80, three to 10 would go up from \$140 to \$160, and bulk collections greater than 10 cubic yards will go from \$210 to \$240. We are proposing to keep refrigerators and freezers at \$35 and other appliances at \$25. In 2020, one of the things we're gonna be coming to you with, we are starting to take a look at what types of appliances are out there, and we're not seeing as much refrigerators or freezers, things of that nature, but we're starting to see more and more of the flat screen TVs and other electronics. So we're doing some sifting through of data on that to find out what our true disposal costs are, especially with Cyber Green no longer providing that service at our, both drop-off locations. So we may be splitting some of those appliances out to some additional categories for you in future years.

Recycling carts again, the 64-gallon carts, we typically don't have a lot of those. We're exhausting our existing inventory. But the 96-gallon carts as recycling or automated programs have gained popularity across the United States, those carts have started to go up as well. So, when we provide that cart there's also labor associated with somebody bringing that cart out and delivering it to the house and then the administrative overhead that goes along with that. The carts are almost \$60 alone right now, so we're proposing that those go up from \$60 to 95. By way of comparison, City of De Pere's 95-gallon carts are \$95, and Appleton's are a rental. They charge you a rent on that per week and that comes out to \$6 per week for a garbage, sorry, \$1.50 a week so it's at \$78 per year. You don't purchase the cart outright, you rent it. So, ours are still... And this also helps when we've got the carts out there and I think we've offered a 10-year warranty on it, what we're not reflecting in the current rate is the amount of time that staff has to go out there and preform maintenance on broken handles, broken wheels, things like that. So we're just trying to recover a little bit of that cost. Improper cart storage is proposed to go from \$33 to \$38. Again, that is a reflection on current labor rates and a little bit more accuracy. I think we had a quarter of an hour and we've actually bumped that up to a third of an hour to reflect the actual time that an average response involves. Weed cutting is something where you're gonna see some changes. The administrative charge per parcel's proposed to go \$48 to \$52. The labor, that is more a reflection of labor rates and overhead, insurance rates, things like that, that we talk about during budget time. But the labor per hour, what we're looking at is a more accurate reflection of how many people go out to answer these calls. We didn't have some really good information in prior years whereas now, with the new... Timekeeping payroll software that we're using, we're able to harvest a lot of this data back and come up with some more accurate, as far as the labor and equipment costs of what's going out there. And we used to charge a minimum charge of a quarter of an hour and what we're finding is it's actually pretty close to a half an hour, including the travel time to respond to some of these things. So, equipment charge is proposed to go for 29 to \$84 an hour. So, a minimum charge for weed cutting or lawn mowing would go from 64.25 up to \$130. Early set-out charges going from, a minimum charge going from 50 to 54. The hourly charge going from \$118.90 to 121. Again what you're seeing there primarily is labor costs, including overhead. Asphalt pavement repair, that is something that we've really started digging into, With what it costs to make a repair for a utility or somebody who's digging in the road, to get that back to a completed condition, if the street is just gravel and we have to dig it out and put a new asphalt surface on there, adding up the pieces of equipment that need to be involved and the number of folks who are on those repair crews, then taking a look at the actual amount of time it takes and how many repairs can be completed in a day, we're showing that the repair for a gravel-based street should go from 46 to \$62 per square yard of repair and on a, oh I'm sorry that's on a concrete-based street. On a gravel-based street it would go from 92 to \$108 an hour. And then snow and ice control, which we're right in the middle of the season now, we actually looked back and took a look at the pieces of equipment that are being used to complete that. Administrative charge per parcel is proposed to stay the same at \$55 but the per lineal foot cost is proposed to be increased from 15 cents to 36 cents per foot. Again we did contact some of our neighbors. City of De Pere charges \$1.02 per foot for snow removal, \$1.62 per foot if it's compacted snow or ice, with a \$75 minimum. Appleton will clear sidewalks at \$75 minimum charge, with 40 cents per foot. So, we think our proposed costs are pretty well in line there. And again, going back, taking a look at some of these historically, we talked about bulk already. The appliances have been steady since 2014 with no increase. The carts, since we went automated, the carts have not changed in cost. We haven't changed what we're charging residents although the cost of the carts to the city, including the repairs have gone up. Snow and ice removal, we've been a dollar here, a dollar there on the administrative charge but the 15 cents per foot has been constant since 2012. Weed cutting has largely been reflecting the cost of labor and overhead and fringe benefits with the exception of the change to go from a quarter of an hour, 15 minutes, to a half an hour as proposed this year. Early set-out charges have actually gone both up and down as we've continued to refine those costs and identify what equipment is being used to take care of that. They were at one time as high as \$154.25 hourly and we're down to 121 right now. And then again the asphalt, the asphalt and pavement repair on a gravel-based street has been in that \$46 range since 2011. And from 2009 up until the end of 2018, gravel-based streets were anywhere from \$84 to about \$93 but as we've gone back and done some true cost accounting to find out what equipment's actually going out on the street to effectuate these repairs. And again, we're not making money on this. All we're trying to do is cover the costs of the people going out to preform the work. That's why we're proposing the 108.

