



MINUTES OF THE IMPROVEMENT AND SERVICES COMMITTEE

**TUESDAY, NOVEMBER 12, 2019, 4:30 PM
CITY HALL, ROOM 310**

A. ROLL CALL.

Present: Ald. Brian Johnson, Ald. Andy Nicholson, Ald. Chris Wery

Excused: Ald. Jesse Brunette

B. APPROVAL OF THE AGENDA.

Moved by Ald. Brian Johnson, seconded by Ald. Chris Wery to approve the agenda of the Tuesday, November 12, 2019 Improvement and Services Committee meeting. Motion carried. Vote: Yes- Andy Nicholson, Brian Johnson, Chris Wery, No- None, Abstain- None

C. APPROVAL OF MINUTES.

Moved by Ald. Brian Johnson, seconded by Ald. Chris Wery to approve the minutes of the Wednesday, October 23, 2019 Improvement and Services Committee meeting. Motion carried. Vote: Yes- Andy Nicholson, Brian Johnson, Chris Wery, No- None, Abstain- None

D. REGULAR BUSINESS.

I. Consideration with possible action on request by Ald. Galvin for Department of Public Works to develop and implement a five year plan to inspect sidewalks and repair or replace them to code (referred to staff at the July 30, 2018 Improvement and Services Committee meeting).

Moved by Ald. Brian Johnson, seconded by Ald. Chris Wery to hold until the December 11, 2019 Improvement and Services Committee meeting the request by Ald. Galvin for Department of Public Works to develop and implement a five year plan to inspect sidewalks and repair or replace them to code. Motion carried. Vote: Yes- Andy Nicholson, Brian Johnson, Chris Wery, No- None, Abstain- None

2. Consideration with possible action on request by Ald. Steuer to study and report out on the feasibility of utilizing the “even-odd” residential address overnight parking scenario, as is done in Milwaukee, in order to relieve the parking problems at residences with limited parking spaces (referred back to Improvement and Services Committee at the November 5, 2019 Common Council meeting).

Moved by Ald. Chris Wery, seconded by Ald. Brian Johnson to hold until the December 11, 2019 Improvement and Services Committee meeting the request by Ald. Steuer to study and report out on the feasibility of utilizing the “even-odd” residential address overnight parking scenario, as is done in Milwaukee, in order to relieve the parking problems at residences with limited parking spaces. Motion carried. Vote: Yes- Andy Nicholson, Brian Johnson, Chris Wery, No- None, Abstain- None

3. Consideration with possible action on request by Ald. Wery to review how sidewalk replacements are funded, with staff reporting back to Improvement and Services Committee how the ten largest communities in Wisconsin handle repairing damage caused by any means to sidewalk. (referred to staff at the October 29, 2018 Improvement and Services Committee meeting).

Moved by Ald. Chris Wery, seconded by Ald. Brian Johnson to receive and place on file the request by Ald. Wery to review how sidewalk replacements are funded, with staff reporting back to Improvement and Services Committee how the ten largest communities in Wisconsin handle repairing damage caused by any means to sidewalk with the report data used as part of item 1. Motion carried. Vote: Yes- Andy Nicholson, Brian Johnson, Chris Wery, No- None, Abstain- None

4. Consideration with possible action on the review and approval of the 2020 Storm Water Utility rates.

Moved by Ald. Brian Johnson, seconded by Ald. Chris Wery to approve the 2020 Storm Water Utility rates as follows:

Monthly charge \$8.59/ERU
Yearly charge \$103.04/ERU

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

E. INFORMATIONAL.

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

Moved by Ald. Chris Wery, 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, No- None, Abstain- None

2. The next Improvement and Services Committee meeting is scheduled for November 27, 2019.

Moved by Ald. Chris Wery, seconded by Ald. Brian Johnson to approve the next Improvement and Services Committee meeting will be on December 11, 2019. Motion carried. Vote: Yes- Andy Nicholson, Brian Johnson, Chris Wery, No- None, Abstain- None

F. PUBLIC HEARINGS.

G. ADJOURNMENT.

Moved by Ald. Chris Wery, 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, No- None, Abstain- None

