



MINUTES OF THE IMPROVEMENT AND SERVICES COMMITTEE

**TUESDAY, DECEMBER 10, 2019, 4:30 PM
CITY HALL, ROOM 310**

A. ROLL CALL.

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

Others Present: Matt Heckenlaible, Chris Pirlot, Celestine Jeffreys, Tina Bunker, Gerald Schaefer, Ald. Barbara Dorff

B. APPROVAL OF THE AGENDA.

Moved by Ald. Jesse Brunette, seconded by Ald. Brian Johnson to approve the agenda of the Tuesday, December 10, 2019 Improvement and Services Committee meeting as amended to hold Item 1 to the end of the agenda and to move Item 12 after Item 5. Motion carried. Vote: Yes- Andy Nicholson, 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 of the Tuesday, November 12, 2019 Improvement and Services Committee meeting. Motion carried. Vote: Yes- Andy Nicholson, Brian Johnson, Chris Wery, Jesse Brunette, No- None, Abstain- None

D. REGULAR BUSINESS.

I. Consideration with possible action on request by Ald. Dorff on behalf of Gerald Schaefer at 1608 Sonata Drive being dissatisfied with repairs done to an area on or near his property that resulted in a sprinkler head being removed.

Moved by Ald. Chris Wery, seconded by Ald. Jesse Brunette to hold until the end of the agenda. 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 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 refer to Claims Committee the request by Ald. Dorff on behalf of Gerald Schaefer at 1608 Sonata Drive being dissatisfied with repairs done to an area on or near his property that resulted in a sprinkler head being removed . Motion carried. Vote: Yes- Andy Nicholson, Brian Johnson, Chris Wery, Jesse Brunette, No- None, Abstain- None

2. 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 (held at the November 12, 2019 Improvement and Services Committee meeting).

Moved by Ald. Chris Wery, seconded by Ald. Andy Nicholson to approve 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 per the following:

- The proposed City program would target a 15-year cycle for proactive, routine inspection and repair/replacement of City sidewalks.
- The program would be capped financially, with an initial program value of \$300,000.
- The City would be partitioned off into similarly sized areas based on sidewalk coverage from our database.
- Seasonal engineering interns would complete inspections for the area targeted in the coming year (inspect in 2020 for 2021 repair/replacement).
- The cost for the engineering interns would be covered as part of the program cost.
- Using the previous year's construction costs, sidewalk inspections would continue until the financial cap is reached, at which time the program is shut off for the year.
- Any areas cut off within the geographically targeted area for a given year would become the first inspected for the following program year.
- The existing complaint-driven program would continue largely unchanged from the existing, but would likely decrease somewhat in size over time.

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

3. Consideration with possible action on request by Ald. Nicholson for (1) review of the Department of Public Works completion date expectations with possible action, and (2) notification to the Brown County Home Builders Association about the meeting.

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

Moved by Ald. Brian Johnson, seconded by Ald. Chris Wery to hold until the January 8, 2020 Improvement and Services Committee meeting the request by Ald. Nicholson for (1) review of the Department of Public Works completion date expectations with possible action, and (2) notification to the Brown County Home Builders Association about the meeting as Department of Public Works staff will be meeting with Brown County Home Builders Association on December 12, 2019. Motion carried. Vote: Yes- Andy Nicholson, Brian Johnson, Chris Wery, Jesse Brunette, No- None, Abstain- None

4. Consideration with possible action on request by Ald. Nicholson to install a street light between 2050 and 2058 Jamesford Avenue.

Moved by Ald. Brian Johnson, seconded by Ald. Chris Wery to direct Department of Public Works staff to work with existing adjacent homeowners to acquire required easements necessary for Wisconsin Public Service to install the street light on request by Ald. Nicholson to install a street light between 2050 and 2058 Jamesford Avenue. Motion carried. Vote: Yes- Andy Nicholson, Brian Johnson, Chris Wery, Jesse Brunette, No- None, Abstain- None

5. Consideration with possible action on request by Ald. Nicholson for status update on plans to address chronic flooding in the vicinity of Main and East Mason Streets.

Moved by Ald. Andy Nicholson, seconded by Ald. Jesse Brunette to hold until the January 8, 2020 Improvement and Services Committee meeting the request by Ald. Nicholson for status update on plans to address chronic flooding in the vicinity of Main and East Mason Streets and Department of Public Works staff to report back to the Committee on feedback from designer on phasing the project. Motion carried. Vote: Yes- Andy Nicholson, Brian Johnson, Chris Wery, Jesse Brunette, No- None, Abstain- None

6. 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 (held at the November 12, 2019 Improvement and Services Committee meeting).

Moved by Ald. Brian Johnson, seconded by Ald. Chris Wery to refer to staff 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 with Department of Public Works staff creating draft ordinances that allow even-odd overnight on street parking during summer months and/or year round and present at the January 8, 2020 Improvement and Services Committee meeting. Motion carried. Vote: Yes- Brian Johnson, Chris Wery, No- Jesse Brunette, Abstain- None

7. Consideration with possible action on request by Department of Public Works to approve Amendment No. 2 for Professional Service Agreement with Ayres Associates for design contract for Haven Place and Hillcrest Drive in the amount of \$21,082.62.

Moved by Ald. Chris Wery, seconded by Ald. Jesse Brunette to approve the request by Department of Public Works to approve Amendment No. 2 for Professional Service Agreement with Ayres Associates for design contract for Haven Place and Hillcrest Drive in the amount of \$21,082.62. Motion carried. Vote: Yes- Brian Johnson, Chris Wery, Jesse Brunette, No- None, Abstain- None

8. Consideration with possible action on the review and approval of the 2020 Sanitary District rates.

Moved by Ald. Chris Wery, seconded by Ald. Jesse Brunette to approve the 2020 Sanitary District rates as provided for in the Proposed 2020 Sewer Service Charges summary. Motion carried. Vote: Yes- Brian Johnson, Chris Wery, Jesse Brunette, No- None, Abstain- None

9. Consideration with possible action on the report of the Purchasing Assistant:

A. Request approval to award the purchase of traffic signal equipment from Cisco (\$16,035.00), Neher Electric (\$1,125.50), TAPCO (\$19,218.41), Viking Electric (\$1,447.15), and Wesco (\$33,065.28).

B. Request approval to award the purchase of traffic signals to Traffic Control Corp. in the amount of \$88,419.

Moved by Ald. Brian Johnson, seconded by Ald. Chris Wery to approve the report of the Purchasing Assistant:

A. To award the purchase of traffic signal equipment from Cisco (\$16,035.00), Neher Electric (\$1,125.50), TAPCO (\$19,218.41), Viking Electric (\$1,447.15), and Wesco (\$33,065.28).

B. To award the purchase of traffic signals to Traffic Control Corp. in the amount of \$88,419.

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

10. Consideration with possible action and authorize payment for the following easement:

Baird Creek Interceptor Sewer Easement at Grandview Road

Erie Road Development, LLC \$25,725
Parcel 21-11

Moved by Ald. Chris Wery, seconded by Ald. Jesse Brunette to approve payment for the Baird Creek Interceptor Sewer Easement at Grandview Road. Motion carried. Vote: Yes- Brian Johnson, Chris Wery, Jesse Brunette, No- None, Abstain- None

11. Consideration with possible action on application for Concrete Sidewalk Builder's License by Milis Flatwork.

Moved by Ald. Chris Wery, seconded by Ald. Jesse Brunette to approve the application for Concrete Sidewalk Builder's License by Milis Flatwork pending an acceptable reference verification. Motion carried. Vote: Yes- Brian Johnson, Chris Wery, Jesse Brunette, No- None, Abstain- None

12. Consideration with possible action on request by Ald. Nicholson, on behalf of Tina Bunker, to have the City of Green Bay own and maintain the storm water management ponds as part of the Grandview subdivision(s).

Moved by Ald. Brian Johnson, seconded by Ald. Andy Nicholson to approve discussing Item 12 after Item 5. Motion carried. Vote: Yes- Andy Nicholson, Brian Johnson, Chris Wery, Jesse Brunette, No- None, Abstain- None

Ald. Jesse Brunette made a motion to deny the request but it failed due to lack of a second.

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

Moved by Ald. Brian Johnson, seconded by Ald. Andy Nicholson to hold until the January 8, 2020 Improvement and Services Committee meeting the request by Ald. Nicholson, on behalf of Tina Bunker, to have the City of Green Bay own and maintain the storm water management ponds as part of the Grandview subdivision(s). Motion carried. Vote: Yes- Andy Nicholson, Brian Johnson, Chris Wery, Jesse Brunette, 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. Jesse Brunette to receive and place on file the Director's Report on recent activities of the Public Works Department. Motion carried. Vote: Yes-

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

2. The next Improvement and Services Committee meeting is scheduled for January 15, 2020.

Moved by Ald. Chris Wery, seconded by Ald. Jesse Brunette to approve as amended with the next Improvement and Services Committee meeting being scheduled for January 8, 2020. Motion carried.

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

F. PUBLIC HEARINGS.

G. ADJOURNMENT.

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

VERBATIM MINUTES

- Meeting to order. Let me record Brunette, Nicholson, Wery, Johnson are present. Approval of the agenda?
- So moved.
- Second.
- By Brunette, second by Johnson. Under discussion? Hear none, all in favor?
- [Board] Aye.
- Motion carried. Approval of the minutes?
- Move to approve.
- Moved by Brunette.
- Second.
- Second by Wery. Under discussion, hearing none, all in favor?
- [Board] Aye.

- Nays, motion carried. Regular business. Consideration with possible action on request by Alderman Dorff on behalf of Gerald Schaefer at 1608 Sonata Drive being dissatisfied with repairs done to an area on or near his property that resulted in a sprinkler head being removed. Grenier?
- Jim received a phone call from Mr. Schaefer yesterday asking for this to be delayed 'til the end of the agenda. He has a medical appointment tonight, and he's trying to get here.
- All right. Motion to hold for end of meeting.
- So moved.
- Second.
- By Wery, second by Brunette. Under discussion, hearing none?
- [Board] Aye.
- Nays, motion carried. Okay, two, consideration with possible action on a request by Alderman Galvin for DPW to develop and implement a five-year plan to inspect sidewalks and repair or replace them to code. Director Grenier.
- Okay, at the last meeting, we provided you with a memo regarding a proposed sidewalk replacement program, and I handed out a copy of that again tonight, that, in essence, provides the framework for a possible forward-looking proactive sidewalk inspection program. Again, going to the proposed program itself, what we've looked at is a proposed program that would target a 15-year cycle for a repeat inspection repair or replacement of city sidewalks. The program would be capped financially with initial program value of \$300 thousand. That's just for the routine. We're also expecting an additional \$120 thousand for the complaint-based existing sidewalk program. The city would then be partitioned off into similarly-sized areas based on sidewalk coverage from the database. Seasonal engineering interns would be responsible to complete the inspections for the area targeted in the coming year, and this would start in 2020, so we would inspect in 2020 for a 2021 repair or replacement program. The cost for the engineering interns would be covered as part of the program cost, so using the previous year's construction cost. Sidewalk inspections would continue until the financial cap is reached, at which time we would shut the program down for the year. Any areas cut off within that geographically-targeted area for the year would then become top of the list for the following year, and the existing complaint-driven program would continue largely unchanged from existing but likely would somewhat decrease in size over time because we would be going to a more routine inspection-based program. So, again, we provided this to everybody as part of the council packet a couple of weeks ago, and it's for your consideration tonight.
- Questions?
- Director Grenier, if I look at this correctly, the amount of time that it would take in man hours to actually observe the sidewalks would be a rather large undertaking at two hundred feet per hour?
- That is correct.

