



MINUTES OF THE IMPROVEMENT AND SERVICES COMMITTEE

WEDNESDAY, MAY 13, 2020, 6:00 PM

Virtual Meeting

**Public may also view meeting 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. APPROVAL OF THE AGENDA.

Moved by Ald. Randy Scannell, seconded by Ald. Lynn Gerlach to approve the agenda of the Wednesday, May 13, 2020 Improvement and Services Committee meeting. Motion carried. Vote: Yes- Chris Wery, Jesse Brunette, Lynn Gerlach, Randy Scannell, No- None, Abstain- None

D. APPROVAL OF MINUTES.

Moved by Ald. Randy Scannell, seconded by Ald. Lynn Gerlach to approve the minutes 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. REGULAR BUSINESS.

1. Consideration with possible action on request by Ald. Dorff, due to great concern regarding the possibility/probability of extensive flooding to the homes and roads on the South Shore of the Bay of Green Bay due to the current height of the bay, to provide for a full report on the progress that has been made on obtaining funding to fix the dike on the south shore of the bay of Green Bay, a timeline on when work on the dike will begin, and how we can finance this work even if we are not able to obtain state and federal grants (referred to staff at the April 8, 2020 Improvement and Services Committee meeting).

Moved by Ald. Jesse Brunette, seconded by Ald. Randy Scannell 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. Jesse Brunette, seconded by Ald. Randy Scannell 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. Jesse Brunette, seconded by Ald. Randy Scannell to receive and place on file and endorse Option #4 from the Dike Recap Memo on the request by Ald. Dorff, due to great concern regarding the possibility/probability of extensive flooding to the homes and roads on the South Shore of the Bay of Green Bay due to the current height of the bay, to provide for a full report on the progress that has been made on obtaining funding to fix the dike on the south shore of the bay of Green Bay, a timeline on when work on the dike will begin, and how we can finance this work even if we are not able to obtain state and federal grants. 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 (referred to staff at the April 29, 2020 Improvement and Services Committee meeting).

Moved by Ald. Randy Scannell, seconded by Ald. Chris Wery to not charge interest for unpaid sidewalk repairs financed by the City for the 2020 program year on 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 failed. Committee will send to Common Council. Vote: Yes- Chris Wery, Randy Scannell, No- Jesse Brunette, Lynn Gerlach, Abstain- None

3. Consideration with possible action on request by Ald. Gerlach to have staff collect and analyze data regarding the number and cost to both the City and the residents of mini storm sewers requested and installed during the spring, summer and fall of 2020 for the purpose of evaluating the impact of the reduction in fee hook-up.

Moved by Ald. Lynn Gerlach, seconded by Ald. Randy Scannell to receive and place on file the request by Ald. Gerlach to have staff collect and analyze data regarding the number and cost to both

the City and the residents of mini storm sewers requested and installed during the spring, summer and fall of 2020 for the purpose of evaluating the impact of the reduction in fee hook-up. 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. Lefebvre to look at residential policy per storm water runoff; residences are experiencing rain water runoff from elevated houses because of floodplain building elevation requirements (FEMA) (referred to staff at the February 25, 2020 Improvement and Services Committee meeting).

Moved by Ald. Jesse Brunette, seconded by Ald. Randy Scannell to refer to Plan Commission the request by Ald. Lefebvre to look at residential policy per storm water runoff; residences are experiencing rain water runoff from elevated houses because of floodplain building elevation requirements (FEMA). Motion carried. Vote: Yes- Chris Wery, Jesse Brunette, Lynn Gerlach, Randy Scannell, No- None, Abstain- None

5. Consideration with possible action on General Ordinance number 14-20, an ordinance to amend Section 29.21 I, GBMC, relating to penalties for parking violations.

Moved by Ald. Randy Scannell, seconded by Ald. Jesse Brunette to approve General Ordinance number 14-20, an ordinance to amend Section 29.21 I, GBMC, relating to penalties for parking violations. Motion carried. Vote: Yes- Chris Wery, Jesse Brunette, Lynn Gerlach, Randy Scannell, No- None, Abstain- None

F. INFORMATIONAL.

1. 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 27, 2020.

