



MINUTES OF THE IMPROVEMENT AND SERVICES COMMITTEE

**TUESDAY, MAY 14, 2019, 6:00 PM
CITY HALL, ROOM 310**

A. ROLL CALL.

Present: Chris Wery, Brian Johnson, Jesse Brunette, Andy Nicholson arrived at 6:05 pm

B. APPROVAL OF THE AGENDA.

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

D. REGULAR BUSINESS.

I. Consideration with possible action on request by owner of Parcel 22-SC490 to subdivide parcel, redistribute currently deferred assessments for sanitary and water main to resulting subparcels, and defer resulting allocated assessments until each subparcel is sold, developed, or until October 19, 2024, whichever comes first.

Moved by Ald. Chris Wery, seconded by Ald. Jesse Brunette to open the floor for discussion. Motion carried. Vote: Yes- Andy Nicholson, Brian Johnson, Chris Wery, Jesse Brunette, No- None, Abstain- None

Moved by Ald. Chris Wery, seconded by Ald. Jesse Brunette to close the floor. Motion carried.
Vote: Yes- Andy Nicholson, Brian Johnson, Chris Wery, Jesse Brunette, No- None, Abstain- None

Moved by Ald. Chris Wery, seconded by Ald. Jesse Brunette to approve request by owner of Parcel 22-SC490 to subdivide parcel, redistribute currently deferred assessments for sanitary and water main to resulting subparcels, and defer resulting allocated assessments until each subparcel is sold,

developed, or until October 19, 2024, whichever comes first. Motion carried. Vote: Yes- Brian Johnson, Chris Wery, Jesse Brunette, No- None, Abstain- None

2. Consideration with possible action on request by Ald. Lefebvre to look at curbside bulk and overflow pickup (referred to staff at the April 24, 2019 Improvement and Services Committee meeting).

Moved by Ald. Jesse Brunette, seconded by Ald. Brian Johnson to receive and place on file request by Ald. Lefebvre to look at curbside bulk and overflow pickup. Motion carried. Vote: Yes- Andy Nicholson, Brian Johnson, Chris Wery, Jesse Brunette, No- None, Abstain- None

3. Consideration with possible action on land lease extension for current Department of Public Works West Side Yard Waste Center site.

Moved by Ald. Brian Johnson, seconded by Ald. Jesse Brunette to approve land lease extension for current Department of Public Works West Side Yard Waste Center site and allow the Department of Public Works to execute the lease amendment. Motion carried. Vote: Yes- Andy Nicholson, Brian Johnson, Chris Wery, Jesse Brunette, No- None, Abstain- None

4. To accept the report of the award of contract EATON HEIGHTS 2ND ADDITION PHASE I to the low, responsive bidder, Jossart Brothers, Inc., in the amount of \$1,176,563.50.

Moved by Ald. Brian Johnson, seconded by Ald. Chris Wery to accept the report of the award of contract EATON HEIGHTS 2ND ADDITION PHASE I to the low responsive bidder, Jossart Brothers, Inc., in the amount of \$1,176,563.50. 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 authorize Department of Public Works to award contracts in the 2019 Capital Improvement Program at a staff level subject to the following conditions:

A. Delay in bringing forward a recommendation to award at the next regularly scheduled Committee meeting would result in an unacceptable delay in starting construction.

B. Any projects so awarded would be reported out at the next regularly scheduled meeting of the Improvement and Services Committee.

Moved by Ald. Jesse Brunette, seconded by Ald. Jesse Brunette to approve request by Department of Public Works to authorize Department of Public Works to award contracts in the 2019 Capital Improvement Program at a staff level subject to the following conditions:

A. Delay in bringing forward a recommendation to award at the next regularly scheduled Committee meeting would result in an unacceptable delay in starting construction.

B. Any projects so awarded would be reported out at the next regularly scheduled meeting of the Improvement and Services Committee.

Motion carried.

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

6. Consideration with possible action on the review and award of the following contracts:

A. GREEN BAY WATER UTILITY DREDGING OF SLUDGE LAGOON NO. 2

B. PARKING RAMP REPAIRS - 2019

C. PARKS PROJECT 3-19 (COLBURN PARK POOL AND BATHHOUSE RENOVATIONS)

D. PAVEMENT 2-19

A. Moved by Ald. Brian Johnson, seconded by Ald. Chris Wery to approve the award of contract GREEN BAY WATER UTILITY DREDGING OF SLUDGE LAGOON NO. 2 to the low responsive bidder, Express Excavating, Inc., in the amount of \$79,712.50. Motion carried. Vote: Yes- Andy Nicholson, Brian Johnson, Chris Wery, Jesse Brunette, No- None, Abstain- None

B. Moved by Ald. Brian Johnson, seconded by Ald. Chris Wery to approve the award of contract PARKING RAMP REPAIRS - 2019 to the low responsive bidder, Central Restoration, LLC, in the amount of \$539,700. Motion carried. Vote: Yes- Andy Nicholson, Brian Johnson, Chris Wery, Jesse Brunette, No- None, Abstain- None

C. Moved by Ald. Brian Johnson, seconded by Ald. Chris Wery to approve the award of contract PARKS PROJECT 3-19 (COLBURN PARK POOL AND BATHHOUSE RENOVATIONS) to the low responsive bidder, Howard Immel, Inc., in the amount of \$2,500,000. Motion carried. Vote: Yes- Andy Nicholson, Brian Johnson, Chris Wery, Jesse Brunette, No- None, Abstain- None

D. Moved by Ald. Brian Johnson, seconded by Ald. Chris Wery to approve the award of contract PAVEMENT 2-19 to the low responsive bidder, Vinton Construction Co., in the amount of \$1,165,678.46. Motion carried. Vote: Yes- Andy Nicholson, Brian Johnson, Chris Wery, Jesse Brunette, No- None, Abstain- None

7. Consideration with possible action on applications for Concrete Sidewalk Builder Licenses by the following:

A. Evraets Concrete Construction LLC

B. Green Bay Concrete LLC

C. Weidner Concrete Construction LLC

Moved by Ald. Chris Wery, seconded by Ald. Brian Johnson to approve applications for Concrete Sidewalk Builder Licenses by the following:

A. Evraets Concrete Construction LLC

B. Green Bay Concrete LLC

C. Weidner Concrete Construction LLC.

Motion carried.

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

8. Consideration with possible action on applications for Tree & Brush Trimmer Licenses by the following:

A. Fall-Rite Services LLC

B. Monster Tree Service

Moved by Ald. Brian Johnson, seconded by Ald. Jesse Brunette to approve applications for Tree & Brush Trimmer Licenses by the following:

A. Fall-Rite Services LLC

B. Monster Tree Service.

Motion carried.

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

9. Consideration with possible action on application for Underground Sprinkler System License for Lizer of Wisconsin, Inc.

Moved by Ald. Brian Johnson, seconded by Ald. Chris Wery to approve application for Underground Sprinkler System License for Lizer of Wisconsin, Inc. Motion carried. Vote: Yes- Andy Nicholson, Brian Johnson, Chris Wery, Jesse Brunette, No- None, Abstain- None

10. Consideration with possible action on request by Department of Public Works to grant licenses for Concrete Sidewalk Builder, Tree & Brush Trimmer, and Underground Sprinkler System at a staff level until September 17, 2019.

Moved by Ald. Jesse Brunette, seconded by Ald. Chris Wery to approve request by Department of Public Works to grant licenses for Concrete Sidewalk Builder, Tree & Brush Trimmer, and Underground Sprinkler System at a staff level until September 17, 2019. Motion carried. Vote: Yes- Andy Nicholson, Brian Johnson, Chris Wery, Jesse Brunette, No- None, Abstain- None

11. Consideration with possible action on request by Brian Milz, 512 Ontario Road, for a sidewalk study on Ontario Road.

Moved by Ald. Jesse Brunette, seconded by Ald. Brian Johnson to approve request by Brian Milz, 512 Ontario Road, for a sidewalk study on Ontario Road and have staff perform the sidewalk study and report out results of the study at the June 12, 2019 Improvement and Services Committee meeting.

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

E. INFORMATIONAL.

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

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

2. The next Improvement and Services Committee meeting is scheduled for June 12, 2019.

F. PUBLIC HEARINGS.

G. ADJOURNMENT.

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

VERBATIM MINUTES

- We're recording. We're live.