- So just to even get the data that we would need to end this current program to replace the complaint-based system--
- No, no, this would be a supplement to it.
- Oh, okay.
- Right, in supplement to--
- Yes.
- Exactly, so based on that alone, unless we're willing to hire more staff, I think that that would be pretty exhaustive.
- Well, what we're anticipating doing is utilizing summer students, which are gonna be obviously at a lesser rate.
- There's no way to view this from above? It's a silly question, but like a satellite or some other?
- No, with the criteria for a pavement defect, we actually have to be able to get out there and measure it within 3/4 of an inch and vertical.
- All right, okay, thank you.
- Any other questions? Go ahead.
- Thanks, Chairman. I like it, motion to approve.
- Okay, there's a motion the floor to approve by Alderman Wery, is there a second?
- What are we approving?
- Why don't you read it? The five-year plan to inspect sidewalks and repair and replace 'em back to code.
- I think we've all had so many--
- Hang on, hang on, hang on, do we have a second? I'll second it, under discussion, Alderman Wery?
- No, I think it's well put together, and I know for a long time I've been hoping we'd have a program like this to get through the city and not just do it outta complaint-driven, so thanks, Steve, for putting it together, I like it.
- Any other questions? Johnson?
- Yeah, and I'm sorry, I'm gonna review this here real quickly, so. Okay, sorry, now that I'm getting to the last page of this report here, I see it's a 15-year cycle. I didn't know what the timing on this was. So is the intent, Steve, then, if you were to hypothetically split the city up into 15 divisions or

sections that you kinda go through one section every year, and then at the end of 15 years, you start over again?

- Yes, that's the case, and having a brief conversation with Alderman Galvin today, one of the things that I think we would be sensitive to is somebody's gonna be first and somebody's gonna be 15th, and obviously, with 15 versus 12, it's not gonna follow exactly the aldermanic districts, so what Galvin has asked is that we try to put together something that has some east and some west for each year, and then, if this were to go through, what we would do is we would, and again, the intent would be if a program were to be adopted, we would start the program in '20 for replacement in '21, so the '20 program would remain much like it has in the past, then it'd be the forward-looking, we'd actually start replacing sidewalks in 2021 under it, so that gives us a couple of months here to try to come up with a plan, what we would anticipate each year over the course of 15 years, and then get some feedback from the council to make sure that you guys agree that it's a equitable distribution around the city. We're not just gonna pick it and say, "This is the way it's gonna be," and then somebody's aggrieved because they're last on the list. We wanna get at least supply in from the council saying that it's a good way to go about it or get your suggestions to modify it.

- Okay, and so, in the future too, is there a possibility to have this kind of stuff in the packet? Just so it would be useful to be able to--

- Nope, you're 100% correct. I think what we got caught with was coming back out of the Thanksgiving holiday and some stuff got missed. All the stuff I handed out today should've been a part of the packet.

- Okay, and so one of the things that comes to mind, and I apologize if it's in here, I'm trying to get through a lot of data but, when we inspect these, we're likely going to uncover more sidewalks that are damaged by trees, I would imagine, than what we're doing right now.

- Correct.

- So there would be an added cost to repair those. Is that accounted for in here?

- That is the \$300 thousand limit. If it's a sidewalk defect that's other than by tree or something city-caused, that's the property owner's responsibility, and that wouldn't be part of this program cost.

- Don't we already budget for that right now?

- No.

- What amount do we budget now?

- Right now, just the tree-damaged or city responsibility is about 120 based on complaint.

- Okay, so we're looking to increase 120 to three hundred, we cap it at three hundred.

- Nope, increase from 120 to about 420. The 120 program, complaint program, stays exactly the way that it is right now.

- 'Cause that could be in anywhere, got it, okay. What is your take or feel in terms of local contractors' ability to respond to that additional repair?

- It is a concern. Right now, we are having trouble getting contractors to respond to our existing complaint-based program. We get one, maybe two a year responding to it. Now, obviously making a larger program, you could have some issues. What our hope is is because we're developing the program for the following year, we're gonna have those locations pretty well nailed down, whereas the existing program is a needs-based, so you're kinda jumping all over the city. Here, you're gonna be more in a geographic area, if you will, more of a condensed area, and the contractor will have the ability to go out and take a look at those sidewalks before bidding, whereas on the existing sidewalk contract, we simply send a work order and say, "It's in front of this address, go over there and fix it," so we're hoping that, because of that, we're gonna generate more interest and more ability, but you're right, there is a concern.

- And do we have any type of financial programming or resources in place that if a homeowner doesn't have the ability to pay for the repairs, is there like a revolving loan or loan fund or anything that they can tap into to assist?

- There has never been anything like that with the city, no.

- Okay, what is the average cost per cake?

- Right now, I think a replacement sidewalk is running...

- Ballpark.

- About 185, \$190?

- That's per cake?

- Per square.

- Per square, yeah.

- Yep.

- Anything else, Brian?

- Yeah, I think I'd probably support this to move forward to Council, but I'm probably gonna have a few questions, and I'm gonna maybe look to engage in before then, so.

- That's fine.

- Absolutely.

- Feel free to call.

- Thanks.

- Brunette?

- I like the idea. There are some bad sidewalks in our city. What I'm afraid of doing is endorsing a plan if we don't have the financial resources to fund it 'cause that's a whole other consideration, and if we don't have contractors within the city that are ramped up to do the work, it's almost as if we're getting ahead of ourselves a bit, so I like the idea. I kind of agree with Alder Johnson that I myself am not ready to support it at the moment, so my vote will be no, but more information, and then I'll look at this a little bit more and might turn it to a yes, but the financial resources to administer such a plan, that's no small thing. That's it.

- All right, all in favor?

- Aye.

- Nays, motion carried. One no, Brunette. OK. Moving forward, where are we, three? Consideration with possible action by Alderman Nicholson for review of the Department of Public Works completion date expectations with possible action, and, two, notification to Brown County Home Builders Association about the meeting. What is that sheet called? I thought I wrote it down.

- The certificate of occupancy? Or are you looking at the inspection memo?

- I believe the inspection memo. Yes, that.

- OK.

- Okay, when did that come out, Steve?

- Oh, that's been placed for--

- August.

- August, and Home Builders were notified and everything, Matt?

- Where this has come about is we've been having issues getting final compliance regarding DPW responsible activities, especially lawn restoration.

- Right, but was the Home Builders Association notified?

- We notified them a couple months ago. Was it August? No. But it was a couple months ago.

- They're aware.

- They're aware of it. I had a discussion with them, and then Steve is going to actually have additional follow-up conversations 'cause right now the way the ordinance reads, if something is non-compliant during the winter months, they have to put up a cash bond to get their certificate of occupancy. They are looking to see if there are other avenues that are available, such as escrows. We've always been told that lending institutions would not accept a conditional certificate of occupancy. It sounds like

that has changed and thereby opens up other avenues of allowing, I'll call it a dirty certificate of occupancy with conditions, so if they have an escrow, they can be approved then, basically showing us that there's money available to finish up sidewalks, driveways, to put in a lawn, 'cause there's, in some cases, properties on a spec home that have been not seeded for two, three years after the house has been built, and so we get complaints regarding, "Well, "why doesn't this property have to be seeded or restored?" So this is just an avenue that we are following what has been established in code decades ago.

- OK.

- And I had a conversation because the request was to notify Home Builders Association. As luck would have it, they reached out to me by letter a week ago requesting a meeting about this very topic, so I reached out to schedule a meeting. They were not aware that this communication was coming forward to the committee, and I did receive an email from Mari McAllister-Charles, who's the Executive Officer for Brown County Home Builders Association, requesting that this item be held because we're going to be meeting on it on Thursday, December 12th.

- Okay, I was gonna ask you, Steve or Matt, if there was any feedback from Brown County Home Builders Association.

- Originally, they didn't like it, but there was communication saying we would discuss it further.

- And right now the feedback we're receiving from the Home Builders Association is, "Let's have a meeting on December 12th."

- Two days.

- Yes.

- Okay, anything else, Steve?

- Nope.

- OK. There's someone from the audience that wants to speak. There's a motion by Johnson to open up for floor. For interested parties, second by Wery, under discussion, hearing none, all in favor?

- [Board] Aye.

- Nays, motion carried, okay, the floor is now open. Just raise your hand, I'll recognize you, state your name and address for the record, please.

- Tina Bunker, 825 South Huron Road, Green Bay, 54311. I sit on the Government Affairs Committee for the Brown County Home Builders, and there was no notification to us that I am aware of until this kinda came down the road. I can tell you at Johnny B Home Construction, which is my dad's company, we're extremely concerned about the costs associated to this, the surprise of it, given we have contracts under construction that don't have funds in the contract. You know, when you're building a house, a homeowner can take on certain things, like landscaping is not part of our contracts, lawns are not part of our construction contracts, and it's not possible to put them in

construction contracts because, this year, we would've never closed on any properties because it rained so much. Hardly anyone got any lawns in whatsoever, and no one's gonna pay to put a temporary lawn in just to get something down when you need an actual lawn done. I know you wanna have the construction company do it, but yet the homeowner, the owner of the property, really is just as responsible for these items, and more so than the builder if it's not described in their construction contract. As far as specs go, those end up being ultimately sold, but at Johnny B Home Construction, we are extremely concerned about the cost that this adds, both in the 20% administration fee that's noted on the form, the cost to actually obtain the bond, and then where does this money come from when, in this particular instance when there was no notification that this was gonna be happening, because the temporary certificate of occupancy we've used for many years, the precedent is that homeowner can do it in the spring, it really has taken us by surprise.

- You're on the government affairs of Brown County Housing Authority?

- Nope, the Brown County Home Builders. Brown County Home Builders. The letter came for Mari Charles. I sit on the Government Affairs Committee, and our committee was not made aware of it. I think the board was made aware of it like within the last 30 days would be my guess, but our committee, which meets monthly, was not made aware of it. We have a meeting coming up. I know you have the taskforce meeting on the 12th, and then, as a Government Affairs Committee, we have a meeting on the 18th.

- On this subject?

- It's on the agenda.

- OK. Steve, who's gonna be at the meeting for Brown County Home Builders?

- They have not told me who.

- Oh, they didn't tell you, oh, okay.

- It's with that taskforce.

- It's the taskforce?

- Mmhmm.

- OK, all right. Anybody else, anything else? Anybody else from the audience? Okay, we'll close the floor. By Johnson, second by Wery, under discussion. Hearing none, all in favor?

- [Board] Aye.

- Nays, motion carried, the floor is now closed. Regular order of business. Johnson, Alderman Johnson?

- Yeah, Steve, how do we determine what the amount of the cash bond is?