- Okay, motion to receive and place on file?
- Oh, question.
- Oh, Alderman Brunette.
- Steve, with the budget that we passed did it include this projected revenue increase?
- It did not.

- It did not, so this would be outside of what was budgeted. The extra revenue, would that just go in...
- It goes--
- To the general budget.
- Do you believe that you would need, obviously this would help you meet your department budget. Do you think that this needs to be instituted immediately after the council decides, or is this something that we could propose for 2020?
- Uh... Again, this was not part of our budget projections for 2019. We're not talking about a significant amount of revenue as well.
- Sure.
- You know, we're not gonna bring in \$100,000 worth of revenue. With all these changes, my guess is we're probably looking at a revenue differential, between not adopting these rates and adopting these rates, probably gonna be more along the lines of \$20,000.
- May I? mean, you laid it out perfectly well. That I thank you for. I just have a hard time. Yeah, it's charging the public these charges when we just passed the budget, that's all.
- Well, sure.
- That's, in my head, what I struggle with. So that's it.
- One question.
- Go ahead, Alderman Johnson.
- Thank you Director Grenier for the information. I agree, like, I'm okay with us raising rates to be appropriate with what our expenses are. The one question I have is related to the minimum charge.
- Sure.
- And I know a couple times, you had alluded to the fact that a quarter hour was, for example, the standard on one, you found that a third tends to be more of the standard. So, we would bill them for a third in that instance, would we not?
- No. No, we... If it was a, somebody just ran out to a house and came back for it, did one job. Unless they were on-site for more than the minimum charge, we charge them the minimum. So, for instance--
- Even if it took them a third of an hour?
- Right. If they had taken off from the East Side shop and run out to the Red Smith area, but they only spent five minutes on site, we would give the minimum charge. The charge was intended to kind of average it out for those eventualities.
- So it's your mobilization cost?
- Pretty much.
- Okay.
- Again, we're not looking to generate revenue off of this--
- No and I understand that, I just--
- What we're trying to do is cover a little bit more close to the actual cost of providing the service.

- And you just oftentimes see that, you know, with other types of industries where they enact minimum charges as a way to generate additional revenue. And I just wanna make sure that we're not doing that. And if in reality, I mean, I agree that we need to bill for mobilization, right? I mean, you gotta load the truck, you gotta get on site. I'm just curious why we're not just billing for the actual time that we're there.