VERBATIM MINUTES

- Brian made a--
- We're recording. Ready to go.
- All right, roll call. Let it be recorded Johnson, Nicholson, Wery are present. Brunette is excused. Approval of the agenda?
- So moved.
- Second.
- By Johnson, second by Wery. Under discussion, hearing none, all in favor?
- [All] Aye.
- Nays, motion carried. Approval of the minutes?
- Moved.
- Second.
- Moved by Johnson, second by Wery. Under discussion? Hearing none, all in favor?
- [All] Aye.
- Nays, motion carried. Regular Business. Number one, consideration with possible action on a request by Alderman Galvin for Department of Public Works to develop and implement a five year plan to inspect sidewalks and repair or replace them to code, referred from the July 30th, 2018. Steve Grenier.
- Okay, I handed out to you a memo, and I was talking to the alders before the meeting started. We're not necessarily expecting action on this tonight. We wanted to get the information in

front of you, and there's a lot of information here to digest, so if you feel that this would be potentially an action item at the next I and S Committee meeting, we would understand that. So basically the memo identifies that we currently have a complaint driven program to order the repair replacement of sidewalk. Alder Galvin asked us to take a look at a five year replacement cycle, so in order to complete that task, we had a number of things we had to do. First thing we had to do was to create an inventory of how much sidewalk we have. It turns out we have a total of just over two million linear feet across the city, which is about 387 miles, if I remember correctly. We then had to estimate what our production rates are for doing the actual inspection, review construction contracts from recent years to determine when we inspect a lot, what percentage of that sidewalk is found to be needing repair, including the amount that's currently city funded repairs. And then we talked to other municipalities that have proactive programs to try to estimate what a potential future outlay would be. So taking a look at our GIS, again, we were able to combine the GIS records and city street length files, and determine that there's about 2,001,900 linear feet of sidewalk existing in the city. Went back and took a look at what it takes, and when somebody goes out to do a sidewalk inspection, they have a generalized sheet that shows sidewalk cakes and a home. So what they do is they'll mark essentially a property line and then the number of sidewalk squares in front of that property, including the corner if it happens to be a corner lot. And then the individual sidewalk squares that are in need of repair are marked out on that sheet identifying not only the sidewalk squares that need replacement, but whether or not it's tree damage or city funded, or property owner funded on there. By the time you factor in the time it takes to physically walk the piece of property, complete the paperwork, including travel time and breaks and things of that nature, it comes out to about 200 lineal feet per hour as a production rate for an individual to do the inspection. That becomes critical once we start talking about how much in a year and how many people it takes to do the inspections. We went back and looked at the last five years of sidewalk contracts to determine how much sidewalk that's being inspected is determined to be impacted. What we found is under our contracts it averages about 32.6% of all walk inspected needs to be fixed, and about 10.4% of the total actually winds up being city tree impacted. We then looked at both Appleton and De Pere to take a look at proactive programs, De Pere, because it's similar in age to Green Bay, Appleton because the sidewalk volume is similar in size. De Pere spends about \$50,000.00 to \$60,000.00 annual on the city responsibility sidewalk. So similar to us they pay for tree damaged walk. And they inspect and repair on an eight year cycle. Appleton has what they call a green dot program, which is a proactive program. They spend about \$250,000.00 annually on the green dot, or proactive program, with an additional \$50,000.00 on complaint based replacement. They will fund sidewalk repairs until they exhaust their money for the year and then they shut the program down. Paulette states that that turns out to about a 22 year cycle to get through the city, and they're on their second cycle right now. So we took the findings, and we tried to translate that into what it would look like for Green Bay to achieve a five year rotation cycle. In order for us to do that we'd have to inspect about a little over 400,000 lineal feet per year, so that's about 2,000 man hours of work, or essentially one full-time equivalent position, just to do nothing by inspect the sidewalk, that's not including observing the repairs. Assuming an overall replacement rate of 32.6%, and a city-funded replacement rate, the reason we looked at both, the overall replacement rates sets the size of the contract that a contractor's gonna have to complete, and the second is what you would have to outlay in cost under current rules. The full project would be about 652,000 square feet per year. Of that amount, a little over 208,000 square feet would be city funded. These are probably biased high because we operate a complaint based program, so there's probably a higher probability of damaged walk in front of every property we inspect as opposed to just picking a street at random. So we then went back and took a look at Appleton's experience, and they're showing a total replacement rate more along the lines of about 17-1/2%, so much lower than we expect under our contract, which is not unexpected. Excuse me.