G. PUBLIC HEARINGS.

H. ADJOURNMENT.

Moved by Ald. Randy Scannell, seconded by Ald. Jesse Brunette 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

- All right, we will commence the May 13th meeting of the Improvement and Service Committee, and we'll note that all members are present. Alder Gerlach, Alder Brunette, Alder Scannell, and Alder Wery. Can I have an approval of the agenda?

- So moved.

- Second.

- A motion by Alder Scannell, seconded by Alder Gerlach, to approve the agenda. Any changes? Those in favor?

- Aye

- Aye.

- Opposed? All right, motion carried. D, approval of the minutes?

- So moved.

- Second.

- To approve by Scannell, second by Gerlach. Any discussion? Those in favor?

- Aye.

- Aye.

- Opposed? Motion carried. Regular business, number one. Nice big long one. I should have Barb read it, no I'll read it. Consideration--

- I can read it.

- No, that's fine, that's fine. That's my job, that's why I get the big bucks, right?

- That's right, yeah.

- Consideration with possible action on a request by Alder Dorff, due to great concern regarding the possibility / probability of extensive flooding to the homes and roads on the south shore of the bay of Green Bay due to the current height of the bay, to provide for a full report on the progress that has been made on obtaining funding to fix the dike on the south shore of the bay of Green Bay, a timeline on when work on the dike will begin, and how we can finance this work, even if we are not able to obtain state and federal grants, this is referred from the April 8th meeting. Alder Dorff, do you want to go first or do you want the Director, it's your item, so?

- No, I'd like to go first, if I may.

- Go ahead. Go for it.

- Because I do want to mention that I worked with Alder Lefebvre on this. She and I both have constituents in that area. We both are equally concerned. I first wanted to say thank you to Director Grenier and to Matt Heckenliable. The memo was excellent. The history you gave was so succinct. And all of the interrelated parts of what's going on in your different, when one option wasn't gonna work you looked at a different option and a different option, and I just appreciate the amount of work that must've gone into all the research that you guys did. And I know that part of my communication talks about funding, which I was reminded of last night as we went through the Finance Committee, and I am certain that will be also a portion of this discussion tonight. But I'm hoping that Matt, you, or you, Director Grenier, can really touch on the parts of the memo that, because everyone may not have been able to read that memo, and I think it's really important for people to see how hard you guys have been working to figure out a solution for this dike. Thank you.

- Director?

- Okay. I'm just gonna start off with a brief introduction here, and then turn it over to Matt so he can go through the memo and brief everybody on what we've been doing, how we got to the point we're at. The dike was constructed in 1973 following a 1972 flood on the bay of Green Bay. Constructed by the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, one of the biggest misconceptions that we have in the community is what the function of that dike is. It's not a true flood control, and by that what I mean, it was, that dike is not intended to be water-tight. It is a wave run-up, or an energy dissipation device. And that's not conjecture on behalf of the city staff, we've actually received verification from the Department of Natural Resources on that. The intent of that dike was to stop the wave action from progressing up onto dry land and adversely impacting those structures. So, I think part of what we're dealing with are expectations from the public that the dike was not intended to address, okay? Original design on that dike when it was first proposed included a clay core that was overlain by heavy riprap and concrete. That's not what was built. What was built, the clay core itself was never constructed. It's simply heavy rock and concrete that's intended to break that wave energy and stop those waves from running up on the shore. That's why, after the last couple of events, every time that I've been asked by the media about failure of the dike I've been quick to point out the dike has not failed. The dike has performed exactly for what it was intended and what it was built for, and that is to break that wave energy. Now there has been waves that have overtopped that dike, but those waves have not propagated and continued up the shoreline where they've hit the houses and caused substantial damage. So again, the dike is performing for what it was intended. We need to make sure that as we consider things and potential actions that may involve the dike, that we keep it in the context of what the dike was intended for. So I just wanted to just put that quick preface out there, and then I'm gonna turn it over

to Matt Heckenliab, who's the Utilities Manager for the City of Green Bay. That Utility Division is the entity that's responsible within the Department of Public Works for working on the dike.