- Based on our experience with recent construction contracts, we estimate the cost to complete the work that's necessary yet to be done, and that's the value of the cash bond.
- So if there's \$10 thousand worth of work to be done, it's a \$10 thousand cash bond?
- Correct.
- And we just sit on that? We hold it?
- We hold it until the date. We give them a completion date as well.
- So we're basically asking contractors to tie up double the amount that's required to get the job done, the amount that they're gonna have to pay to do the work and the amount of the cash bond?
- I guess I'm not following.
- Hypothetically, right, they need to put in a lawn, and it's gonna cost them \$10 thousand to do the lawn.
- That's one of the things I wanna clarify right now. We're not talking about lawns.
- What are we talking about then?
- We're talking about site stabilization, so that could be accomplished with an annual rye and annual winter, something just to turn the area green and stabilize for erosion control purposes, not the full lawn.
- Okay, so, when that's not done, and we use the cash bond to go and perform this work, who's actually performing that work?
- We would probably hire a contractor to come in and do that.
- Provided that they have not already done so.
- Right.
- The builder/contractor/homeowner has 'til X date in spring to complete the work. If they do not complete that work by said time, we will give them notice saying, "Your deadline is up. "Do you have any plans?" "Yeah, we're looking at next week." Great, if there is no plan of action, we will then move forward and do the work and utilize that cash bond to complete that work come spring.
- How many times a year would you say that this is presented as a problem?
- Since construction is booming the past two years, we could be looking at 30 occasions?
- It's basically a time-of-the-year thing. So if we get to October 1st, the ability to, we think, to get out there and get some annual temporary cover crop on that is still there, but, for whatever reason, there are several contractors who are not doing it. Likewise, if sidewalk is required, and that's kinda

where this started was we had an issue a couple years ago where there were some subdivisions, sidewalk was required as a condition of occupancy as part of the plat and the sidewalks were never installed. DPW and inspection found that. We wound up doing a research backwards over six or seven years'-worth of plats, identified a number of subdivisions where that was the case, and then we had the sidewalks ordered in, and the residents were then upset with DPW. "Why didn't you catch that as part of "getting the house approved for occupancy?" So we went back, took a look at the ordinance, and tried to figure out what options were available, and this cash bond was an option that was available to us under ordinance, so that's why we started there. Now, was that the be all, end all? Absolutely not, which is why we're having a meeting. We're willing to look at things. It can be possibly done by escrowing funds, and the escrow could be something from the buyer, not necessarily from the seller, but at least that stuff is being discussed and disclosed with the buyer and the seller upfront at the point of sale. What we were finding was this was not being done by a developer or builder, and it wasn't necessarily being disclosed to the buyer, and then they were getting caught with this. So all we're trying to do is to ensure that the work that's necessary to be done is being done and that nobody is being caught unawares by it. So, again, we're open to some suggestions on getting to that goal.

- Yeah, and it sounds like we're probably gonna hold this anyway, but I'm just trying to get a little more information so I better understand the issue too.

- Yep.

- And then maybe one last question that I have, when and if there's a disagreement between the builder/developer and city staff, is there an arbitration process to help resolve that difference, or is it exclusively at the decision of the staff?

- At this point, it's exclusively at the decision of the staff.

- OK. I just noticed that that was something that was not in here, and so I just kinda wanted to know how that worked. All right, thank you.

- Okay, any other questions, or do you wanna hold next meeting until they have the meeting?

- I would move to hold.

- OK. Motion by Johnson to hold until our next meeting. Second by Brunette, under discussion. Hearing none, all in favor?

- [Board] Aye.

- Nays, motion carried, moving forward. We are at consideration with possible action by Alderman Nicholson to install a street light between 2050 and 2058 Jamesford Avenue, Director Grenier?

- That's the large handout that I gave to you, the color aerial photo. As luck would have it, there's a lotta these out there. This one was actually approved back in 2002 to install that very light. When we tried to acquire the easement necessary, 'cause, in this area, on that even side of Jamesford Avenue, I guess that would be west of Bader Street, the power is in the backyards, so it goes on the back lot line, so on that corner between 2050 and 2058, if you'll look, you can see the shadow of the utility

pole down there. What we have to do is come between the houses down the lot line, install a pole in the public right-of-way up on Jamesford Avenue, and, in order to do that, we have to acquire an easement from both property owners. We were unsuccessful in acquiring the easement back in 2002, so the light was never installed. So with this one, I think, because that approval never was rescinded, I think the appropriate action would be to direct staff to attempt to acquire the easement from the current owners, and we can report it back under an item or report it back under a director's report or however you guys want to address it, but I don't think you need to act to approve it 'cause the approval never got rescinded.

- So what do we need, just a motion to--

- I think a motion to direct staff to attempt to get the easement from the current property owners at 2050 and 2058 would be appropriate.

- OK.

- So moved.

- Second.

- Moved by Wery, second by Johnson, under discussion. Hearing none, all in favor?

- [Board] Aye.

- Nays, motion carried. Five, consideration with possible action by Alderman Nicholson for the status update on plans to address chronic flooding in the vicinity of Main and East Mason Streets, Director Grenier?

- Actually, I'm gonna turn this over Matt Heckenlaible, the utility manager.

- Matt, you got the floor.

- We have an engineered solution. It's not without some challenges, and it's not without a small price tag. Ultimately, what it is is between East Mason and Lime Kiln, there are two six-foot-by-12-foot box culverts that would be installed underground. Going diagonally from Cliff Wall over to the intersection of East Mason and Main Street would be about a 60-inch diameter pipe there, and then from Lime Kiln all the way down to Baird Creek, so Elizabeth Street by the McDonald's there, there would be a six-by-12 box culvert down the middle of Main Street. There are a few sanitary sewer conflicts. One of the other engineering concerns is, by pushing all this water down that new conduit, we would potentially wipe out the shoreline of Baird's Creek by Riverside Ballroom. The other potential would be that much volume of water. The good news is that solution does take care of all the drainage issues under a design storm for both the Main Street corridor up by Family Dollar, Arby's, Familia Dental, North Shore Bank, and then the flooding up by Cliff Wall Auto, so there would be zero ponding for our design storm. Bad news, you're looking at 28 to \$30 million. That on top of flooding concerns elsewhere and projects elsewhere, preliminary borrowing that we're looking at for 2020 construction is upwards to \$36 million. Taking those numbers onto this year's budget alone, if we would just look at the debt service, we'd be adding on an additional \$35 per ERU on top of the 118 that we're at.

- Why so much, Matt?
- Because we'd be borrowing \$36 million. The debt cost is, I believe, somewhere around eight million dollars.
- No, why would it be so much for the project?
- Dyking, its overall miles.
- Okay, so it's material? A lot of it would be material?
- Well, part of it's material, part of it's the depth, and we're gonna have to go right down the center of Main Street, so we'd have to do a lotta concrete repair on Main Street.
- Okay, well, that's my question, okay. Go ahead.
- So, we have that. We had flooding last weekend up off of East Shore Circle. We could do a dyke repair, or there was discussion about possibly raising the dyke to help try and eliminate or alleviate some of the flooding that has occurred there. If we looked at raising the dyke, we're looking at another eight to \$12 million.
- That would help Main and Mason Street?
- No, no.
- Matt's just giving you some other projects that--
- I don't see other projects on the agenda.
- But what I'm getting at is this 28 to \$30 million project would chew up pretty much all of our capital for 2020. There would be no other projects.
- Can they do half or a quarter?
- We have a communication into the consultant. We might be able to break it out into segments. Obviously, that won't alleviate the flooding, then, in year one, year two, year three, possibly then in year four, assuming that we do it in a four-year process, but you then have pipe that is in the ground that is doing nothing but being in the ground, so, ultimately, we would need a commitment saying, "Yep, we will fund that project "in its entirety to make that go away." I ran the numbers on breaking it out into four. Instead of 36 or \$30 million, it'd be seven and 1/2 million per year. That cuts the rates, obviously. I think it was \$15 instead of the \$35.
- Can you contact the consultant, then? See what feedback he would have on that question?
- I've been in communication. The question, I guess, the council or to the committee tonight is do we want to expend, for round numbers, \$30 million to resolve a flooding issue that goes away in a couple hours? Now, yes, it impacts properties, but Antoinette is impacted for different projects,

Shawano Avenue is impacted different projects, East Shore Circle is impacted probably. We have other projects, other problems. Do we tie up that amount of capital?

- Well, first of all, it's not a couple hours. I can guarantee you that, Matt, so that's not true. I know it would affect other projects. What other projects affect that? So that's the argument. What I would like to see is just to hold this for the next meeting and just have that feedback from the consultant on that question.

- Can we break it up into multiple sections?

- And then see what he says, and then we'll make our decision then. That would be my wishes.

- The only other thing that I would ask that you guys keep in the back of your mind is, again, we're bringing that storm sewer up to our current design standard. Actually, we're coming a little bit above. We decided rather than take it up to a one-in-10 storm, we decided to bring it up to a one-in-25 storm, but that means we're only bringing it up to a one-in-25 storm. The last three major storms that we had in town that caused the flooding across the city all exceeded that design capacity, so it's gonna flood under those events anyway. It'll handle the smaller storms, but it's not gonna handle a one-in-50 storm or a one-in-100 storm, and two years ago when we had the storms in August and then again in September that caused a lotta that rampant flooding across the city, that was a one-in-500 and a one-in-750 storm. It's not gonna handle those, we're still gonna flood.

- So 500 is what?

- That's what they used to call a 500-year storm, but it's a one-in-500 chance. That just means that on any given day, it has a one-in-500 chance. You could have back-to-back one-in-500 storms.

- Right. I'd like to take care of the more common storms 'cause a common storm floods, so I guess that's my goal, so my wish is to hold it and just see if you can touch base. Pardon?

- I can potentially have information by next meeting.

- Well, I'd rather have it at the committee, then we can discuss it. Thanks, Matt, that's my wish.

- Small question.

- Yep, Johnson.

- Matt, we're looking at basically when you say the boxes, essentially what we're looking to do is tear up the street, put these boxes under the street, and that's kind of what would hold the water until it can ultimately discharge?

- That would be the south end between Lime Kiln and Mason, but once it got north of Lime Kiln, that would be a direct conduit that would be your storm sewer, so it is not holding the water, it is conveying the water.

- Right, okay, got it.

- A box culvert is simply a rectangular pipe instead of a round pipe.
- Right, but is it bigger? Is that the idea?
- It's six feet tall and 12 feet across in theory.
- So that's what I mean by it holds water too. I understand it still flows through there, but it has the capacity to hold it.
- Yeah, box culverts sometimes trips people up. They're not as familiar with them. It's a rectangular pipe instead of a round or oblong one.
- So when we're looking at this area in particular, is there any possibility of a retention pond that could serve the same purpose, and is it because there's not land or because a retention pond won't work?
- There's not adequate enough space in that area.
- What if there was?
- One of the first options that was looked at was doing underground detention for all of the East Town Mall area, taking all that water outta the equation. That was a \$20 million project to get two to three inches of relief in that flooding. We looked at doing a pond in Gagnon Park. That doesn't work. There's a space between Family Dollar and Martin Hardware. We looked at using both the park and that property. That relieves it by about six inches.
- So is it because of the location of the pond or because it's a pond?
- Location of the pond.
- OK.
- So something would have to be built right there.
- Remind me to talk to you about something.
- Now, we did bring up the option of--
- He's always going somewhere, right?
- We did look at an option of we just buy out those properties and put a pond right there. Obviously, it's not great economics, if you wanna call it that, that they just built and now we're gonna tear it down. We get that, but there's other financial penalties, if you wanna call it that, with the TIF, but, yeah, we're open to ideas. If we can find another engineered solution for less than \$28 million, the \$30 million, we're open.
- Okay, thank you.

- Any other questions? If not, I'll entertain a motion.
- I think there's one on the floor already.
- I second your motion to hold. You made a motion to hold, and I second it.
- Okay, I can't remember, but all right, all in favor?
- [Board] Aye.
- Nays, motion carried. Okay, I wanna ask the committee, I gotta leave soon. If we could bring 12 to surface here, number 12.
- Move to amend the agenda slide 12 to now.
- Second.
- Okay, motion by Johnson, move 12 to the next item of the agenda, under discussion?
- Aye.
- Aye.
- Okay, all in favor?
- Aye.
- Nays, motion carried, all right, 12. Consideration with possible action by Alder Nicholson on behalf of Tina Bunker to have the city of Green Bay own and maintain the storm water management ponds as part of the Grandview subdivisions. Director Grenier, I talked to you last week about this. Can you just elaborate what--
- Well, I reached out and had a conversation with Ms. Bunker yesterday, and what it actually is is a request that, if the city constructs the infrastructure as part of a subdivision, so we build the roads, we build the sewers, we build the water main, that the city also build the storm water management and assess those fees back against the properties benefiting. Now, I'm also gonna turn this over to Matt. Matt has a synopsis of subdivision construction dating back to the adoption of the ordinance in 2001 and whether or not this is a practice that the city has engaged in previously.
- So a brief history, our storm water management ordinance was adopted in 2001. Prior to that, easiest way to say how storm water management was handled was, "Get the water off my property "as quickly as possible and I don't wanna deal with it." In a lotta cases, that's still the mindset until they submit a plan to us and we say, "Ah, no. "You need to do storm water management." Yep, thank you. So Director Grenier stated that there was a few projects that were brought to light in his discussion with Ms. Bunker as far as where past practice may have alluded that we constructed the infrastructure and then had the developer pay a fee in lieu of because a pond existed. In 2000, McAuliffe Heights subdivision, which is over by Christa McAuliffe Park, the platting process started in 2000. The plat was recorded in February of 2001. Because the process had started in 2000, no storm

water management was required. The same thing happened with McAuliffe Heights Phase Two. That was recorded in January of '02. However, in Phase Three of the subdivision, which was done in 2003, a fee in lieu of was generated because we were anticipating having a future pond in that area. In 2002, the city constructed a storm water management pond at the intersection, our very first pond of that era, at the intersection of Huron and Sitka. A year later, Woodside Heights subdivision went in, so, for that case, a fee in lieu of was generated because we had an existing regional pond. The Huron-Sitka pond--

- Why was that pond constructed?