- We'll call the meeting to order. Improvement and Services Committee of May 14th, 2019. Roll call. Alder Wery is present. Alder Brunette, present. Alder Johnson, present. Alder Nicholson is coming. Approval of the agenda.

- Move.

- Second.

- Motion by Alder Brunette, seconded by Alder Wery, any discussion? Seeing none, all those in favor say aye.

- [Multiple] Aye.

- Opposed, nay. Approval of the minutes. Item C.

- I do approve.

- Second.

- Motion by Alder Brunette. Second by Alder Wery, any discussion, seeing none, all those in favor say aye.

- [Multiple] Aye.

- Opposed, motion carries. Regular business. Item number one, a consideration of possible action requested by owner of Parcel 22-SC490, to subdivided, parcel, redistribute currently deferred assessments for sanitary and water main to resulting sub-parcels and defer resulting allocated assessments until each sub-parcel is sold, developed, or until October 19th, 2024, whichever comes first. Director Grenier.

- In you packet we have a memo that outlines the parcel in question. This is out in the University Heights Industrial Park off of 54-57. So if you take a look at the map, on the end of Equestrian Road, the west end of Equestrian, that's the Aurora Medical Clinic that you can see from the 54-57 interchange. So what we're looking at is the parcel that's labeled for ownership as Charlotte Weber Et Al. It's a rather large, in excess of 15 acre parcel. And when Equestrian and Champeau went in, back in 2000, the original parcel was then split by the right-of-way for Equestrian Road and when you look at the parcel from an aerial photo, it kind of lends itself to three individual sub-parcels if this were to be further subdivided for development. When the initial development or the initial infrastructure improvements back in 2000 went in, the property owner at the time requested that the assessments out there be deferred and there is frontage on the north side of Equestrian, the south side of Equestrian, and then also along the north side of Champeau Road. The Equestrian Road right-of-way or frontages are both sanitary and water, and the Champeau Road frontage only has water, there is not sanitary down there. Yet the sanitary kind of ends where you see on the far right-hand side of the graphic, there's a road that cuts off there, that's about where the sanitary currently ends. So we've been working with, with a real estate agent, or real estate firm, working on behalf of the seller out here, the current property ownership group, and there is a desire to develop what we have titled sub-parcels one and potentially sub-parcel three. When this originally went in, the assessments were deferred until sole developed or until October 19th of 2009, the owner did come back twice and request that county council further issue five-year deferrals. These parcels are currently undeveloped. They are just farmland, so ordinance does provide that the county council can set a deferral of what determined that is. And five-year increments seems to be somewhat logical. However, if any one piece of the parcel is sold or developed, all of the assessments currently come due, and this is a situation, it's commonly referred to as being land-rich but cash-poor. So large parcels have these massive assessments against them. And the agent representing the owner approached the department, and asked if there would be some way to split those assessments up, and that's how they're calculated, based on the frontage for each of the individual resultant sub-parcels. So we took a look at it to see if there was, if there was a way to do it, and obviously on the bottom of the memo we provided you with what those frontages for each sub-parcel would be, so

physically we can do the calculations, then it became a question of whether or not that was allowable under ordinance. So we took a look and it was our interpretation it was. We ran that down through law department, and law department concurred that yes, this is indeed something that can be done. We do believe that this is in the best interest of the city, because since 2004 when the assessments were first levied, this property has been sitting out there undeveloped, not generating any tax base outside of what's on farm land. No additional development and those assessments are just hanging out there, pending a future collection. If we allow the property owner to split the assessments commensurate with the frontages on each of the three sub-parcels and do a land division, and they're able to sell any or all of the parcels. That makes it a more attractive development opportunity for somebody. Number one, on any parcel they sell, we get the development and the increased tax base that goes along with that. But number two, we're actually able to collect the assessments that are due on that individual sub-parcel. So we do believe it's in the city's best interest to allow the property owner to do the subdivision, split the assessments as indicated on the bottom of the memo, and then collect those in current day dollars on any parcels that get sold. So our recommendation would be to approve the request that's come before us.

- Joe, did you want to speak?

- I can go further on that if you have questions or anything. If you want to open the floor, I'd be happy to just go a little further.

- So moved.

- Second.

- Motion by Alderman Wery, second by, or excuse me, motion by Alder Brunette, second by Alderman Wery, any discussion? Seeing none, all those in favor say aye.

- [Multiple] Aye.

- Opposed, nay. Okay, thanks. Joe Warren, representing Seidl and Associates at 839 Lombardi Avenue, the properties listed by Seidl and Associates has been for many years, 'course you've seen the deferments from 2009, 2014, when the market was completely crashed, there was really no hope of anything coming in. Well, the economy's doing pretty well right now. People have money, they want to spend it. And this just makes it easier for them to come in and spend it. I'm representing a buyer, coincidentally, as an associate with Seidl. And that is looking at developing the southern-most ten acres. And there is an accepted offer already on the further north 1.6 acre parcel that is currently split by Equestrian. So the 1.6 acre parcel is scheduled to close first. In order for all of this to happen a certified survey map needs to be done, this all needs to be parceled out. Once the map is done and that one 1.6 acre parcel were to sell, the entire assessment would be due. And the entire assessment is about two and a half times the amount of the purchase price of that parcel. So this just makes it easier if the assessments are split up by parcel. We get closure on that southern ten if we can work something out and get that deal done and that 1.6 on the northern side, then that middle parcel becomes a lot more desirable as well. Once everything's developed. So that's the gist of it. Dodie is here, she's with the, part of the Et Al on the owners side of it. So if you have any questions on that side.

- Questions?

- Motion to close the floor...
- Second.
- Motion by Alder Brunette, second by Alderman Wery, is there any discussion? Seeing none, all those in favor say aye.
- [Multiple] Aye.
- Opposed, the motion carries.
- Motion to approve.
- [Multiple] Second.
- No brainer.
- All right, we have a motion by Alderman Wery. Second by Alder Brunette, any discussion?
- They're basically, Steve, they just want to develop the land, right?
- Correct, the big difference here is, as most are indicated, all of those assessments would immediately become due if they split the land. Here what we're doing is we're taking the individual assessments, tying them to the resultant parcels after division, and only collecting when those smaller parcels get--
- But we are going to collect?
- Absolutely.
- Right.
- It just makes it a more amenable collection.
- I'm good, I'm good.
- Okay. Any other discussion? Seeing none, all those in favor say aye?
- [Multiple] Aye.
- Opposed, the motion carries. Alder Nicholson, you're on item two.
- Number two, consideration of possible action on request by Alderman Lefabvre to look at curbside bulk and overflow pickup, referred to staff at April 24th, 2019, Improvement and Services Committee. Kathy.
- Yes. So what has staff come up with?

- Well, unfortunately I see you don't have the packet, so I think what we can do is gonna come down here.

- Yeah, I moved.

- I can share with you.

- Okay, sure.

- Same thing that the Alders, the other Alders are looking at on their tablets. So we did take a look at what it costs us to run the program. So our annual bunker program runs us about \$724,000 a year. The four weeks of overflow, the extra bags you're allowed to put out are about \$8200 a year, so it's about \$33,000 for the total year. So \$8200 per week for each of the four weeks. And then the curbside bulk collection is, for each of the two weeks, is about \$32,500, so about \$65,000. So the bulk and overflow runs the city about \$822,000 for the year. So then, all we did with the next couple of sheets is show you exactly how we came up with each of those. Those sub codes, what goes into it.

- See, that's labor and costs of disposal.

- Correct, correct. So for instance, the bunker program, we spent about 780 hours with each of three dump trucks. Total of 1560 hours with a loader, 832 hours for each of the three truck drivers, 1820 hours for the loader operator, we usually employ two bunker monitors, about 2700 hours per year. So then the tipping fees, it's about 1700 tons that comes into the bunkers at \$43 a ton, that's \$73,000, so that's where you come up with the \$724,327 that he quoted earlier. Operations director Purlatt did also split up by labor, equipment, and tipping fee, for the overflow, curbside, and the curbside bulk e-waste. Then what we did is we provided you with a summary, Chris did talk to a total of 23 communities across the state, everything from our neighboring communities, Allouez, Ashwaubenon, Bellevue, De Pere, Appleton, Eau Claire, Fond du Lac, Howard, Janesville, Kenosha, La Crosse, Madison, Marinette, Menasha, Milwaukee, Neenah, Oshkosh, Racine, Sheboygan, Stevens Point, Waukesha, Wausau. So we tried to get as big a cross section as we can. What we found was that for curbside overflow, trash bags, nine of the 23 cities surveyed collected that at no charge or in specified weeks during the year. Four out of 23 of the cities collected a fee for that service only. And nine of the 23 cities did not offer overflow at any capacity. For curbside bulk collection, 13 of 23 cities surveyed provided that at no charge during specified weeks, and some of these folks only do it one week, some do it every week. Kind of all across the board. Seven of 23 cities provided it as a fee per service. For instance, De Pere curbside bulk, minimum \$40 charge. Fond du Lac is a \$40 charge for one cubic yard.

