



MINUTES OF THE IMPROVEMENT AND SERVICES COMMITTEE

**WEDNESDAY, APRIL 29, 2020, 6:00 PM
CITY HALL**

Virtual Meeting

**Public may also view at
www.youtube.com/CityOfGreenBay**

A. ZOOM MEETING INFORMATION.

I. This item contains documents which provide call in information and instructions for the Zoom Meeting.

B. ROLL CALL.

Present: Ald. Chris Wery, Ald. Lynn Gerlach, Ald. Jesse Brunette, Ald. Randy Scannell

C. ELECTION.

I. Election of Chair and Vice-Chair.

INFORMATIONAL: Election of Ald. Chris Wery as Chair of the Improvement and Services

Committee.

INFORMATIONAL: Election of Ald. Randy Scannell as Vice-Chair of the Improvement and Services Committee.

D. APPROVAL OF THE AGENDA.

Moved by Ald. Randy Scannell, seconded by Ald. Jesse Brunette to approve the agenda of the Wednesday, April 29, 2020 Improvement and Services Committee meeting. Motion carried.

Vote: Yes- Chris Wery, Jesse Brunette, Lynn Gerlach, Randy Scannell, No- None, Abstain- None

E. APPROVAL OF MINUTES.

Moved by Ald. Randy Scannell, seconded by Ald. Jesse Brunette to approve the minutes of the Wednesday, April 8, 2020 Improvement and Services Committee meeting. Motion carried.

Vote: Yes- Chris Wery, Jesse Brunette, Lynn Gerlach, Randy Scannell, No- None, Abstain- None

F. REGULAR BUSINESS.

1. Consideration with possible action on request by Ald. Brunette to amend and update the Stormwater Utility ordinance to include and explain the impact trees have on stormwater retention and drainage, and to provide a dollar credit to property owners who have trees planted or growing on their property in order to be consistent and fair with what the majority of the Common Council passed in November 2019. If the ordinance and Equivalent Residential Unit calculations are not adjusted appropriately, then Forestry expenses should no longer be paid for by Stormwater utility rates effective January 2021.

Moved by Ald. Jesse Brunette, seconded by Ald. Randy Scannell to refer to staff to modify existing ordinance to further define pervious area in the ordinance and report back to Committee the request by Ald. Brunette to amend and update the Stormwater Utility ordinance to include and explain the impact trees have on stormwater retention and drainage, and to provide a dollar credit to property owners who have trees planted or growing on their property in order to be consistent and fair with what the majority of the Common Council passed in November 2019. If the ordinance and Equivalent Residential Unit calculations are not adjusted appropriately, then Forestry expenses should no longer be paid for by Stormwater utility rates effective January 2021. Motion carried.

Vote: Yes- Chris Wery, Jesse Brunette, Lynn Gerlach, Randy Scannell, No- None, Abstain- None

2. Consideration with possible action on request by Ald. Galvin that the current process for funding sidewalk repairs contracted by the City for residents be studied with the possibility of making changes.

Moved by Ald. Randy Scannell, seconded by Lynn Gerlach to refer to staff with staff reporting back

to Committee at the May 13, 2020 Improvement and Services Committee meeting the request by Ald. Galvin that the current process for funding sidewalk repairs contracted by the City for residents be studied with the possibility of making changes. Motion carried. Vote: Yes- Chris Wery, Jesse Brunette, Lynn Gerlach, Randy Scannell, No- None, Abstain- None

3. Consideration with possible action on request by Ald. Lefebvre to request committee to look at the issuing of a sidewalk café permit to Titledown Tobacco per Section 6.155 Green Bay Municipal Code – (1) Definitions: (a) sidewalk café is any group of tables, chairs, benches, or partitions maintained within the public right-of-way for use directly in front of an establishment with a valid restaurant license (held at the March 25, 2020 Improvement and Services Committee meeting).

Moved by Ald. Randy Scannell, seconded by Ald. Jesse Brunette to approve changes to the ordinance on request by Ald. Lefebvre to request committee to look at the issuing of a sidewalk café permit to Titledown Tobacco per Section 6.155 Green Bay Municipal Code – (1) Definitions: (a) sidewalk café is any group of tables, chairs, benches, or partitions maintained within the public right-of-way for use directly in front of an establishment with a valid restaurant license. Motion carried. Vote: Yes- Chris Wery, Jesse Brunette, Lynn Gerlach, Randy Scannell, No- None, Abstain- None

4. Consideration with possible action on request by Ald. Steuer to have the City of Green Bay look at docking facilities at Green Bay Metro Boat Launch and see about alternatives to the existing docks, including portable docking systems, such as those at Brown County facilities in Allouez and De Pere.

Moved by Ald. Randy Scannell, seconded by Ald. Jesse Brunette to open the floor for discussion. Motion carried. Vote: Yes- Chris Wery, Jesse Brunette, Lynn Gerlach, Randy Scannell, No- None, Abstain- None

Moved by Ald. Randy Scannell, seconded by Ald. Jesse Brunette to close the floor for discussion. Motion carried. Vote: Yes- Chris Wery, Jesse Brunette, Lynn Gerlach, Randy Scannell, No- None, Abstain- None

Moved by Ald. Randy Scannell, seconded by Ald. Jesse Brunette to open the floor for discussion. Motion carried. Vote: Yes- Chris Wery, Jesse Brunette, Lynn Gerlach, Randy Scannell, No- None, Abstain- None

Moved by Ald. Randy Scannell, seconded by Ald. Jesse Brunette to close the floor for discussion. Motion carried. Vote: Yes- Chris Wery, Jesse Brunette, Lynn Gerlach, Randy Scannell, No- None, Abstain- None

Moved by Ald. Randy Scannell, seconded by Ald. Jesse Brunette to receive and place on file the request by Ald. Steuer to have the City of Green Bay look at docking facilities at Green Bay Metro Boat Launch and see about alternatives to the existing docks, including portable docking systems, such as those at Brown County facilities in Allouez and De Pere. Motion carried. Vote: Yes- Chris Wery, Jesse Brunette, Lynn Gerlach, Randy Scannell, No- None, Abstain- None

5. Consideration with possible action on request by Ald. Vander Leest, on behalf of area residents, for the sink hole in the front yard of 1831 Van Oss Court near the newly installed mini storm sewer be investigated by the Public Works Department and to be fixed in the spring (referred to staff at the March 25, 2020 Improvement and Services Committee meeting).

Moved by Ald. Randy Scannell, seconded by Ald. Jesse Brunette to receive and place on file the request by Ald. Vander Leest, on behalf of area residents, for the sink hole in the front yard of 1831 Van Oss Court near the newly installed mini storm sewer be investigated by the Public Works Department and to be fixed in the spring. Motion carried. Vote: Yes- Chris Wery, Jesse Brunette, Lynn Gerlach, Randy Scannell, No- None, Abstain- None

6. Consideration with possible action on request by Ald. Wery on adjusting mini sewer hookup fees (held at the March 25, 2020 Improvement and Services Committee meeting).

Moved by Ald. Randy Scannell, seconded by Ald. Jesse Brunette to approve the request by Ald. Wery on adjusting mini sewer hookup fees to \$500. Motion carried. Vote: Yes- Chris Wery, Jesse Brunette, Randy Scannell, No- Lynn Gerlach, Abstain- None

7. Consideration with possible action on request by Ald. Wery for an update on repairs or resurfacing of Shawano Avenue (referred to staff at the March 25, 2020 Improvement and Services Committee meeting, and amended to request staff to find out from WisDOT how to get the project scheduled).

Moved by Ald. Jesse Brunette, seconded by Ald. Randy Scannell to receive and place on file the request by Ald. Wery for an update on repairs or resurfacing of Shawano Avenue, and amended to request staff to find out from WisDOT how to get the project scheduled earlier. Motion carried. Vote: Yes- Chris Wery, Jesse Brunette, Lynn Gerlach, Randy Scannell, No- None, Abstain- None

8. Consideration with possible action on request by Department of Public Works to approve single source purchase from Xylem for stormwater pumps and control panel for the Museum Place Storm Lift Station and approve the purchase of the pumps and control panel in the amount of \$123,750.

Moved by Ald. Jesse Brunette, seconded by Ald. Randy Scannell to approve the request by Department of Public Works to approve single source purchase from Xylem for stormwater pumps and control panel for the Museum Place Storm Lift Station and approve the purchase of the pumps and control panel in the amount of \$123,750. Motion carried. Vote: Yes- Chris Wery, Jesse Brunette, Lynn Gerlach, Randy Scannell, No- None, Abstain- None

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

A. Purchase of Dewatering Hoses and Pipes for new pump purchased in April 2020. RFQ #3250 was issued for this and 3 responses were received. All responses received did not meet the stated specifications as required for aluminum piping. A vendor who was able to meet specifications was sourced for a cost of \$33,361. A "No Substitute" request was submitted and approved by the Director of Public Works and the Procurement Manager (see attached).

B. Awarding Edison Park Pickleball Courts project base bid and alternate to Poblocki Paving Corporation, West Allis, WI. RFQ #3245 was issued through the Purchasing Department and one response was received. The department is recommending that the base bid and alternate are awarded for the sum of \$78,557.80.

C. Request approval to purchase annual street maintenance consumables as needed for the 2020 season and for annual budgeted expenditures from 2021-2025 from the contracted vendors as noted below.

Moved by Ald. Randy Scannell, seconded by Ald. Jesse Brunette to approve the report of the Purchasing Manager:

A. Purchase of Dewatering Hoses and Pipes for new pump purchased in April 2020. RFQ #3250 was issued for this and 3 responses were received. All responses received did not meet the stated specifications as required for aluminum piping. A vendor who was able to meet specifications was sourced for a cost of \$33,361. A "No Substitute" request was submitted and approved by the Director of Public Works and the Procurement Manager (see attached).

B. Awarding Edison Park Pickleball Courts project base bid and alternate to Poblocki Paving Corporation, West Allis, WI. RFQ #3245 was issued through the Purchasing Department and one response was received. The department is recommending that the base bid and alternate are awarded for the sum of \$78,557.80.

C. To purchase annual street maintenance consumables as needed for the 2020 season and for annual budgeted expenditures from 2021-2025 from the contracted vendors as noted below.

Motion carried. Vote; Yes- Chris Wery, Jesse Brunette, Lynn Gerlach, Randy Scannell, No- None, Abstain- None

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

A. RESURFACING 1-20

B. SEWERS 3-20 MINI SEWERS

Moved by Ald. Randy Scannell, seconded by Ald. Lynn Gerlach to approve to award the following contracts:

A. RESURFACING 1-20

Part A to the low responsive bidder, Fischer-Ulman Construction, Inc., in the amount of \$448,537.50.

Part B to the low responsive bidder, MCC, Inc., in the amount of \$1,361,814.67.

B. SEWERS 3-20 MINI SEWERS to the low responsive bidder, DeGroot, Inc., in the amount of \$324,752.50.

Motion carried. Vote: Yes- Chris Wery, Jesse Brunette, Lynn Gerlach, Randy Scannell, No- None, Abstain- None

II. Report of actions taken by Department of Public Works

A. Granting of Licenses

I. Sidewalk Builder

- a. Brian's Quality Concrete
- b. Carter Trucking & Excavating
- c. Jim Fischer, Inc.
- d. KPC Concrete Contractor LLC
- e. Loch Construction Co., Inc.
- f. Melnarik Concrete, Inc.

2. Tree & Brush Trimmer license to Bay Valley Tree Service.

3. Underground Sprinkler System to Wolfraths Landscaping LLC.

Moved by Ald. Randy Scannell, seconded by Ald. Lynn Gerlach to receive and place on file the report of actions taken by Department of Public Works. Motion carried. Vote: Yes- Chris Wery, Jesse Brunette, Lynn Gerlach, Randy Scannell, No- None, Abstain- None

G. INFORMATIONAL.

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

Moved by Ald. Randy Scannell, 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- Chris Wery, Jesse Brunette, Lynn Gerlach, Randy Scannell, No- None, Abstain- None

2. The next Improvement and Services Committee meeting is scheduled for May 13, 2020.

H. PUBLIC HEARINGS.

I. ADJOURNMENT.

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

VERBATIM MINUTES

- So we'll call to order the meeting of the Improvement Service Committee for Wednesday, April 29, 2020. Role call, Alder Gerlach. Alder Scannell. I see Alder Scannell, I just don't hear him.

- That's not a bad thing. Unmute Randy, unmute.

- Unmute.

- Unmute.

- Alder Gerlach is on mute as well.

- I think she just--

- Now I'm muted. I just wasn't here. I needed to take a break.

- Okay. Alder Wery.

- I'm here now.

- Alder Wery and Alder Brunette.

- Yes.

- Present.

- Okay. Election, election of chair.

- I move to nominate Alder Wery for chair.

- Are there any other nominees? Excuse me?