- Assuming that 32% of the total damage is tree impact, which I would think would be consistent regardless of complaint or not, that would place city funded in the range of about 5.6% of the total inspected. So with a program of that size on a five year rotation, we would be looking at a \$2.6 million sidewalk contract, \$840,000.00 of which is city funded. That far exceeds by probably four-fold, any contractor in this area's ability to complete. So we'd be asking the impossible of concrete contractors. It just can't be done. Appleton has told us that even at their size, at 250,000, they're having a tough time getting somebody to bid it and successfully complete it within the course of a year. So rather than look at it on a cycle, we decided to take a look at it on a cost basis. If we did a program that was in the \$300,000.00 to \$400,000.00 a year range, what would that look like, and what would that give us for a return on a cycle? Again, taking some of what we found with our program and some of what we found with Appleton's program, what we're seeing is if we left a \$100,000.00 for complaint based, and if you're doing periodic, routinely through the city, you're still gonna have complaints come on in the areas that you're not doing that year. So about \$100,000.00 for the routine program and about \$300,000.00 for the forward looking program, that equates out to about a 15 year cycle. So if the city were looking to move forward with something other than what we have right now, what we would look at is we would target a 15 year cycle for proactive routine inspection and repair replacement program. It would be capped financially with an initial program value of \$300,000.00 worth of city infrastructure. The city would be partitioned off into similarly sized areas based on sidewalk coverage. So it can't necessarily follow aldermanic districts or anything like that. We'll just simply count up the amount of sidewalk and try to break it into 15 roughly equally sized areas. What we would propose to do is hire seasonal engineering interns, and those engineering interns would complete the inspection and likely also travel along with the sidewalk contractors to document the repairs that were done. They would target the area for the next program year. So they would inspect in 2020 for sidewalks to be replaced in 2021. We'd be one year out on what they're inspecting. The cost for the interns would be covered as part of the program cost which is a relatively minor amount of money. Using prior year's construction costs, the sidewalk inspections would continue until the financial cap was reached, at which time the program is shut off for the year. We do anticipate there's gonna be some areas of town where we may get through the entire area, and not exhaust the entire \$300,000.00. There's gonna be other areas in town where the sidewalk is older that we're gonna hit the \$300,000.00 before we get through the geographic area we've targeted. If that happens, and we have to shut the program down before we get through the area, any areas within that, any cutoff areas within that geographically targeted area, automatically become the first ones we inspect for the following year. And the existing complaint driven program would continue largely unchanged from the existing, but over time would decrease because of the periodic or routine inspections. That should knock out a lot of the complaint driven issues. So again, a lot of information to digest. More than anything we wanted to get it in front of you and get some initial feedback. If you folks wanted to chew on this and mull it over and take a look at what you like, what you don't like, potential changes, things of that nature, we'd be open to that as well. The other thing that we do need to keep in mind. I don't have it in here, but it's something that does have some criticality to it. From a financial perspective, if you've been attending the Finance Committee meetings when they've been talking about the five year CIP, Bond counsel has recommended that we cap our bonding at about an \$8 million level for levy-supported bonding. The way things are playing out this year with the budget, \$1.8 million worth of equipment replacement is now going to bond, so we're knocking our bond issue down to about 6.2. Historically, DPW, for our annual capital improvement program, we've been at about the \$4.8 to \$5.1 million range for our existing program. So if we hold that at that same level, that's really only going to leave a million to a 1.3 million for everybody else in the city, and we're talking about investing an additional \$300,000.00 outta that 1.3. I don't disagree that this is a necessary thing that we need to do, but we may need to think about program size and where we're gonna find the funding, which is again, why I'm telling you. If you decide that you need some time to think about this one, I'm with you 100%, 'cause I'm all ears.

- Any questions?
- I would move that we table this until the next meeting, and at least give **Galvin** an opportunity to come and talk about his item.
- And I did have a phone conversation with **Galvin** about this, so he's at least aware of it. But we will make, I'll email both of these documents out to all 12 of the council members, so that everybody has them. We weren't able to get them in the packet, otherwise everyone would have them already.
- Alderman Johnson, I would recommend to hold, not to table.
- Would we? What's the difference?
- If you table, somebody has to physically take action to take it off of the table before you can discuss it again.
- Got it, okay. Yep, then it would be hold.
- Second.
- Motion by Johnson to hold. Second by **Wery** for next meeting, **Steve**?
- Yes, that'd be fine.
- And you're gonna to talk to **Galvin**, correct?
- Yes sir.
- Okay. All right, we're under discussion. All in favor?
- [All] Aye.
- Nays, motion carried. Two, consideration with possible action on a request by **Steuer** to study and report out on the feasibility of utilizing the even-odd residential address overnight parking scenario, as is done in **Milwaukee**, in order to relieve the parking problems at residences with limited parking spaces, referred from the November 5th meeting, Common Council. Any communication with **Steuer**?
- I did.
- Oh, okay, go ahead.
- Yeah, Mr. Chairman, he's out of town.
- All right.
- He said there's no particular rush on this one, so he requested if we could hold it 'til next meeting.
- Is it okay?

- Mm hm.

- Okay.

- Is it a motion? I'll second.

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

- [All] Aye.

- Nays, motion carried. Three, consideration with possible action on a request by Alderman Wery to review how sidewalk replacements are funded, with staff reporting back to Improvement and Services Committee, how the 10 largest communities in Wisconsin handle repairing damage caused by any means to sidewalk, referred from October 29th Improvement and Services. Wery, you wanna start, or Grenier?