- That's where I'm going. The pond was not constructed for the anticipation of the subdivision. It was actually a requirement of the Huron Road, County Trunk EA, reconstruction from Mason Street up to ultimately the bridge. It was sized such that it could take development, and thereby we could then charge a fee in lieu of for the whole Woodside Heights and Star Creek Court subdivisions. 2005, Eaton Heights subdivision went in. The developer was tasked to not only design the pond but also construct the pond, of which the developer did, and finally turned that pond over to us this year, 2019. Largo Ridge subdivision has a long history. It started in about 2004 where the developer was tasked to, again, manage storm water on their site because of the subdivision. Revisions were made in 2005 and 2006. In 2007, we constructed a pond across the street on the south side of Lake Largo Drive, what we call our Brown County Farm Pond. Ultimately, in 2014, the Largo Ridge subdivision was constructed. Other projects out there, Ponds at Baird's Creek, which is on the...

- One second, Matt, I'm lost. I got Grandview subdivisions.

- Yep. Ultimately where I'm going is a history that our practice isn't so much that we build the pond. Ultimately, we have built ponds prior to some developments going in, but a lot of our ponds have been retroactive or we put the onus onto the developer, and that's where I'm just going was I have at least five subdivisions, five or six subdivisions, that we have put the onus directly on the developer. They have designed, they have built. Ultimately, they then turned them over to the city for future maintenance consideration.

- And that's what you told me, Steve, last week. Okay, all right. Anything else, Matt?

- That's a brief summary.

- Okay, thank you. Any questions?

- Motion to open the floor.

- Motion by Johnson to open up the floor, second by Wery. Under discussion, hearing none, all in favor?

- [Board] Aye.

- Nays, motion carried, okay. The floor is now open, just raise your hand, recognize you, just state your name and address for the record, please.

- Tina Bunker, 825 South Huron Road in Green Bay, 54311. One of the ponds that I have specifically mentioned to both Jim and Steve is Royal Woods Estates. Royal Woods Estates was the streets were done by the city, and, as part of that, the storm water pond was dedicated, was specifically for that subdivision, was dedicated to the city and they assessed back to the area that specifically, with Grandview Place, it's a large 240-acre subdivision. The developer is really looking to have just a very consistent look and development of the area, but ultimately there will be different builders and potentially other developers that will develop blocks more or less, so I look at it as a regional pond to facilitate the different people that will be coming in to develop, and it's very difficult to put that upfront and assess back from a developer's standpoint, but the city has the vehicle to be able to do that, so in this particular case, we are having them do the roads, and precedent is that that pond was put in and assessed back to what funnels into it, and Royal Woods Estates is an exact example of that. In my history, when the pond was done and owned by the developer, they were also putting their own roads in, so they were kind of handling all of that development on their own versus having the city to do it. That's a special assessment through the special assessment process.

- Any questions from the committee? So, okay. So, Tina, what are you looking for then?

- I'd like to see the ponds in Grandview be handled as regional ponds where we'll have them, for example, do the first one, and I imagine, in the future, those people that go in and decide to have a block done for, say, we'll have the city to come in and do the work for that, but that that storm water, it's basically a fee on that assessment that has to be paid just like your street fees and other fees that are a portion of it, that would be for that storm water management.

- Now, Matt, is that against our ordinance?

- What has happened when a subdivision gets platted, if there is a regional facility there, we can charge a fee in lieu of, and when we set the assessment rates, we also set that fee in lieu of rate, and then that is a fee that is paid upfront at the time that the plat is recorded, so it's not an assessment on the property. That is an upfront collected cost. As far as Royal Woods goes, it was a fee in lieu of, plus there was a cost to purchase property for the pond for Royal Woods.

- Okay, is that different from the Grandview subdivision?

- Grandview subdivision, we don't own the property, and there is no pond there, so.

- Royal Woods was one instance where something similar to what Tina's asking for was completed, but that's the only one we've been able to find. The other instances that she referred to in our conversation, Woodside Heights and Largo Ridge, there were regional ponds that were constructed for other purposes. Typically, as our storm water utility, we wouldn't build a pond for a residential subdivision. If we're building a pond, we're building it for a regional application for compliance with our MS4 permit, and if we can do that and build it large enough to accommodate additional future development, and we've done that. This would be something relatively new for us. If the committee wants to do something like that and have the city build the pond, then my recommendation would be, again, you're looking at adding additional costs to the storm water utility, which is gonna drive everybody's ERU costs up because the city is holding those development costs. Instead, what we would do is we would identify all properties benefiting from that pond, and we would assess back immediately, whether it's developed or not, because why should the city hold those costs? There's a cost of holding that money.

- Tina?

- And, I guess, there's so many different property owners that I think that that could be cost prohibitive. We're trying to foster development in this area, and if it could be deferred on the parcels, paid for the ones that can use it right away but deferred for the ones that have a future use for it basically.

- But by deferring, then the storm water utility is gonna have to absorb that cost, which is going to drive up the storm water utility costs. That's all I'm explaining, that deferrals work out good for the property owner, but it forces the city through the storm water utility to pay for that cost and hold that cost, and we don't get to renegotiate that, okay? If we defer an assessment, we have to borrow money, and that goes into our bonding cut, we're paying that off over 20 years and there's no ability to prepay it if somebody turned around and pays that assessment. So we get 20 years of interest on there as holding cost automatically. Again, if that's your decision, that's fine. I just want you guys to know what the financial impacts of the city are on something like that.

- Well, that's good to know. All right, Johnson?

- Is there a time sensitivity for this particular item for you?

- Well, I do have a project that I have been trying to subdivide for three years now. I'm on my second buyer of it that I have lost. My past experience with the city, I expected to follow this type of development, and I was surprised in June of this year when I was told that that was not how they were planning to handle that particular project, and I've kinda been giving these examples. Is it timely like I need this done tomorrow, no, but I would really like to be able to sell these parcels, this particular parcel, shortly after the first of the year and have that development finally get off the ground. It's been literally years that I've been trying to work through this.

- So if we held this for a month, and I'll explain why in a second, this wouldn't derail anything for you? I understand we want decisions to move quickly but--

- At this point, a month is small potatoes in the grand scheme of everything, but I do have a contract that is going to expire again shortly, and that would be coming very close to what that date is in a month.

- Question, Johnson, what are you getting at? If this is time sensitive, what are you thinking?

- Well, it goes back to the same question I had earlier, and I'm looking at this agenda item. Background is blank, recommendation is blank, fiscal impact is blank. Matt, I appreciate the background you gave us, but, boy, that's a lot of information and content to synthesize here in our heads. I still don't know what the fiscal impact is on this and still not entirely certain what the staff recommendation is. That type of stuff in written format presented to the committee ahead of time would, I think, really help us make a better decision here, and I don't wanna speak for the rest of the committee members right now, but I'm still having a tough time wrapping my brain around all this and what exactly is happening and the type of money that we're talking about. So my point is if we held this for a month and we had this information presented to us in written format that we could make a more informed decision. I know that would help me, provided it doesn't, again, derail anything that's

in place for the property owner, but, again, that's where I sit right now. I'm not sure where the rest of the committee sits.

- Well, I'll be honest with you on it, I don't know that we're gonna be able to estimate the financial impact 'cause if we change this, if we go to this as an approach, this is gonna be available to every developer out there, so anyone who's building a subdivision has the same option to have us front the money and hold it for 20 years and then piecemeal it back as the properties are developed.

- So what you're saying is this is completely, I guess, an unprecedented practice right now?

- Well, I'm not gonna say it's unprecedented. In a manner of speaking, something like this was done with an imminent development project. The developer was required to purchase 1.5 acres of land immediately adjacent to the development, dedicate that over to the public, and then we built the pond and immediately assessed it back against the resulting parcels that would benefit. What we're talking about here is potentially building a regional pond that could service 20 acres? I don't know, 10 acres? Having a limited number of single-family residential homes and then a large tract or several tracts of undeveloped farmland that will remain as undeveloped farmland. That pond would be sized big enough to handle the flow from all of it but only be assessed back against those individually-platted small lots. Any of the big lots, which are subject to future subdivision, are being requested to be deferred at which case the city's gonna have to incur that debt service and pay that off over the course of 20 years. We are the bank, we're the holding company at that point. So I think something like that, especially on this kinda scale, if it was done on one subdivision, that's one thing. If we're talking about making a policy change and doing that across the city for all developers, that's something quite different.

- Well, that's kinda what I was getting at. Is there a gap in our ordinance that needs to be tightened up to provide greater clarity on these types of transactions?

- I don't think so because, each year, we send out a letter to developers. Does the developer's letter talk about storm water management?

- Yes.

- Okay, and we identified it. As part of a subdivision, you are required to. And that's on any development or redevelopment. That's in the ordinance, it's very clear that it indicates that the developer is responsible for managing their water. Now, again, if as part of our MS4 permit, we have reason to put a large regional pond in someplace, more often than not, that is, like Huron, when Huron Road went in, we knew that there was a need to have storm water management for that road, so we put the large pond in at Huron and Sitka, and while designing that pond, somebody had the foresight to size it large enough to provide storm water management for a future subdivision on the east side of Huron Road, so then we had that pond there and there was capacity in it, so we were allowed to let somebody essentially buy in. Generally speaking with a residential subdivision, the but-for test, the only reason that that pond is required is for somebody to build the subdivision, and like, I guess, there's a parallel that I would draw, the decision was made to utilize the vehicle registration fees for reconstruction resurfacing but not for new streets, but for that subdivision, that new street wouldn't be required. There's a case to be made here that, but for the subdivision, the storm water management's not required because farmland is not subject to the storm water requirements.

- Well, and you could also make the argument that farmland doesn't pay as much in taxes as a bunch of new homes.
- Correct, yep.
- And we should maybe figure out a way to make that happen. Is storm water fees the way that we fund this right now, or is TIF an option?
- That you would have to discuss with--
- New land development?
- Yeah.
- Tina?
- Could I please describe Royal Woods Estates? So, Royal Woods Estates was done in two parts. It was about 20 acres, and it was done exactly like what I'm asking here where a part of it was put in, and there was no timing on a second phase, which was done two to three years later, I believe that second phase was done. So, yes, it sat out there. There really has not been a lot of development over the last 10 years, and a lotta that was done privately, so I think that this is a precedent that one would look to as to how this has been handled in the past. If you look, permits are down, I believe, 50%, I think, from '18 to '19 in the city of Green Bay, but they're going gangbusters. It's just so difficult to get anything done right now, and other municipalities are looking for ways to help them versus looking for ways to hinder growth.
- Any questions from the committee for Tina Bunker? Do you have anything else, Tina?
- Motion to close the floor.
- Motion to close the floor.
- Second.
- Regular order of business by Johnson, second by Brunette. Under discussion, hearing none, all in favor, nays, motion carried, okay, what are the wishes of the committee? We're in regular order of business.
- I make a motion to deny.
- Okay, there's a motion on the floor to deny, is there a second? Failed for a second, entertain a motion.
- Mr. Chairman, I did like the idea, as Alder Johnson stated, if we could get a little bit more detail in writing. Great information, but it was flying pretty fast and furious and understood most of it but .
- Well, I found out about it this morning, so I quickly--

- No, and you did a great--

- Threw information down.