- Thank you, Steve. Thank you, Alder Dorff, for that introduction as well. As you noted, we did prepare a memo pertaining to the dike, with a history that goes back to pre-1972. The primary function after the 1972 flood was for the city and the Army Corps to take emergency action to create this dike, this wave run-up, energy-dissipation structure, which has a secondary function, to hold back water in calm weather. One of the key elements, when this was developed, was that the city had to go out and obtain a significant amount of easements from each of the property owners so that the dike could be constructed by the Army Corps, and ultimately to be inspected and maintained as necessary by the City of Green Bay once the Army Corps constructed it in '73. There was approximately 184 easements that needed to be obtained. And that was done in a timely manner, in about a six month time period. What that does, it gives the right to the city to access this property and prevent any type of private improvements from being constructed that may hinder future activities or maintenance and inspection. Pre-December 1 last year, 2019, the city had done some recent inspections, in 2018, in early or mid-spring of 2019, and the plan moving forward there was to do some spot reinforcement of the dike, primarily where some of the armament has been displaced throughout the whole entire structure. That was our game plan as of September of last year, and that was the intent going into the construction season. December 1 came about where we had significantly high Great Lakes water levels, i.e. bay level, and then had substantially sustained northeast winds which blew waves greater than the height of the dike over the dike and caused some localized flooding in and around especially the East Shore Circle neighborhood, near Bay Beach, and that's when we started looking at other alternatives, which included the possibility of raising the dike throughout various means and methods, from adding additional stone. One of the alternatives was to look at whether or not we could utilize sheet piling edge to reinforce the dike, both at the existing level and or raising it. Again, a meeting that was held with the neighborhood association then in January, it was brought to my attention that a lot of the construction of the dike may not have been as proposed in the original documents provided to the Army Corps and to the DNR back in 1972 and '73, it, as Director Grenier stated, having a clay core as the center mass of the dike. What was reported to myself was that the clay core was actually constructed with rubble, riprap, excess concrete, so non-clay type materials, and as such we would not be able to drive sheet piling through that rubble, so that negated using that sheet pile option. Through the middle of February we were still looking at alternatives. In the middle of March the DNR contacted ourselves to inform us that they had come up with a emergency action due to the Great Lakes water levels, and the concern of significant erosion going on the Great Lakes and the bay of Green Bay. And they created a program called the Great Lakes Emergency Erosion Control Self Certification Program. What that does is allows individual property owners to take emergency type actions to place heavy riprap or riprap stone or clean concrete with no metal, no paint, along the shoreline at a two foot horizontal to one foot vertical slope, on top of some filter fabric, not to exceed the top of the existing, in this case, dike, or land structure to help reinforce, to prevent any additional erosion. We have been in contact with the DNR numerous times between March and as of early this week regarding this process. Ultimately the work can be done utilizing this process, but there's a lot of challenges that still need to be overcome. Primarily that the city does not own the property, therefore the city cannot sign the self-certification forms on behalf of the property owners. So ultimately we need to obtain approximately 160 signatures throughout the whole entire process on this self-certification form. Then one of the additional requirements is once the work has been completed, ultimately the Great Lakes individual permit needs to be obtained through the Department of Natural Resources. On a normal project, normal process, you would have to get the permits first, and right now the DNR is

stating that this could be upwards to 145 day process. So the self-certification process will allow us to do the work, and then followup with the applications and permitting process after the fact. The challenge there is the erosion control application or the individual application can only be applied for online and needs to be signed by the property owner online. You need a special account to work with the DNR, so we will actually be looking at creating a designation of signature authorization form that allows the property owners to give the city representative the authorization to sign and obtain the individual permits on their behalf. So we have begun creating these self-certification, or filling out these application forms. We have begun filling out the individual Chapter 30 permit forms. We have not come up with a designated signature authorization form and we are working diligently to try and come up with a biddable contract, which we think we can have out to the public as soon as next week. From the time we advertise to the time shovel-ready, out in the field, we're looking at about a 60 day process. So if we say we can have the project out the door, advertised as soon as next week, we'd anticipate shovel, moving dirt, moving, removing trees to gain access, in and about the first week of July. Now that raises the question of, we can bid it, we can start getting authorization. However, one of the larger hurdles that Alder Dorff made mention to, is we have no funding. We have taken some looks at funding from the federal side, funding from the state side, most of that is available at only certain times of the year and for specific projects. It doesn't necessarily relate to these type of projects. So, when we started this whole process late last fall, in developing our Capital Improvement Program, we set aside funds to at least start the process in reinforcing the dike. And in last night's Finance Committee meeting, that took a little bit of a hiccup, is my understanding. So, that is kind of a brief summary of my memo. And I'll turn it back to Director Grenier.