- So then you have no, like we have special times, they have no special times--

- Correct.

- This is just, you can pay, okay.

- And then, but then you go to Appleton, Appleton collects every other week with no additional charge.

- Yeah.

- So three of 23 cities do not provide that service at all. Providing a bunker for citizens to drop off, ten of 23 cities provided that at no charge. Three of 23 cities provided it with a fee. And ten of 23 cities don't offer that at all. Curbside yard waste collection, 13 of 23 cities provide spring and fall collection. One community only provides spring. Five only provide fall. And four provide no curbside collection. So this isn't terribly different than what we found several years ago when we went to the automated program. Staff's recommendation is the program is working well the way that it is, we seem to be tracking very positively with the 23 communities that we did survey. So our recommendation would be to leave the program as-is.

- So you think, what, four times, correct? I was, I mean, 20 is ridiculous.

- Absolutely, and we have already made that commitment to taking a look at the actual week-- Right, to put it later in-- Well, later, it'd actually be later in March or early April, one of the two.

- I would say about, when would you start the yard waste, that's in April?

- Yard waste starts in April.

- Yeah. But the thing is too, most people, if cleaning up, but, I would at this time clean up my garage, you know, I might have a bunch of stuff there. My attic, you know, basements, you've got accumulating stuff, and that's when people, you want to do it when the weather's nice, right?

- I did mine on March first. What are you looking, for example?

- Where did you put it?

- Kathy, what are you looking for?

- Well, I just wanted to, I don't care how many times you do it, that wasn't the thing. I just thought March is a dumb time to do it because well, look at this last time, you couldn't even put it out! I mean, we had this much down by the road, where were you going to put it, in the street? So I just thought, May's a better time, that's when people are thinking of, you know, doing cleaning, real good cleaning in your house and everything. And fall is kind of the same thing.

- Steven, do you have a problem with that? If you change it to April?

- Well, again, the issue that we identified at the last meeting is, during April and early May, the same vehicles that we're using for curbside bulk and overflow collection are what we use for the spring yard waste collection.

- Right.

- So if we were to go in May, and again, what we did before we set that date, we looked at historical trends, and we picked the highest-volume week, and that happened to be that second or third week of March, whenever that happened to be.

- Okay.

- I'm not opposed to changing the week, because I think if you tell people, and you get it out there, I think that they will react to that, what I might suggest is that we would do, if you want to delay it, and you want to put it more into a warmer weather period, that we do it after spring yard waste collection. That was--

- Midway or the third week--

- Closer to around Memorial Day, third week of May, something like that. The downside to that, you know, I do have to make sure that I give you all the information. Then the requests to extend spring yard waste have to go away because I got to switch those vehicles out and get into bulk bank, I can't collect the same--

- 'Cause you finished with the yard waste--

- Typically around Mother's Day.

- Mother's Day, okay.

- Which is the second weekend of May.

- Anybody have any questions or concerns?

- Motion to...

- Oh, okay, there's a motion to receive and place on file or under discussion. Go ahead, Kathy.

- So okay. Well, I would think you're going to have to vote to change the, if you're gonna go into May, You're going to have to vote to change that, too.

- Correct.

- Yeah.

- Well, that's actually something we took up at the last meeting. We're working on that.

- Yeah, right, okay. Just want to make sure that something happens on that.

- Okay. Brunette?

- Thank you. I was just going to say what Director Grenier said. We talked about something at the last meeting, what I recommend to Alder Lefevre is that we put a process that if this is a request you have, as we look into the budget, that might be the more appropriate time to add any additional--

- I'm not asking for anything additional, just changing the date. When they do it. And I don't know if that really, so that doesn't really change your budget or what you've got, or if it's the same, gonna be the same amount.

- It's just a policy decision.

- It's just, right.

- ...Motion to that effect today, right.

- No, I don't think so. I think what we'll do, because of the direction that staff has given, we are looking into what a good potential move might be. We can bring that back as an informational item.

- Sounds good.

- I don't know that it necessarily even requires a vote.

- Okay.

- If it does, we'll get it rostered for--

- Well, you'll let us know.

- Absolutely.

- And the one other--

- Just one second.

- Go ahead.

- You'll let us know, right?

- Yep.

- Okay.

- Yeah.

- Anything else, Steve?

- Not from me.

- Kathy?

- The other thing is the December, can you find that you have... How come in December, the December one?

- Oh yeah.
- That seems weird to me. 'Cause I don't think I'll do any bulk in December.
- Is that late December, after Christmas?
- I think it is.
- I think people get new things and are--
- But yeah, so what are they throwing away? Recyclables, probably. But even--
- No, they're actually, that's for bulk as well.
- Yeah, that's why they have it.
- Okay.
- And again, what we did was we went back and we took a look at where were we getting most of our curbside bulk, and we set those two weeks as the ones that we picked. But--
- Do you think that the forecast...
- We're more than happy to go back and take a look at that again.
- No, if it's working, if that's what you think. You know.
- Yeah, I mean.
- That's fine.
- This year we happened to wind up with big snow piles during March.
- Yeah, that could definitely happen.
- It could, absolutely.
- We couldn't even get in the neighborhood! Like with the year before.
- Please don't say that.
- You know, I remember 80 degree weather in our March.
- Yeah, it's--
- So who knows?
- Wisconsinans are always...

- Well, you'll bring something back.
- Yes sir.
- Okay.
- Second the motion.
- That's fine.
- Okay.
- Fine, thank you.
- Chris is second. Sorry, thought there was one. Me bad. All in favor?
- [Multiple] Aye.
- Nays, motion carried. Thanks, Kathy.
- Yup.
- Three, consideration with possible action on land lease extension for current Department of Public Works West Side Yard Waste Center site. Grenier?
- We have been going back 12, 13 years. There was a land exchange between the city and the county, so we're actually residing on the county's land right now to operate our West Side Yard Waste Site. With environmental regulations and staff being dedicated to trying to get infrastructure projects out the door as opposed to working on a yard waste site, we still haven't gotten a new yard waste site approved on the property we own. And instead, we have been renting from Brown County Port and Resource Recovery Department. They have offered us some very attractive terms, here to allow us to continue to reside on that property. It's gonna cost us a lot to pick up and move. So the longer, until these rental rates start getting on a site, it's actually cheaper for us to continue to rent and operate status quo where we are. So staff would recommend that we execute this amendment with Brown County for the rental rates that are specified and at such time that we do have a site that we're ready to move into, we also, you know, not part of this discussion, but kind of tangential to it, we are working with the communities of Ledgeview and De Pere who are both losing their yard waste sites on a possible intergovernmental agreement, which would necessitate us moving on to a different potentially bigger site, potentially splitting that waste up into multiple sites. But this at least keeps us with a viable West Side facility while we continue to pursue those discussions. So we are happy with returns that Brown County has offered, we do recommend approving the amendment.
- Johnson.
- Steve, I just, maybe just a comment. What, actually a question. What do we pay right now?
- I think we're paying a thousand a month right now.