- Director.

- Alder Wery asked us to take a look into this. So again, what we did is we got some information for you. Not necessarily looking for action tonight, because again, there's some information here that I think everybody's gonna want to chew on a little bit. So what we did is we actually went to the 15 largest by population, trying to get a better cross section of what other folks do, and all municipalities, all 14 of the municipalities that I spoke to, if a utility contract is the reason the sidewalk was damaged, so if Wisconsin Public Services renewing gas mains, if Verizon is putting fiber optic under, every municipality immediately turned around and holds the offending party responsible for that. So what we're really left with is tree damage, or things like tree damage, and everything else. So if because the city has a tree there in Green Bay, the city picks up the cost for tree damaged walk, whereas the property owner is responsible for all other types of damage to the sidewalk. So that was the kind of the breakdown that we did with the other municipalities. And if you take a look at the information that we gave you, it's kind of all over the board. Milwaukee sets up an annual program, and I think they have two aldermanic districts per year in the program. So they have more of a routine, go around the city kind of thing. And if you're in the program, it's a 50/50 cost share whether it's tree damage or not. If you're outside of the program, they do not have a complaint based program, if you're outside of the program and you want sidewalk replaced, it's 100% property owner cost. Madison also has a program. 50/50 cost if you're in the program. If the property owner elects, it's a 50/50 cost share in the program if you let the city do the work. If the property owner goes out and hires a contractor, it's 100% property owner cost. If you're not in the program, and you identify that there's damaged walk that needs to be addressed, first you have to contact engineering, they have to come out and agree to it, but if they agree that it does, they will offer a rebate as part of the cost. So kinda similar to what we do here. And that's the same whether it's tree damage or not. Of course Green Bay, tree damage we pay, anything else, property owner does. Kenosha is the same as Green Bay. Racine it's 100% property owner cost no matter what, tree damage or not. Appleton is just the opposite, it's 100% city cost, tree damage or not. Waukesha is the same as Green Bay, the city pays for trees, property owner pays for everything else. Oshkosh is 100% property owner cost. Eau Claire is 100% property owner cost for the new walk, but the city will dispose of the old concrete regardless of tree damage or not. Janesville is 100% property owner cost, the city doesn't pick up anything. West Allis and La Crosse, both 100% city cost. Sheboygan, if it's tree damage, they'll offer a 40% rebate, 40% of the cost is picked up by the city, 60% by the property owner for the first two sidewalk panels, and 100% thereafter, non-tree damage is 100% property owner cost. Wauwatosa offers a 33% discount if it's tree damage, regardless of how much, and 100% property owner cost if not tree damage. Fond du Lac, it's a 50/50 cost split between the property owner and the city for tree damaged walk, and non-tree

damaged walk is 100% property owner cost. So again, how that may impact how our funding is currently set up, I would imagine you guys are gonna want to take a look at this and kinda come up with it, but I at least wanted to get the information and get the process started for you. At least you have the information to work from.

- Appreciate it.

- Wery.

- It's excellent information. I do think it can go hand in hand with the other item.

- Which is why we kinda tried to keep 'em together.

- Yeah. I'd make a motion to hold it until the next meeting so we can handle both these at the same time.

- Hang on, okay, you wanna hold what, both what? One and three?

- Yeah.

- Well, three, one's already held.

- Right, so you wanna, okay, that's what you're talking about.

- And keep 'em on the same track.

- Okay, Wery made a motion to hold. Johnson second?

- Just a question.

- Hang on, I need a second.

- I'll second it for discussion.

- Okay, you've got the floor.

- Steve, would it be possible to get some data, and I apologize, I, through a quick scan I guess, and I maybe not immediately seeing it in your other report, but how much sidewalk we currently repair each year, do have like maybe last five years worth of data?

- Yes we do.

- I just think that would be useful information to see as well, so we know what we are repairing versus what we anticipate through--

- We're currently averaging about, one year we inspected 21,000 lineal feet. But that was an oddity. We're averaging I think about 8,000 lineal feet, which translates to about 40,000 square feet.

- Oh, is that's what here, total sidewalk inspected?

- No, no, no.

- No?

- That information is not in there. We referred to looking at it, but we didn't give it to you. So I think we're at about 8,300 lineal feet a year that we're inspecting, at five feet wide that comes out to about 41,500 square feet a year that we're doing inspections on. Of that, 10.6% is city funded, so that comes out to about 4,400 square feet. That can't be right.

- And I don't need the numbers now, Steve. If you've got that for the next meeting, that's helpful.