- We don't need a second, right?
- No.
- Correct. If Alderman Wery accepts that nomination, that automatically becomes the second. So are there any other nominations from the floor? If not, you have the ability to cast a unanimous ballot or we can do a role call vote.
- Unanimous ballot.
- Unanimous consent?
- Sure.
- Yes sir.
- With no objection then, congratulations Alder Wery you are the Chair of the Improvement Service Committee and you may take the thing from here, sir.
- Thank you Steve. Well done. Next is the election of the Vice Chair. Can I have a nomination?
- I nominate Alder Scannell if he'd like to take the responsibility.
- I accept the responsibility.
- All right, I have a nomination for Alder Scannell. Any other nominations? Any other? Any other nominations? All right. Those in favor of Alder Scannell being the Vice Chair.
- Aye.
- Aye.
- Say aye. Opposed? Motion carried. And, onto the approval of the minutes. First I wanted to welcome, I didn't mention it last time but Lynn, Alder Gerlach, right? I wanna say that right every time.
- Very good, thank you.
- Gerlach, okay. It's almost like you wanna say Gerlach.
- No please don't.
- Okay. Approval of the agenda.
- So moved.
- Second.

- Motion by Scannell, second by Brunette to approve the agenda. Any discussion or changes? Those in favor.

- Aye.

- Aye.

- Opposed? Motion carried. E, approval of the minutes.

- So moved.

- Any wishes?

- So moved.

- Second.

- Motion by Scannell, second by Brunette to approve the minutes. Any discussion? Those in favor.

- Aye.

- Aye.

- Aye

- Opposed? That carried. Regular business. One, at least everybody writes nice, short ones. Way to go Jesse. Consideration with possible action on request by Alder Brunette to amend and update the stormwater utility ordinance to include and explain the impact trees have on storm water retention and drainage and to provide a dollar credit to property owners who have trees planted or growing on their property in order to be consistent and fair with what the majority of the common council passed in November 2019. If the ordinance and equivalent residential unit calculations are not adjusted appropriately, then forest re-expanses should no longer be paid for by storm water utility rates effective January 2021. Alderman Brunette.

- Yes, thank you Chairman Wery. I don't really wanna rehash history with the budget but one thing that I didn't feel comfortable with at the time was the move of forestry expenses to the stormwater utility rates. I mean, that vote was that vote but what I was concerned about was to be consistent with the authority the Improvement and Service Committee has on stormwater policy and the ordinance, that should have appeared before the committee before it was voted on in that manner. So my motion, or my agenda item is so that our staff, you know, Mr. Grenier and his staff, look to amend the stormwater utility ordinance. Director Grenier, the latest one that I could find on our website was amended December 2016. Was that the most recent one that has been amended?

- I would actually have to defer to law to find that out. I'm not sure. They are the ones who keep the updates for the ordinance.

- That's fine. And so what I'd say is that I reviewed the ordinance yet again. I did it twice at the time of the budget and I did it again today and the word trees doesn't appear a single time in that entire

ordinance. So, again, I've read literature that supports that trees absorb stormwater. Not disputing that fact. But if that was the basis for moving that expense to the utility, we need to update the ordinance so that it's fair and it really should come through this committee for a real good discussion. The second part of that, in my district specifically, I have a whole lot of trees people have planted. It's a very wooded area. And so, if we're going to, you know, in a way penalize them might not be the right word but for property owners that have a lot of impervious area, roof lines, driveways, sidewalks, anything with a surface that does not absorb water, if that helps determine the amount of money they pay to the stormwater bill, then if trees absorb stormwater, we need to develop a system with the ordinance that I'm proposing. We need to be able to say that to those homeowners that have trees, they should get a credit on their stormwater bill. You can't have it both ways. We can't say that trees absorb stormwater but then not give people a credit for the trees that they have on their property. So that's the basis for this. This hasn't really sat well with me for the last few months and I just think as a committee we really need to discuss this and amend the ordinance for the sake of transparency. So that's my soap box that I'll jump off of for the moment. If Director Grenier wants to respond to that or has questions for me, I'd be happy to answer them.

- All right thank you, Alderman. Director Grenier?

- Ah yes, as a matter of fact, the way the ordinance is written, the ERU is, it's not an equivalent residential. It's an equivalent run off unit. So what we're measuring is impervious areas. So any area that has the ability to absorb stormwater, be it grass or tree, if it's a vegetated area, there is no charge to the property owner for that. So let's say you you have a residential lot that's all planted in grass or all planted in trees, the way the ordinance addresses that is you don't get charged the stormwater fee for that because there's no impervious area. The more impervious area that you have on the parcel, the more ERUs you have and the more in stormwater you charge. The reason that trees aren't included in the ordinance is because it's inherently a credit or a no dollar charge under the ordinance as it sits. Three credits that are provided to ERUs, the utility can provide credits for an ERU determination for non-residential properties if they're discharging stormwater directly to the waters of Green Bay, the Fox River, or the East River, they will get a two thirds ERU for doing a direct discharge, not flowing through the city system, a 10% credit in the number of ERUs for properties that provide privately constructed and maintained detention or retention facilities and there is also a 10% credit in the number of ERUs for residential multi family condominiums that also provide privately constructed and maintained detention facilities. The reason that there's not a 100% credit if they have their own treatment is the ERUs also pay, not only for the treatment system but also for the collection system which is the storm sewer itself. Not just the pond. They are, those types of, those three credit areas are still utilizing the storm sewer system whereas anybody who directly discharges, so, I don't know if they do or not but let's take for instance Lights Memorial Park. If somebody were to develop at Light Park into a commercial enterprise of some sort and they had a discharge directly into the river, they would be permitted directly by the Wisconsin Department of Natural Resources. They wouldn't use our storm sewer system and they wouldn't use any of our treatment system. Therefore, they would get a credit on that. So that was the first one that we talked about with the direct discharge. So again, the way the ordinance is written, grassed areas and tree areas automatically have a zero charge. They only people who are being charged are the ones who have impervious surfaces and the amount of impervious surface determines the number of ERUs that are being charged.

- All right.

- Any questions for the Director? Alder Brunette, any other?

- Chairman Wery, I think, see that's, I'm frustrated. First off, thank you Director Grenier. You explained things well as usual but for me the frustration is this cognitive dissonance, if you will. On one hand we say that stormwater, trees absorb stormwater so therefore we should have the Forestry Department paid for by this utility but that's a rather large shift to stormwater utility bills, 1.2 million roughly. My whole point of seeing this is that really, I'm not, that the credit to homeowners who have trees, that's part of it but the overriding concern I have is we really, the Improvement and Service Committee, should really be voting on an updated ordinance that speaks of trees. If we're gonna add 1.2 million dollars of expense yearly, the ordinance should be rewritten to reflect that additional cost. So that's my main concern. The secondary part of that, the trees and the credits, we can have that discussion. My point is if you look at the ordinance, the Improvement and Service Committee with the director, Mr. Grenier, we have the authority on stormwater utility. So we should have voted on this at the committee level at the budget rather than having it part of the budget item. So those are my comments. I'll make a motion when the time is appropriate but thank you for the explanation Director Grenier.

- Thank you Alderman Brunette. Any other committee members? Anybody else attending the meeting who wanted to comment on this? All right, well Alder Brunette, do you have a motion?

- Yeah, I'll make a motion to refer to staff to begin the process of updating and amending the stormwater management ordinance and report back to this committee by July, you know. That gives enough time to start the process.

- Motion by Alder Brunette to refer to staff to update the applicable ordinance and bring it back by July. Is there a second to that?

- Question if I may for Alder Brunette.

- Yeah, sure.

- Go ahead. I'll let you go.

- Just, I'm not exactly sure what specifically you want. I mean, given Director Grenier's response, what exactly are you looking for in the update?

- We need to, thank you, we need to explain trees, how it absorbs stormwater. To read the ordinance, there's a lot of, you know, technical jargon that you need a degree like Mr. Grenier's to understand. My point is that, to the public, if we're gonna say that trees absorb stormwater and that helps with the flow and the prevention of toxins going to our bays and rivers and whatnot, that really should be reflected here and after reviewing it three times, trees aren't mentioned a single time. So it's just, I'm not looking to, I'm not looking for anything other than to have a policy that's more reflective of the effect trees have on stormwater and right now that, quite honestly, you would really have to make a stretch to say that that's in that ordinance. The word forest is mentioned twice, forestry. Vegetation's mentioned a handful of times but seriously, the word tree is not mentioned a single time. So I'm not looking to micromanage what Director Grenier would do but we really should have some language 'cause when I was researching this around budget time, I saw the arguments

made about trees and affecting water. Director Ditscheit mentioned that several times at budget. That should be part of that ordinance, that's all.

- All right well we do have a motion on the floor. Is there a second?

- I'll second, Alder Grenier. I mean, does that make sense to you, Director Grenier?

- All right we have a motion and a second. Director Grenier?

- Yes, we can work with law to implement the language that Alder Brunette is requesting.

- I have a question.

- All right, sure. Alder Gerlach.

- And I'm not trying to be challenging or anything. I'm just trying to understand this, Alder Brunette. What is the ultimate goal behind this? Are you trying to encourage people to plant more trees or are you trying to budget differently and not have the tree, the forestry part of this stormwater budget? I just don't understand.

- Yeah, I mean, ideally I'm not gonna lie, I voted against the budget. I voted against it at budget time so I have a disagreement with it. That's not really the issue here. The issue is here that if we're going to say that trees absorb stormwater, that change should have been made at Improvement Services. So it really is to update the ordinance to the correct manner in which it should be and to come through this body so that we can have that discussion. What Director Grenier just mentioned a few minutes ago, that's a discussion we should have here. Okay, trees affected, the girth of the trees, the people that have forested areas. At any rate, we should be looking at that ordinance. It's been three and a half years. I think, you know, a good review would be necessary. So I'm not really looking to revisit the budget, although I don't agree with it. To me that's secondary. The main thing is this committee is in charge of the stormwater utility system. We should have that debate here so.

- Alder Brunette?

- Yes.

- Would it be fair to summarize that the current ordinance talks about the impervious areas and is silent, relatively silent, on the pervious areas and your desire is if we're going to fund areas using stormwater money the ordinance should at least address that?

- You summarized what I couldn't in 15 minutes so thank you. That's perfect. I agree, that's perfect.

- Thank you. Now I understand.

- Okay. Anything else from the committee? Anybody else attending? All right. We have a motion by Brunette, second by Scannell. All those in favor.

- Aye.

- Aye.

- Opposed. Motion carried. And Steve, you got the motion, right?

- Yes.

- Okay.

- Yes I did, thank you.

- Number two. Consideration and possible action on request by Alderman Galvin that the current process for funding sidewalk repairs contracted by the city for residents be studied with, oh, making changes. I see 'em there. Alderman Galvin.

- Thank you Chair. This comes out of, I hope you're all aware that starting this summer there is a new policy for sidewalk repair but what I'm talking about just pertains to this year and currently this year for sidewalk repair, if somebody complains about a sidewalk, the city goes out and examines that particular piece of sidewalk, determines if it needs to be replaced or not based on the Federal Disability Act which means it's not just broken but it could have a divot in it or anything that might trip up a citizen with a walker or anything else or like that. But what the city does mainly, you know, you've got three types of sidewalks that need to be repaired or who has responsibility? One is the city for damage caused usually by trees on the terrace and then also the ramps at the corners is the city's responsibility. Any other damaged sidewalk is the responsibility of the property owner. And what's happened, especially in my district and I think in some of the more near east and near west side districts is that they have a policy that until someone complains, they don't do anything about it. Because they're not aware of it, they're not liable so they don't need to take action and neighbors have been hesitant to call and complain because to have a sidewalk that's been heaved by a tree means all their sidewalk is now under scrutiny and it could cost a considerable amount of money for them to replace it. And so, I've got a lot of neighbors that have been complaining about tree heaved sidewalks. I've got one lady, she's 94 years old. She's owned a house since the 50s. They came out and they marked 26 sections of her sidewalk to be replaced and I believe the current rate is about \$170 a section if it's done by replacing the cement. And she's concerned, her family's concerned. It's quite a financial strain on someone who's living on a social security check. The city does offer the possibility that people can pay for it to the city. The city will do the work and you pay 'em back over, Steve, I think it's four years.

- I believe it's five.