- Okay.
- So it's going up a hundred dollars per month, per year.
- And, I mean, I'm just looking at this, I mean, we're looking at a nine percent increase every year and a 27 percent increase over a four year period. I'm encouraged by the fact, of course, that the dollar volume isn't significant.
- Correct.
- But the percentage, I mean, that's a great return investment for the county. So I just think as we look at this long term, you're going about an intergovernmental agreement.
- Yes.
- To me would likely kind of fit the city long-term.
- Correct.
- With those types of increases, and again, I'm supportive of this, if you are, you know, comfortable with it because the dollar volume isn't significant, but--
- And that's, you hit the nail on the head with that. When we look at it from a percentage basis, it looks pretty out of sight. But when we're talking about real dollar expenditures, they're increasing \$1200 over the course of a year. So it's... It's not, in a real dollar expenditure, it's not a heavy hit for us.
- Okay.
- Okay, anybody else? Comments, concerns? Well wishes of committee?
- Move to approve.
- Motion to approve by Johnson, second by Brunette, under discussion. Hearing none, all in favor?
- [Multiple] Aye.
- Motion carried. Kay, we're moving forward. Number four, to accept the report of the award of contract Eaton Heights Second Addition Phase to the low big, responsive bidder, Jossart Brothers, in the amount of one million, Steve?
- Yep, \$1,176,563.50.
- Okay.
- This was one that you gave us the authority to award at staff level to keep the project moving forward. This is a pretty substantial subdivision on the northeast side of the city, up near north of

Humboldt Road, up near Highland Howie's if you're familiar with that area. Very encouraged by the bidders we got. Received six bids on this and the price is, we're hearing reports from a lot of people about not getting bidders, and the price increase that we're seeing is in line with what we were expecting, so it wasn't that the prices were out of whack, and the fact that we got six bidders and all the prices were relatively consistent with each other. So we're very happy we did make that award. Project is moving forward. That's gonna increase probably, I think it's another 15 lots or so.

- 15 to 18 lots.

- 15 to 18 lots, so then, they are chomping at the bit. We actually have construction companies following our road building and sewer equipment around trying to erect foundations as we're still trying to build the roads, so. We're just reporting that out to you that we did make that award.

- Okay, so what are you looking for then, do we need to receive the place on file?

- I thought this would be for you guys to--

- Okay.

- Yeah.

- Motion to accept the report by Johnson, second by--

- Second.

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

- [Multiple] Aye.

- Nays, motion carries. Number five, consideration with possible action on request by Department of Public Works to authorize Department of Public Works to award contracts in the 2019 Capital Improvement Program at a staff level subject to the following conditions. A, delay in bringing forward a recommendation to award at the next regular scheduled committee meeting would result in an unacceptable delay in starting construction. Are we gonna handle these one at a time?

- No, it's both conditions.

- Oh, okay. Any projects so awarded would be reported out at the next regular scheduled meeting of the Improvement and Services Committee.

- This is the same request we brought to you the last couple of years, because we're going into summer schedule, we'll be only meeting once a month. That you make a recommendation to the Common Council, the Common Council give us the authority to award the construction contracts during summer schedule, and then we report those back now to you when we meet, so we don't delay projects.

- So, right. And then Steve, you will, if there's any issues, you'll let us know.

- Absolutely.

- Okay, thanks. Yep. All right. Johnson.

- I think a similar proposal came before Protection Policy Committee the other night, last night, and I opposed it, and the reason I opposed it is because, I mean, the argument again was the summer schedule concept and I've just at least seen here a number of bids that have come forward where we've only had one bidder. Or a number of projects where we've only had one bidder and I know I oppose the elevator project because, not because I didn't think it didn't need repair, but a million dollars without a competitive bid just didn't sit well with me, I know we've got another bid coming up on later on the agenda here that's gonna be in a similar circumstance, and, is there two bids?

- There'll be two bids.

- Okay. That makes me feel better.

- No I know, there's actually two contracts that each had--

- Oh, that each had one bid.

- Yep.

- No, that doesn't make me feel better. So again, it's just one of those things that it, I think the legislative body exists for a reason, and that reason is to make sure, you know, that there's proper oversight of some of these things, and I want to be clear, see, that I'm not trying to send a message that we don't trust staff to make these decisions. But the legislative body has the responsibility, here. And if we're not meeting frequently enough to meet that obligation, I think that is a relevant discussion and, you know, you had that about a year ago. I think when we made some decisions there. But I think in the spirit of consistency, with my opposition at the Protection Policy, I'm gonna do the same thing here. And again, not a reflection of our staff's ability to make these decisions as it is that I think it is important that as a council, that we do maintain oversight over those things for which we're responsible.

- Okay. Anything else?

- Nope.

- Brunette?

- Yeah, and I agree with that, and again, it's that unintended consequence I guess of the council making the decision to only meet during one meeting a month during summers that puts a real demand, if you will, on the staff that's not always fair. And waiting to get the approval for the councilmen, and I know we have special meetings, but I've never been comfortable with one meeting per month for the council for this reason. But again, it's not a reflection on your department, it's just that the bind that we put you in as a council, we've discussed that, we voted on it a year ago, I wasn't comfortable with it then, and I'm not now, but again, as Alder Johnson says, not a reflection on you or your judgment, it's just the situation we put you in.

- Wery, you got any comments or concerns?

- Yeah, I was wondering--

- Go ahead.

- Did we utilize this last year?

- Ah, there were probably half a dozen.

- And then does it fall off again once we start meeting two times a month, October or--

- Well by that time, we're no longer bidding projects, typically.

- I will say one thing too, though, is that Director Grenier runs his budget well. And any time a bid comes back that's high or for whatever reason, you feel we should not approve or re-bid, you've always shared that with us, so in that regard, I, you know, trust your judgment on this. By going ahead and approving it, somebody change my mind to council depending on how we discuss it there. But you've always come back to us when things just aren't quite right. So my opinion. That's been my experience with you.

- Any other comments? I guess I disagree, but I tell you what. I mean, I disagree with if we, if we have Director Grenier in the past you've taken care of this before, correct?

- Yes.

- Okay. I don't have any issues, if there's any problems, Director Grenier will call and will set up a meeting. But if we have one bidder or any other issues that rubs you the wrong way, Mr. Brunette, Mr. Johnson, give me a call, we'll get a meeting going. Is that fair enough? But if you have no issues with the agenda, I mean, what's wrong with just letting staff having it?

- I think the issue itself is that it's happening. I mean, it comes to us after the fact. It's already been awarded at that point. And I think we're seeing an increase in recurrence of, I mean, correct me if I'm wrong, Steve, but it seems at least, it's been a lot of one-bid projects that have been coming through. And I think that's the area where I have the biggest challenge.

- Yeah, there probably are... There probably is a slight uptick in it. But, you know, when we get to that, the projects that we're talking about, the second one that I'm referring to that had a single bidder was the parking ramp repair contract. That's some pretty specialized concrete work, not just any concrete flat work contractor can do that. It's Central Restoration is the low bidder, we just opened those bids at two o'clock today. The prices actually came in under what we were anticipating and they were very consistent with their pricing last year, Central Restoration has been a low contractor with us for probably the last seven years. So the fact that there was only a single bidder on that doesn't surprise me, I think other contractors trying to get into that market and make money doing it are seeing what Central is doing and what they're doing it for, and they're realizing they can't compete. So with some of these sole bidders, I think there are justifiable reasons why we're only seeing one contractor. That goes for our sidewalk and pavement repair contracts, we kept only seeing one or two contractors bidding on that. That's a function of it being a needs-based contract,

it's a very long time period that we're tying that contractor up and we may have nothing for three weeks and then we need them for four weeks solid every day. And scattered around the city. So it's kind of a feast or famine, and when you get that contract, it's hard for you to bid in other municipalities because of the sheer size and scope of work that we bring to the table and the inconsistent nature of it. So there's not a lot of contractors who want to bid that project, so we wind up with a very small number. Not sure, and I don't know if Director Ditscheit is gonna have any insight as to why things turned out the way they did with this Colburn Pool Project, because we had a lot of interest in that, I just don't know why we got one bidder on it. That's one of those oddities that I don't know. Relative to how the bidding process works, one thing I do feel comfortable telling you is that, you know, we do strictly adhere to public bidding statutes and we do this in conjunction with the Law Department. So everything we're doing is up, you know, completely transparent, we're following the public bidding laws that are out there. None of that changes whether we're doing a prior, you know, given prior authorization to award or not. And obviously if we don't have the money to pay for the work, we're gonna recommend that the project not be awarded, if it comes in over what we have money to spend, we're gonna make the same recommendation you if you're here or we would make a, simply not award the contract, we'll report that back to you as the reason why the bids came in over, so.

- Anything else, Johnson?

- Just again, Steve, I trust the process, I trust the staff.

- I understand, yep.

- I think for me, this is about ensuring that as legislators, we're holding ourselves accountable to an appropriate level of oversight so I think for today, I'm still gonna oppose this to be consistent with my vote from last night. But much like Alder Brunette alluded to, we always reserve our right to gather more information prior to council.

- Yeah, I'm fine with that. So...

- Go ahead.

- I'm good.

- So... Steve, let me ask you a question. So basically, let's say we vote this down, then what?