- We've been letting contracts in the, Now the contract total isn't... Isn't reflective of city outlay, because more often than not the contract has both the city funded and the non-city funded, and we invoice the property owners back. But this year's program was a typical program, and I think we're in about the \$300,000.00 range. Of that about 1/3 is city funded, so about \$100,000.00 of city funding and about \$200,000.00 worth of--

- Would that program take into consideration people who do it on their own?

- No, but that's a very, very small percentage of people.

- Okay.

- It's exceedingly rare that somebody does it without, they just find, number one, they have a tough time getting the concrete contractor. Number two, when they do get a quote, the quote's typically aren't as low as ours because of the volume we're doing.

- Okay. And then, how would you say those numbers compare to, looking at comparable city like Appleton, right, and again, recognizing their program's different, but how would you say their volume compares to ours? Because again, they're on a proactive schedule, we're on a reactive, so if we're going to even have that discussion, it would be nice to see what a comparably sized city does.

- Yeah, we're... We're in the same neighborhood total expenditure as what they are. And they're on about a 22 year cycle right now. And again, part of ours is... part of ours is city funded, part of it is not.

- Right.

- They have a little bit more walk than we do. They're up over 400 miles, about 420 I believe, versus the 370, 380 that we have. So there is some minor differences there. And again, taking all that into account, that's kinda why I took a look at the \$300,000.00 range for the proactive program is, if we were to... if we were to look at... Not bonding too much money for it, but not going to a 22 year cycle, I wanted to cut that cycle down a little bit. So, to be honest with you, I was kind of just synthesizing some numbers and I'm sure in your business, you just, you tend to look at some things. and you don't necessarily have an answer in mind when you go in, but as you're looking at it, a number pops into your head, and you say, let's try this, okay, that's kind of what happened. I'm looking at what Appleton is spending, what their return cycle is, how much they're paying for, how much we would expect to pay for, does the program change or not? And assuming the program didn't change, let's take a look at 300, 350, somewhere in there, and \$300,000.00 came out at a 15 year program cycle, and I thought, if we're gonna make a change in the program, I would think 22 years is probably not acceptable, but 15 might be. So that's kinda got to where I was.

- Okay. So then you had mentioned that contractors wouldn't be able to keep up with this pace. Do you have like a number in your mind in terms of what they could keep up with? And is that purely anecdotal?

- Between \$300,000.00 and \$400,000.00, we're pushing the envelope. We have about a \$300,000.00 program this year, and I don't think we're gonna finish it.

- Okay. And then, just one last thing, and Alder Wery, this is completely up to you, but recognizing that these go hand in hand, do we need to keep these separate items moving forward, or could we potentially receive and place this on file, and use this data with the initial item? With Galvin's item.

- I'm fine with that.

- Okay, just to condense them.

- Okay.

- Yeah.

- Do we just make a motion to merge this item with number one, and then bring it back?

- We could. The only issue with that is both items, we then put that together, and we're going to wind up with something that's rather wordy.

- Are you looking for--

- 'Cause really there's no, this is more informational to be used later, which would be in here, so we can receive and place on file.

- Potentially, it could change how we fund sidewalks, which is why I want to keep it separate. But, if that potential change is something that can be addressed under Galvin's communication, I'm okay with that. I don't want you to lose your communication either.

- Well, I think that's fine.

- It's up to you. I would use this info in making a decision.

- I'll just make a motion to receive and place on file, with the caveat that this information be included with the prior agenda item.

- Second.

- Okay, Wery has motioned, second by Johnson. Under discussion? All in favor?

- [All] Aye.

- Nays, motion carried. Okay, four, consideration with possible action on the review and approval of 2020 Storm Water Utility rates. Steve Grenier.

- Okay, well this one is pretty straightforward because we took care of most of it at the budget hearing last week. With the expenses that are incurred by the stormwater utility, the rate is simply taking the expenditures divided by the number of ERUs. And that comes out to a dollar

per ERU. So these numbers came directly out of the budget as adopted. So total expenditures are \$9,430,720.00. We do anticipate applying interest revenue. As that money comes in during the course of the year, Diana takes and shoves that into a segregated account and the interest that's generated off of that, we get to apply back against for, essentially applying surplus, if you want to think of it that way, to help keep the cost down. This past year, it generated about \$75,000.00. So it's not chump change, we do want to recognize that and take that into account with keeping the rates low, so we've subtracted the \$75,000.00 off. That nets us out at \$9,355,720.00, divided by 79,250 ERUs, that brings the ERU charge per year to 118.05, or \$9.84 per month. I made a mistake, I was off by about \$7,000.00, \$7,500.00, during the budget discussions, which is why the numbers presented tonight by Matt Heckenlaible are slightly different than the ones that I had given during the joint Personnel Finance Committee. So we are talking about going from 92.12 per ERU this past year in 2019, up to 118.05.