- Five years but with interest. And I've got people now calling me also besides this elderly person. People have been furloughed from their jobs, laid off from their jobs due to the COVID issue and I talked to Steve about this and Steve's been working, I mean, we trade a lot of phone calls on the sidewalks. Probably more so than streets actually. But I've been talking to Steve about this and he's hesitant to not do the work because the longer we put it off, the worse it gets. The more people it'd be work, if you've ever been on the finance committee and you've seen the amount of people that put in claims to the city for tripping on sidewalks and becoming injured and things like that. I've tripped and fallen. My wife has tripped and fallen. Luckily we haven't had any injuries other than our dignity. So, you know, it's a concern and it's a concern to me that I don't necessarily wanna put off either because, again, I have elderly, I have people walking their children, I have children walking in

the streets because our sidewalks are in such bad shape. And this is year 'round. You know, I mean, even during the winter time, the ice snow melts and because the sidewalks aren't where they're supposed to be, you get puddles. They freeze. They're ice. People are walking, they're tripping. Some of these sections as much as six inches. So, I thought maybe as an incentive for people to continue or at least ease the pain of having the work done, that the city offer them that five year loan interest free. That's what I'm asking this committee. I'm not sure what the cost would be, to be honest with you, because I have found out from working with Steve that city employees who understand the sidewalk needs will come out, even the homeowner and sometimes a section of sidewalk can be repaired merely by putting some caulk into these divots or into these cracks to make 'em smooth which means no one has to replace any cement or you can actually have mud jacking done, which is still far less expensive. But the city does offer two options and the first one I really like is if you are gonna have the work done, the city will do it and they get a low bid and I did some sidewalk in front of my house a few years back and I wanted it done now and I paid more to have it done because those contractors will charge you as an individual more than they will charge the city. So that's one break they get if that if the city does it it's less and it's less a considerable amount of money. So what I'm asking is as something to incentivize these people to get this work done and not put it off is that we offer them that loan of money interest free over a five year period. I think that would be more palatable to homeowners to get the work done and get it done now. Thank you.

- Thank you, Alderman. Let's see, Director Grenier, any comments on that before the committee--

- Just one. Just one and those of you who've served on INS have probably heard this multiple times when we set the assessment rates every year. The reason that we set the, that there's an interest rate is we're actually, the city's actually borrowing money. So it's the bond rate that we're borrowing the money at plus two percent to account for the administrative costs to track and send those bills out to the property owners over the next four years. So just, not that I'm one way or the other on it, I just wanna give you the back story as to why the interest payment is charged to those property owners when they finance through the city. It's the bond rate that we borrow the money at plus two percent for admin.

- And Steve, has the decision been made where you are starting in the city? Like, what part of the city?

- I don't know that we've come to that conclusion. I've been working with, when we went to remote operations, my GIS individual is not at City Hall so corresponding with him is a little challenging and quite frankly since, since we started working remote things have been kind of crazy here for me so I have taken that program and put it down into the hands of the sidewalk folks to give me a recommendation back. They have come up with 15 zones on either side of the river but we haven't necessarily decided what zone we're going to start in and it may be something like a random number generator of one through 15 so that everybody's got an equal shot at it.

- Okay.

- And anecdotally, I think it is related to this conversation, one of the things we are a little concerned with is depending on how long this pandemic continues and with the social distancing, we may not be able, I don't know if we're gonna be allowed to hire summer students and if we're not allowed to hire summer students, that may jeopardize our ability to do that forward looking program. They're gonna

be in the field but they need to be trained and in order to be trained they've gotta be with somebody. So, we're still trying to figure that out.

- All right, thank you Director.

- Chris, if I could just throw in one more comment.

- Sure, go ahead Alder Galvin.

- And, this somewhat relates to the wheel tax. When the wheel tax was being thought of, I did have a discussion with the mayor at the time and I don't remember if I had a discussion with Steve that we, that some of that wheel tax money, either some of it as is or we added more onto the wheel tax could have gone towards sidewalk replacement and it was decided that getting the wheel tax through was gonna be difficult and throwing sidewalks into it would make it even more difficult. So I was able to, you know, better some than none at all as far as the wheel tax went. So that took a lot of pressure off of DPW having projects get put on the shelf because residents didn't want it and things like that and that's why I thought maybe this interest free program would be kind of an incentive somewhat like the wheel tax. All the citizens would then be sharing in the cost of replacing these sidewalks, to an extent, but I'm just throwing that in there. Thank you.

- All right thanks. Committee, any questions? Alder Brunette, I see your hand up and Alder Scannell.

- Yeah, it's a very interesting idea. I'll be honest, I don't have a lot of sidewalks in my district. I would love them but I don't wanna require constituents out here to pay for the cost. So sidewalks are sort of that thing that create a very healthy, livable, walkable community and because a lot of the folks who have sidewalks typically, in Alder Galvin's neighborhood and some of the more center city areas. Alder Wery, when I lived in your district, as you know, ton of sidewalks and a lot of them are in disrepair and so in that the city's fault it's just the cost. The homeowner needs to do always have the resources to do it so you have a situation where a public good is enhanced. Better sidewalks paid for by the property owner but the public benefits from that when you take a walk up and down the streets. So I'd be inclined to wonder how much such an interest program would cost. You know, if it's 15, \$20,000 a year. Who knows what that cost would be? We'd have to look into it but I think that's a worthwhile cost for a majority of the tax payers to pay if it means that a sidewalk gets replaced paid mostly by the property owner, an interest free loan. They're making a payment over five years. So, I mean, I'll make a motion when the time is appropriate but I think it's worth looking into. We would need the cost before we could make a policy decision on that. Thank you.

- All right, thank you Alder Brunette. Alder Scannell, you had your hand up?

- Yep, yep thank you. Just my question is is would that cost be spread out or would one department get hit with it or a couple of departments?

- It's not a departmental charge. It becomes part of your debt service.

- Okay. I figured but I wanted to make sure that there wouldn't be any department that'd be hit with this. I think--

- No, it simply gets rolled into the debt service. You would be collecting less in revenue each year than what you did before. Although we don't have solid dollar figures, looking back I don't have this year's assessment rates in front of me right now but in 2019 the interest on unpaid assessments was 4.5. In 2018 it was 4.75%. So, Jim, do you remember? Was it somewhere in the neighborhood of six this year? Did the rates go up?

- [Jim] For the?

- Unpaid assessment interest rate.

- [Jim] 4.77.

- Okay, 4.77. So we're still under five percent. So, I don't know, because we're billing that back I don't have the numbers that we billed back but even if we go conservative and assume that the interest rate's five percent and there's a half million dollars worth of sidewalk that folks wanna finance out that way, that would be an extra \$25,000 on a half million dollars worth of borrowing.

- And you mentioned also like a two percent for all the notices. Does that come out of any particular department?

- That's all rolled into that same.

- Okay.

- The assistant director tells me that his recollection of the interest rate on unpaid assessments for 2020 is 4.77%. That means that the bond issue is expected to come in at a 2.77% rate and then they add two percent for admin off of that.

- All right, thank you Alder Scannell. Alderman Steuer, I see your hand up there. You see--

- Okay, unmute. I'm unmuted. Thank you Chair. Well, I appreciate Alder Galvin bringing this forward because this has been something that in my eight years on council has been an issue and I think one of the biggest complaints I get is somebody says, well, I've got like seven or eight or 10 squares, cakes that have to, three have to be replaced by the city and the other seven by me. They don't look that bad. Maybe some of 'em are, some aren't but the question they'll say, well, look at across the street and then I'll walk across the street with them and I'll see seven or eight that are really terrible and it's kind of like, so, I think as far as getting consistency as far what the process is. I'm happy that we're putting together some kind of a document that we can all look at but, you know, roads is a big thing but I think sidewalks is a very big thing as well. Let's see. I think that idea about the sidewalk zones, like a map or something that they can look at so that we can get a handle on what areas are gonna be done. There are many citizens that will not complain because they're afraid that if they do complain that they will be socked with extra costs. So, I don't know how you get around that. I've got three or four folks that have called already and Director Grenier, I'll be emailing that to you tomorrow as far as, you know, what we have to do. And, I think citizens just need to know, okay, there's a cost to doing business. You are a citizen and there are costs that you have to deal with. I understand that but, you know, I think the complaint driven thing is one issue and citizens just wanna know, well, why me? You know? But sometimes I tell 'em that's just the cost of doing business. So, just a couple of points and I just hope we can keep that in the discussion. Thank you.

- All right, thank you Alderman Steuer. Anyone else? Any questions or comments or I'll entertain a motion?

- Alder Johnson is trying to comment.

- Oh. I see there's two Alder Johnsons here. Brian Johnson, Brian Johnson. Brian Johnson one.

- Thank you Chairman. Alder Galvin it sounds like you're indicating that you have several constituents that have already contacted you but what I'm hearing from Director Grenier is that we have not yet begun this process. So, am I not understanding something here or are those constituent concerns unrelated to the proactive sidewalk inspections? Hi Anne.

- Brian Johnson just said hi.

- Hey Brian. Finish your milk.

- Yes ma'am.

- I love milk.

- Oh lord. No, no that's fine. Thank you honey. Am I turning red? Can you see it? The program that, the sidewalk program starts next year. What I'm dealing with this year is just complaint based sidewalk replacement.

- Okay.

- But if, and I'm just asking for this year if this is something that, you know, as we're looking forward if we get better compliance or less friction because, let's face it, if we do the program they have to replace it. Okay? And, unfortunately some of these individuals do own corner lots where there's gonna be quite a few cakes that need to be replaced or repaired and that's why I appreciate Steve's staff coming out with the individual property owners to show 'em what needs to be done so they can get a better idea on what the costs are gonna be moving forward for them but I'm only asking for this year right now 'cause we don't know what's going to be going on next year or anything else. Does that answer your question, Brian or I did I miss it in my?

- No it does and ultimately why I was asking the question and what I'm trying to wrap my brain around, Director Grenier, it sounds like the proactive sidewalk inspection program would be that the sidewalk cakes would get inspected this year but would be replaced next year?

- Yes, yes.

- Okay so we're not yet seeing feedback on that front, you know, in terms of inability to pay. I think it's natural that we're going to hear some negative feedback, right? People don't like it when government tells them they have to spend money and replace something on their property that's three out but I think what we have to cut through is is it a chronic problem or are these isolated incidents because I wanna make sure that isolated incidents aren't affecting policy for the entire city.

So, I need kind of indication there on if this is authentically, you know, a deep seated issue or if this is just a few incidents.

- Right. I've had six complaints this year so far and last year I had, I think I had a little bit more than that and some people actually withdrew their complaints because a deep cost. And then I had one neighbor who just went ahead and replaced every cake and it turned out later on he could have just simply repaired several of them. He lived on a corner lot and I think he ended up replacing over 20 at 170 bucks a piece it was kind of a steep bill for him to foot. I mean, he did it and he knew it was his responsibility and I get that from most people is they understand it's their responsibility it's just, it's costly and I think anytime we can ease that pain a little bit if we can, I'd like us to be able to do that.

- Okay, thanks for answering my questions, the both of you.

- Thank you Alderman. Any other questions? Oh, over to Scannell.

- Quick one. So slab of sidewalk is called a cake?

- Yes.

- That's a cake walk?

- Yes.

- Sorry.

- You're not recognized anymore. All right, well committee, what are your wishes?

- Well Alderman, make a motion or?

- I'm not sure if there was a motion yet but Director Grenier, how difficult would a rough estimate? I know it's tough but and it wouldn't be till next spring.

- Well, if the Alder, if Alder Galvin is looking specifically at this year's program, I think we should be able to pull something together within the next two weeks.

- Right. I'm looking for this year. So what happened was he identified sections last year, marked 'em this year and they're gonna be replacing them this summer if everything comes together.

- Director, would it be too cumbersome if it weren't just across the board zero percent? If it were more, because this is really based on, you know, the tough economic times if it was hardship but you're gonna need some process where people don't appeal on a hardship but we have that right? 'Cause everybody might not need this.

- That process already exists under assessments. I think it would, I think it would not be a stretch to apply that to these costs as well. The appeal on assessments. I think that ordinance language would be applicable here as well.

- Alder Galvin, is that something you'd be open to is hardship based?