- Then it goes to Common Council and if Common Council upholds that action, then we simply, we go back, we're limited to awarding contracts once a month when we meet.

- Okay, once a month.

- Right. So it could, we could be delaying some projects and, you know, we could run up against a window at the end of the year. Don't know that, but.

- Right.

- It could.

- All right. Go ahead. Chris?

- I'm of two minds, obviously. Last year we had the big debate about how many times to meet and, this is an unintended consequence.

- I'm pretty boisterous about us meeting often enough to handle our business, not, you know, take vacations, 'cause we're elected to do our work. However, on the other hand, we're seeing the unintended consequences of possibly delaying projects and, I think as others have mentioned, your department's always been very fastidious about, if the money's there, the money's there. If it's not, we're not going to award a goofy contract. So I'm gonna vote in favor of the recommendation because we've been put in this situation. I'm not sure yet, and there again like you just said, you still will end up be looking at the summer schedule, so I don't know what it's going to look like. But for this year we've been put in a situation and I don't want to hamper the projects we have going out. I'm going to err that way.

- You know, to some point, I agree with you, Wery. I see you, Kathy. I agree with you, Wery, and if we have any issues, like I stated before, Director Grenier would get ahold of us and we would have a meeting right away. So like here, I don't see, I understand we're, you know, we gotta be, we are still accountable. 'Cause basically, it comes upon to us and if there's any big issues, Director Grenier will let us know, we'll get a meeting going, but, I guess that's my two cents worth. Kathy?

- That's what I was going to say, what you said about, Alderman Nicholson, is that, remember we said that we could always have extra meetings if we have to. If something comes up that really needs to be done, the business has to be done, and we'll just call a meeting. It could be at the Common Council. We could call an extra Common Council if we need to. Because we said we didn't want to tie it, you know, situations like this that happen. It would tie us down, oh, you can only meet once, you know. A month and then you've got problems. So that's what, right, that was the stipulation. I'm pretty sure that's what we said that we're going to leave it so that you could always have an extra meeting if you need it. And so, okay.

- Thank you.

- Motion to approve five A and B.

- Motion by Brunette to approve five A and B.

- Second.

- There's a second by Wery. Under discussion. No discussion? All in favor?

- [Multiple] Aye.

- Nays?

- Nay.

- One nay. Recommendation it goes to the City Council. Next week. Six, consideration with possible action on the review and award of the following contracts. Steve, do you want to handle this one at a time?
- Certainly.
- Okay, A, Adam. Green Bay Water Utility dredging Sludge Lagoon Number Two, Director Grenier.
- In your packet, we've provided you the summary of the bids, we had three bidders in discussions with Green Bay Water Utility. They are recommending award of bid base bid plus alternate two to Express Excavating Incorporated, the low responsible bidder, in the amount of \$79,712.50.
- Okay, any questions or concerns, if not, I'll entertain a motion.
- Move to approve.
- Motion to approve by Johnson. Second by Wery. Under discussion. Hearing none, all in favor.
- [Multiple] Aye.
- Motion carried. B, Boy. Parking ramp repairs, 2019, Director Grenier.
- Okay, parking ramp repairs. Long day, sorry about that. As I indicated to you, we had one bid. That was from Central Restoration, LLC, in the amount of \$539,700, comparing their bid prices, their individual unit prices for this year's bid to individual unit prices for the 2018 bid, we did find that they were very, very competitive numbers with last year. So staff is recommending award of that contract.
- Any questions or concerns, if not, I'll entertain a motion.
- Move to approve.
- Motion to approve by Brunette. Second by...
- Second.
- Wery, under discussion. Hearing none, all in favor.
- [Multiple] Aye.
- Motion carried.
- C, Charlie. Parks project 3-19. Colburn Park Pool and Bath Renovations. Director Grenier.
- This one we had one bid. Came in from Howard Immel, Incorporated at 2.5 million, I know Director Ditscheit is here if you have any questions regarding this contract itself.
- Any questions or concerns?

- Yeah, I mean--

- Go ahead, Brunette.

- You see, do you think it's high, I mean, does it seem high? It seems high to me, without any level of expertise.

- Again, for that I'm gonna defer to Ditscheit on this. That's why he's here.

- The other thing I thought of when I was here walking up, before walking up, it's just the roundness of it, 2.5 million, as if it was just, I hardly ever see bids that are--

- That exact.

- So it makes me think that it was rounded up and that's hysterical, perhaps.

- All right, I'll just give you a little bit of history, here. So we bonded three and a half million dollars to renovate Colburn Pool, we went through three different renditions of renovating this pool, the first two were thrown out because the cost was higher than 3.5, considerably higher. So the initial concept was a complete renovation with a brand new pool and bathhouse. The second one was just renovate the bathhouse, but get a new pool. And then this one, what we were directed to do about a year ago, a year and a half ago, was to just do whatever we need to do to make the pool last another 20 years. So that was the direction given by staff at Park Committee and City Council level. So what we ended up doing, if you look at these plans, this is what the scope of work was. So the first plan, or the first sheet just shows a rendition of what the, what the exterior is going to look like when it's all said and done. We really didn't do any renovations to it other than replace the siding and the roof and outer windows and doors. So it's really just maintenance only. We really didn't do any structural work at all. If you look at the second page, this gives a summary of really what's in this contract. So in the bathhouse, if you read over the bullet points, there, it's really just a cosmetic fix and taking care of maintenance things that we haven't done since we opened the pool, 50, 60 years ago. So it's taking care of ADA compliance issues, it's, you know, just doing cosmetic fixes, so renovating the bathrooms to modernize them, renovating the shower rooms to make 'em up to code. And then the rest is just tile the floors, paint the building, roof needs to be replaced, and then we do, we are just doing a couple of minor renovations to the storage areas and the way that you enter the pool. 'Cause it wasn't ADA compliant with how it was. And this is going to give us some additional storage. As far as the pool itself, really, we're not changing the pool basing at all, it's the same base and we're just, all we're doing is repairing the gutter because it's not level. And then we're adding a liner to the pool, which should last about 20 years, is what we're being told. And then in the basement bill, that's where the majority of the cost is spent. So the basement is actually replacing all of the mechanicals. Because nothing has been replaced down there since the pool was in place. Or installed, and everything is just aged. So it's replacing all pipes, all the pumps, all the filters with new equipment that will last another 20 years. Plus beyond. If the pool stays open past then. And then on the site work, so the third page shows the site work, there's very little site work. All that we're really doing is changing the fence configuration a little bit. Redoing a little bit of the concrete between the bathhouse and the pool, which isn't shown on this plan, but it's very minor. And then adding a permanent concession stand. So that's what this work entails, now the concession stand will be done by park staff at a later date, so that's not part of this contract. The pool, the estimate for these renovations was two millions dollars, was the engineer's estimate. The bids came in at 2.5 million. So it is higher, and it is higher than what

we talked about a year ago when we put together this plan. I think at the time, we said that the renovations would cost about 1.2 million. But as we kind of dug into it a little bit more, you know, some of the renovations became a little more extensive than we thought. So the engineer's estimate kind of went from 1.2 million to two million. And then the bids came in at 2.5, which, I agree is a high bid, it's higher than what we would have liked to have seen. But it is within our budget. So we budgeted, we bonded three and a half million. We have spent probably about 650 of that in consulting fees between the three different concepts that were brought forward. And then we did some renovations and did some stuff already. So our own staff renovated the bathrooms over the winter months, we purchased inflatables, we purchased new chairs for the facility. So what's left, like I said, is about I'd say 2.7 million is what's left. Of which 2.5 million is the bid. So there's enough money to do it. But it's not quite what we talked about a year ago. As far as how much money would be left over.

- Brunette.

- Recent history, how many awards have we, how many projects have we awarded to Howard Immel Inc.? That name's familiar, have we done business...

- Offhand, I don't know. Immel's definitely a reputable contractor, they're a large contractor.

- Yeah, that name's familiar to me.

- Yeah.

- I mean, is there any possibility, and again, not demeaning the reputation of Immel, that's not what I mean to do, but is it possible, some things I see bids come in that just to put a bid out there, it'll be a high amount, like when we bid on it, but it's, we're not going to get awarded the bid, there's no risk of that here, is there?

- It's like selling a house, you put it out high, see if someone'll grab it.

- Yeah, one bid.

- Or you negotiate.