- Any questions. And if, oh, Johnson.

- Steve, when I'm looking at these numbers, I'm looking at, you know when we're looking at the rate, four years ago it's \$5.87, the new proposed rate, \$9.84, represents a 65% increase in four years. And when I look at the total, like the dollar volume, in the last 10 years we're looking at a 95% increase.

- Mm hm.

- Can you, other than the transfer of the Forestry Department this year, what other things have contributed to such a steep increase?

- Two things in particular. Number one, transfer to capital. That's what the stormwater utility pays for accommodation of storm sewer replacement and upgrades on street projects. And stormwater management devices, so any ponds that we're building, except for the one going in on Basin 110 right now. Lift station upgrades, those types of projects, so capital projects, storm utility has to cover their own. What we can't cover with transfer out to capital we have to cover with debt service, not too differently that what the general levy does, but the utility has to cover their own debt service as well. So that's one of the primary items. The second one is equipment. As we have added new staff and new capabilities in the sanitary sewer, I think when we bring the sanitary, the annual sanitary reports that are submitted to DNR, we've been able to show you how we cut from a 13 year cycle to a five year cycle to get through the city and spec and clean the sanitary mains, and as a result of that, we're getting less and less backups, especially backups that are city problem. The same guys work in the sanitary section as work in the storm. We have a sewer utility and they work on both types of pipe. Those folks have continued to take the lessons they've learned on the sanitary side, and they are now applying that to the storm side because storm has been largely ignored after the years. What we're finding is a lot of our storm sewers that are surcharged, that hold water on a regular basis, they're underwater, they're working as long linear detention basins, and they're sedimenting-in on the bottom. So we're having to go in and do more proactive maintenance on those pipes to get them cleaned out so they've got the capacity and take the stormwater inflow when the storms come. In order to that we had to buy some equipment. And the combination truck that we bought this year that's used by both sanitary and storm, I think that was a million dollar piece of equipment in and of itself. So that cost is a portion both between sanitary and storm. So the equipment upgrades, equipment replacement, and then the investment in bricks and mortar infrastructure are the primary reasons that both of these have gone up. Especially on the stormwater management side of things, so ponds and proprietary devices and things like that. When we started doing work, in roughly 2002 through about 2009, the city had contracted with a consultant and they went around and did a master plan for the city and looked at where we could implement stormwater management devices. A lot of that low hanging fruit was gone by 2009, 2010. So

now we're having to buy properties which are prime development sites, and sometimes the developers are charging us premium cost just to get our hands on the property so we can put a pond on there, and... Wearing my city hat, I find fault with that. But wearing my capitalist hat, I understand where they're coming from. If I didn't waste that valuable property sticking a stormwater pond on it, they would be able to get X number of thousands of dollars for that lot to put a development project on it. And then I wear my city hat and I say, yeah, but, but for that pond, you can't do stormwater management, so none of the site is developable, I should only pay you farm field prices. So we're caught in that sometimes as well.

- How does our rate compare to other neighboring municipalities?

- Offhand I don't know.

- Close, high, low?

- I think we are high, but not excessively so. We didn't talk actual numbers, but I was at a conference down near Tomah last week with the American Public Works Association. And I was talking sidewalks among other things with a variety of folks there, and mentioned where we are this year with our stormwater because we had just come out of budget on Tuesday, and on Wednesday night I drove down to Tomah for the conference. So things were fresh in my head. I was talking to a couple of folks, I know I had discussed with, I don't think Madison is necessarily a good comparison because they're so urban, but had a conversation with Janesville, was talking with De Pere, somebody from Sheboygan. Wisconsin Rapids, Fox Point, but again, that's suburban Milwaukee, I don't think that's really comparable. A few other municipalities, Oshkosh. And when I mentioned that we were going from 92.12 to 118.00, by and large most of the guys said, oh, man, I didn't realize that you were that low before, but boy you made a jump, that's a little on the stiff side. So I think a city comparable to us in development characteristics and so on, we would probably be in about the 107, 110 range, I'm guessing, which is about where we had been projecting it until Forestry. So a little more than, give or take, about half, maybe a little less than half of the increase this year was, it's going from 92 to 102 to 112 to 118, maybe 35, 40% of the rate increase was due to the Forestry issue. The rest of it was because of the needs of the stormwater utility.

- Do you have, and I understand you don't have it now, and we're gonna take action on this today, this goes to full council, right?

- Yes.

- Do you have the rates for nearby municipalities in your office somewhere?

- No, I don't. We would have to reach out.