- Ah, to be honest with you no. I'd rather see it across the board.
- Okay.
- And, like I said, I've got a lady who's 94. I've got another one where the husband was just laid off. I mean.
- Alder Galvin, you're fading away.
- Oh, I'm sorry. So I just think there's enough going on, I think, that I would prefer to see it across the board.
- All right.
- Thank you.
- Committee? I don't see anyone jumping up and down to continue talking.
- I'll make a motion that we refer this to staff to get some estimates and pick it up from there.
- All right motion by Alderman Scannell to refer this to staff for some cost estimates and bring it back. Steve, two weeks okay or do you need a little more time?
- Let's put it down for two weeks. That keeps the fire on us.
- All right. Is that all right Alderman Scannell? Two weeks?
- That's fine, yep, yep.
- I'll second.
- All right, there's a second. Second by Alder Gerlach. Under discussion. All right, those in favor.
- Aye.
- Aye.
- Opposed? All right, that motion carried. Thank you Alder Galvin. Number three. Consideration with possible action on request by Alder Lefebvre to request committee look at the issuing of a sidewalk cafe permit to Title Town Tobacco per section 6.155 Green Bay Municipal Code. Number one, definitions. Sidewalk cafe is any group of table, tables, chairs, benches, or partitions maintained within the public right of away for use directly in front of an establishment with a valid restaurant license held at the March 25, 2020 Improvement Service Meeting. I don't see Alderman Lefebvre here. Steve or Director Grenier?
- Alder Lefebvre called and told me she was not able to attend but I don't know if you've seen the news today but things in her neighborhood are not good. But I have no problem explaining what was

done here. The way that the ordinance was written, section 6.155 Municipal Code, identifies a sidewalk cafe permit and it used to refer to those who held a restaurant license. Unfortunately a couple of years ago when we re-codified chapter six in municipal code, the definition for a restaurant was removed. What I've been informed by our law department is the state has a definition of restaurant and a local municipal definition cannot be more restrictive than what the state definition is. So we're using the state definition of restaurant and if a bar has a pizza oven, that's a restaurant. As long as they prepare the food. They can't have a bag of chips or a Slim Jim or beef jerkey behind the bar but if they heat up a frozen pizza, they have prepared food on premises, that qualifies as a restaurant. Currently the ordinance and those of you who participated in the sidewalk cafe discussions back when the ordinance was originally drafted, from what I remember of that, there was a pretty clear desire on behalf of the common council that this sidewalk cafe applied to restaurants and not to bars. It looks to me, based on what my discussions with law department are, that the state has kind of taken that out of our hands. So a bar would qualify as a restaurant, again, provided that they have something as simple as a pizza oven or a panini press there. With that in mind, Title Town Tobacco, that's the old Prohibition Lounge on Broadway, they have a revocable occupancy permit to allow tables, chairs, benches for their patrons to be out in the public right of way and they've been a very good participating agency, a good partner agency with the city on that. They would also like their patrons to be able to enjoy a beverage while they're outside on the tables and chairs having a cigar but the ordinance doesn't provide that because it's only for a restaurant and a restaurant's pretty ill defined under state statute. So they called Alder Lefebvre to revise our municipal code and what we've done is we've brought this through law department for their review and the draft language we've come up with is in the packet that we submitted to you. It would apply to any Class B beer, Class B liquor or Class B combination license holder. Any of those would be able to apply for the sidewalk cafe permit and it's a three step process. You first apply for the revocable occupancy permit, which provides for compliance with the Americans with Disabilities Act within the public right of way. Upon issuance of the revocable occupancy permit, you then seek through the Protection and Policy Committee an amendment of your licensed premises. Once you receive that approval then there's an application, again, through the Department of Public Works for the sidewalk cafe permit but if you've successfully got the other two components, the sidewalk cafe permit is automatically granted. Similarly, if you have one of the two component pieces rescinded, the sidewalk cafe permit goes away. A little bit of a technicality that you need to be aware of. Those of you who've been involved with the issuance of liquor licenses in the past know how difficult it is for us to revoke a liquor license. So let's say, just for the sake of discussion, for one reason or another the recommendation was made and supported to revoke the sidewalk cafe permit and that was due to the revocable occupancy permit for the pertinent construction within the right of way like the tables and chairs. We would revoke the sidewalk occupancy permit. They would no longer have the sidewalk cafe license but their licensed premises would still include the public right of way. You can't sit down. It gets a little bit weird. We're hoping that it never comes into play and law department assures me that they are ready to deal with it should something like that happen. So basically what we've done is we've revised the ordinance not to reference restaurants but instead to reference Class B beer, Class B liquor, and Class B combination licenses and then made the ordinance consistent with state statute.

- All right. Thank you, Director. Questions from the committee?

- I have a question.

- Any other alders?

- Can you hear me?

- Yep, go ahead. Alder Gerlach.

- This is the one that I was asking about before that I just don't quite understand what this statement means that she's asking the committee to look at the issuing of a sidewalk cafe permit and I promise you I have read all of this material in the packet and I just don't understand. First of all it seems to me that you're saying Title Town Tobacco does not have a pizza oven or anything that could be called or make it be a restaurant, right?

- We don't know that.

- Okay, okay. That's fine. Second thing is Alder Lefebvre asking that we consider giving them a permit or that they have a permit and we consider rescinding it? I don't understand what she's asking for.

- They do not currently have a permit because they have not demonstrated that they're a restaurant to us because our definition of restaurant is silent now.

- Okay.

- So we've not asked the question, historically that has been considered to be a bar and under the ordinance as it's written, they would not be eligible for it. Now they could make a demonstration that they are a restaurant by having a pizza oven or something. They've not done that and rather than get into that subtlety of argument, Alder Lefebvre asked us to take a look at potentially revising the ordinance instead.

- And I've seen how the ordinance is revised. Is that something that's just being shown as a possibility or has action been taken on it?

- Nothing has been taken. We brought draft ordinance language for your consideration and I specifically asked law department to show the strike outs and the revisions so that you can see very clearly what the ordinance used to read versus what it's proposed to read in the future.

- Okay, one more question. How does Title Town Tobacco fit into the situation specifically?

- Right now they don't qualify for a sidewalk cafe unless they were to come and demonstrate that they are a restaurant.

- But they've asked for one? They've applied for one?

- I don't know that they've applied for it. They've inquired about it and have been told that they do not qualify.

- Okay, thank you.

- All right. Thank you Alder. Any other questions from the committee or anyone here?

- Alder Wery, just one question.

- Sure, Alder Johnson.

- Director Grenier, regardless I guess of which direction the committee ultimately falls on this, the one thing that maybe concerns me is the three step process. It seems to be much more cumbersome than it needs to be. If the committee were to chose to take action on this today, how do we condense that into just a one application process? Check these three boxes all through will be addressed by us. So that way we're not putting people in front of all these different committees.

- I struggled with that myself and tried to work that process through the law department. It still will take three independent actions but I don't know necessarily that the applicant is gonna have to fill out more than one form. On the single form or whatever documentation we come up with for the application for the sidewalk cafe permit, that will automatically start with INS getting a revocable occupancy permit. Presuming that the revocable occupancy permit is granted, we'll send that out, get it executed by the applicant. When we get that back properly executed, we will take care of notifying Protection and Policy that there's a request for amendment of premises. Once Protection and Policy takes action on that, we will take the application back and grant the sidewalk cafe license because they've already applied for it when they initiated step one.

- I appreciate the fact that that's how the process needs to work with our current set up. So I guess maybe the more direct question is how do we change the set up so that one committee can just handle this particular application and that we don't need to bounce it to multiple committees?

- I don't know that we can because--

- Like, current set up. I understand, you know, INS has oversight of the sidewalks. Protection Policy has oversight of the liquor, you know, the liquor license. So I understand again why that's separated right now. But is there an action we can take to just condense it?

- From where I see it, I don't think so. That might be a question for you to ask the city attorneys.

- Sure. And perhaps maybe what makes more sense at least for today's discussion is let's first see how INS lets this conversation unfold and then, you know, how we streamline the process might be a secondary discussion but at least I just wanted to broach the subject.

- All right, thank you Alder Johnson. All right, anyone else on this item? Questions, comments? I'll entertain a motion.

- I make a motion to approve the changes.

- All right. Motion by Alder Scannell to approve the recommended changes to the ordinance regarding sidewalk cafe permits. Is there a second to that?

- Second.

- Second by Alder Brunette. Under discussion. Anybody wish to discuss it?

- Question again.

- Sure, Alder Gerlach.

- I'm sorry I'm having so much trouble with this one. Does, Director Grenier, does the city, is this what the city wants to do? These are the changes you've proposed and this is how you'd like to move forward? Are you advising that we do this?

- Department of Public Works is neutral on this. I believe law department is neutral on it because when I had the discussions with the law department and with the mayor about this, I did remind them that there was significant discussion relative to only allowing bars not, or only restaurants, not bars when the original ordinance was passed. Both the law department and the mayor brought back to me that if that's all somebody has to do is demonstrate that they've got a pizza oven, why are we forcing them to go through that exercise? That's cumbersome.

- Okay.

- So if that's all a bar has to do is have a pizza oven back there whether they use it or not is irrelevant, they have the ability, they meet the definition under state statute, you might as well just allow any Class B license holder to have this privilege. If they're a responsible business, they're a responsible business.

- Thank you Alder. Alder Scannell. Just for Alder Gerlach. The city for a while, and I was part of this, Protection and Policy played a big role in this, is to try to create a more vibrant downtown and then spread out throughout the city of a cafe atmosphere and we'd like to try to also start pushing for more bike pedestrian friendly and that just jives into that whole cafe atmosphere. So this is something the city's been kinda working towards for quite a while.

- So Alder Scannell, you're in favor of this? You think this is a good idea?

- Yes.

- Okay, thank you. Sometimes I need a little guidance.

- All right. Any other committee members?

- Chairman, just one more question.

- Oh, Alder Johnson.

- Yeah, if that's the action or the motion that the committee is going to take, perhaps maybe just ask that we could put that rider on there to check with law department on how we can streamline that process.

- Okay, thank you.

- I actually, I disagree with that. I don't think Protection and Policy should be giving up their expertise for the alcohol land and I don't think, for sure, INS should be giving up their expertise on the

sidewalk end. I think that's just the nature of the beast we're gonna have to deal with that these respective committees, I can't see how we'd be able to mesh those two together in any productive way. We're just gonna have to keep them separate. I should think that, I mean, both committees meet roughly the same weeks and everything. So it would be pretty expeditious I would think any process. Unless one of the committees holds up the permit for one reason or another but then again, if it's held up, there would be a reason for that. So, I would hate to think that this committee would be infringing on or stepping on Protection and Policy's toes. I don't think that's a good idea. I don't think they'd wanna give up their jurisdiction, you know, their committee work and I don't think we should give up ours to them. So, I appreciate the concern but I don't think I see any way going forward with it.

- And I appreciate that Alder Scannell. That's fine. I'll just address it separately but I kind of view this as one jurisdiction which is the City of Green Bay and we gotta find a way to make things easy when working with people in the city, not make it harder. So, again, I'm happy to take that up separately.

- All right. Thank you Alder Johnson. Any other comments, questions? Alder Steuer.

- Thank you your honor. Or Chair, I should say.

- You can just stick with honor.

- Chair, your honor, Chair. Okay, whatever. I appreciate Alder Johnson's comments on this but I also agree with Alder Scannell. You know, it's a little difficult. I know that we're trying to streamline things and trying to make it as simple as possible but, you know, there's two specific actions that happen from each of these committees and I think it's important that we at least look at that. Maybe down the road we can look at it differently but I think right now it's working and I would say continue that role. Thank you.

- Thank you Alder. Comments?

- Yes sir.

- All right, Steve. Director Grenier.

- Hopefully this may alleviate Alder Johnson's concerns although it may cause other ones. The way things are written currently and the current state of practice with revocable occupancy permits, those are actually handled at a staff level unless denied. A denial can be appealed through INS. So staff would be handling the revocable occupancy permit. It would then go to Protection and Policy simply for the amendment of licensed premises. It comes right back to staff and we issue the sidewalk cafe permit. INS really doesn't see it unless we say no to something. So we are looking to try to streamline this as much as possible while still respecting the jurisdictions of the various departments and committees.

- Thank you Director. Any other comments? All right, those in favor of the motion.

- Aye.

- Aye.

- Opposed. Motion carried. All right, on to number four. Consideration with possible action on request by Alderman Steuer to have the City of Green Bay boat facilities at Green Bay Metro Boat Launch and see about alternatives to the existing docks, put in portable docking systems such as those at the Brown County facilities in Alloway and De Pere. Alderman Steuer.

- Thank you, Chair. Correct? And I will call you Chair? Okay. Anyway, I some weeks ago, one of my constituents who is here and I will ask to have the floor open so he can speak, Mr. Scott Meverden. Anyway, a couple of weeks ago he had talked to me about a number of things at the boat launch and I know, Director Grenier, we've talked about things over time too with docking facilities and this, that, and the other thing in Green Bay and I was very interested to drive over there, and this was about a month ago and I took a number of pictures just looking at the facilities the way they are and they're more permanent over there. I also drove down to Brown County and De Pere. I didn't get to Alloway but I was looking at how each facility was handling docking, you know, docking type things with boaters. And, you know, I had a good conversation with my constituent about this and he brought up a lot of good points and before I really continue much, I would really like for him to weigh in and I kind of agreed with him on a number of things and I just would like him to have that opportunity. So I would propose if you could open the floor, I would appreciate that.

- Motion to open the floor.

- Second.

- All right. We have a motion by Alderman Scannell. Seconded by Alderman Brunette to open the floor in the discussion. Those in favor?

- Aye.

- Opposed?

- All right, the floor is now open. If anyone is here for this item, I just need your name and address.

- Scott Meverden.

- All right and then your address Mr. Meverden.

- 1515 Bond Street.

- Thank you. And the floor is yours.