- Right, if you have one bid, that's my main concern. Other than have we had business with them, you said they're reputable, that makes me feel better, but. That's Alderman Nicholson's sense of things, you could just throw a number out there and hope it sticks, and I don't have much experience with this company.

- Technically, sorry for interrupting you.

- No, I'm done.

- Go ahead, Johnson.

- Thank you Dan, for that oversight. What would be, I mean, if we were to send this out to Green Bay, 'cause that's my biggest concern, again. We've talked about this before. It's that we've received one bid. This isn't a competitive process at this point. And I think, it is our responsibility to have

appropriate oversight, you know, the fiscal management of these projects, and so what would be the impact to the department, to the project, if we were to send this project out to Green Bay? What does that process look like?

- I do have to tell you some additional information which I didn't to, I kind of wanted to answer your questions here. But you may or may not be aware, but over the last five years or so, since we've been looking at different renditions of this pool, the Health Department has kind of told us year to year, either fix it or you can't open. And every year we're like, well, we're in the process of rebidding it and redesigning it, and can you let us go through that process, and see what happens, and then we go through the process and it was, you know, and we threw it out twice. We're at the point now where the Health Department has told us that unless the city is committed to these renovations, we cannot open the pool. And so they actually told us that we cannot open the pool this year, I was able to discuss that--

- Wait, wait.

- Let me, if we're--

- Either we're in compliance or we're not. I mean, to hold us, I mean, hostage about approving a plan, that seems a little bit--

- Well, it's not the, yeah. It's not that they're holding us hostage, like I said, they told us years ago that this pool wasn't compliant. And we need to bring it up to par with what the code says. So it's been a recurring discussion with the Health Department for years. And in every rendition of the pool design, we have addressed their concerns and they've said, okay, you bid down and award the bid. And you've addressed our concerns. They're at the point now where we've bid it out twice, now this is the third time. And they are telling us we have to become compliant. So before we can open. So what that means is basically, in order to be compliant, their main concern is the circulation rate of the water. And in order to do that, we have to replace the equipment in the basements, so the pumps have to be replaced, along with some other pieces of equipment. And they will not let us open this year without two things happening. One of three things, let me rephrase that. So first thing is, we need compliance, we need the state to review the plans, which they did already for what you see here. And the state has reviewed and approved the plans saying we're acceptable to these repairs. So you're okay, there. The second condition was to fix the pumps and the stuff that needs to be fixed in order to become compliant with the circulation. We cannot do that in the time frame we have because by the time the pumps get ordered, designed, get state approval, the season's done already. So the third option that the state or the Health Department said they would consider is if the city awards this bid, if we can't be in compliance with the second option, because we can't do it in time, then the third option is, if the city awards a contract showing that they're going to build the state-approved plans, then we can open and delay it for a season and then do the work in the fall. Because that's how it's set up right now is this work would be done in the fall. Obviously, pools open in two weeks. So we wouldn't be able to make these repairs in time for the opening.

- In answer to the earlier part of your question, what does it look like and what's the possibilities, my very real concern is if we reject a third bid, and send it out for rebid again, we get zero bidders next time. I do believe that there is some allowance in the bid that we received, that a contractor may have been hedging a little bit. That the... This is the third time it's been bid, it's been rejected twice.

They're protecting themselves a little bit against that possibility here. I... It is a very real concern of mine that if we reject the bids and redo we will not get bidders in the future for this project.

- And I do just want to be clear, too, that, you know, this has been an ongoing discussion with the Health Department for years. And, you know, every time we go through this, you know, they're willing to work with us. And so they're still trying to work with us this year. But they want a commitment from the city that yes, you're going to do these repairs. 'Cause we've been talking about it for four or five years now. So. It's not that they're trying to hold us hostage, they just want the repairs to be done.

- You have the floor, Johnson.

- Okay, so. I appreciate the oversight on that statement and perspective. It just would seem kind of odd to me that they would say, hey, it's safe to open the pool this year but we're not going to let you open it unless you approve the bid for work that's going to occur after the season's closed? Again, that's holding someone hostage. I mean, that just doesn't seem like a responsible practice to me. But I mean, either the pool is safe to open or it's not. And I mean, from what I'm hearing, they've given you the green light that the pool is safe to open two weeks from now, right?

- Correct.

- So, to me, the bid issue is separate. Again, I think it's important to note, I mean, this project has obviously had a long history. And I'm personally not interested in reneging on a commitment that the council has made to this, we've made the commitment, and so to me it's just, my interest is making sure that we're making a responsible financial decision to the taxpayers. And when I see one bid that has come in half a million dollars over what the engineering studies has indicated would be an appropriate bid price, that's the piece that I'm concerned about. So. I'm open to hearing what other Alders have to say about this, but that's the piece that I think we really need to have a discussion about.

- Wery?

- Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Director, does this address any of the parking?

- This does not address the parking. So the parking would remain as it is.

- That was sufficient for the pool?

- It meets code because we, the lower parking lot is our overflow parking area for the pool. That is why it meets code.

- And obviously it's been an eight-year odyssey with us and they did well, and evolved with voting on it or following it. That the community pretty fired up, you know, about it and, I think what you're seeing maybe with bidders is, you know, the city keeps putting it out there, pulling it back, putting it out there, pulling it back, putting it out there, pulling it back, and it does wear down people on projects, and they could have seen the same thing with the bridge lane and things of that nature. You know, where you put it out there, pull it back. This should have been built six years ago, right now. Six years ago and there, if not for former, sorry... Former Mayor Schmitt, I could talk to him now.

Because the community raised a million dollars. We were ready to roll. And there's still, I think about \$47,000 left, because everybody, most people pledged. And some people who donated wanted their money back. \$40,000, for us to keep it in there, I think is that going to be going towards the snack--

- Yes.

- Snack area, I think that the group said put it towards that new concession area, so I don't know how free most of that expense is. Yeah, we have the 2.7 million, so 2.5, I think we move ahead with it, get it done, show the community that we'll follow through with it. Late, but that'll be it.

- Jesse and Kathy.

- And I agree, I think the political process has contributed to the increased cost in how we've been represented. In my district, I know that the neighborhood support is still has been high, still is high. If you recall, the first meeting, first public forum that we had, Can really kick this thing off, Was August 2012, so we're looking at nearly seven years of this, I think that the more we delay it, push out what is inevitable, that is that the pool should be redone in a way that the council approved it, we're just going to keep wearing down the community to the point that Director Grenier said, we're not going to get any bids at all. And that's what we're fearful of. So as much as I don't like a single bid, given the history of this, and given that it's the only council and perhaps the former mayor's doing, that's not meant to be a cheap shot. That's my personal, you know, commentary. Not a cheap shot. But I think that the political process has driven up the cost and I'm in favor of moving forward and we'll just really added, not added, but maintaining a very nice event that's served our city since 1967.

- Kathy?

- Yeah, I think you owe it to the community people that have been working on this a long time to get something done, because if you delay it again, I think people are just going to say, what is wrong with this city? They can't follow through on anything, it seems like delay, delay, delay, and then their costs go up. But I was going to also mention this company, Immel. I've heard that they've been in this community for 40, 50 years, maybe longer. They've been, yeah, so don't worry about the company. They've been in business a long time. I've heard of them, you know, off and on on a lot of projects. So I think they're a good company. So but yeah, it's a shame. I think that it was, you know, Steve had mentioned that, because things haven't followed through I think other companies said, you know, why are we going to bid on this, and, you know we've spent all the time, you know, it takes them time just to get their bid ready. And then you don't go follow through on it. So that might be the reason, too. So. But I think yeah, you've gotta go ahead with it. Thank you.

- Okay. Anybody else? If not, entertain more, Johnson.

- Just a closing comment, I want to be clear that, I am going to oppose this to begin, it's about the opposition to the process. And the piece that I want to be clear about is that I am supportive of the project. I do think it is important that we finally get this project done because, you know, there has been this back and forth badminton game and that I think needs to end and we need to honor the commitment that we made to the community on this project. But I think my, you know, and this goes back to the discussion that we had previously about the overseeing of the bid process, and to me this is an example of something where I feel like the council does need to maintain effective level of oversight when these projects come forward. So let the project just, it's the process.