- Thanks, Matt. As Matt indicated, we do have some, there's a couple of things from last night that play into this. At the Personnel Committee, there was discussion relative to the resiliency coordinator that was proposed for this year to be hired. One of the anticipated functions of that resiliency coordinator was to be a resource to seek out and obtain funding sources for resilient activities, and again, difference between resiliency and sustainability, resiliency is the ability to bounce back after a manmade or natural disaster, like a flood. So when the mayor first talked to us about having a resiliency coordinator, flooding issues and seeking out funding for mitigation, recovery, and prevention, that was part of what we envisioned that resiliency coordinator to be taking up. And obviously we've not hired that individual yet. One of the other things that Matt alluded to, Alder Dorff alluded to, is there is \$2.5 million set aside, identified within the Capital Improvement Program that was adopted by the common council for the Department of Public Works, for activities related to this dike. However, that bonding request has not been adopted yet. We have done a lot of work, but we are, very quick going to be getting to a point where we're also going to have to commit funds. Matt indicated that we could have a contract ready as early as next week, to start getting in front of prospective bidders, but, we can't put that out for bid until we have a commitment for funding the project. So I don't want to be alarmist, but, we have gone a pretty significant distance already, that next step, of actually putting a contract on the street and getting a contractor selected, cannot happen until we have a bonding, the storm sewer supported bonding approved by the council. Alder Dorff, I see you're...

- Go ahead, Alder.

- I'll let the Chair call on me, Alder Wery.

- Alder Dorff, go ahead.

- Thank you. Yes, and I understand that, and as a result, I have already put out a communication to the mayor about the possibility of emergency, finance, and council meetings, having an additional one in June. I don't know, I know we can't get this done by next Tuesday, which is the last meeting we've got in May. I would like to get this done by June 3rd, because that's the first meeting we have in June, and in order to do that, we're gonna have to add on, not only, we possibly could get it done at the next Finance meeting, then we've gotta add on that Bonding, like we have the budget meeting with the joint Finance and Council, we need the joint Bonding and Council meeting as we had last year. So, we're gonna probably as a result, and I can see that this, we have to bond this money for you to move forward on this, for you to move forward on anything. So, yeah, we gotta get this done. I would love to hear from other council members, their thoughts on, let's move this ahead fast, what do you think, guys?

- Thank you, Alder Dorff. Anybody on the committee--

- Chairman, can I speak?

- Okay, Alder Lefebvre. Go ahead, Alder Lefebvre.

- [Kathy] Yes, just, one thing I wanted to make one correction. They keep talking about the flood in '72. Yes, I think we bought our house in '71, we, in the summer, we would have a tiny little, water would come up a little bit, and the kids would play in it. But that's not the big one. It was in '73, the massive flood, it was not '72. But someone told me that, I believe in '72, the city was talking about doing something, and it wasn't until after the '73 flood that there was meetings with the neighborhoods, the neighborhood people here, and they discussed the dike idea, and actually they told us, either you do the dike or they'd raise East Shore Drive, which, I think that's why, 'cause some people were questioning it, oh, do we really need it? Well, yes we did need it, because if you would've raised East Short Drive, we definitely would've been on the other side of the water. But anyway, so it was done. And I want to mention that the last two recent floods, the December one, I had nothing coming over my dike. It was down a little further, about five houses down. It kind of ran over and it came into my yard 'cause I'm lower, and then it came around the front. And the one in the end of April, I did not, there was run-over. Someone had mentioned there was like two foot waves coming over. No, that didn't happen. It was run-over coming over the dike. And I will say that both of them have moved so many of the stones. A lot of our big stones are gone, we have very few, most of them are down in the water, and have slidden down, and it's also eating the clay top where we have our grass and that, it's eating big sections of that out. And that's why I'm saying, I say breaching, that once it eats through enough of that on the top, it's gonna come into the slant and then it's just gonna pour in. So it's that one thing I think we have to really be cognizant of, that the dike is in bad shape. That last one really did something to it. And it is imperative that we get going, but I understand, I know, there's all these different steps that have to be done. And another thing that I will mention, that the neighborhood association is here, and they're more than willing to help, whatever we can do, we're here. And so the city, and Steve, and your department, reach out to us, do you need us to get people to sign things and get information out to people, whatever you need, we're here to help. Okay, thank you.