- Over this past couple months De Pere Dam is always open the last week of March to accommodate for their, the walleyes or trout running in. We have paid to the City of Green Bay or we can pick it up at the City of Green Bay the boat parking that we have to put on our trailers. That goes to Brown County, I believe and I don't have the information if it goes to Brown County and the City of Green Bay. My question is, De Pere and De Pere Docks go in the end of March for the walleye runs. I do have a boat myself and I have seen the problems down at Green Bay boat launch. The docks for one I know are out of date. Mark had sent me a video to watch and Smokey's that is now attached to Stall Bay, he had made a comment that went to the mayor, Jim Schmidt, and one of their offices saying that

the docks are 30 years old. And I went down there and I looked at 'em. My wife and I took a ride. They are made of two by 12s. If anybody knows what wood does in water over time, it rots. And, you have to replace those. My question is why can't Green Bay make some kind of adjustment to the dock system for Bay Beach, the Green Bay Metro Boat Launch to make it either out of aluminum or steel? And, the composite boards on the top. Why can't Green Bay alone be as one with Brown County when they're putting theirs in at the fair grounds and at Alloway Boat Launch and they're up to date but Green Bay is out of date but the Green Bay residents are also buying the registration boat stickers to park their trailers there and that's supposed to be going to the revenue for Green Bay?

- All right. Thank you Mr. Meverden. Any questions from the committee for Mr. Meverden? Any questions? All right, Alderman Steuer.

- Well thank you, Scott. I know that you were talking about a couple of the permanent features over at the Metro Boat Launch. You know, there was a couple of things there. First of all the parking lot is in pretty bad shape too. Needed some repair. That's another point. But as far as some of the permanent features that are there, the docking facilities themselves is like concrete and you said one of 'em is in bad shape that you noticed and people are having a hard time getting into their boats. They're slipping, per se. I mean, you said you witnessed some of this. So I wanted you to talk a little bit about your thoughts, and you've worked with metal. You've done some of this work in the past so you understand some of the construction type of things with it. So, I guess I would like your opinion about the permanent features that we have at Green Bay. You already talked about, you know, the wood and the problem of rotting and such. But as far as what they're doing at Alloway and De Pere where they're putting in these temporary set ups and it seems to be working very, very well.

- Go ahead Mr. Meverden.

- From what I've seen is the parking lot is in disarray down at Green Bay Boat Launch. The last couple of weeks that my wife and I have taken a drive, if you're looking at the dock, it's docking system itself you have six poles. The one closest to the water on the base around the riverside to, now I've gone out and measured 'em and I don't know if I should have done that or if I should not have done that. If you go from the riverside to the first, which would be the middle set of poles that's a 30 foot span. If you go from the middle poles to the second poles it's a 15 foot span. With high water last year people were still trying to dock their boats in Green Bay City Boat Launch. Even if you would build it out of aluminum or metal it would bring it out to the parking lot. Alloway and De Pere have axles that even my half ton pick up truck could pick up and wheel it into the water, put them together and keep on pushing. The parking lot, it's still being used as far as parking but parking is totally messed up down there. You have six rows of parking for boats and trailers that are only half used and if people don't have boats and trailers they have to park all the way over by the access road to get past the pavilion and then there's only two rows, maybe a block long for the people to park. Well, that's all fine and dandy but if they're further, if they're getting on a boat, that's two blocks that they have to walk. Why can't we cut the parking lot in half for boats and trailers and the other half for cars without the City of Green Bay Parking Utility giving people tickets? Now they're gonna probably have to put signs up and say car passed this area back. But the parking lot itself needs attention because of if you're looking at the docks seven and eight poles, and the poles are labeled, seven and eight has, I don't even wanna call it a pothole. It's a crater. 'Cause you could put both sides of your axles of your boat in that hole and then you would cause damage to your barrage, your tires, possibly your axles. People are staying away from seven and eight. I had told Mark, Mark Steuer, and within two days

maybe, I don't even know how long it was, within two days there was two temporary docks put together and they are operating right now. Going through Alloway's docking system and De Pere docking system, there have been more trucks, trailers, boaters now docking at Green Bay and just using two docks. Within the last two days, we went down there and we counted 19 people by Green Bay. We went down to Alloway and we counted half that and that has been going on for, I'd say the last week, that now Green Bay because they have their docks in. Otherwise, there would not be a dock there yet until Green Bay got all their systems together.

- All right. Thank you Mr. Meverden. Any other questions for Mr. Meverden? Anybody else here to comment on this item?

- Yes ma'am.

- Gerlach. Alder Gerlach.

- Thank you.

- Well, do you have a question for Mr. Meverden?

- Yes, I do.

- Okay, go ahead. Alder Gerlach.

- Yes ma'am.

- It seems to me, Mr. Meverden, like you really understand this and you have experience with it. I have no experience with it whatsoever and I don't know if this is appropriate but it just seems like you have some really good ideas and some specific ideas and I wonder if it makes sense for you to just sit down with Alder Steuer and come up with a specific proposal of what you think ought to be done and bring it to the committee. I don't know, Alder Wery, is that appropriate?

- Ah, well, anything's appropriate. Certainly I would like you to sit down with Director Grenier and ballpark it.

- I don't know where everybody grew up at, if they were actually grown up in Green Bay or, you know, came here when they were younger but I grew up in Green Bay and I remember that being a thriving dock system out there when I was younger with my grandfather. Right now it's in disarray. I would be ashamed to show that to my grandfather right now and .

- Go ahead Mr. Meverden.

- The docking system down there right now, I had talked to Mark and Mark had told me too that there was another Alderman up for development in that area. As far as I don't even know what you were trying to explain to me, Mark, but the parking lot itself needs to be not so much resurfaced. I worked in asphalt before. I know what you can do with asphalt. It's just the time and the people needed for that. I could get estimates for rebuilding a dock. I know how to rebuild a dock. As far as how the City of Green Bay wants to go with it, I could even build the dock. I know people that would help me build that dock to a safe docking system.

- All right well I appreciate that. Maybe we'll take you up on that, Mr. Meverden. Let's see here.

- Well, I'm not working so.

- You've probably been on many of them. Any other questions for Mr. Meverden? Otherwise, let's bring it back to committee so we can discuss it and get some action on it. I appreciate you speaking on this, Mr. Meverden and the committee's gonna talk about it right now for a while, okay?

- Okay.

- Motion to close the floor.

- Motion by Alderman Scannell. Is there a second?

- Second.

- Second by Alderman Gerlach to close the floor. Those in favor.

- Aye.

- Aye.

- Opposed. Motion carried. All right, what are your wishes with this item. I guess, Alderman Steuer, you brought this forward. What are you looking for?

- Well--

- Yeah, let's, Alderman Steuer, bear with me one moment. I'm gonna go to Director Grenier just to kind of fill in some gaps and then we can kind of go from there.

- Yeah.

- Okay, Director, I know we've talked about this in the past.

- Yes and I see Kaurie Mihm with the Parks Rec and Forestry Department is on the line with us. I don't know if this is the item that Kaurie is here for interest on but she may also wish to weigh in at some point in time so I just wanted to make sure that you knew she was here. Yes, we are aware of the damage to the launch at the seven, eight ramps that did occur this winter. So that's why we have put the barricades up and not allowed people to use that. With the damage that's occurred to the docking systems over the last three seasons, we only have enough pieces to use two docks at this point in time. Everything else is damaged. DPW has been in discussions with the Park Rec and Forestry Department this year to talk about dock replacement out there because the docks have been, they are 30 years old. DPW staff does those docks during the winter. We take them into a closed facility and rebuild them each year and we're getting to a point where we're putting more into them than they're worth. So we have actually been talking about that but that's gonna involve a bond request. To significantly change the docking system is also gonna require us to change the in water portion of the docks. Now what we are looking at, I've tasked my staff with taking a look at instead of

having a single platform that goes out into the river that's between two columns, the pile, to potentially look at a system more like what's at city deck where it's offset off of only one set of piling that has a circular collar that hooks onto it. So, we are, the city is looking into replacement of those docking facilities. What we're dealing with is a question of money at this point in time. This being like several of our facilities, the reason Parks is involved, the water's edge is what separates the jurisdiction. So the parking lot, the building, the restroom areas, that kind of stuff, that's all being maintained and under jurisdiction of the Parks Department and we put the in water facilities in. That's why DPW is involved. To have dates when we put our facilities are based on our historic knowledge of when we can expect to have safe facilities out there, not only for our personnel to get those facilities in the water but also to protect the docks from damage. I know we've been significantly criticized by fishing groups over the past couple of years that Green Bay, you need to get your docks in the water a lot quicker and the last three years in a row if we would have put the docks in when the fishing groups had asked us to do it, we had ice shelves come back up the bay and we would've destroyed our docks each in the last years. So, we do know what's going on. We're so close to the mouth of the river that we are susceptible to wave and ice action where De Pere and Alloway are not. They are significantly up river and they are sheltered. Smokey's is actually closer to the bay but they are inside of a breakwater. They are also sheltered and protected from ice and wave damage where we are not. So we do have to be careful. We're talking about tax payer funded infrastructure out there and we can't place that in jeopardy of being damaged. So some of the things that Mr. Meverden has asked for are currently under consideration between DPW and Parks and we're trying to find a place to work those into a future bond issue.

- Thank you Director. Alderman Steuer.

- Yes, thank you, Chair. Well, I wanna thank Scott for his testimony and Director Grenier for your comments as well. I think, you know, a lot of us are aware of some of the geographic limitations that are set up because of that but with that being said, you know, and I realize Parks will have to be involved in this as well but I think it's very important if we're talking, especially in this timeframe that, you know, we're looking at fees and such with the city, you know, having a number of boaters, having quite a few folks being able to use a facility, you know, those monies, a lot of that will be coming into the City of Green Bay and I think it's important that we don't deny that possibility. So granted, you're near the mouth of the river, you know, you're near the mouth of the bay actually and I understand some of those dynamics but from what I saw, and I'm not a boater, but I went down there and took a look at it and I was kind of stunned, you know, at some of the damage there and I realize, Director Grenier, that you did bring this up. So I'm happy that you and the Parks Department are at least looking at this but I think moving forward I think it's very important that we as a city have some kind of a plan or something in place and believe me, Scott knows 10 times more than I do about this and I would appreciate his comments and any other folks that use this, you know, have come our way so that we can utilize that moving forward. So, that's where I'm at. Thank you.

- Thank you Alderman. On the committee like to comment or? Asking questions. Is there anyone here from the Parks Department from this end?

- You wanna open the floor again?

- Committee.

- Okay.

- Mr. Meverden wants to speak.
- What would the committee like?
- Can you open the floor one more time?
- Move to open the floor to hear from interested party.
- Yep, second. I had to unmute.
- Yeah, I was gonna say I saw your mouth moving.
- Brunette and Scannell to open the floor. Those in favor?
- Aye.
- Aye.
- Those in favor?
- Aye.
- Aye.
- Opposed. Motion carried, Mr. Meverden.
- Steve brought up a good point about being right at the mouth of the bay. I don't agree with taking the docks out in December though because that's what happened last year. Now, if there was a problem with getting the docks out before the ice came in, that I could understand but the docks were left in until late December when the ice did come back in. So, having them outside of the poles as a floating pole, that would be all fine and dandy but, I guess my question is why are we separate in this when if we were one municipality we should have a mind of our own of when we put the docks in and when we take them out. Not Brown County rules two parts of it and Green Bay is on their own. Docks are there for people to enjoy the open waterway but I don't know of many boaters that don't put their equipment away at the end of December.
- All right.
- With their boats.
- Thank you Mr. Meverden. Any questions for Mr. Meverden from the committee? All right. I'll entertain a motion to close the floor. Alder Scannell and Alder Brunette. Did you second that? Okay. Those in favor of closing the floor.
- Aye.

- Opposed. Motion carried. All right, what are your wishes committee? I guess Director is this, Director Grenier, is this something that would be ready to bring back in not too long of a time to kind of give us an update?

- Well, it depends on what type of an update you're looking for. What I can tell you is everything that we've got that's usable is in the water right now. One of the things Mr. Meverden did refer, was talking about is when we pulled the docks last fall I think we left them in two weeks longer than I wanted them in. We got a schedule we use and we did kind of concede a little bit for the late season fishermen to leave them in but with the dock facilities we have at this point until we buy new and we need a crane to get those docks in and out. We try to time that when we're doing the other docks so we only have to rent and mobilize that crane one time 'cause that's a pretty substantial cost to get that crane in here to get those docks out. To bring it in a second time, again, that comes out of our budget. So we wanna maximize the amount of work we're getting out of that crane at any one time. Also, because we have to get guys out on the docks, out in the water to get them both in and out, when we get to certain parts of the year I just don't feel comfortable putting my staff at risk out there to do that work. So.