- Okay. Entertain a motion. Motion to approve by Wery. Second by Brunette.
- Second.
- Under discussion, hearing none. All in favor.
- [Multiple] Aye.
- Nays.
- Nay.
- Motion carried. Okay, number, ♪ Bum bum bum bum bum ♪ Oh... Seven.
- Payment 2-19.
- Oh, okay, D, David, Pavement 2-19. Go ahead, Steven.
- Open the bids today, we had five bidders. Benton Construction came in as the low responsible bidder at a total cost of \$1,165,678.46. High bid was \$1,798,926.99. That was De Groat. That was a flyer, all the bids came in, the three, the four, four of those bids were between 1.1 and 1.4 million, which was dead on with where we were expecting costs to be. We know De Groat is busy right now. I think given the construction, the time that we let the contract go with the construction schedule's calling for, this is fitting in with what we call late season work. That's where some of these contractors were looking to pick things up to finish their season off. So that's reflected in numbers, we were very, very encouraged with what we saw, so we are recommending award to Benton in the amount of \$1,165,678.46.
- Any questions or concerns? If not, I'll entertain a motion. Johnson?
- Is this, are we looking at 6-D, here? 'Cause I don't see this information in the packet.
- We just opened the bids this afternoon. That's why you don't have it.
- So the bidding window on this was a few hours?
- No, no, no, no. They've had the bids for, the bidding process went for two weeks. But we opened them today.
- Oh, unsealed.
- We just unsealed them and read the numbers today.
- Got it, semantics there.
- So there wasn't enough time to get the... To get it into the packet for you.

- All right, thank you, Steve, for this, this is what I was looking for.
- Move to approve.
- Second.
- Kay, there's a motion by Brunette to approve, second by Johnson. Under discussion, hear none. All in favor, okay, motion carried. Kay, moving forward. Number seven. Consideration with possible action on application for concrete sidewalk builder license by the following, you got any issues with any of 'em?
- All are good.
- Okay. We'll take 'em all together. A, Adam, Evraets Concrete Construction, B, Green Bay Concrete, C, Weidner Concrete Construction.
- Move to approve.
- Any questions? Motion of the floor is to approve.
- Second.
- By Johnson, our discussion, hearing none. All in favor?
- [Multiple] Aye.
- Nays, motion carried. Number eight, Consideration of possible action for tree and brush trimming license by the following, got any issues with A or B?
- No sir, both good.
- Kay, we'll take 'em all together. Fall-Rite Services and Monster Tree Service. Any questions or concerns, if not, I'll entertain a motion.
- Motion to approve.
- Motion by Johnson to approve. Second by Brunette. Under discussion, hear none, all in favor?
- [Multiple] Aye.
- Nays, motion carried. Nine, consideration with possible action on an application for underground sprinkler system license for Lizer?
- Yes sir.
- Of Wisconsin, motion by Johnson to approve. Second by?
- Second.

- Wery. Under discussion, hearing none. All in favor.

- [Multiple] Aye.

- Nays, motion carried. Ten, consideration with possible action on request by Department of Public Works to grant licenses for concrete sidewalk builder, tree and brush trimmer, and underground sprinkler system at a staff level until September 17, 2019. Grenier?

- Again, this is similar to what we had with the award of contract, you gave us the ability to award these licenses at a staff level last year during summer to keep things moving along. If perchance there winds up being one that we would recommend not awarding, and we were to deny that license, they automatically have the write to appeal, and that appeal would then come before the next regularly scheduled.

- Any questions or concerns? Johnson.

- Just a comment, I just want to, I am going to support this one, and the reason is, is because this is approval of license, there's no financial impact to the city. But I want the public to understand why I support this one and what I didn't the others.

- Motion by Brunette to approve, second by?

- Second.

- Wery, under discussion, hear none.

- Aye, oh, sorry.

- All in favor.

- [Multiple] Aye.

- Nays, motion carried. Okay. We are at 11. Consideration with possible action on request by Brian Milz, 512 Ontario Road, for a sidewalk study, actually it was for, not sidewalk study, it was for implement of sidewalks on Ontario Road. Director Graneire.

- Well, that's the first--

- The same thing?

- Well, the first step in getting sidewalks would be to perform the sidewalk study to determine the need.

- Okay.

- If the council wishes to skip that step and simply order the sidewalks installed, you definitely have that latitude.

- I guess I was under the impression there's sidewalks there, then there's some properties that don't have it, and then they continue again. Is that true?
- There are sidewalks on the section of Ontario north of Beth... But I think from Beth down to, down to East Mason, I don't think there are sidewalks right now. I could be wrong, but--
- Didn't he, didn't this, didn't Mill send some email?
- Yeah, I think--
- When did he--
- It's just stating, could not attend.
- Yeah, he asked me if I would read it out loud if you guys are okay with that.
- Oh, perfect, yeah. Sure, go ahead, thank you.
- All right. I gotta size this thing up. Okay, so this is from Brian Mills, testimony 5-12 Ontario Road. To the Improvement and Services Committee, Dear members of the Improvement and Services Committee, thank you for consideration of the sidewalk study and possible action for Ontario Road. I regret that I am not able or not available to testify to your committee due to a previous coaching commitment. As you are aware, Ontario Road is a very busy street. The street appears to be wider than other streets in residential areas and was initially designed to have sidewalks. This is apparent by the sidewalk being present on the 500 block of Ontario south Defender Road. And a continuation of the sidewalk in the 300 block of Ontario to McAuliffe Park. The lack of stop signs, change in speed limits from the Bellevue section of Ontario into the Green Bay section in general population growth results in significant traffic often in speeds in excess of the posted limit. McAuliffe Park, like many of the fine parks in our city is used frequently by families in the neighborhood and guests throughout the city. However, it is dangerous for people to have a section of sidewalk then walk in the street and back onto the sidewalk. It becomes unpredictable for drivers and pedestrians alike. And puts both at risk. With continued growth in our area, I am asking that the sidewalk be completed to McAuliffe Park, I'm under the impression that when the houses were zoned over 15 years ago, that the builders were expected to install sidewalks. While there may remain a few open lots, the majority of areas where sidewalk was started are now fully established, some for over a decade. I've included a map of the area on the next page. I understand that there is a study that is scheduled to take place, however I hope the committee can join me in seeing the need to complete the sidewalk as was originally planned, hopefully this can be done without special assessments to our neighbors but regardless, for the safety of our neighborhood residents and other visitors to our wonderful parks, the sidewalk needs to be completed, thank you for taking the time to consider this request. I'm happy to be contacted at the above number if you have questions. Sincerely, Brian Mills.
- How come the sidewalks weren't implemented when the houses were established, Steve?
- In this area, it's likely because of the changes to the zoning ordinance. The zoning ordinance has evolved over time, and there were periods of time that based on lot and city sidewalks were not required on either side of the road. Then as we started getting, we started understanding why the

need for sidewalk was there, the curb ordinance provides for a certain number of lots per acre you need a sidewalk on one side of the road as the lots get more dense, then the sidewalks have to be on both sides of the road and there still is a provision based on if the lots are scattered out, big lots where no sidewalks are still required under zoning. More often than not, it's a function of what the zoning ordinance was at the time that the lots were recorded, not when they were built upon, but when the plot was recorded.

- So how many properties are we looking at--

- Again, offhand, I don't know because I had the conversation with you, Alderman Nicholson, I don't know that, I don't remember seeing that email from Mr. Mills, so we haven't seen it, you as Alders have.

- Should we hold this up until our next meeting, then? Discuss it more, or, where are the wishes of the committee?

- We're good either way.

- Okay, I think--

- Go ahead, Brunette.

- That Mr. Mills wanted to, I think he was, in the end, hinting that, hinting maybe directly, said that he would like the sidewalks put in at no special assessment. But I'm fine with getting, kind of, I don't know, a study? Is that what he's requesting, I'm not okay with approving, you know--

- The side, typically what we would do, is we would do a sidewalk study, which we go out there, we look at the use of the road and the patterns and the number of pedestrians that are out there and make a recommendation as to whether we felt from a safety perspective, sidewalks were warranted. I have a feeling, just a gut feeling, because that's my neighborhood, I live there. I have a feeling that we're going to see Ontario, the reason Ontario is wide is because Ontario was originally designed as a collector or an arterial, it was either going to be Ontario or Huron. Huron got billed as EA, but Ontario was still built to that width because both of them went as far north as Sitka and then ended. It was just Ontario pushed across Baird Creek. Or, I'm sorry, Huron pushed across Baird Creek. And Ontario didn't, it stops at the park now. Okay? So with that, the road is designed for higher volumes, it does carry higher volumes than residential streets that come off of it, as a result of that, pedestrians walking in the curved lane are in my opinion, are unnecessarily placed at risk. My gut tells me that a sidewalk study is going to say sidewalks should go in and on at least one side. Then it comes, so, if I had to guess, that's the likely thing you would be getting out of a sidewalk study. So, with that in mind, it would then come to the committee with a recommendation that sidewalks go in on one side or the other, you would have the ability to say yes, east side, west side, or both. The way things are set up under ordinance right now, the cost of those sidewalks are, it's not necessarily an assessment per se. Okay, we don't levy a special assessment. It's that similar to what you're going to see at council, the resolution for sidewalk repairs, the sidewalks are ordered, installed, and the costs associated with that are directed to the abutting property owners. The reason it's not an assessment is because we don't charge them and go out and do the work. It's, they have the ability to complete the work using their own forces, if they fail to do so, then the city will do the work and bill them for

it. So that's what, it's kind of a semantics thing, but there is a difference between an assessment and what we're charging.