- All right, thank you, Alder Lefebvre. Committee members, any other Alders?

- I'd love to do, Chairman, is make a motion to open the floor to hear from interested parties.

- Okay.

- Second.

- I have a motion by Alderman Brunette, second by Alder Scannell, to open the floor for any interested parties. Any discussion on that? Those in favor?

- Aye.

- Aye.

- Opposed? Motion carries, the floor is opened. Is there anyone here wishing to speak to this item? If you could just give me your name and address?

- [Steven] Like to speak. Are we unmuted?

- Yes, you are.

- [Steven] Okay, Steven Holschuh, 2218 California Avenue. A few questions. The current elevation of the dike known, and that has it settled or sunk at all?

- Did you get that Steve?

- Have we done surveys for the top of the foundation of the dike?

- I didn't get it.

- The current as, the current elevations?

- [Woman] I wrote a chat, you can chat and everything.

- No, we haven't done a formal survey of the top of the dike. The proposed elevation back in 1973, by city datum, was 103. By the emergency rules through the DNR we cannot raise the dike at all. So it is, the reinforcement that would be done would be to the existing top of dike as it lies today, assuming that the contractor would be disturbing some of the ground on top and on the leeward side, they would have to restore that. And... Basically feed and mulch and level the areas out. But as far as raising the dike, anything greater than what is out there today is not the intent of--

- [Wp,am] Mr. Chair?

- Under the DNR's emergency, per self-certification program.

- [Woman] Mr. Chair?

- [Man] I know, I heard you.

- [Woman] Well you missed nothing.

- [Man] Chair?

- Thank you, Matt.

- [Woman] Steve is now talking.

- [Woman] Steve, is Steve Holschuh still there?

- Okay, one at a time, please. One at a time, do not speak, please, and just keep it orderly, and just ask to speak, and then we can do it one at a time, otherwise it'll be really confusing. Right now Mr. Holschuh has the floor. Did you hear that, Mr. Holschuh.

- [Steven] I do, I have one more brief question, and then going forward, to give other folks a chance, I will work my questions through Kathy, that she can get them in at either another time. The other question I have is, is there a maintenance strategy for the dike, and I'll term it in what's used in the maintenance, if you think of the shop in the city. If you have a piece of equipment, a truck, anything, you can have a maintenance strategy that's called run to failure. You can just run it until it stops and you can tow it in. It works okay with something with a truck but not with plumbing issues. In reading the report that Matt put out, thank you, Matt, there's at least two occasions, I'm reading statements like there were not obvious signs of the dike failing. Do we have to wait, if the dike had failed or does fail in the future, a breach through the clay cap, is that what it would take to get action? Some type of an emergency action?

- The answer to that is no. Obviously we've been planning to bring forward a project to the point where we've committed, we've recommended, expenditures of about \$2.5 million this year. There has not been a good maintenance strategy in the past. That is something we are correcting. We are going to continue with annual inspections, more periodic if necessary, if we get big storms. In the future we will continue to go out after each and every one of these large storms to do a quick inspection to see if anything has happened. But the plan moving forward is to have routine inspections of the dike, and if we find issues that need to be addressed we will program those in a timely manner. So there is the intent to have a more proactive maintenance strategy moving forward from this time.