- Well Director Grenier, I would ask, is there any kind of timeline right now that's been discussed as far as when we want to replace them? Next year, the year after?

- Based on the preliminary discussions that I've had with the Parks Director, we didn't think that we could get it into this year's bond issue. This year's bond issue is pretty tight. We're looking at doing the best we can to keep limping these things along for this year and with the hope to get something for the 2021 bond issue.

- Okay. So would this come back to Parks first or your committee? Do you know which one?

- I would expect to see it as part of our capital program for 2021.

- Alderman Steuer, you had your hand up.

- Well, that's why I appreciate the comments, Director Grenier. You know, I think in the interim you and Parks Department can assist and talk about how we can go about it. I've already done a bit of work on this, you know, on my own and so has Mr. Meverden as well as one or two other folks that I know who are boaters and I'm just wondering if there's a way that we could put something together in a proactive way that we could deliver to your departments and you can utilize it accordingly. I mean, I, it would be nice to understand the bonding requests are very steep this year. So, if we gotta wait a year, I guess but like I said, I feel what I saw it's not very safe at this time and I, you know, people can wheel and deal and try to get in their. What I saw, part of the problem is because the water is high and is just not real conducive to real safe entry. My other thing is the fact that, you know, we, I think the city is losing out as far as the fees and things like that at this time. We're part of an ocean port. You know, we have water. We've got the unbelievable resource that so many other communities would die for and I think we need to utilize this as best as we can and I, so I guess what I'm asking, Director Grenier, is if you would entertain some information from us that you could utilize as well or would you prefer to just work on it with the Parks?

- Not only would we entertain it, we would very much welcome it.

- Well, we'll be happy to do that. I know, Scott, we can't open the floor again. I mean, I don't think. No, just, well, unless you want to. It's up to you, Chair. Anyway, I'm done for now. I think that we've made some end roads here. I think I'll talk to Mr. Meverden and some other folks as well and I think we can put some things together. If there's input from the council on this, I think would be very good. I would appreciate any comments that we could bring forward from citizens and also from council. I think we could do some good things.

- Thank you Alderman Steuer.

- Thank you.

- Committee members, Alderman Scannell.

- Yeah I'd just like to make a motion and if you're gonna meeting with, if Alder Steuer and concerned citizens are gonna be meeting with Grenier and then if there's any actionable item for us they could come back to us with it, I would just receive and place this on file for now. That's my motion.

- Okay so there's a motion to receive and place on file. Is there a second to that?

- I'll second it.

- Second by Alder Gerlach. And that's with the understanding that there's a group that will be discussing this and working with the Director and when they're ready to maybe bring something back then we can take it up again. Is that? Okay. Any other discussion on this item? All right, those in favor.

- Aye.

- Opposed. That motion carried. Thank you Alderman Steuer. Thank you Mr. Meverden. I agree, it's long overdue for those so keep pushing. All right, number five. Consideration with possible action on request by Alderman Vanderleest on behalf of area residents for the sinkhole in front of, in the front yard of 1831 Van Oss Court near the newly installed mini stormwater to be investigated by the Public Works Department and to be fixed in the spring. This was referred March 25. I don't think Alderman Vanderleest is here.

- Staff just wants to, staff wants to report that all work has been completed and Alderman Vanderleest was notified of that so we're just closing the loop on this.

- Motion received and placed on file.

- Way too easy.

- Alderman Scannell. Received a second. Second by Burnette. Discussion? Those in favor.

- Aye.

- Aye.

- Motion carried. Number six. Consideration with possible action on the request by Alderman Wery on adjusting mini sewer hook up fees. This was held from March 25th meeting. And I know there's an attachment here regarding the fees. The discussion was, just to Alder Gerlach, the fees have of course cropped up over the years and now they're a little over \$1,000. We had temporarily set them back to 500 to encourage people to hook up to the mini sewer to help with the run off issues and with that thought, again, I had requested that we put it back on again to see if we could get more people hooked up to the mini sewers. So, Director Grenier was gonna provide information on fees, which he did, and I'm gonna turn it over to him.

- Okay, well we did provide a memo that kind of outlines the history of the mini storm program and how the fee structure was developed. It is interesting to note that back in 1976, the common council did specifically indicate that the charge for mini storm should be the same as hooking up to the storm sewer. Again, we go through and we talk a lot about what's going on here, the short version of this is the storm sewer is in the pavement. We do allow residents to hook their sump pumps or downspouts to that to help alleviate nuisance conditions. The mini storm is for areas where a storm sewer connection to the main is not readily available. What that could mean is one of two things, either the street doesn't have storm sewer, in which case the residents never paid the assessment associated with the storm sewer or the storm sewer's out in the road but a lateral was never extended to the property and what we're trying to do is minimize the cost to the resident not to have to dig into the road and do all the road restoration. So instead, we had them hook up to the mini storm. Again, it is interesting to note or worthwhile to note the pipe to get down to from the point of connection, we typically tie into an inlet in our storm sewer system and then run a small diameter six inch PVC pipe in the terrace and provide that point of connection for the sump pump and or roof drains. That small main is not assessed. They're only charged the connection fee again, which represents what would it have cost for the materials, not the paver restoration to the main in the road. So, what we've identified in here is that we, the storm utility considerably subsidizes those mini storm connections already. So the property owner is getting a fairly substantial break, even with charging the same cost as it would be for a connection to the main. The other thing is unless we have a justifiable, defensible reason to charge a differential rate structure, we're prohibited from doing so and that would be a discussion that you would have to have with the law department.

- Thank you Director. I know we did talk about that back in 2018 and we moved ahead with it and didn't have an issue. I think the overwhelming concern being the alleviating of flooding in neighborhoods. I'd be interested to see what the committee thought on this issue or anyone else. Let's see. Flipping between the pages here. Alder Scannell. Go ahead Alder Scannell. Just some questions. Alder Wery, are you getting a lot of feedback? I haven't got anything from my constituents or anything. Are there a lot of people not hooking up because of the cost or have heard any kind of push back or anything that brought this to ya?

- I have encountered that, one, and looked into it during the year when the fee was lower and then, of course, when you went to do it it was doubled. So, there are people who are holding off, you know, and almost \$1,000 fee plus whatever you pay the contractor. I don't know if it's 500 to 2,000. So you have 1500 to two grand to help alleviate water issues. You know, that's not something that everybody can just drop on something like this. A lot of time that flooding affects multiple properties. So, I'm just looking like we did in the past to help encourage these hook ups.

- Then it would just be to Director Grenier. How big a hit is this on your department?

- Well, we did, the last page of the attachment shows the difference spent versus collected on the mini storm.

- I saw that.

- So, in 2019 we lost almost 271,000. \$270,557.28.

- And how is that made up? That wouldn't be through bonding, would it, or?

- Bonding supported by the storm water utility, yes.

- Okay, all right.

- So, Director, correct me if I'm wrong but if you have 20 people sign up for this program and you half the fee from 970 down to, you know, 480, the amount of money we'd be short is the 480 times 20, you know.

- That'd be the difference between the maximum fee collected, yes.

- Okay. So in the last few years we've had, what? 11, 14, 13, 19. So I mean, if you go with 20 you're looking at a hit of maybe 10 grand if 20 people sign up. So that's what the effect would be.

- Okay, thanks.

- If there's more people, there would be more of an effect. Alder Gerlach.

- Just to be clear though, if you lower the fee, you cut it in half let's say, as you're proposing, that's not just, like what you said, a \$10,000 hit. That's in addition to the money that's already being lost in the program, right? Because I'm looking at this page and it's all in the red. So, the city has lost money on this all along. So, it sounds to me like we would just be losing more money. Is that right?

- That is correct but as Alderman Wery had indicated, the incremental loss is a relatively small one.

- And, okay. Anyone else with to, Alder Steuer.

- Thank you Chair. You know, this has been an issue in my district for a while too, different folks that have to hook up to the system this way. I'm all for the program stating that, well, if one person's gonna do it, if you can get the entire neighborhood to lock into this, you know, Alder Wery suggested the lower fee. I would feel that there would be more folks that would get involved with this and maybe we could cut into that red a little bit. But, you know, if you just do one here, one there, it's quite expensive for an individual homeowner. So, I don't know, Director Grenier, if we have a map or something out there that shows areas in the city that have had the mini sewer program instituted. It would be nice to get a feel for that and I'm just saying if we could move forward and look at other areas and maybe neighborhood association meetings or something that would let the citizens know ahead of time, that, hey, this is a possibility and you might need to hook up before you sell your home. You know, different things like that just to have that information. I don't have one myself in my house but there will come a day where I'll need to do it. So, I think part of it is the initial cost. You know, people are like, oh boy. It's like the sidewalk issue. It's storms mini sewer.

Things like that. It would really be nice to have a feel for the city how much, or how many areas are covered by mini sewers and such and work off of that. So that's just my comment.

- Thank you Alderman Steuer. Alder Johnson.

- Thank you. I will just maybe echo the sentiment that I do support the reduction of the fee. One thing that hasn't been brought up, well, for one my district does experience a lot of flooding in different capacities and I'm actually holding onto right now to about six different residents, their request to look at this and so I think, at least in my area it's impacting quite a few people but the thing that hasn't been talked about, with my district in particular, in an area of the city that really could see one of the biggest benefits from the hookups is that this is also one of the lowest income, if not I think the lowest income census track in the entire city of Green Bay. And so, we've kind of got this perfect storm here where you have a district that's experiencing a lot of flooding and then you have residents that don't have the means to do the hookup. So I think providing some relief in that regard would be a really useful tool to help encourage people to make those hookups and alleviate some of that flooding.

- Thank you Alder Johnson. Anyone else wish to comment or ask a question on this one? All right, I'll entertain a motion if anybody wishes to make one.

- Alderman Wery, it was your anything you want of this? I mean, would a receive and place in file be appropriate? Is this a budget item? Should we discuss it then?

- I was actually looking to have the fee reduced back down to 500.

- Yeah.

- So motion to reduce the fee to 500.

- I'll second that and with Alder Wery, I agree with the conversation. I remember a time when it was much reduced and this was a big service that was provided in the city and, you know, it's hard to balance our budget a lot of times but this is something that if it can alleviate flooding and damage to homes it's something that, as a city, we should encourage and figure it out in the end.

- Okay but--

- Go ahead Director.

- Just to be clear, I wanna understand why the Alders think this is gonna alleviate flooding. It has nothing to do with that. This is simply hooking up somebody's sump pump to a storm rather than letting it discharge to grate.

- Well, I think you just answered, I think Director. A lot of times people have it popping it right back into the yard and just keeps circulating or goes into the neighbor's yard, cause the ponding water when you can just get it away.

- That's my understanding.

- It's yard flooding.

- Yeah, exactly. I guess it's all based on grade of a person's property and a lot of that falls on the homeowner but, you know, if it's outside of the drain tile it seems to help but I've seen yards all throughout the city when we have a lot of moisture in spring where their yard is just flooded and unless that pipe can go all the way to the street, which we don't allow, I do think it prevents yard flooding but that's just my opinion from what I've experienced.

- It depends on how many trees there are. It depends on how many trees there are.

- Yep, always.

- Well there was a motion and a second. Any other discussion on this item? Alder Gerlach.

- And this is a stupid question. I'm sorry, I have to ask this. Are you talking about that black hose that I see coming out of people's houses all over my neighborhood?

- Yeah.

- Yeah.

- Oh my God. I'm sorry. I'm sorry. That is disgusting. And you know what it does? It runs into the road and then it runs down the street and freezes solid in winter and it is, oh my God. Thank you.

- Yeah, you're welcome.

- Just one question.

- Alder Scannell, sure.

- Do you know, can block grant money or anything be used for this sort of thing? Do you know Director Grenier?

- That's a great question.

- No, okay.

- Probably only in certain neighborhoods maybe. Okay.

- Yes, it would have to be relegated to low or moderate income neighborhoods.

- Okay.

- Are there any other discussion on this item?

- I would just like to comment on that. For example, my neighborhood falls into that block grant category. Maybe it's worth looking into. Maybe people, neighborhoods that do, 'cause there's a lot of that in my neighborhood. I live in Old Krebble and maybe it is something to consider if this can be

covered with the block grant funds because I am just not in favor of reducing the fee and going further in debt with a program that's already been losing money all the time.

- All right. Thank you. Any other questions or comments? All right, the motion and the second was to lower the fee to 500. Those in favor of that item.

- Aye.

- Aye.

- Aye.

- Opposed.

- No.

- Okay. That passes three to one and we'll probably talk about it at council this week but I do like the idea for the block grant. Those have been all designated for this year already but next year I'm sure we could, I'd definitely be interested in having that available. All right. We are onto number seven. Consideration with possible action on a request by Alder Wery for an update on repairs of resurfacing of Shawano Avenue, referred from March 25th and amended to request staff to find out from WisDOT how to get the project scheduled. I think we had a little progress on this. Director Grenier.