- Trying to track the actual time is a little difficult with the variety of tasks that Department of Public Works does on a daily, weekly basis. One of the big changes that we had this year, especially as it relates, preparing some of these, the expertise of the financial supervisor is in a completely different arena than some of the folks who've worked, and I've had great employees, don't get me wrong. My supervisors have been fantastic. But somebody who's got this kind of cost accounting background, I've not had this at my disposal in the past and Nancy's done a fantastic job at really digging in the weeds and trying to figure out what our true cost is. She looks at things more with a business acumen than anything else. So, she's actually been trying to get in there and figure out what is it costing us to provide this service because these services are not core services, okay? So we don't look at some of these things in the same vein that we do with snow plowing. Snow plowing is something that folks are paying their taxes for, that's a service that they expect. What these are, are charges for services above and beyond for those folks who aren't holding up their end of the civic bargain. So, they should be paying a little bit closer to the actual costs. We shouldn't be subsidizing that with--

- Totally agree.

- They're here, you know, the folks are here anyway.

- I don't think you're gonna see any objection from anybody on that front.

- And that's kinda why we've taken this different approach this year and why those costs have gone up a little bit.

- Okay.

- My opinion is, it should be more.

- You know, it's--

- I mean, really?

- I don't think it's--

- It's common sense, Steve.

- Overly surprising that we've had--

- Take care of a sidewalk--

- We've had that discussion--

- Take care of a yard.

- Because you've mentioned that to me in the past.

- Yeah, so. You wanna add another \$1,000 to everything, I don't care. You'll get everybody's attention. Yeah, I bet they won't do it again. If they do, hey, we're making money.

- Yeah.

- Well, we'll see.

- That's my opinion.

- What I will say is important to me is that we have that recourse for citizens, homeowners, who are charged who they feel was an invalid charge or they have a reason to appeal that. That I will most certainly, most likely vote in their favor.

- Absolutely.

- Just because human error can, you know, people in my district have come to me with different things and your staff have been great with the latitude that they have to understand that. So, with this, with any changes, we'll wanna make sure that we keep that in mind sometime. 'Cause the way it looks to the public, if it was an error that they were charged or if they feel it was unjustified, then they look at this and go, wow, I was charged \$90 to pick up this or that. You know, sometimes it's just an error that they make. And what I don't want it to appear is that the City is penalizing, or looking to make money off of our citizens and I know that's not your intention--

- Correct.

- But we always have to walk that very careful line.

- Yep.

- Motion to accept, or, is there a motion on the floor?

- Well, there's not a motion on the floor and my personal preference, you can vote it down if you want, but I would like to make a motion to accept but make it effective July 1st, 2019.

- Second.

- The reasoning that it--

- Okay. Hold on, just for this.

- Motion by Brunette to start it July 1st?

- July 1st, 2019.

- July--

- Make effective July 1st.

- Effective July 1, 2019.

- And the reason is--

- One second. I got a second from Wery under discussion, Brunette.

- And the reason is we just passed the city budget, open up for public comment and I know that you're not using this to balance your budget, Steve. I understand that 100% but the way that it looks to the public, for me, is that they could have presented their opinion on a budget that we passed that did not include these fees and now we're adding these fees a month after the budget was not voted in, but effective. So, I think it gives us a little time to... It looks better to the public, in my opinion.

- Just a point of clarification, Steve.

- Go ahead, Alderman Johnson.

- If this were adopted by Council next week, how quickly does this go into effect without Alder Brunette's provision?

- They would go into effect immediately.

- Immediately, okay, thank you.

- Okay, what do you mean by that Steve? These fees are gonna be--

- If Alder Brunette had not had the proviso in there of holding this off until July 1st, the fees would, if it'd simply been accept without condition--

- Oh, right.

- The fees would go into effect immediately without warning.

- Oh, without his motion.

- Correct.

- Oh, okay.

- Yes.

- Yeah, this makes sense. Go ahead, Mr. Johnson.

- That's all I wanted.

- I'm not gonna support that. I mean, these fees are set up to basically deter people from, or make sure their sidewalks are taken care of, right?

- Well it's simply meant to try to cover our costs.

- Or?

- If they were punitive--

- Right.

- They'd be a lot higher.

- Right. But I mean, it's for sidewalks.