- Great job, but I really wanna make an informed decision on this 'cause it's a big one. It's a big policy change and it affects quite a bit, so do you think you could, by our next meeting, have something down, maybe a little bit of the history, or what it would mean to change it financially? The best you can, you know, we can't get it exact, but is that what you're looking for a little bit?

- Yeah, especially on the financial side of it, because I think in the city of Green Bay, we have to find more ways to say yes, and we have to find ways to take these developments and put houses on 'em so we can tax 'em and not just sit on farm field for three years. There's just something fundamentally misguided about that, but, to your point, I need the information to make the right decision. I'm not feeling that loop is closed for me right now, so did you make the motion to hold?

- Yeah, I'll make a motion to hold--

- Motion by Wery to hold, is there a second? Second by Johnson, under discussion, Wery?

- I think you had stated earlier, but what information would you like to see, Alder Johnson? Kinda rattled off a few things.

- Honestly, if Matt compiled everything he just gave us orally, put that in writing, and I understand your point, Director Grenier, that maybe we don't have a clear vision of fiscal impact, but I think there's gotta be something that says, "Here's the things we know and here's the variables "that we can't quite pin down and here's why." That would be very useful for me, along with a staff recommendation.

- Steve, do you have all that?

- Yes, sir.

- All right, all in favor?

- [Board] Aye.

- Nays, motion carried, I gotta go. Johnson, Alderman Johnson, could you take over?

- Thank you.

- Which item are we on here?

- Actually, I'm gonna check, are you Mr. Schaefer?

- Yes.

- Okay, Mr. Schaefer has arrived.

- I'd entertain a motion to move item one to the next agenda item.
- So moved.
- Second.
- Any discussion, seeing none, all those favor, say aye.
- [Board] Aye.
- Nos, the motion carries. Item one, consideration with possible action on request by Alder Dorff on behalf of Gerald Schaefer at 1608 Sonata Drive being dissatisfied with repairs done to an area on or near his property that resulted in a sprinkler head being removed. Director Grenier.
- And, actually, this, I'm gonna defer to City Attorney Chavez.
- Thank you, so the issue we have right now is that Mr. Schaefer has actually submitted a claim against the city on this matter. It is currently pending, he submitted it on, I believe, the 19th of last month, and so it is actually be before the Claims Committee at that time or at our next meeting, which is coming up, I think, this week or next week, and so, at that time, we will be undertaking investigation, and we do a pretty thorough investigation of all of our claims that happen, and so I would recommend you hold this. I would actually recommend you refer to the Claims Committee for us to do our review on it, and if there's anything that needs to be brought to you guys we are more than happy to bring it back as an explanation of what we found as part of the process.
- OK. Alder Wery?
- Thank you, Attorney. What's the amount of the claim?
- Three hundred.
- Three hundred thousand? Or three hundred dollars?
- Three hundred dollars.
- Oh, okay. And our level was 50 thousand, right?
- 25.
- 25 thousand.
- Let's see if Mr. Schaefer would like to speak. You guys wanna open the floor?
- Before it opens, I have one for Attorney Chavez. If the gentleman does approach the committee and we say one thing or another, as a member of the committee, do you recommend we just hear what he has to say and just not state anything as a committee 'cause we oversee the claims process?

- So the way the claims ordinance is set up is, anything under \$25 thousand, the Claims Committee, since there are so many of us on it, we have final jurisdiction over that. That jurisdiction has actually been delegated to the committee itself, so that would fall on the Improvement Council's oversight anymore.
- Fair enough.
- But, at the same time, once we have an opportunity, every claimant has a different approach. Some like to be very involved in providing information to us and so if Mr. Schaefer wants to do that, we will listen to whatever he has to say, and anything that doesn't get resolved, he can bring here. The claim itself, the three hundred dollars, that would be outside of that.
- Thank you.
- So this would be a perfectly acceptable forum today to listen to Mr. Schaefer and you can take that information?
- The concern that I have is that the entire committee is not here, and so any information that I'd be relaying, it'd just be relaying that information--
- Except it's public, so Andy could get it.
- No, I get that, I get that, so that's the first one, and the second one is the purpose of the Claims Committee is to actually do this process for you all so that it takes out the political component of it.
- OK. Any other questions for Attorney Chavez? No?
- Does Alder Dorff have any?
- [Dorff] I had tried to explain via email that this is probably what would happen, that it would go to claims first, but my understanding from the last email I have from Mr. Schaefer was he wasn't gonna be here, and I didn't think I could be here, as my committee met at the same time, but then I got done earlier so I just came, so I didn't really know that he was gonna be here then. I thought he had an appointment, is that correct?
- [Schaefer] But then I called and then I was told that I could be moved to the rear of the agenda.
- [Dorff] But nobody told me that.
- [Schaefer] I know, so I didn't hear that from you, so then I heard it from somebody that I called, and so I hustled over here after my doctor's appointment. Here's the bottom line, I made the claim not on the 19th--
- [Dorff] You can't talk at them.
- [Schaefer] Well, I'm gonna increase the dollar amount if I gotta come back, my time's worth--
- [Dorff] Excuse me, Mr. Schaefer. So someone will make a motion to open the floor? OK.

- He's here. I'll make a motion to open the floor.

- I'll second that, we have a motion by Alder Wery, second by Alder Johnson to open the floor for interested parties, is there any discussion?

- Yeah. These are tough situations. I'll listen to the gentleman, I think that's our duty, but I'm not gonna comment, I'll state that upfront, so to the speaker, I'm not gonna ask questions. I'll vote to allow you to address the committee, but any decision or discussion we have, I just think it puts us at a very ethical dilemma.

- Okay, is there any discussion regarding opening the floor? Seeing none, all those in favor, say aye?

- [Board] Aye.

- Opposed, motion carries. Mr. Schaefer, if you could just please state your name and address for the record.

- [Schaefer] Sure, Gerald John Schaefer, 1608 East Sonata Drive, Green Bay, 54311. I made the claim on October 30th, not the 19th, so that's inaccurate. This has been a problem for over 19 years, okay? I've been waiting patiently for 19 years. I built the house and I was here for two things, to ask this committee to make the recommendation to the city attorney to pay me three hundred bucks, make this problem go away, and that's more than generous for the time that I sunk into me being a citizen of the Green Bay community to get something repaired, and then it eventually ended up affecting my personal property, so I was here for two things, for you guys to make the recommendation to let's get this thing ended, give me my three hundred bucks, and we'll call it fair. It's taking so much of my time that I'm tempted to amend the claim now to start charging what I typically charge my customers, and that's two hundred dollars an hour. It's beyond ridiculous. 19 years, this has been going on. I'm gonna try to keep this very high level. The theme here is it's just been nothing but a string of uncooperative behaviors for mutual benefit so that we could just take a simple problem and just get it done, work together between the city and a citizen of the community and get something fixed. It's ridiculous how this has gone on. This started in May, and we're now eight months down the road, and we're talking about a lawsuit for three hundred dollars. Totally ridiculous, it's taken 12 emails from me, 12 emails from Alderman Dorff, three emails from the city's department. Level of communication has been zip, nonexistent. I've been a project manager for 36 years, large capital project management. I'm certified, PMP certified by PMI. I have done very, very large projects. I've personally been involved in the construction of over two hundred homes. I personally held a contractor's license in this very city. I built my own house three times. I built spec homes. I was raised in the building business, and when I get lectured from the department about permitting and did I have the proper permits for a sprinkler? Yeah, I did. There was nothing but a series of failures to success, I call it, from Mr. Grenier's department, and it goes back to day one. I'll just hit the highlights. I got photographs and everything. Communication's been nonexistent, very poor. I called the city in May, coming out. I fixed this sprinkler head. Just about every house in my neighborhood, out in Lake Largo is where I live, just about every house has a in-ground sprinkler system. When I personally sat at the counter here to get the building permits with my framer, we got the permit, we had the sewer permits, everything was done legit, okay? And when his department tells me that his records don't show that there was ever a sprinkler permit put in, I can't help that, I have to trust that it's done right, but I know I paid for 'em. I know I paid for everything. When I come to court, I'll bring the

binder, and then I'll prove it. I called the city in May. "Can you come out and take a look at this? "The sewer is busted up." I'll give you the pictures. I'll give you the pictures right now, you can take a look at it. I'll give you all my evidence, and then it'll be really, really easy for you guys to defend your case. The pictures are so obvious, it's ridiculous. I don't even need these back. This is them. This is the original condition. It's so busted up, the water won't even go in the sewer. Then the city comes out and they decide to do a repair, and they pour liquid tar in a two-inch gap thinking they're gonna fill a two-inch gap and stop the water from going behind the curb. In the meantime, it's sunken the ground down, and it's pulling my sprinkler head. I repaired that sprinkler head three times over 19 years. Dug out the ground, lifted up the head, put more ground in, because it's filling into the bottom of the sewer vertical and it's filling in because it's not connected right. I did that three times. I wasn't gonna do it this time. I called in early May so that we could get it all done, work together. "Guys, let me know when you're gonna fix the curb. "I'll be out there, I'll pull the sprinkler head back, "I'll dig it out myself, I'll pull it back. "Form it, pour it, I'll put it back, end of story." City comes out after numerous phone calls and emails, phone calls that they never respond to anything, so then I result to a written communication. I come home, and then that's how they scoped that out. Right there is how they scope it out, the pink paint. Whoever scoped this out can't even see that the whole pavement is busted out. I don't know if you've seen that, but that's horrible. I send an email back to the city saying, "Who's scoping this? "You agreed on to make a cut line, "and then six inches away it's still busted out?" I sent that email, "Let's do it right. "Cut it six more inches out to the side." Those yellow arrows are my arrows. If I hadn't done it, that's the job you would've got. I send that email out, no response. Like I said, three emails. Over the course of eight months, I get three emails. Come home and then that's what you see. That's what I'm gonna get for my taxes, my over seven thousand dollars a year in taxes. This is the kinda work I get, and then I get a email, the one email that I get from the director is written in a fashion looking down the nose. It was very offensive to me. Alderman Dorff heard it from me. She took the heat for the email that came like I didn't know what I was talking about. Who doesn't know what they're talking about? Look at those pictures. US Mail was complaining about it. The water was pooling there, it won't go in the drain, it goes out in the middle of the street. US Mail sends me a letter saying they're not gonna deliver to the mailbox, that I should get out there and start chopping ice in front of my mailbox because it's pooling up and it's going out on the street. I told the US Mail, the postmaster at Cofrin station, I told him, "Take it up with the city," and that's where it ended. I wish I would've saved those letters. That was like three years ago, it's still pooling up. I'm almost done. So I get home, I get home when they poured the very first time, I get out there, I get home, I showed you the pictures of where they poured the tar in there? They poured tar in a two-inch gap, and they threw a ground on top of my sprinkler head and plant grass seed. I didn't ask you guys to fix my lawn. I asked you to fix the curb. Fix the stuff you're responsible for. So you bury my sprinkler head. I couldn't even take a picture of it for my case so that when we talk and try to resolve this, I can prove that there was a sprinkler head there because it comes up later. I see the construction signs. Finally we're getting something to move. I see construction signs there, I see the spray paint, send the emails, I look at the sign, and I find out that Fischer-Ulman is the contractor. Okay, I wrote it down. Nobody calls me and says, "Hey, Gerry, it's gonna be done. "Maybe you can get out there. "Get out there with your shovel, "and maybe you can pull your sprinkler back "and get ready, we're coming." I don't get a phone call. I come home from work one day, everything's ripped out. It's ripped out so bad and so deep that I don't even know where my sprinkler, the end of the hose is anymore. So now I got a buried hose in the ground with the dirt thrown back on top of it, and now I got who knows what with water migrating back to the next sprinkler head. Now this spring, I'm gonna have to turn on the water and flood the area and find out how far back, and I have pictures of that. Now I have to find out where the hose was cut. Here's the best part. After I see that, then I called the mayor. I didn't get one phone call, "Can we work