- We actually had more progress than we thought. Included in the packet is a letter from myself to Dave Segerstrom who's a Project Development Supervisor with the Wisconsin Department of Transportation here in the northeast region requesting that the project be included for scoping for a future surface transportation improvement program administered through the Wisconsin DOT. Just today I received a letter back from Anne who is the Northeast Region Programming and Scoping Engineer and Anne, the letter reads, Dear Mr. Grenier, thank you for request in scheduling an improvement project on State Highway 29 Shawano Avenue between Hudson Street North Oakland Avenue. My understanding is that the original pavement was constructed in 1948. The first overlay was completed in 2005 and after reviewing the current pavement data and briefly discussing with the Northeast region's pavement engineer, the Northeast Region will schedule and improvement project in state fiscal year in 2028 pending funding availability. It is likely to be a mill and overlay type project. So, within the next several months, programming is gonna be reaching out to us to begin gathering information and to enter into a state municipal agreement. Any utility work underlying that road will have to be funded separately by the city, which is common for DOT projects and then a reminder that the city would be responsible for 25% of the design costs but the great news is the state has included this in their 2028 fiscal year. So, I realize that's, you know, that's eight years out. I get that. But there is a light at the end of this particular tunnel. So my staff at DPW will continue to do what we can to maintain and patch that road and hold it together for the next eight years but I think, Alder Wery, I think I may have told you that absolute best case, they've already got the first six years of the program spoken for. We're looking at some point beyond that to come in at eight years was fantastic. So, I'm really happy with the response that we got from Wis DOT on this. So, this afternoon when I got the email from DOT, I reached out to my division heads and the Green Bay water utility and said, you know, fantastic news. We were notified that we got a project coming and 2028 will be here before you know it. I mean, eight years goes by in a blink of an eye. I've already

been the director for seven and a half, by point of comparison. So we are already starting to scope and plan in house so that we're ready to have that discussion with DOT.

- That is great news. I mean, for how long have we, Steve, pounded our heads against the wall on this road, right, with the state.

- Four years.

- Do we have a good plan on how to address the mine field to make it less of a mine field for the next eight years?

- Again, we're just gonna continue to go out there and patch the holes. The problem is the underlying concrete, it's a 1929 concrete. It's literally crumbling so we can't anticipate where the next hole's gonna come because we'll patch here and then a hole develops over there because the concrete underneath it completely fell apart.

- If we can, and you guys do a great job. You really focus, especially on those side ones along the sidewalk. If you drive on that one, you're taking man, you better have good insurance for your car.

- Agreed.

- Okay. Alder Brunette, you had your hand up.

- The four alders, you, Steuer, Scannell, Johnson, this is all your area. I would say, I mean it's nice to hear that it's being acknowledged. To hear that it's eight years I guess in BP world maybe but I think that seems like forever to go, forever in the future. I mean, I would wonder now that they've acknowledged that it's a project that they're gonna fund or look at funding, can we just maybe turn up the, you know, public pressure through our state legislatures to move that up a little more? I'm not as optimistic. Eight years just seems, I drive that road all the time. It's rough. I mean, it's rough. Eight years from now who knows what it's gonna look like. Go ahead, Steve, I know it's your district.

- Thank you Alder Brunette. You'll be the only one left on the council at that time, Alder Brunette.

- I'll be long gone by then, trust me.

- Alder Steuer.

- Well thank you Chair. I agree with Alder Brunette on this too. I mean, we're looking at Gray Street in our area and the last time that was worked on was 1952. So, I look at dates on this and granted, eight years does seem like a long time and I know it takes a while for the wheels of government to grind but, you know, we've got a number of alders here that Shawano Avenue is really not good. I wish we could do this for some other roads in Green Bay as well. I'd like to throw Bond Street in but we're talking about Shawano right now. So, I think with that being said, you know, if we could put a little pressure on the state. I don't know, Director Grenier, if you feel that would help at all but my feeling is that if we can get some little quicker movement on this, I don't see any harm in trying.

- Steve, have you seen projects move up if pressure's applied?

- As I indicated, the first six years of their program is already committed. They have projects under contract, signed, ready moving forward. We're only going into the scoping. Scoping typically is 12 to 18 months of a project. So, I don't think you're gonna get any sooner than seven years 'cause again, the first six years of the program, that's already been approved by the Governor. It's signed. It's done. So absolute best case, I don't wanna categorize it as poking them with a stick but essentially you're gonna be poking them with a stick to move up one year.

- I would never poke anybody with a stick.

- Oh yes you would.

- Unless it was Randy.

- One thing, Chair Wery, more funding to roads, that's how it can move up. Will that happen in Madison? Likely not. But, I mean, that is a possibility if, you know, this governor or any future governor and the legislature allocates more money to roads but I won't hold my breath.

- Okay. Did I miss anyone's hand here? Alder Johnson.

- Thank you Chairman.

- Can't really hear you. Oh, there you go.

- Can you hear me? Are we good?

- Yep, perfect.

- So Director Grenier, we appreciate your enthusiasm given how long we've been poking at this but I'm less enthused thinking about eight years and putting it into perspective the current condition of that road and so, you know, I've had previous conversations with our state representative and at one point he had suggested that the state does maintain an emergency fund for certain types of road repairs and I can't help but wonder if there might be an opportunity for us to make a request of that fund to put a more comprehensive patch on that road, similar to what was done on North Broadway in Alder Scannell's district. It's my understanding that that more, again, more comprehensive patch was really meant to have sort of a 10 year shelf life. And so, if my numbers on that are all drawing up, I'm just wondering if that might be a possibility because I think the patching of individual potholes there has proved to be relatively ineffective. I know your team, Director Grenier, is out there constantly filling and refilling and I just think about gosh, the labor effort that goes into that. And so, if the state would have the ability, again, to fund. Heck, I'd even say locally. If we had the ability to fund something that's, like an eight year solution, I guess, as opposed to an every snow fall solution. Your thoughts, Director Grenier?

- North Broadway has become the no good deed goes unpunished of my department. I did not want to do what I did out there. We literally had no choice. That road, while Dubrow was doing the work to repair the joints on the MSB interceptor line that thing fell apart. It literally turned to gravel underneath the wheels of the cars and as fast as we could patch the gravel, it was falling apart worse. I didn't have any choice whatsoever but to do what I did out there.

- It reminds me of Shawano Avenue.

- Believe it or not, Shawano's not that bad. But, the minute we start picking at Shawano, if we start pulling that asphalt off, we're gonna be in the same boat and we're talking about, we're probably looking at a three million dollar, eight year fix. Given the length of that, the width of it and the amount of material we'd have to utilize and at that point you're better off not taking the DOT funding and going it yourself and then we're talking, you know, I got a feeling that this eight year project, it's not gonna wind up being a mill and resurface. I think it's gonna be a more comprehensive reconstruct out there. Speaking with water utility today, their water main three vintages, I believe they said 1929, 1930-something, and a 1950s vintage. So all the water main out there has to go. By the time we dig that much out we haven't evaluated the sewer conditions yet. We may wind up with two thirds to three quarters of that road being impacted which is what happened with Belt. Belt was originally supposed to be a resurface or a mill and overlay and by the time we got done with the utility damage out there, the DOT consented and said, no let's go ahead and reconstruct it. There's not gonna be anything left. I've got a feeling that's where Shawano is headed so I think we're gonna get a good project out of it. Really the only way to move that up is if we tell the DOT thanks but no thanks. That is a connecting highway and we get connecting highway money for that and part of the connecting highway money that we get for the state aid on that is to do all maintenance. So that's very clear in the state municipal agreement for connecting highways. All maintenance activities are our responsibility. We can't go back to the state and say, please raid your secret stash. They're gonna come back with the state municipal agreement and say, for the money you get every year, right here it says in the document, this is yours. We've asked that question.

- Well, given the condition of that road, I mean, how optimistic are you that we're able to properly maintain it for eight more years?

- We'll do what needs to be done. That's a street and that's a major street in the City of Green Bay. We're not gonna let it become totally impassable. We will continue to work on it. For maintenance activities, that has probably become priority number one with our department.

- Okay.

- It's, and Steve you know this, and Alder Johnson, everybody, it's sad if you come in from the west side, you know in off the highway or any of the suburbs and you're going down Shawano and you wanna get downtown. It's sad. It's a sad representation really, presentation of our city if you go by West High School and you got this road falling apart. And people ask you about it all the time, right? Brian, you know, when are we gonna get this dang thing fixed. It's hard to explain it to them. Anyone else on the committee have a question? Alder Steuer.

- Thank you Chair. You know, I know we've all talked about the time frame and the potholes and how to maintain it and how to all that and it's all fine and good. Director Grenier, is there a temporary fix where you could somehow regrade or, you know, a lot of times when you resurface you just do a, skim off the top portion and then you just regrind it and do something. Is there a fairly inexpensive way to just go across some of these really bad areas and just lay something down temporarily that would hold up for six, eight years until we could finally do our project? You know, you do the potholes constantly and I know we only had like \$200,000 in our budget at one time. I'm not sure what it is exactly now for potholes but it seems like we're using a lot of that money just for Shawano and a few other major roads. I don't see why there's some way that we couldn't use some

kind of grinding machine, just kinda cut it down a couple of inches and then just resurface that area temporarily so that it could last four, six, eight years. Just a thought. I don't know what you think on that.

- There's only an inch and three quarters of asphalt on top of the underlying concrete to start with. That was the DOT project back in '05. If we peel that off, the act of doing the milling, we will lose the 1929 vintage concrete and it will fall apart. We've looked at this in the past. The reason we haven't done the mill and overlay is because it's not going to work.

- No, I just had to ask. Just thought I'd ask.

- Director Grenier, do you need more funds to address Shawano as far as the patching or pothole filling? Do you have enough?

- I have not heard anything to the contrary yet. I've not heard that we don't have enough money to patch it. Anticipating where you're going, if I do hear something I will definitely come back and ask.

- We'll shake the money tree.

- Okay, no, that's fair enough. If I do hear from my staff that, Steve, we're losing money on Shawano, we need more, I will definitely come ask for it. I understand the priority here.

- This road out of all of 'em makes me sad. Alder Brunette.

- Thank you Director. I think that, Director Grenier, it is good news in a way that we received notice from the state they acknowledged it in their plan. Obviously not anything near what we were hoping for but if Director Grenier believes it's a positive move in a good direction, that's a good thing. So, I would make a motion to receive and place in file so we move on.

- All right. Motion by Alder Brunette. Second by Alderman Scannell to receive and place in file. Any discussion on this? All right, thanks Steve. I appreciate you doing all the work on this and at least we are moving in a positive direction. Those in favor.

- Aye.

- Opposed. Motion carried. And those potholes will be done by next week?

- Ah, no.

- Next item. Number eight. Consideration with possible action on request by Department of Public Works to approve single source purchase through Xylem for stormwater pumps and control panels for the Museum Place storm lift station and approve the purchase of the pumps and control panel in the amount of \$123,000, \$123,750, there we go. Go ahead, Director.

- And actually I'm gonna have, I see the purchasing manager, Calvin Winters is online with us. So I'm gonna turn this over to Cal to see if he's got anything to say first.

- Mr. Winters.

- [Calvin] Can you guys hear me now?
- Yes, I just unmuted you.
- Oh yes.
- [Calvin] Okay. So this is a request that Jim came to me on pump system that they, if you guys have standardized so that it's the same pumps, the same parts, the same training for us. So they came to me with this request to single source this for that reason which, with that reasoning being same parts, same training, same maintenance, I did approve this on that.
- Okay. Questions from the committee?
- One of the other things--
- When do you expect this? Oh go ahead Director.
- Okay. One of the other things about Xylem, like products and Xylem being the local rep for them. They are located in Pewaukee so delivery charges are minimized and response on any maintenance activities that we need, we have the ability to simply pull the pump out, put it on a truck and in an hour and a half to two hours have it at a reputable dealer or the factory authorized dealer for service which has been an issue for us in the past. So that also does play into the reason why we are requesting to sole source this.
- When is this being installed, Steve?
- That's a this year project. This is for the lift station that's going in on Museum Place that will help to alleviate the flooding in the Antoinette area.
- I'm sure that's music to Brian's ears. Alderman Johnson. Is that also gonna help, I know Antoinette, I know Shawano usually by the fire station, that usually gets really flooded. Does that also help that?
- Boy, offhand I don't know if those are interconnected.
- Okay. 'Cause they're like right by each other.
- Right but .
- Did you call on me?
- Alder Gerlach. Alder Gerlach, yes, go ahead.
- Just wondering if this financial outlay, \$123,000 is already within the approved budget.
- Yes.
- Okay, thank you.

- All right, thank you Alder. Any other questions from the committee or I'll entertain a motion.

- Motion to approve.

- Second.