- Correct, it's for sidewalks--

- That people should take care of. And I constantly call the city on... Basically, same addresses. Same addresses for grass, long weeds, long grass. It's, to me, the public that take care of their yards and their property, are not involved with this. And if, somehow, there's a mistake, they can appeal and basically we give them the benefit of the doubt. But it's a high percentage, in my opinion, that a majority of the people are subject to this. And Steve, how many times has your Alderman called you for a sidewalk, or grass, or some issue that's beyond the call of our service?

- Well, we get these a lot.

- No, but I mean, responsible citizens is what I'm trying to get at.

- Oh, sure, no, I understand.

- It's basically a high percentage of the same addresses. And I'm sick and tired of it. I really I am. I mean, 17 years, I'm still calling on the same addresses and they still don't get it. That's why I stated, why don't we put \$1,000 on it? Is, will that deter them? I know it'll get their attention.

- That it would.

- You bet it would. And maybe we wouldn't be getting these addresses all the time, the same ones over and over. So, I don't think, and I know that there are a number of citizens in the area I represent, would be for this, because they're

constantly calling on their neighbors, over and over and over, not once during the summer, numerous times over the summer, every year. So--

- I mean--

- I mean, you could, one second, Mr. Brunette. I know if we took a poll, I'd bring it right through District 3. There'd be a lot of individuals that would support starting it right away. But that's my two cents and I am not supporting it because of that. Who's next, who wants the floor next? Brunette, go ahead.

- If I, I would just, I don't wanna confuse the issue. I'll withdraw my motion if you wanna make a motion to accept then we can try and avoid that confusion.

- That's fine, I mean, maybe I'm out of order, but--

- No, that's fine.

- With experience, this is what I have been experiencing. And Steve, I call you right away or Pirlot. If I can't get ahold of Mr. Pirlot, I'll call you and try to take care of it. Or, I mean, the office at 3-3-5, or 3-5-3-5, then I'll go to Pirlot, then and you and I constantly have been calling the office for 17 years and it's the same addresses. But, go ahead Mr. Brunette.

- I have a little bit of a different situation in my district because some properties are tax-exempt trusts where, when you deal with some properties, one property owner could get charged substantially where another resident of another property could not because their property's held in trust. So for me, in my district, it's a matter of fairness. What we get charged, you don't get charged and that's where my frame of mind is. So, I'm fine withdrawing the motion. I think your motion would, if you wanted to make one to accept, I think would be appropriate.

- Okay, hang on, let me see if I got this all. And we're still under discussion, Alderman Johnson? Or do you wanna wait 'till?

- No I support what Alder Nicholson has said primarily because, if in fact the purpose of raising the fees is to make sure that we're recovering our costs, to me, that says that, as it stands today, we are not recovering our costs and we're subsidizing people who are not taking care of their property. So, for that reason, I would also favor enacting it, with Council's approval immediately.

- Next. Do you want to vote on your motion?

- I withdrew my motion--

- Okay.

- But I wanna comment on whatever motion is made.

- Mr. Johnson, do you wanna make a motion?

- I move to approve as proposed by staff.

- Motion to approve that is proposed by staff by Alderman Johnson, second by Wery, under discussion. Brunette.

- Yes. Just so the Committee knows, I'll be voting no. And the reason is, for my district, until we work out some sort of service agreement or have a discussion with the Oneida Tribe, it's hard for me to justify increases for some constituents and not others. So, that's why I'll be voting no.

- Fair enough. Still under discussion, hear none, all in favor.

- Aye.

- Nays? Motion carried.

- No.

- There's a no on Brunette.

- Yep, we got it.

- Okay, moving forward. Okay, four: consideration with possible action 2018-2019 Early Mini-Storm Sewer Program. Director Grenier.