- Okay, so they're not published somewhere where they're easily accessible.

- Not to the best of my knowledge, unless other municipalities have it in their budget books as well.

- Sure, all right. I'm good, thank you.

- Alderman Wery.

- Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I did have a question on the dike maintenance, it looks like we had \$5,000.00 in there, and that was the same maybe last year. Is there a program right now, we're

systematically inspecting and repairing the dike, or is this for, is this what that's used for? Dike maintenance?

- That's what that is for. We actually had a little bit more than that last year, to do the inspection, so this is to continue the inspection. If it turns in to an actual repair project, then we'll take that out of capital. Yeah, the guys, staff has been working with East Shore Neighborhood Association and things like that. We understand how concerned they are, and so are we.

- Is there a lot of damage that we've found out there?

- More so due to ice shove, which considering last winter, wasn't--

- Bad?

- We did find some issues where neighbors had modified the dike over time, so simply mentioning, hey, not so good, you weren't supposed to do that, put it back the way it was, and we're getting more voluntary compliance. More so than I thought we would. And then some of it is due to trees growing through the dike, so we've got a future project to go out there and eliminate the trees. We're gonna cut the trees down so they don't continue to grow. We're not so sure what we're gonna do with the root system that's already in the dike, we may do more damage by trying to dig it out. Instead let the tree roots decompose, settle back down and then infill overtime in the future, maybe the better way to go? We're still evaluating that as well. Yeah, the maintenance, it's more dike inspection than maintenance.

- Because I was just wondering, it's a low number, if there's actually--

- Yeah, no, the actual maintenance would come out of capital projects.

- And that was next question, and you had mentioned the capital projects. In 2016 it was 1.4 million, and then next year would be 3.1. That's more than double.

- Yep.

- Are there that many that you mention--

- Well, we're anticipating the 106, lift station's gonna go well over a million dollars in and of itself.

- That would be, okay.

- Yep.

- Are there any other flooding issues being addressed with this?

- Any of the flooding issues. Anything that we're doing comes outta this. Now what we've done with a couple of locations, we're going to be doing for the Antoinette sewer, we're gonna get down in there and try to get a flap gate installed to try to stop the river from back flowing, but by doing that, the water's not going to flow out very easily either, so we're putting a small pump in there to try to keep the pipe dry in between. It's not big enough to handle the big rush of water that comes in, but hopefully it will be able to create some storage to initially get that water in there, and then get it pumped back out over time until we can come up with a bigger system.

- Did we come to a resolution about some of the flooding on Main Street, was that an option?
- Nope, the consultant--
- Okay.
- The consultant is still working, matter of fact, I just talked to the consultant while we were down in Tomah as well.
- Okay, 'cause I know we were talking about something by Cass, there was like a--
- Yeah, what they're doing is they're putting the final numbers together on a cost estimate.
- Okay.
- What we're looking at is from the dead low between the Dollar Tree and the new Arby's, and Familia Dental. There is box culverts that will run all the way from that point down Main Street to Elizabeth in front of the Riverside Ballroom. And we're talking in the \$30, \$35 million range for something like that.
- So it was Main and Mason and Schwartz and this?
- Yep.
- This report that you--
- No, not in this one. That's in the report that Alder Wery was talking about.
- That one back in, a couple of months there.
- Yeah.
- Steve, why isn't it in the stormwater utility rates, Main and Mason?
- That would come back up in the capital improvement program.
- That'll be coming back, okay, all right. Sounds good.
- The entire budget for the stormwater utility is only \$9 million, that one project is gonna be well over 30 in itself.
- Okay, got it, I understand.
- That's all I had, thanks.
- All right, I'll entertain a motion.
- Motion to forward to Council.
- Motion to forward to--
- Unless you have a different motion, Alderman Johnson.