- Did that answer your question, Mr. Holschuh?

- [Woman] That's Chris Wery, that's--

- [Steven] Yes. That's, I'm done now, thank you.

- Okay. Thank you, Mr. Holschuh. Is there anyone else from the public who wishes to ask a question or comment?

- [Woman] A question.

- Sure, if I can get your name and address? Was there a member of the public who wanted to speak?

- [David] I have a question.

- Okay, I just need your name and address, please?

- [David] Yep, I'm David Corey, at 1917 Lakeside Place.

- Okay, go ahead, Mr. Corey.

- [David] I had a question for Matt. When you, I appreciated the background that you gave about the history of the dike and how it was built, and you said that it was primarily, the primary function was to decrease the wave energy that was coming off, and I just wanted to ask, it seems to me that that was actually the problem, was that the flood on April 29th and the one last fall, the waves were so strong that the water was coming through in-between the rocks. And so it seems to me that the force of the waves and the energy that was causing the soil in-between the rocks to erode, and if that's what made the little rivulets that then flooded our back yard and then all of Lakeside and East Shore? So I'm wondering if in fact it is still able to maintain the function that it was originally designed for, namely to decrease the energy of the waves? Because it appears to me while watching it last April 29th, that was exactly the problem, it was the force and the energy of the waves that caused then a breaching or a deterioration of the soil between the rocks? Thank you.

- I think the answer to that. The wave itself, the wave was broken down. You had water coming through, but the wave itself did not continue up through your backyard and hit the house. So the function to dissipate the energy of the wave, is still intact, that's what this thing is intended to do. Again, it's not intended to be water-tight.

- The other aspect is, we will acknowledge, or I will acknowledge that a lot of the armament has been displaced and that is the primary function of the action that we are proposing to take, or are planning to take, is to place new stone in and around the dike edge. We actually have video and photos of the last storm, of waves coming up over the dike. So, the elevation of the bay, in and about the time of that storm was around elevation 101, 101-1/2. We had reports of six foot waves in some areas crashing over the dike. That means there, in some cases, was four foot waves coming over the dike, so any armament that was there, wasn't able to dissipate as much energy. And then as the day went on, the whole bay level subsided because the wind subsided, and the waves, obviously, subsided as well, thus the storm sewer systems in and around Lakeside Place, East Shore, were able to catch up and relieve the ditches and whatnot in that area.

- Thank you, Matt. Mr. Corey, did that answer your question?

- [David] Yes it did, thank you.

- Any thing else, from Mr. Corey? No? Any other citizen--

- No.

- Okay, anybody else with a question from the public?

- I do.

- Just give me your name and address?

- I have just a statement.

- Could I get your name and address, please?

- Sure, Belinda Dow, 2747 East Shore Drive.

- Thank you.

- Yes, thank you. Just to tag on to what Kathy was saying and what others have mentioned. In that April storm, also in December as well, but in April, the waves were definitely several feet over the dike. We ended up with water coming over the dike and, just a few feet away from the house. The only reason we ended up not getting anything in the house or under the house was because my daughter, thankfully, to all of you who took part in providing the sand bags, that did help, but we also had a professional pump to pump water back into the bay. Other than that we would've really had a mess. That's all I would like to say.

- Thank you, Ms. Dow.

- Yeah.

- Anyone else from the public? Anyone else?

- [Lynn] I have a question.

- [Woman] Lynn Walters.

- Could I just get your name and address?

- [Lynn] Lynn Walter, no S, W-A-L-T-E-R, 2323 Lakeside Place.

- You go ahead, Lynn.

- [Lynn] I have a question that directs more, I suppose, to financing, but I'm afraid if the floods keep going our property values are gonna tank, and the tax base is gonna go down from our property values going down. Right now, if I can't tell a seller that this is not gonna happen again and again and again, it's gonna be hard for me to even sell the property.

- Did you have a question or was it more of a comment, Lynn?

- [Lynn] It was more of a comment and I was just wondering what kind of response I could hear from the committee about that question about financing and property values?

- Well, I think, Barb, are you Chair of the Finance? Or is it Bill?