- Back in 2017 we did the Mini-Storm contract out and the prices came back through the roof to the point that we couldn't afford to award the contract. Then, 2018, as a result of that throughout 2018 we're still trying to play catch up and Mini-Storm is a combination of requests by citizens, requests by alders and areas that have been identified by the Inspection Department as being nuisance conditions. So, since June of 2017, we have received a lot of requests for Mini-Storm. Now, by way of comparison, back in about 2011, 2012, this program was down to about \$90,000 on an annual basis and Ed Wiesner and I were thinking about abandoning it and discontinuing the Mini-Storm project. We've got... Nine requests that came in between June, 2017 and April of 2018 that we provided to you in your packet and we're expecting that to be about a \$304,000 contract. Since that time, since May of 2018, we've received 11 more requests. So what we're proposing to do is put an early-season contract out. We're discussing that here tonight. Put it out on the street in February, open the bids in early March with the anticipation, as soon as the snow comes off in April, hopefully we can get out there and start catching up with these projects that have been hanging out there for over a year, and then we will continue taking a look at these additional 11. We're anticipating that could be another \$240,000 worth of Mini-Storm. We'll finalize that list up and bring that to you in the late spring so we can get that contract bid out for a fall construction, which typically has been our Mini-Storm contract is in the fall of the year. So, what we're looking for tonight, we wanted to bring forward the Quincy Street, the Smith Street, the Suydam Street, Third, Chicago Court, Carry Lane, Shawano Avenue, Columbia and Mancy. That will be our early Mini-Storm program. And bring that through for review and approval.

- Alderman Wery.

- Thank you. What are the streets that were added after that?

- So far we've got a request on Langlade, on Calvin, Morgan, Neville, Grignon, Oakland, Chicago, Franz, Langlade, Howard, and Porlier. And the actual addresses that have been involved in that I'd be more than happy to share with you.

- Right, thanks.

- 'Kay, any other questions? If not, I will accept the motion to approve.

- Do approve.

- Motion to approve by Brunette, second by--

- Second

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

- Aye.

- Nays? Motion carried. Five: Consideration with possible action on request of DPW to modify Section 6.35 GBMC relating to Underground Sprinkler Systems. Grenier.

- Okay, the next several of these all the modifications to ordinance hopefully should go pretty quickly, I'll walk you through exactly what we're doing. Underground sprinkler system, section 6.35 of the code, all we're looking to do here, number one we're gonna change the licensing period. Instead of it terminating on January 1st, it'll terminate on December 31st. And the application fee, there's a dollar value associated with the sidewalk. No, there's, or this is the underground sprinkler system, the fee is actually written into the ordinance, which would require an ordinance change if we ever wanted to change that fee. We've simply changed the language to reflect that it would include the required application fee at the time of submittal. We changed the suspension. Anyone who would be so suspended, have their license suspended,

that suspension would not exceed 12 months as opposed to not exceed six months, that we change the name of the license to an underground sprinkler system license.

- Put through--

- And you're gonna see some recurrent themes on a number of these ordinances. We had various licenses expiring at different times all across the board for the licenses that we're responsible for. We're trying to consolidate everything onto the calendar year.

- Motion to approve by Wery, second by.

- Second.

- Brunette. Enter discussion.

- No question.

- Yep, Johnson.

- I like most of the modifications and I notice this theme with a number of them that we're extending that suspension to a term of 12 months.

- It could be up to 12 months, yes.

- Okay, it just seems to me, and this kinda goes back to a point that Alder Nicholson made earlier, which is, sometimes how difficult it is to do business in the City of Green Bay. I'm just curious why we wanna do that, make that 12 months and, again, continue to restrict our pool. I mean, it seems a bit excessive. I mean, are there other ways to remedy that, so that we're not discouraging people from wanting to work in the City of Green Bay?

- Again, what we're looking at is contractors who would have a license suspended, which is a pretty drastic step, you gotta go pretty far to get your license suspended. And I think part of the reason why some of the suspension times were the way they were were related to how the licenses expired. I believe the sidewalk builder's license expired in April of the year. So, your new license came due in April but you really only poured concrete sidewalk until October. A three-month suspension was effectively a year suspension, specially if you got it in September. But if you wanna reduce the suspension to six months, we're fine with that. Generally speaking, if you're doing work of such quality that would result, or you have a business practice that would result in having your license suspended, that license suspension is gonna have to come back here.