together, Ger? "We're gonna be out there this Thursday. "We're working with Fischer-Ulman, they'll be out there." Working with them when they go out there, I woulda taken a day off to make this happen. Doesn't happen, doesn't happen. It's all torn up, I get home, surprise, surprise. It's almost like a "up yours" kind of an attitude. "'Cause we didn't have it in our records "that you had a sprinkler system there." I even forgot to mention the fact that, when they first went out there to put that tar, pour the tar in there, they plugged the drains. Without even pulling the files, I talked to Dave W from the department. I don't know his last name, but when I talked to him, they were plugged into some lateral going in there, but I have downspouts. I said, "Did you check to see where my downspouts? "I had a permit for the downspouts "to be going into the storm sewer." "Oh, no, I didn't know that." Well, why are you guys plugging laterals without checking the records for where the downspouts? I think right now it's plugged, and my downspouts in my garage are filling up against a stop, and I'm hoping the ground's taking it. I hope I don't have water pressure now on my foundation to my garage. I asked very specifically in an email, "Please answer this question." I still don't have that answer. I called the mayor's office after everything was all torn up. I talked to Jared, his assistant. I tell him the whole story, the 27 emails that started in May, we're down eight months, we have a lawsuit now for three hundred bucks, \$172, and here's the quote, \$172 for the sprinkler company, the company that installed it, to fix it. \$172, I couldn't believe it was that cheap. I rounded it off to three hundred for my time for being an associate project manager for this department to get the job done right, otherwise you woulda had it scoped wrong. It's still not done right. Like I mentioned, that plug, and I'm arguing about it. I have lost more money on this job trying to help the city and trying to work together than what it's worth, so if I have to file this \$94.50 to take it to civil court, and I waste more of her time, more of your time, we can do that, we can do that, because that's what seems to get attention around here. That's the way it looks to me, all right? Never and I guess the thing that's very interesting to me is Jared says to me, after I tell him the whole story, he said, "I was told that there was never a sprinkler there. "It was never removed. "We never removed a sprinkler outta your lawn." Somebody's lying to Jared, somebody's lying to the mayor, and it ain't me. You think I don't have anything else to do but to come here and ask for three hundred dollars for a fictitious sprinkler head? So either your subcontractors are lying to you, or your city employees are lying to you. Whoever dug out that lawn that day when I was at work, they took my sprinkler head, and I want it back, or pay me the three hundred bucks. And the best part about it is Alderman Dorff is hearing all of this chatter wondering the same thing what I'm wondering: why can't we work together? Why can't Green Bay be a city where the citizens pull together and make it a nice place? I hear Tina Bunker wanting to build up a development. I've known Tina Bunker for years. This is so frustrating, so frustrating, and then what happens when Alderman Dorff is doing her best to try to make people work together, she's telling me when the meeting is, and I get the notice for this meeting last Friday. Last Friday, I get the formal letter in the mail, and I'm supposed to drop everything and be here on Tuesday because she told me the first meeting was Wednesday. It worked fine. Then I get a letter and it's like, "Now it's Tuesday." We changed more emails again, okay, fine. Things change, okay? I get it, things change, but, all right, now I've sat here another hour. Three hundred bucks. If this goes to court, I'm very tempted to total up all my time, the 27 emails from eight months from May, I'm tempted to do that. I guess I'm done. I would like this committee to recommend that it's not worth her time to argue over three hundred bucks. That would be good value. That would be good business at this point. I'm done.

- Any questions?

- [Dorff] I just have a statement. It's true, this has gone on and on. I actually have 40 emails here that I just counted. That was just since June, and I actually talked to the city person who went and checked

on the sprinkler system, and I don't remember what her name was, but she had actually contacted then the contractor and said that she's worked with him a long time, and he said the subcontractor said he didn't see a sprinkler head. It's coming from the subcontractor that they didn't see a sprinkler head, but one is missing, and I know it's just been very frustrating for Mr. Schaefer. It has, and things are fixed now. The curb is fixed, but I also know that you guys really can't do what he's asking you to do, I understand that. I know that the process has to be the government process where it has to go to the Claims Committee. That is the only place it can go, but I understand his frustration and why he's asking you to do something that you really can't probably do, so that's all I got to say.

- I will add this, I asked both contractors. Then I found out that Feaker & Sons were involved with it. Somebody decided to cut the road up all the way to the center of the street, the center storm sewer. That's not even done right. A couple years back, that rim of that man-way sits at least two inches higher than the road. Two winters ago, the plow came through, lifted that cover up and took the cover off, and there was a big hole there, and kids were standing there waiting to get on a school bus to go to school. I called the police department non-emergency number and I said, "You got a hole in the middle of the street. "If a school bus or some other car comes through there, "their wheel's gonna go down there, "and it's gonna create an accident, "or some kid's gonna fall there, whatever." "Sir, can you stay there until a police officer comes "or until the city can put a barrel "or something in front of it?" I'm going to work! I said, "No, it's not my responsibility, I'm calling you." Then I waited for a cop and a cop sat there. This was two years ago because the sewer isn't right. You can see it in the pictures, it's sitting higher. The repair that was just made on this curb, whoever put the asphalt in there, okay, it's not right. It's still low. The water's gonna pool to the street, and it's gonna get high enough, it's gonna freeze, and then it'll run to the curb. It's already doing it now with this last freezing rain. It's still not flush, and the contractor that claims that there was no sprinkler head, I questioned them about it. "They're saying either you said it, Feaker or Fischer-Ulman. "You're saying that there was never a sprinkler head there," and they said, "We're not gonna comment on it. "If there's gonna be a lawsuit, "we're not gonna comment on it," but I said, "I don't know who the project manager was. I found out from Ulman that it was this Jennifer McCarthy, I believe, I got her name written here, and they said, "Yeah, she's really fun to work with," and that was sarcasm, and I said, "If she's the same gal "that did the road up on Lake Largo Drive at the top." A couple years ago, that intersection was done, I had to call her and ask her, "When are you gonna remove the barriers?" And she goes, "When it's all painted and striped "and everything's all done." I said, "Do you know that's been done for three weeks "and you still got barriers there?" She didn't know that. I told her she needs to get out of her seat and go look at her jobs like a real project manager.

- OK.

- [Schaefer] I'll wait.

- Yep, any questions?

- Motion to close the floor.

- Second.

- I have a motion by Alder Brunette to close the floor, second by Alder Wery, any discussion? Seeing none, all those in favor, say aye.

- [Board] Aye.
- Motion carries. Nay, motion carries. Committee, what's your pleasure?
- I'd like to defer to the judgment of the city attorney and defer it to the Claims Committee.
- As a motion?
- Yes.
- OK.
- I'll second that, and under discussion, I could?
- Yep, so we have a motion by Alder Brunette, a second by Alder Wery. Discussion, Alder Wery.
- Apologize you went through all that. Whoever's fault or whatever happened, whatever it's worth, I'm sorry you went through that.
- I appreciate that, but this is not good business, guys. I expect more for seven thousand dollars a year. I'm done.
- Thank you. And I think the correct path is to go that way, so.
- Yeah, I would agree with that. We have a process in place that's intended to protect all taxpayers, and this is the process, so I support, as well, a referral to the Claims Committee. Glad we had the opportunity for Mr. Schaefer to share what he wanted to share, but I do think we gotta follow the process.
- [Dorff] Thank you.
- Any further discussion? All right, all those in favor, say aye.
- [Board] Aye.
- Opposed, motion carries. We are onto item six, consideration with possible action on request by Alder 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, held at the November 12th, 2019 Improvement and Services Committee meeting.
- Hold for three years.
- What's that?
- I said hold for three years. That'd be a new motion. Just kidding, I wanted to see Mark fidget.

- Gentlemen, it's already quiet. Thank you, committee. Well, we've been talking about this for some time. Like I said, originally I brought this forward from a citizen who has a small house, in terms of it's a corner lot, single solar garage, three cars, they only have room for two, so generally it seems to be a simple city issue more than outlying areas, so I was looking at it strictly from a standpoint of trying to help out citizens as far as parking, and I was talking about the "even-odd" situation that Milwaukee has. As you can tell by the sheet I handed out, it's kind of all over the board. I guess what I'm asking for, I'm not even asking for winter parking, and a lotta cities have November 1st through March 31st as you can't park, so I think that was one of the concerns that public works had brought up and the police as well, so that's not even something I would entertain, so that's, you're talking, five months, so that's a good chunk of the year. As you can tell, there's inconsistent regulation citywide throughout Wisconsin. This is just 16 cities that I looked at. I think some of the concerns were about other folks parking in front of your house with this "even-odd" scenario. My thought is this, is that if you have a parking permit, one parking ticket is, Steve, what is it, \$27.50 for an overnight parking ticket?

- 27 right now.

- 27? So if you had one, maybe two parking tickets, the permit would cover that, so a lotta folks are getting parking tickets, and I think people would rather pay for a permit. I think some folks are also complaining, and I know the police have brought this up too, about junked cars or maybe there would be someone homeless living in a car in front of your house. I think one of the situations that I'd look at is that, if you have a permit in your car, that maybe there was something that could be stated that it would be in front of your house, and then across the street if it was an "even-odd" type of thing. If you don't have a permit, then you'd go through the same situation. You'd be ticketed or towed or what have you or cited. So I don't buy that in that sense. I did call the City of Milwaukee Parking Utility, and they mentioned that, last year, they raised \$4.5 million in revenues from this system, and Green Bay being about 1/6 the size of Milwaukee, that would be roughly \$750 thousand or a little bit more that possibly could be raised in revenue. As you know, with the contentious budget that we had this year, one of the things I've stated that I will try to do is look at other ways to bring revenues in the city, so this is a secondary factor that comes into play, not just from the people who are parking and have issues that way, but also looking at it as a revenue source. Like I said before, most cities I looked at prohibit winter parking, so, like I said, November 1st through March 31st, I'm fine with that. That's five months outta the year. That's almost half the year. I think I kinda stated it. Going through each of the websites, it's a little difficult sometimes. They're not very clear. Some of 'em are clearer than others, but generally speaking, with overnight parking, it's usually a 2:30 to six or two to five in the morning, that type of thing, and I know that Milwaukee where I grew up had the "even-odd" and I think that's another reason I brought it forward because Milwaukee's a much bigger city and they have other issues with parking and things like that but it seemed to work there, and of the 16 cities that I looked at, 12 of 'em had some kind of scenario that way, and some of these are older communities, some are in newer communities, and I've heard direct from and Chief Smith speak about this at length, and I've heard it, and I understand their side of it. I'm not waving the flag and saying, "Well, "if it doesn't happen, I'm gonna get really upset about it." I'm just bringing this forward because I'm looking at it. This an issue, I feel, and I feel that we have an opportunity to bring some revenues into the city as well. So that's it, and I'll be here for other discussion and question, but I wanted to bring it to the committee again and see what your thoughts might be.

- What do you ultimately wanna see, Mark?