- I'll make a motion to move forward with the sidewalk study.

- How long is that going to take?

- We can probably have this ready for you the next time we meet, in a month.

- I'll second then.

- Okay. Motion to move forward with a study. Second by Johnson, go ahead, Johnson.

- Just an FYI, Steve, I did forward that email to you so you have that.

- Thank you.

- And maybe just an inquiry, just so that I'm clear, the sidewalk study is performed 100 percent in house?

- Yes.

- Okay.

- Our traffic division will take care of that.

- Thank you.

- Wery. Okay. All in favor.

- [Multiple] Aye. Nays, motion carries. Informational. Director's reports, Steve.

- Just a couple things for you, real quick. First of all, we do have the floating docks in for the year. That's a good thing and a bad thing. What I mean by that is, river levels are very high right now. We've had some issues relative to the gangway, it isn't exactly a gangway, they're actually backfish, So you have to walk up to get on the floating docks. When that condition occurs, we are barricading the docks off, so folks aren't going out there 'cause that's actually an unsafe condition. We've had some issues with the floating docks at Leicht Park, the river levels have risen so high that collars that hold the floating docks to piling in the water have slipped over the top of the piling. We've had to chain the docks together and tie 'em to shore so they don't float away. That has also caused some significant damage, high water conditions have caused significant damage to the docking or the lodge facilities out at the Metro Bolt Lodge. The way those are constructed, there are two segments up on the shore which do not float. They provide a rigid connection to the piling out there so pedestrians can walk out there. And then you get on the floating sections, well the floating sections are going up and down with the water levels. And those pin sections can't. They're just not designed to do that. And through high water wave action, we've sustained some pretty substantial damage to our launch ramps. So we are looking at making some, making some changes to how those sections are constructed, potentially buying some new ones. Some facilities like De Pere, they actually have them

on wheels where you can wheel those sections in and out so they're easily deployable, ours are not like that. Based on how the piles are connected and some cross members between those piles, and on one of the docks, even if we can get one or two in early, that would be appreciated by the sport fishermen. One of them we need low water conditions to get in there and cut some cross members out. Either that or we're going to have to sheet pile coffer dam it, de-water the area, and that gets expensive. We wound up with some of this high water, it actually beat the cross members and knocked them out. So we have one that we're looking at making some modifications to. Don't have that in the bonding for this year, so we're going to see if we can find the money at the end of the year to try and do that. Potentially to go to more of a floating or an aluminum at least to get some of the weight down so they're easier to handle. But we have sustained some pretty significant damage again this year at Metro. We do have multiple crews out on patching duty. And have for the last couple of weeks. So we are going everywhere as fast as we can with that. As a matter of fact, I had a discussion with staff yesterday, we typically don't like to use cold mix because cold mix just doesn't last. But we only have the two hot mix trailers and there's only so much that the hot mix guys can get done. I have authorized the expenditure of money to go out and buy some cold mix because we can send other crews out and even if the patches only last three weeks until we can hot mix 'em, hopefully we can scrape up the cold mix and re-use it with another patch until we can get there with a more permanent solution. So we're throwing everything that we have on trying to get these pothole issues taken care of. That leads me to the last thing I just want to advise you of, I don't know if you are aware or if you've seen, but we've had some lane restrictions and some closures on Broadway between Dousman and Mather. There was a project that went last fall by Green Bay Metropolitan Sewage District New Water, they had some of their force main that had some joint leaks, so it had locations where they had to dig down and repair the pipe. Not uncommon, that happens over time. Those permanent pavement repairs are being restored right now and the way Broadway is constructed, there's actually a concrete base underneath it with an asphalt overlay, so we have to match that, otherwise you wind up with differential movement on the pavements, and we'll get freeze-thaw, you can really cause some serious damage to the road. And our equipment. So, it's taken some time and it's pretty big patches that we had to make. That necessitated moving all of the traffic both northbound and southbound into the northbound lanes so we're using the northbound travel lane as the southbound lane, and the northbound parking lane as the northbound travel lane. That parking lane was always designed as a parking lane, that was an add-on in the 90s. When they did the bump-outs, it was never intended to be a full-time traffic lane. And it just got pounded. It fell apart under the traffic loads. That's an old street, it's like a 1992 construction, so it's almost 20 years old, and again, it wasn't designed for this kind of punishment. Especially with that being a truck route. That's I41 and Alt 43. So there's a lot of heavy truck movement through there. So we made the decision last week, it was unsafe for people to be on it, we just shut it down. We moved the traffic over to Ashland, it's not something we want to do, we understand that the impacts of the residential over there, but for traveling safety, it had to be done. Jim and his staff has been working really diligently on that, we got a repair plan in place, I think we're going to, the anticipation is we're going to have everything repaired and we should open again by the end of the Memorial Day weekend.

- Kay, interesting.

- So I just want to make sure you guys are all aware of what's going on.

- All right, any questions or concerns? Johnson?

- I appreciate the explanation, Steve. I was actually over in that area, and was kind of confused why they stopped the concrete where they did, so I appreciate that explanation. But maybe just, I'm glad that we closed it down, 'cause that street is just horrendous.

- Yeah.

- Maybe if there's one request, a courtesy maybe that I would request of your team, with any business improvement district area, some communication to those areas because I know I have a number of businesses that reached out to me that were concerned.

- Are the BMEs on our, do you normally get our media releases when we do a--

- I personally subscribe to them, and when I got it, I put it out. But my point is, if there's a proactive way, you know, to communicate with them, so that if there is, you know, some kind of contingency plan, I understand this one was, you know, like that. Right, it was a quick decision. But a lot of times when they have construction closures, you know, there's different things that bids might do to help guide the traffic, but I noticed that even though the release came out as a full closure, it hasn't really been a full closure. You know, even today, I saw traffic going through there, so it's, I don't know if that's intentional or not. Traffic is going through there. Just so that you know then.

- It's supposed to be hard closed.

- I've noticed some people--

- The contractor pulled back almost to Elmore.

- Okay.

- From Dousman.

- Yeah.

- I think Dave is trying to do Dousman...

- Okay.

- All right, well, be advised there are vehicles on that road frequently.

- Yeah.

- And some of them choose to move cones and go through anyway. So.

- To that point very briefly, Alderman. The mayor's office is also looking at putting together more of a comprehensive press release outreach, community information type thing. That's not something that has really been a coordinated effort, so that every department's doing it the same way and you know, everybody talking to each other, that's an initiative that the mayor's office has started. So I'll definitely bring that forward to them as well, because there are other things beyond our road closures that could also impact BIDs.

- Right, okay, thank you.
- Anything else, if not--
- There's one question.
- All right, go ahead, Wery.
- No retirements, no defections. Usually at this point in the meeting you tell us you've lost helpful employees.
- I don't know, it depends on--
- Two weeks.
- ...Who the last ones were.
- Good news, all right.
- All right.
- Motion to receive it and place on file by Brunette, second by Johnson, any discussion, hearing none. All in favor, nays, motion carried. Okay... Tentative, June 12th. I'll touch base with everybody it should be okay or, what do you recommend.
- A monthly meeting? Or...
- We can do whatever you want on it.
- Just to have some agreement on the committee, just for my sake and my scheduling, but some personal changes in work schedules just, we can talk as...
- We can talk.
- As a committee. I just hope to have some consistency.
- So motion to adjourn.
- Motion to adjourn by Brunette.
- Second.
- Second by Johnson. Any discussion, hearing none. All in favor.
- [Multiple] Aye.
- Motion carried. We're adjourned. It's all yours, Wery.