- So this committee makes the decision about suspension?

- Yes, yeah. We would have to bring it. You award the license. You would be responsible for revoking that license as well.

- How often does that happen?

- I think we've had two concrete sidewalk builder licenses--

- We've had two or less since I've been down here.

- And I can't tell you the last time I saw an underground sprinkler system. I don't remember one in my alderman years.

- We had an underground sprinkler two years ago.

- Was there really?

- Yeah. And a concrete sidewalk builder's.

- Oh, so there was one each.

- One of each, yeah.
- Okay. So, it's pretty infrequent.
- Good? All right, all right.
- Any other questions? If not, entertain a motion. By Wery, second by?
- I already second it.
- Oh you did. Oh, we're under discussion, I'm sorry. All in favor.
- Aye.
- Nays? Motion carried. Consideration with possible action on request by DPW to modify 9.20 GBMC relating to tree/brush trimmer license required, which is number six. Go ahead.
- Okay, again, what we're changing here--
- Same thing?
- Is we're...
- 'Kay.
- Instead of the license terminating on February 1st, we're making it on the calendar year.
- 'Kay.
- Changing the application fee, instead of having a dollar value specified by ordinance that it would include the required application fee at the time, and any license suspended would be, you would have 12 months from the date of revocation as opposed to three.
- Okay, entertain a motion.
- Move to approve.
- Second.
- By Brunette, second by Wery. Enter discussion, hear none, all in favor.
- Aye.
- Nays? Motion carried. Seven: Consideration with possible action on request by DPW, modify Section 9.21 GBMC relating to right-of-way excavation and occupancy. Director Grenier.
- Okay, this is right-of-way excavation and occupancy. Repair of paved areas, the temporary repair, we used to, currently we are calling out three-quarter-inch crushed stone compacted in 12-inch layers. The crushed stone shall be placed within three inches of the finished grade and the excavated area to be filled with three inches of cold mix bituminous, which will conform to the existing paved surface. Instead of calling out the actual repair, we're simply directing them that the temporary repair must meet the construction methods and site restoration in accordance with applicable parts of City of Green Bay's standard specifications for construction standards for Public Works Construction, the current edition. So we're directing them right back to our standard spec. We had a pretty massive rewrite of standard specification last year and it's going through a minor tweak this year. Rather than every time we update the spec, having to go back and do two readings of the ordinance, we simply want to make the ordinance reflect back to the standard spec, so that's--
- Move to approve.

- Motion to approve by Wery, second by?
- Second.
- Brunette, enter discussion, hear none, all in favor.
- Aye.
- Nays? Motion carried. Nine: Consideration with possible action DWP to modify 9.25 GBMC relating to license of sidewalk builders. Director Grenier.
- Well, I guess first of all we had was construction repair of sidewalks under 9.24. That's simply a--
- Did I skip one?
- Yeah.
- You need to--
- Oh, sorry.
- That's fine.
- Oh, gosh.
- That was an administrative change. Instead of it saying a cement sidewalk, it's a concrete sidewalk.
- Entertain a motion to approve.
- I don't know about that one.
- Okay.
- Moved.
- By Wery, second by Johnson.
- Second.
- Under discussion, hear none, all in favor.
- Aye.
- Nays? Motion carried. Nine, I already read it. Go ahead, Steve.
- Okay, here we're identifying again, changing cement to concrete throughout and adding concrete sidewalk and the driveway apron. What we wanna make sure is that folks are licensed when they're pouring concrete within the public right-of-way where there's any expectation that the public may enter onto that piece of concrete. Your driveway, closer to the home from the sidewalk section, that is private property, and if the general public was walking on that, that would be considered trespass. However, your driveway apron is within the public right-of-way so there has to be some expectation that the public may have access to that so we wanna make sure that the same license for the sidewalk builder applies to the apron. So that's why we added apron throughout. Again, as with the other licenses we've talked about, we've sort of put everything back onto the same calendar year, changed the application fee to reflect the fee in effect at the time. We have changed the bond requirement from 2,000 to 5,000. That's kind of a, that's a compromise position, I guess the best way to put it. We had \$2,000 for sidewalk builders but it required a \$10,000 bond to excavate within the public right-of-way which you have to do to build a sidewalk. So, there was an inconsistency there and what we did was brought it back down into the middle. \$5,000 for a bond is not difficult for a small contractor to get. But not requiring them to go up to the whole \$10,000 that we previously had for excavation in the right-of-way, a sidewalk contract for