- Motion by Alder Brunette, second by Alderman Scannell to approve. Discussion? Those in favor?

- Aye.

- Aye.

- Aye.

- Opposed. That motion carried. Number nine. Consideration with possible action on the report of the purchasing manager. A, purchase of dewatering hoses and pipes for a new pump purchased in April 2020, RFQ 3250 was issued for this and three responses were received. All responses received did not meet the stated specification as required for aluminum piping. A vendor who was able to meet specifications was sourced for a cost of \$33,361 and no substitute request was submitted and approved by the Director of Public Works and the Procurement Manager. See attached. Steve or Mr. Martin?

- I think either myself or, either myself or Cal could handle this. As we've indicated on the summary, we put a specification out amongst the notification and what we're looking at here, this is the pumps, hoses, and fittings that go on our suction trucks. So, it's imperative that they be the aluminum pipe because they need to be able to withstand the rigors of bouncing around on one of the sucker trucks and then being deployed down manholes and aluminum, as opposed to some other metal, because of the lightweight nature of it. I mean, these guys are taking 'em off the truck and onto the, you know, off of the rack on the truck and then deploying them on a very regular basis. They get used daily. What we had was some vendors who were trying to substitute other materials for what we asked for and that simply, based on our experience in the field, that's not going to work for us so we did approach Cal and ask that a no substitute be inserted into the specification and as a result we wound up with only one vendor who was able to supply.

- Any questions from the committee? What are your wishes?

- Motion to approve.

- Second.

- Motion by Scannell, second by Brunette to approve. Any discussion? Those in favor.

- Aye.

- Aye.

- Opposed. Motion carried, thank you. B, awarding Edison Court Pickle Ball Court project, base bid an alternate to Poblocki Paving Corporation, West Allis, Wisconsin. RFQ 3245 was issued through the purchasing department and one response was received. The department is recommending that the base bid and the alternate are awarded for the sum of \$78,557.80. Director?

- With any public construction over 25,000 that has to be led by public bid and that has to be done through the Department of Public Works, for a number of different types of projects what we found is the pool that Purchasing Department has, especially on these small or unique type contracts, they actually have a better selection of contractors than respond to our open bid requests. So we work cooperatively with the Purchasing Department to make those determinations and where we determine that they have a better vendor selection which will in turn result in a better product and lower cost to the city, we authorize them to put the contracts out. Now they follow the exact same statutory requirements. There's no shortcutting or anything. We're simply using the Purchasing Department because they get a better vendor pool. Pickle Ball courts, it's kind of a specialized asphalt that paving so there's really not a whole lot of guys who do it. I was a little surprised that we only had a single response but Poblocki is a contractor we successfully used in the past and the cost, we did go back and review that with the Parks Department to make sure that the cost came in within their expectations and was part of their project 'cause we're putting this contract out on their behalf. So, we are recommending award of the contract, even though there was only a single vendor.

- Did it come in within our budget? Did it come in within budget?

- That I would have to defer to Kaurie Mihm. And it looks like I need to unmute Kaurie. Sorry about that Kaurie.

- [Kaurie] That's okay. Can you hear me?

- Yep.

- Yes we can.

- [Kaurie] Okay. So, it did go a little over budget and mainly it was because we had decided to include resurfacing or I'm sorry, re-color coding the existing tennis courts which are on the north end of the park. So on the north end, there's two existing tennis courts with also four pickle ball courts that have temporary nets. So, on the north end you can use it for either tennis or pickle ball and the south end of the courts, there's two existing tennis courts and those are being converted to six permanent pickle ball courts. So, when we decided that we should include the color coding also for the north end, it kind of increased the budget but it really makes the most sense to, or the cost I should say of the project but it really makes sense. It's time for that area of the courts to be resurfaced and since we're gonna have a contractor there mobilized anyway, we were able to find additional funding which was, let's see, about \$18,000 over our original cost but we were able to find it so we do have the funding and we'd like to move ahead with just getting it all done at one time and then in the future when there's maintenance that needs to be done, we can re-color code both sides at the same time. So, that was kind of the reason for doing that.

- Thank you, Kaurie. Where did that funding come from? Was it another project that was maybe under budget?

- [Kaurie] Yes it was in kind of one of our pots of money where we've been kind of lumping some of our athletic fields and courts, you know, into one pot and some of those projects were under budget so we did have that additional funding. As part of the project as a whole, in 2019 the city financed 50,000 and then the Petland Pickle Ball Players also donated \$10,000 towards the project. So that's where the funding came from.

- All right. Questions from the committee. Alder Brunette.

- Yeah maybe it was a lack of a, you know, better term but I don't like that there's a pot of money that, to me, as a taxpayer when a project comes under budget then that should be, you know, we shouldn't hold that for future projects. Maybe that's a policy discussion for a later time. I'm not gonna parse it right now but just something to keep in mind is when we come under bid on a project, you know, if we don't have oversight on that, it could lead to some real strange dealings in the future. Projects that are being done or funds that are being held over for future projects that defeat the whole purpose of an open budget discussion. So, nothing other than that comment's needed but just something to keep in mind.

- Thank you, Alder.

- Motion to approve.

- Motion by Alderman Scannell to approve.

- Second.

- I'm sorry, who had the second?

- Brunette.

- Brunette, second by Brunette. Further discussion? Those in favor?

- Aye.

- Opposed. One nothing, approved. Item C, request approval to purchase annual street maintenance consumables as needed for the 2020 season and for annual budgeted expenditures from '21 to '25 from the contracted vendors as noted below. All you, Director.

- I'll start off and Cal, feel free to interrupt me if I misspeak some where along the line. Back in March, Alderman Nicholson, then Alderman Nicholson asked us to, reminded me that he and I had had a discussion relative to approaching Brown County Public Works to see if they could possibly be a vendor for our asphaltic materials and we had not done that. So, following that committee meeting we did go back and approach Brown County. Brown County did indicate to us that for cold mixed asphalt, they don't produce that. They buy that commercially as well. So recommendation from Purchasing Department is still to go to either Northeast Asphalt or MCC at an anticipated cost of \$118 a ton and the 2020 budget includes up to \$10,500 for the purchase of cold mixed asphalt. However, Brown County does produce hot mixed asphalt. We had originally quoted Northeast Asphalt at between 56.25 and 58.75, depending on the type of mix we needed per ton from Northeast Asphalt. Brown County has agreed to supply those same two mixes to us or as close as

possible. We won't notice a difference, let's put it that way. There's some minor formulation differences but from a performance standpoint, they're interchangeable with the two mixes that Northeast Asphalt had quoted us on and Brown County will supply that to us at \$49.50 a ton. So the total budget estimate, \$91,200, the total expenditure remains the same. It's just, we'll be able to get more asphalt going with Brown County.

- We know where to use it. Shawano Avenue.

- Any questions? Motion by Alderman Scannell. Second by Brunette. Any discussion? Those in favor.

- Aye.

- Aye.

- Alders, motion carried. Number 10. Consideration with possible action on the review and award of the following contracts. A, resurfacing 120. B, sewers. Three, mini sewers. Any issue with any of these Director?

- No. The bid summary for the mini sewer was included in the packet but we only opened the contracts for the resurfacing yesterday. So just very briefly, you can see before you the bids that were received. We had three contractors bid on the part B, which is the concrete portion. So, curb and gutter repair or things of that nature and then two contractors bid on the asphalt, MCC and Northeast Asphalt. Low responsive responsible bidders, Fischer-Ulman Construction for part A in the amount of \$448,537.50. And MCC Incorporated was the low responsive responsible bidder for the part B at a contract amount of \$1,361,814.67. Staff does recommend awarding those contracts to those vendors in the amounts identified and we will have that bid summary in the packet that goes forward to council.

- All right.

- Motion to approve.

- Can we take these together, Steve?

- You can, yes.

- All right, thank you. Did I hear a?

- Motion for approval.

- All right, motion by Scannell. Seconded by Alder Gerlach had the second. Any discussion?

- The lowest responsive bidder for both projects. So one bid one, the other bid the other?

- Correct. The way that the item will read in the minutes, what you approved was the award of the contract sewers, 3-20 mini sewers to Dubrow Incorporated in the amount of 324,752.50 and then resurfacing contract part A and part B with the contractor and numbers that I had read off to you.

- All right, any other questions? Those in favor.

- Aye.

- Aye.

- Opposed? Motion carried. Number 11. Report of actions taken by the Department of Public Works. A, granting of licenses sidewalk builder, Brian's Quality Concrete, Carter Trucking and Excavating, Jim Fischer Incorporated, KPC Concrete Contractor LLC, Loch Construction Company Incorporated, and Melnarik Concrete Incorporated. Two is tree and brush trimmer license to Bay Valley Tree Service and three is underground sprinkler system to Wolfraths Landscaping LLC. So Director, it looks like those are already over.

- Yes, the committee did grant us the authority while the pandemic is going on to handle those license issuances at a staff level. So we're reporting off. All of these contractors have worked for us before. Again, this is more or less procedural but we do wanna make sure that we keep you posted and in the loop on this.

- Motion to receive and place on file.

- Motion by Alder Scannell to receive and place on file.

- Second.

- Second by Alder Gerlach. Discussion. Those in favor.

- Aye.

- Aye.

- Opposed. Motion carried. Informational Director's report.

- Director's report will be painfully brief tonight. I'm headed back into the field as soon as we get done here. I've been out since about nine o'clock this morning dealing with flooding issues across the city. Strong northeast winds came in ahead of a storm front. We didn't get a whole lot of rain but those winds coming in gusting up to 52 at times, we had waves that were hitting the dike out along Shore Drive crashing 10 to 12 feet up in the air and then the remainder of the wave coming right over the top of the dike. Almost 30 years I've lived in Green Bay. I've never seen the type of flooding I saw today. We literally had a river flowing alongside of, well, Alder Lefebvre's house is in the middle of a lake and there was a river flowing across Shore Drive into the Wildlife Sanctuary. It's crazy. I saw places in Green Bay, the north end of Ashland Avenue up by Fort Howard Park was under water. I've never seen water there before. We had a river flowing across North Broadway at Prairie because the Fox River blew its banks out. We had four foot white caps coming backwards up the Fox River. I don't know if the two remaining docks we have at metro, I don't know what we even have them anymore. They were getting banged around at nine o'clock this morning and we didn't feel safe trying to get 'em out of the water to try to rescue them. This was just absolutely nuts. Things do look like they've stabilized at about four o'clock this afternoon. It looks like the winds are starting to shift out of the north as opposed to the northeast and they're dropping in intensity, steady blow at 20 to 25

knots with gusts up to 35. So that's a far sight better than 35 steady with gusts of 52 that we had earlier today. But, if you're so inclined, please send good thoughts and prayers to those who have been impacted by this. This is much worse. It's a combination of the March 2019 East River flood and the December 2019 Bay flood all in the same day.

- Thank you Director. Questions?

- Wery, one question for Director Grenier.

- Go ahead.

- Yard waste before that, you know, doing the yard waste and advertising that on social media, that's helpful. One person had a question, Nikolai. When's the last date that you think along Nikolai they'd have to get yard waste because I think pick up's the 11th. What would you recommend I tell him? Just, can I tell him--

- It's under water now

- That's true. Well, it's former Alder Wiezbiskie's property, if that gives you reference.

- Oh okay. I would suggest that he continue to monitor social media or contact the Operations Division directly. We are keeping up with that on a daily basis and I had some folks ask me, well okay, when are you getting to my street? And I keep telling them, watch the social media. And that's how they're responding to me. They're actually asking me the question through Facebook so I know they're reading the posts and what I've told them is, okay, if we say today on Wednesday that we're in Monday routes on the east side and your garbage, that means we're two days, we're picking yard waste two days behind your garbage day and your normal garbage day is Friday, expect us to be there on Wednesday. So that's kind of how it works. My recommendation, that's why I asked Operations Manager Pierlot to start posting that daily was to get that information off to the residents every day so that they can monitor that.

- Okay, thank you.

- Any other questions for the Director?

- All right.

- Thanks for the good work.

- Motion to receive and place in file.

- Second.

- Motion by Scannell, second by Brunette to receive and place in file. Those in favor.

- Aye.

- Aye.

- Aye.

- Opposed? Motion carried. Our next meeting is scheduled for May 13th and I think we'll just keep it up as we always do. We'll follow parks and hopefully we can keep it on this Wednesday rotation so everybody knows when it is, where it is.

- My only request is that we make just a little more gap in between.

- Oh, all right.

- I don't remember a meeting for I&S. This is a long one.

- Yes.

- Yeah. We had to break in Lynn. Lynn, our meetings are always this long. Oh man. No, they're not. They're not. Jesse talks too much.

- Motion to adjourn.

- Second.

- Motion to adjourn by Brunette. Those in favor.

- Aye.

- Aye.

- We're adjourned.

- Thank you all.