- I would like to see, I think, the "even-odd" parking scenario. It has worked in other cities. I think that it could work here, so I guess that would be my ultimate. Have it permitted so that could be 35, \$40 a year per car. I know some folks who worry about, "Well, other people are gonna park in front of my house." You could actually bring language into it that would say that maybe you park in front of your house and then across the street back and forth, rather than parking pell-mell all over the place. I don't know, maybe that opens up at a can of worms, but I'm looking at it strictly from the merit of what it is. I'm looking at "even-odd" parking. I'd say the central city definitely. When you get out to the farther regions of the west and east side, it's not an issue at all.

- What do you want the action of the committee to be today?

- Well, winter is upon us, so my thought is that it's not time-sensitive, per se. I would like to see something in place by springtime.

- My point is we don't have an ordinance in front of us or any kinda change to look at to actually vote yes or no on so is there a directive that you are seeking from staff?

- The directive that I would like to see would be for staff to, even though they were against it, so that might be difficult, but I think if the committee directed the staff to come up with a scenario that would say, "Yes, we can do an even-odd parking scenario for the city," and that there would be a fee imposed for a permit, that that would be another revenue source for the city. I would entertain that, so I don't know if that's specific enough. Do you want a little more? Like I said, it's not time-sensitive, in the sense. I would like to see something in place by spring, so I would say April 1st.

- OK. Thank you, unless you guys have questions for Mark. Staff, I know you've given your input at previous meetings. Is there additional input you'd like to provide?

- Well, in my opinion, what you would be doing is you would have to adopt a policy to allow for an on-street permitted parking program 'cause currently that's not permitted by ordinance, so, number one, you'd have to adopt a policy change, and then the second phase of that would be to prepare draft ordinance language to accomplish that, if that's the direction that you're headed.

- Committee?

- Thank you to Alder Steuer for bringing it forward again. This goes back to my time representing the 8th district, though I haven't had too many interactions with people who are really pushing for this change. From what we've been told from staff is that, when there are situations that come up, our current system carves out some level of exception that seems to work fine for most people. Understanding public policy, you're not going to make 100% of the people happy. You're probably not going to make 80 or 90% of the people happy, but, in my opinion, the system we have seems to be working fine because I haven't seen, and this is just me speaking, I haven't seen a huge outcry from the public, other than a few things I've seen on social media here and there. I think my term in office this time around, I haven't received a single phone call on overnight parking, and this has been in the media for a few times now, and so it's hard for me to push forward with something if, in my opinion, the outcry from the community is not that great for a change, and I'm also having a hard time getting past what the objections of the police department were. That, to me, is a very compelling case to keep it where it is short of a huge public discussion in order to overturn it, which hasn't happened to

this point. I'm content with keeping it as is unless we have much greater public input that I hear, so thank you.

- Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Like I said at the last meeting, I was always in favor of having some overnight parking, and last time I had some reservations. Since that time, I have done a newsletter asking everybody their opinion on it and sent out a couple hundred emails. It's a 60/40 split. 60% of respondents want it changed, 40% don't. The more passionate people are definitely in the 60%. Most people don't care or just didn't bother to comment or for them it wasn't, whatever, really. They're just, I don't know, whatever. You can tell they maybe experienced the bad results of changing it, so that's been my experience in district eight. One of the residents mentioned about Syracuse. They used to live there, so I looked up Syracuse, and they have "even-odd" parking, and they get, I don't know, 130 inches of snow year, around twice what we get, and so I reached out to Syracuse and talked to a couple different people there. They said it works fine for them. I guess back in the '80s, they used to have parking on both sides of the street, then they changed it to one and then the other to take care of snow removal. That's about all the contact I had with them, but it seemed like if it could work for them, I don't know why it couldn't work for us. I don't know about the fee, though. When I bring that up with people, they're not real happy about that idea, so I wouldn't mind sending this to staff to look at an "even-odd" parking solution, maybe with or without permits.

- And I think, to me, obviously I represent a little bit older part of the city where I do have this challenge a lot. I kinda floated the permit fee by a few people, and I don't know if we've really talked about that at length where if we've just did a permit, we didn't do "even-odd", it was just a permit only, but it would allow you to park on the street year-round, if that would potentially be an option, but I'm still having a hard time, I think, getting over the objections of saying that there's not many people that need this but then we argue that the city's gonna turn into a dumpster fire if it happens, and I'm not saying staff's making that argument. That's just some of the conversations I've had with different people, so I guess I'm just having a tough time reconciling those two arguments, and I think if this is something that could reasonably serve a number of people in our community, I think there's a lotta discussion about visitors and how sometimes the six allowances that we have don't always serve that purpose. I was looking at some place, I think it was Chicago, where they actually allow you to buy packs, and so that was interesting to me so that, if you do have visitors often, you can literally buy a pack of overnight passes, but even I was just in Chicago the other day as well or the other weekend and one of the things that they had was signs up that just said, "No parking when there's two inches or more of snow," and that's kind of a nice way, I guess, to get around the snow emergency situation is, if it's properly posted, we're gonna bring the plows through when it's two inches, which I think is our policy in residential streets right now, could that be an easy solution? So I still think, at least from my experience, that there are a number of residents that struggle with this not only from a day-to-day perspective but when they have guests, when they don't wanna drive. It's kind of what the safe park issue is intended to resolve but that didn't hit every hole either, and so I'm for continuing to explore this. It's very difficult to make decisions when you don't have an ordinance in front of you, and so it would intrigue me to at least see a draft of a possible ordinance revision.

- Thank you, that's actually a good point 'cause whatever you gentlemen decide, as far as a motion goes, I would recommend that it has some teeth to it because we've referred to staff a number of times, and we get screwed the same thing, which then compels us, as a majority, to vote against the change, so I think that's what you were trying to get from Alder Steuer is what motion can be made to actually have staff create something that we can look at and vote on, not just what their recommendation is, so that's all I had to say.

- Chris, from your experience, are you aware of other communities that take the "even-odd" discussion outta the equation, that just have a permitting structure that would allow people to park overnight?
- The only one I'm aware of is Milwaukee. I think it's \$55 a year, you can have your pass on your car.
- And the only reason I bring that up too, real quickly, Chris, is because, when you have a permitting system, I think a lotta the fear is that people may park a car and never move it. At least a permitting system gives you a way to address that. You can revoke the permit if they violate certain guidelines, a guideline being car's gotta be moved every 48 hours or whatever it might be, so that's kinda the only at least rationalization that's kinda gone through my mind.
- At the last meeting, last time it was discussed, the committee had asked for just a summary of the metro area and I agree with Alderman Steuer's online research. It is kinda hard to navigate some of their sites, so I talked in-person to our communities around us. Obviously, Green Bay, we talked to ourselves. We don't answer ourselves, but the city of De Pere, the village of Bellevue, village of Howard, village of Allouez, village of Ashwaubenon. Bellevue, Howard, Allouez, Ashwaubenon, no parking two AM to six AM except during winter months, which is basically November 1st to either March 31st or April 1st, and talking to those four villages, every single one of 'em said, and you should have a summary of it, but where I highlighted or bolded, that was their exact wording. "Exceptions are very seldom granted." "Few exceptions granted." "No exceptions granted by village." In very, very rare occurrence, Ashwaubenon, their ordinance is pretty strict. You have to submit your exception request in advance in writing to the Public Safety Department. Basically, it's don't even ask was my take on it because it's a total administrative process. City of De Pere, no parking two AM to six AM. This was kinda unique that I didn't realize. I thought it was year-round just like us. It is year-round, no parking two AM to six AM year-round, but it's only Sunday night through Thursday night, so they allow Friday night and Saturday night. Your in-laws coming in, friends coming in, that type of thing.
- I would imagine city services like street sweeping are not happening over the weekend, would that be correct?
- Generally speaking, right. And an interesting one also, just to add on, I don't mean to drag this out, Allouez, born and raised in Allouez, but I never realized this unless this is something relatively new, on your garbage day, it is no parking on your street from six AM to four PM.
- That's new because of automated.
- Yeah, so I thought that was kinda interesting, so even if it's parking allowed, if it's my garbage day, I can't park out there, so that was kinda interesting to find out, and I did a slight minimal financial impact. If we go to "even-odd", that question was also asked, basically you're getting rid of all the revenue for overnight on-street parking citations, but based on what our discussions with city of Milwaukee, they said that basically they see 30% compared to if they wouldn't allow the on-street parking. Their estimation is 30% of their citations, they'd have overnight on-street parking violation citations because of people who get confused which is the right side, which is the wrong side, so based on that assumption, that's the only thing I had to go on. Purely numbers, Parking Division

would lose \$231 thousand a year in revenue if we went to "even-odd" without a permit. If there's a permit, obviously there's revenue to compensate.

- Would you lose staff? 'Cause we'll still need to enforce it.
- We still need to enforce because there is a nighttime parking ordinance.
- But would it be less staff? I don't know how many staff you use right now.
- We only have four people. No more than three are working on any one day, and we have 46 square miles, so we pick and choose on our enforcement. If we went to a permitted system, right now, as parking manager, I know that we run at a standstill. We've talked briefly about what-if another half-time person in the office. If we went to a permit-type system where you're have more activity, revenue movement, yada yada, issuing permits, we'd have to have another full-time staff member in the office, so I can run those numbers, that's not a big deal. We can show what's the cost. I can draft ordinance text all day long. That's what we do for a living, so I can have that stuff prepared, if that's what you're asking.
- Did have a question, Chris, good information. Am I reading this right that Bellevue, Howard, Allouez, Ashwaubenon, you can park on the street overnight in summer, just not in winter?
- Correct, yes.
- And they don't have a permit aiding. They just park overnight.
- Correct, yep. Just open parking at night.
- So everybody around us except De Pere.
- Right.
- De Pere's like us except weekends are--
- Yeah, except they allow it on weekends.
- Mark, was there a reason you wanted to charge a permit fee? Just revenue?
- [Mark] Like I said, I think when I brought that up, it was more or less thinking in terms of budgetary items. I know that Milwaukee does have that, and I listened to Chris's comments about the citations versus the permits, and that's definitely a feasible thing to talk about. I'm not beholden to it. My initial reason for looking at this was for the people that have difficulty parking. That's my main priority, I think. Plan B was to look at a possible permit, you know, fee. Like I said, there are people in the central city that might not enjoy that, paying another fee. We have enough, I guess, but I think part of it is that, if you get one parking ticket, it's \$27.50 or what have you. Even if you had a \$30, that would take care of one parking ticket, and there are several folks in my district that have had numerous parking tickets over time. It's not mandatory. I just brought it forward because I thought that it would be another possibility for revenues that could be brought in. I know that, as a city government, we

provide services. We don't have a whole lot of opportunities to bring in revenues, and it was just another opportunity. What's that?

- Generally speaking, you're just for more taxes then?

- Say that into the microphone.

- [Mark] Listen, I'm not being held to the fire on that one.

- Yeah, no, I'm just teasing too. All right, all right, any further discussion?

- Yeah, I actually might change my mind a little bit on it. Why don't we just do what the surrounding communities are doing, Bellevue, Howard, Allouez, Ashwaubenon? Allow except in winter?

- For me, at least, it still doesn't solve the problem, which is individuals not necessarily having a place to park because they still have the problem in the winter.

- Well, maybe you have permitting in winter, I don't know.

- I wouldn't mind seeing a draft ordinance of an "even-odd" scenario. I think another bit of information that would be useful, I think, is, again, going back, if my memory serves me right, we only do plowing of the streets when it's two inches or more, and so how many snow events do we have a year where that occurs?

- Runs anywhere from a low of six to a high of 25?

- OK. That's a snowy year.

- Right, when we've had 'em.

- [Mark] We're not looking at winter. I'm not looking at winter, as far as parking. Was that a part of it?

- So you'd do "even-odd" just in the summer? What problem are you solving then?

- [Mark] Well, what you were bringing up was--

- You said you have residents who have a challenge. Their driveways are too small, so if you just do "even-odd" in the summer only, how are you fixing that problem for 'em?