excavating in the right-of-way as opposed to the utility contractor excavating in the right-of-way, the potential for causing damage in the right-of-way is minimized. So, we felt the 5,000 was a good compromise position. And again, maxed out the revocation of license at 12 months.

- Any questions? If not, entertain the motion--

- Oh, the bad news.

- To approve and to receive.

- No.

- To approve? By Wery, second by?

- Second.

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

- Aye.

- Nays? Motion carried. I have to leave. Mr. Johnson can you take over please?

- Item number 10, consideration with possible action the report of the purchasing manager. Item number A, request approval to award the purchase of traffic signal equipment to TAPCO for \$40,330.

- [Standing Man] This is a straight-forward bid for traffic signals, traffic poles, hardware. Put it up for bid, got four responses. We awarded, in each case, to the low responsive bidder. The only award that requires Committee approval is the TAPCO award for \$40,330. The other awards were less than \$25,000, significantly less, so, just I'm asking your approval for the TAPCO award.

- How much do you learn when you sit here and watch the rest of these meetings until you get tired?

- [Standing Man] I learn a lot.

- Get some rest.

- I'm a citizen and a tax-payer as well, so.

- Okay, very impressed.

- Entertain a motion to approve.

- Move to approve.

- Second.

- Any discussion? All those in favor say aye.

- [Aldermen] Aye.

- Thank you

- Motion carries. Item number 11: Consideration with possible action on the review and award of the contract Ray Nitschke Memorial Bridge hydraulic repairs, held over from the Improvement and Services Committee meeting on November 26, 2018. Director Grenier.

- We bid this contract out in November with bids received on Tuesday, December 4. No bids were received.

- Okay.

- And there were a couple of reasons for that. The normal bidding period, especially with the holidays, didn't provide the contractors with enough time to put bids together. So we have met with contractors, found out what the issue was, made some minor modifications to the bids, and the bids are back out on the street right now. We hope to have them within the next month or so but as far as the original contract, no bids were received so we would recommend a receive and place on file.

- Entertain a motion to that effect.

- So moved.

- Second.

- Any discussion? All those in favor say aye.

- [Aldermen] Aye.

- Opposed, nay, motion carries. Item number 12: consideration with possible action on request by KS Energy Services to renew the annual hold harmless agreement for access to the City of Green Bay sewer system to conduct inspection of the sewer mains and laterals.

- Just in case you aren't aware, KS Energies works primarily on behalf of Wisconsin Public Service. And what they do is they drop their televising equipment down into our sewers to check for the location of the laterals. So they can locate the laterals when they're doing, a lot of times they're either doing gas or electric, and they're doing boring in the public right-of-way in the terrace areas. So they have to be able to pothole down and find the laterals and they use their television cameras from inside of our pipe to physically locate those laterals so they know where to dig. Because they're entering our sewer system, that's our property, we don't want just any contractor in there rooting around and causing damage. So, we have a master agreement that we entered into with KS several years ago and they've been a great partner, they share anything that they find while they're in our sewers. If they see a problem or things like that, they always share the data back with us. So that's why they're entering our sewers and it's been a mutually beneficial relationship. The city does recommend authorizing this renewal.