- I do.
- I'm not approving, I'm just forwarding it.
- Okay, my motion, I think... well let me ask you a question, Steve, if we make a motion that modifies this rate, how does that impact what you do?
- We won't have enough revenue to cover our expenses for the year.
- Let me be more specific, right, we passed a budget with the assumption that we were going to pass whatever stormwater rate was put in front of us.
- Well actually when you approved the budget, part of what you approved was the revenues. And the anticipated revenues from stormwater was in the budget, but not the rate. If we adopt a different rate, we won't make our revenue projection. We'll come up short.
- So the city will have to make--
- Somebody's gonna have to, yeah.
- Yeah. So the city budget would have to adopt for that. You'll still be able to do all the other things here. I mean, hypothetically, if I make a motion that says we're gonna reduce this by \$1.189 million, what would be the next step? It's gonna be pulled and discussed at Council.
- What do I anticipate is gonna be the next step? I'm gonna be tasked with finding a way to make that up. 'Cause the expenses have already been approved. Somebody's gonna tell me I have to figure out a way to either cut the expenses or make additional revenue, one of the two.
- I'm not sure why the Parks Department wouldn't be tasked with that.
- Not that it matters, but I'm not gonna be there. Next week is Michigan deer season, I'm leaving for vacation on Thursday morning, so, not that I don't want to have the discussion, I just want to be honest with you, I'm not gonna be there.
- No, I understand, and I think we all know how this is all going to play out, but out of principle, I'm gonna make the motion that we approve a stormwater rate of \$103.04 per year. Would that be the appropriate way to word the?
- Sure.
- 'Cause essentially what that is is it's the total amount minus the Forestry Department, and then if my math serves me right, that's what it would equate out to.
- I'll take your word for it.
- Just round it off to 104. It's up to you.
- Yeah, why don't we leave it, then the math lines up and people understand the principle behind it, so 103.04. And if the budget vote is reflective of this one it'll get reversed.
- Second.

- You got the motion, Steve?
- Yes.
- Okay, it was made by Johnson, second by Wery, under discussion? Hearing none, all in favor?
- [All] Aye.
- Nays? Motion carried. Okay, Steve, it's your report.
- Okay, three things for you quickly. Number one, I don't know if you heard or not, I'm not being facetious, I'm being serious, I don't know if you heard...
- It's snowing?
- That's Webster open.
- I can go there right now.
- You can drive north, well you can't get between Main Street and University, but from University all the way out to Madison's open.
- All right.
- \$13.3 million project that's been on the books since 2005.
- But the feds paid for that, didn't they, Steve?
- Feds paid 4.9 of it. 4.9 out of 13.3.
- Okay, well that's about a third or something.
- So, happy to have that one done. With the early snow, we had to make a decision, and the decision was just made this morning. We had to pull the fleet in, we've got them converted. Staff has assured me that by 7:00 a.m. I will have my sweet 16 ready to roll. But we had to pull the fleet in to get them ready to start plowing, we're anticipating to get three inches tomorrow, which two is our cutoff for plowing. This effectively ends our leaf collection for the year. We're not happy about it, but we've gotta do what we can. Talked to staff, although the trucks are converted, we have the ability with the tractors and the old garbage trucks, the old railroaders, we call them pans, 'cause they got the pan that lifts down. Time, weather, staff availability, equipment-related, everything's dependent, but if things allow us to do it, we're gonna continue to pick away on the piles that are out there. So we're not completely abandoning it, but we can't make any guarantees that we're gonna get any further than we've gotten already.
- Do we start over on Venus Drive, 800 block?
- Let's start with something that rhymes with great. Like eight, eight.
- I gotta have some benefit outta this job.
- You get lotsa phone calls, how's that? Do we have any of those elephant ones left, those kinda vacuum ones?

- Those actually become the least effective because once the leaves get frozen, then you don't suck anything up, and they're bonded to everything underneath. The tractors and the pans become the best things that we have. The weather's also caused some issues on our outstanding contracts. The weather we had earlier in the year, especially through late July and through the month of August has pushed the utility contracts back, the utility contractors are the ones who got delayed because of the weather. That pushed them, their completion, into what normally would have been our paving window. On a normal year when we have warm weather into the second, third week of December, it's not such a big deal, but with before Halloween we had our first snow, the asphalt plants are shutting early. We've got frozen substrate. We can't pave on frozen material. It'll jeopardize the quality of the roads. So paving contractors are shutting down early. Staff is working to get things buttoned up, but on some of the asphalt streets we have out there, we may have to get the first lift down, ramp up on the edges and around the manholes, and hold on until Spring to finish that surface list to get the product quality, and make the asphalt last. So just in case you see that, the staff is working with the paving contractors to try to get paved out if we can, but if the weather doesn't cooperate, it's gonna cause us to have prematurely failing asphalt. We'll simply get the binder down and wrap everything up and hold on 'til spring. So we just want you guys to know what's going on. That's the end of my director's report.

- Okay, motion to adjourn.

- Well, under informational, it shows November 27th, but Alder Nicholson and I were talking about that, at the County Board meeting, that's actually the day before Thanksgiving. And I don't think we have anything that's really gonna be time sensitive, so I made the recommendation to Alderman Nicholson that our next scheduled meeting would be December 11th.

- Sounds good to me. That's good input.

- Motion to adjourn.

- Motion to adjourn by Wery.

- Second.

- Second by Johnson, under discussion? Hearing none, all in favor? Nays, motion carried. We're adjourned.

- That was yours, in case you want it.

- Yeah, I need scrap paper.