- [Mark] Completely, right, well, like I said, after listening to what the police brought forward and Public Works, it's like anything else, you're looking at a good situation, and you're not gonna get everything you want. Like the song says, you can't always get what you want, but you're right, I haven't really thought on that one a whole lot as far as wintertime. Wintertime is a separate entity, and, as Alder Wery said, he was looking at some of the other surrounding communities and what they do. If you can correlate it to that and say, "You know, it works for them, why can't it work for us?"

- Well, I guess I disagree, Mark, in the sense that I don't think it's a separate entity. I think if we're gonna give staff a directive here, we gotta make that decision. Is winter in or out?

- [Mark] Well, I wanted to bring it to you, I gave you some of my thoughts. I'm not being held to the fire on this. I would say that I would trust the committee to come up with something. I would. Is that a good one?

- Well, maybe what I'll do, just to expedite this, I would make a motion, if that's all right with you guys, that the staff come back with a ordinance draft of "even-odd" year-round and an ordinance draft of "even-odd" just during the summers. Seems like we've got two modes of thought here, so if it's easy, Chris, just it's one or the other, yeah.

- Gotta start somewhere else, I can--

- Permit? Permit or not? Fee or not?

- I am not going to make that as part of my motion. If Mark wants to see that, he can talk with Chris and figure out how he wants to make that amendment later, if he'd like to.

- Tax man can put it in.

- So you're suggesting let's get this out first and then amend it accordingly.

- I'm suggesting I'm generally not in favor of a permit, so I'm not going to include it in my motion.

- And you have to start somewhere.

- Yep.

- Gotta start somewhere.

- So that is my motion, Alder Wery seconded. Is there any discussion? Seeing none, all those in favor, say aye.

- Aye.

- Opposed?

- No.

- Motion carries two to one. Item number seven, consideration with possible action on request by Department of Public Works to approve amendment number two for professional service agreement with Ayres Associates for design contract for Haven Place and Hillcrest Drive in the amount of \$21,082.62. Director Grenier.

- And I think what we're looking at here, this is just to finish up the Hillcrest Drive design with Ayres. Number one, there was a change in the contract completion date, which created some inefficiencies for Ayres. There was two additional design meetings above and beyond what was in the original

scoping hours, and then we had to break the project up into two separate projects as we did the resurfacing on Haven Place last year. We got Hillcrest in the program, at least, for next year. So total add was \$8,457.62, and staff recommends--

- It's 21.

- What's that?

- It's 21.

- Oh, I'm sorry, everything all in was \$21,082.62. The dollar value isn't of concern. That's below the \$25 thousand, now \$50 thousand, threshold, but we're actually amending the contract, and you guys did approve the contract's total. We're looking for approval to amend the contract.

- So moved.

- Second.

- We have a motion by Wery, a second by Brunette. Discussion, Alder Brunette.

- Yes. I want to thank Director Grenier and Mr. Brunette for bringing this forward and keeping your word. I know we had butt heads on this project from the get-go, but I was very much appreciative that this is being included and for the community's sake, I will say that, of the roads in the city, because Hillcrest does service quite a few subdivisions in that far west side, it actually is probably, in my opinion, one of the worst roads in the city and definitely in need of repair, so I just wanted to say that, thank you.

- I'll give you one of the worst but--

- It's the worst.

- I can tell you that I know there's couple of 'em over in Alder Dorff's district because they're ones that I drive to work everyday.

- It's one of the worst.

- I can tell you that the few that are in my neck of the woods.

- Thank you, though, I know it's difficult when these things come up but I appreciate you including this and moving forward, thank you.

- As long as my sidewalks get inspected first.

- Any further discussion? Seeing none, all in favor, say aye.

- [Board] Aye.

- Opposed, motion carries. Item number eight, consideration with possible action on the review and approval of the 2020 sanitary district rates, Director Grenier.
- Preface this real quickly before I turn it over to Mr. Heckenlaible. The short answer is 99% of what goes into these rates was already approved as part of the budget. Again, that's all we're doing is taking the sanitary budget and turning that into a rate that the rate-payer pays. The exception to that is we needed to wait until December, no, end of November?
- Last week Wednesday.
- Okay, last week Wednesday, whatever date that was for Green Bay Metropolitan Sewerage District NEW Water to approve their ordinance because two or three of our line items in the sanitary budget are actually pass-through costs directly from NEW Water, so once they finalize their rates, we can now finalize ours and bring that forward, so what Matt's gonna do is walk you through the information that we talk about each year, as far as the strength parameters. We've got some historical numbers and a graph showing what the rates are, and then our recommendation to approve the rates for sanitary sewage for Green Bay rate-payers for 2020.
- Love to hear about Kjeldahl nitrogen.
- TKN for short, TKN. It's one of the strength parameters. Ultimately, like Director Grenier stated, we take our budget, I put it into a 11-page spreadsheet. We take our five-year rolling average of strengths. We come up with that. This year's five-year average, for the most part, is lower than it was last year, which is a good thing in that that lowers the rates, and then ultimately we take into account influent infiltration. Unfortunately, with all the wet weather that we've had and our aging infrastructure, we have seen over two million dollars' worth of excessive flow going to the waste water treatment plant that we are getting treated as clear water, but unfortunately that clear water gets charged out at our strength rates, so we get charged that additional fee from NEW Water. Ultimately, we have to wait, as Director Grenier stated, until NEW Water passes their rates. For the most part, some parameters went down, some went up. This year, the volume charge went down by three cents. Again a positive considering we're sending excess flow there because of all the wet weather, influent infiltration. BOD, bio-oxygen demand, is up by four cents. Suspended solids is more or less an even wash. Phosphorus is up by 17 cents, and TKN is up by five cents. Running all that through the numbers or through the spreadsheet, we ultimately come up with we take everything and put it into a volumetric charge, so instead of charging everybody a volume charge, a BOD charge, a suspended solid, phosphorus, TKN charge, we just roll it into a volumetric charge. Green Bay Met's portion of a person's bill is \$3.04 per hundred cubic feet of water used. That is metered from their water meter. The city charge is \$2.17 per hundred cubic feet, and the total charge then is \$5.21. That \$5.21 is a 3.37% increase over last year's rate. The city's portion of the volume charge went up by 1.88%, and NEW Water's portion went up by 4.47%. The trend is actually a little down for this year compared to the trend line that we have been going on. NEW Water actually found some surplus money last year, and they said they were anticipating a large bump in budget this year, some odd reason, I'm not complaining. Their budget was actually fiscally responsible, in my opinion, and so we actually have favorable rates this year. So as far as a recommendation, I would request that the committee adopt the 2020 proposed rates that are on the two pages provided to you.
- Could you repeat that? No, I'm kidding. The whole thing!

- Which part? You want the abridged version or the unabridged?
- That probably was the abridged version.
- Unfortunately it was.
- Move to approve.
- Second.
- All right, we have a motion by Alder Wery, second by Alder Brunette, any discussion, seeing none, all those in favor, say aye.
- [Board] Aye.
- Opposed, motion carries. Item nine, consideration with possible action on the report of the purchasing assistant: A. Request approval to award the purchase of traffic signal equipment from Cisco, \$16,035, Neher Electric, \$1,125.50, TAPCO, \$19,218.41, Viking Electric, \$1,447.15, and Wesco, \$33,065.28.
- Included in the packet was a summary that was prepared by Becky Macco, the purchasing assistant. You'll notice Mr. Jensen is not here as he is retired, but similar to what we've done in the past, each of the individual line items and low vendor, or the six vendors responding, have identified this and gone through both the purchasing department and the electricians within DPW. Low vendors have been identified and then for each of the responding low vendors, we've grouped together what equipment would be awarded to each, and the summary dollar values have been provided to you, as read by Alder Johnson. The staff's recommendation is each of these are responsive low vendors and have successfully been with us in the past, so recommendation is to award as read.
- I read it, looked good, I'd move to approve.
- Second.
- Motion by Johnson, second by Wery, any discussion, seeing none, all those in favor, say aye.
- [Board] Aye.
- Opposed, motion carries, item B, request approval to award the purchase of traffic signals to Traffic Control Corp in the amount of \$88,419.
- Again, we've got that summarized. What you will see is there were actually three vendors responding. The low vendor, at \$83,820.72, was General Traffic Corp outta Newburgh, New York. However, we have had problems with delivery and quality issues with that vendor in the past, so they were disqualified, and Traffic Control Corp in Woodridge, Illinois came in at a low of \$88,419. Difference between them and TAPCO, TAPCO was at \$89,184, so less than a thousand dollars on \$88 thousand worth of equipment. To be honest with you, I think you see some of the issues that we were dealing with that caused us to disqualify the apparent low in their bid. This was definitely a case

where somebody low-balled something and we were gonna get less than quality materials, as they provided in the past, so recommendation would be to award to Traffic Control Corp that \$88,419.

- Steve, just a quick question. Just because I think as long as I can remember, we've always just approved the low bidder. When you sort of disqualify a bid, are there any legal ramifications for any--

- Oh, this is something we have done in the past. Absolutely, this is not the first time. The legal ramifications, as long as we have justification and documentation proving why we did not award to a low, state statute does tell you that there is no guarantee of award to a low bidder. It's to a low responsive bidder.

- Okay, and you're confident in the documentation we have.

- Yes.

- Move to approve.

- Second.

- We have a motion by Brunette, a second by Wery. Any discussion, seeing none, all those in favor, say aye.

- [Board] Aye.

- Opposed, motion carries. Item 10, consideration with possible action and authorize payment for the following easement: Baird Creek Interceptor Sewer Easement at Grandview Road, Erie Road Development, LLC, parcel 21-11, in the amount of \$25,725.

- This was also included in your packet. What we have is a sanitary sewer easement that gets us part of the way across the Grandview property. What we are acquiring is the easement to get us the rest of the way along the proposed future Rocky Arbor Trail out to Grandview Road. The sanitary interceptor will then proceed south from Grandview and that will open up the remainder of that area east of the existing I-43 industrial park. That's the proposed new TIF area. That will be able to provide sanitary sewer service to that easement that we've been looking for for a while. The price was right, so we are asking for approval of that payment on the easement so we can go ahead and get that sewer constructed in 2020.

- Move to approve.

- Second.

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

- [Board] Aye.

- Opposed, motion carries. Item number 11, consideration with possible action on application for concrete sidewalk builder's license by, is it Milis?

- Milis, yes.
- Milis Flatwork. My screen's going dark because my battery's running low.
- Our recommendation would be conditionally approve upon receipt of positive reference check.
- Motion to approve as worded.
- Second.
- Motion by Wery, second by Brunette, any discussion, seeing none, all those in favor, say aye.
- [Board] Aye.
- Opposed, motion carries. E. Informational, director's report on recent activities of the Public Works Department.
- Short report, we are out plowing, we are out scraping and working in residential roads, and we'll continue to do so until we're back at square one.
- That maybe completes it, so that's gotta be good.
- I'll take it.
- Good job.
- Last night was tricky, last night we were working.
- I had one but Chris gave me a very thorough response via email, so I really do appreciate that. That was something that it helped the constituent understand, so thank you.
- I did have one, but it wasn't my district, so I'm not going to.
- All right, entertain a motion.
- Under item two, we just wanna make a correction there. It looks like the next INS meeting is tentatively scheduled for January 8th.
- Okay, we need to first, though, in the report entertain a motion to receive a place on file.
- So moved.
- Second.
- I have a motion by Wery, second by Brunette. Any discussion, seeing none, all those in favor, say aye.
- [Board] Aye.

- Opposed, motion carries. Item two, the next Improvement and Services Committee meeting is scheduled tentatively for January 8th, 2020.
- Move to adjourn.
- Second.
- Motion by Brunette to adjourn, second by Wery. Any discussion, seeing none, all those in favor, say aye.
- [Board] Aye.
- Opposed, motion carries. We are adjourned.
- Thank you.