- Move to approve.

- Second.

- Any discussion? All those in favor say aye.

- [Aldermen] Aye.

- Opposed? Motion carries.

- I need about, I think I'm through.

- All right, number E, informational. The next Improvement and Services Committee meeting is scheduled for January 23rd, 2019. Item number 2: director's report on recent activities of the Public Works Department.

- Under the Director's Report, I would simply identify that we got through December fairly well. Had some warm weather to help us along here at the beginning of January, but I wouldn't hold my breath that it's gonna hold out forever. Things are looking good for the beginning of the year. Looks like we're gonna finish up last year's budget in fairly decent shape. I did do a interview with Channel 5 on Monday, again what we're asking folks to do is adopt the inland nearest your home and help keep that clear. I know I've gotten some feedback from the public about that, not entirely complimentary, saying that's a city service. Actually that's not. Making sure that we don't have the flooding on the street, that's actually been more of a recent point of emphasis. So, I don't have staff sitting around waiting to go out there and do that, so that's why we're kinda asking folks. We're not dictating it, we're saying, if you've got an inlet close to your home and you don't wanna see flooding or street ponding that freezes up and becomes ice later on, consider going out there and cleaning that.

- I wouldn't worry about it.
- Well, I don't. It's just a little point of clarification.
- No, it's a--
- You know, if folks are contacting you and saying, why is the City doing this? We're trying to enhance the service that's currently being provided. We're not adding anything new And this is not something we've done in the past.
- Many hands make light work, as my daughters would teach me.
- Absolutely.
- Well, it protects their property
- Sure.
- You know, Boy Scouts used to shovel out fire hydrants, you know?
- I'm sure they still do, but that sort of civic involvement we need to encourage.
- So, right now we're doing okay and as long as the warm weather holds out, we'll be all right but I wouldn't hold my breath. I think we're in for some yet.
- So with all those savings though from December, we can now apply that. We have enough to cover half of our stormwater issue here, right?
- That actually goes back to balancing last year's budget.
- So, Alder Wery?
- Thank you, Mr. Chairman. And Steve, I emailed you about this but I think it's good for public discourse, too.
- Sure.
- When will the wheel tax use recommendations come to committee?
- Wheel tax, the uses of anticipated wheel tax revenue will be part of the annual CIP discussion.
- Which is when?
- When did we all go?
- We're looking to bring that, first meeting in February?
- Probably be mid-February.
- Okay, probably the second meeting in February.
- And, second part of the question, is that early enough then for Committee and Council to take action and adjust it? 'Cause it's not meant to be just a report, here's how we're doing it, it was meant to come through Committee and say, well, we think it needs to be tweaked this way or that way. You know, we're not doing enough railroad, or you think you need to do more streets, or, it's not just a report it's a recommendation.
- Well, it's coming. It's definitely early enough because that happens prior to the recommend, one of the things that comes out of the CIP discussion is once the CIP is adopted, then there's a recommendation to bring that forward to

Finance Committee for bonding and that's where this money ties in, is what's being funded on the wheel tax revenue and what goes to bond.

- So, I know, I've always said I wanted the wheel tax so that we could do double. Double the roadwork. So I am hoping to see that or more. We'll see what comes forward, but--

- I can guarantee you you're not gonna see double.

- All right, but that's the whole reason. We have to do more roadwork, and if we're not doing more roadwork. I get my blessing. Thanks.

- Any other?

- Motion that we receive and place on file the record.

- Yep.

- Second.

- This report?

- Any discussion, all those in favor say aye.

- Aye.

- Opposed? Motion carries.

- To adjourn?

- Motion to adjourn.

- Elder Brunette.

- Second.

- Second by Alder Wery. All those in favor.

- [Aldermen] Aye.

- Opposed. Motion carries, we are adjourned. Five minute break for hamster bladder people.

- Move to re-meet.