- Oh, it's me, it's me, thank you so much for throwing that on me. Yeah, I can't really answer that because I don't know. I don't know the effect on property values. I don't know what the worth is of all the property out there. I do know, I'd like to get to the point where we talk about getting money for the project. So I'm hoping we'll get back to that at some point. That's the question that I led with. So hopefully we can get back to that. Thank you.

- All right, thank you, Alder Dorff. Perhaps not the exact answer you were looking for, Lynn, but I think everybody's concerned with the safety of everyone there, and their property values, in total, and that that's all part of this decision. And I think you can see everybody's really pushing to get to the point here, very quickly, that we can get a project moving.

- [Lynn] Thank you. Thank you.

- All right, thank you, Lynn. Anyone else from--

- Yes sir? I would like to speak?

- Okay, yes, please, your name and address?

- It's Pat Hagerty, 2637 East Shore Drive.

- Thank you, Pat.

- Well, unfortunately my house is between two homes that are much higher than mine, at least four feet higher. And because of the way the dike is constructed, when the water comes over like it did both instances, I get water from not only my own yard, but also from the other two yards. So I have a lake, this last one, all the way from the dike, all the way to across the street, I was surrounded by water. I'm on a three foot crawlspace, I have no basement, and the water was actually going in my west window well, broke through, and it came out in my east window well in my garage, and then luckily it flowed out to the road. So it was, I had a real mess, I still do, along with all of the things that come up from the water. The stone is almost impossible to get out of my lawn. And the waves were coming over, it was just, it was very scary to be here. I felt like I was looking at the ocean, that the waves were so high in my area. And they were definitely breaking over the dike. I had, it seemed like I had some small white caps, in fact, right up by the dike down the back part of my yard. So I think every house, every instance, is kind of a little bit different. Both of my neighbors have no water. Their front yard started to fill up because mine was so full. So that's just my comments.

- Okay, thank you, Ms. Hagerty. Anyone else from the public wishing to comment or have a question?

- [Kathy] Chairman Wery, can I mention, can I, can I, talk to Pat on that? I wanted to ask her to stay on the meeting here. Number four might be part of that. It's about the people who have to build up for FEMA, and then they have all the runoff of water, not just from, not from the dike, or the bay I should say, it was mostly from all the rains that we were having and everything, that they have to mitigate that runoff. So she might want to listen to that one.

- All right, so noted. All right, if no other comments, I'll entertain a motion to close the floor.

- Motion to close the floor.

- Second.

- Motion by Alder Scannell, second by Alder Gerlach. Discussion? Those in favor?

- Aye.

- Aye.

- Opposed? Motion carried, all right, the floor is closed. Any committee members or any other alders here wishing to comment or make a motion?

- [Kathy] Alder Chairman, can I mention something again?

- Alder Steuer?

- Go ahead, Lefebvre can go ahead.

- I'll recognize Alder Steuer first and then we'll go back to you.

- Sure.

- Okay.

- Okay, well, he deferred.

- I deferred.

- It's all yours, Kathy.

- [Kathy] Oh, okay. I wanted to go back to Steve Holschul. I think the question he had wasn't quite interpreted right, 'cause he sent me the email and I know we had discussions on this, and I have noticed this also. I think what he meant is that there are areas of the dike, it seems like it has settled. It might not be at 103. Has the city gone through and actually checked to see, is the whole dike at the 103 elevation all along? I guess that's for either Matt or Steve?

- We did understand that question. And we did answer it. No, we have not completed a formal survey of the elevation to the top of dike.

- [Kathy] Okay, okay. Okay, but you're aware that there could be some of that happening?

- Yes.

- [Kathy] Okay, all right, thank you.

- All right, thanks, Alder Lefebvre. Alder Steuer, back to you.

- All right, thank you, Chair. I've got a few questions, so I might be reading a little bit here. And either Steve or Matt, you could answer these I would hope. I noticed the map, there's 12 work zones that are shown, from zone 10 through zone 21. They're all different sizes. I guess I just wanted to know how these were delineated? I suppose they're between roads. But they're all different lengths. So I was just wondering how that was delineated?

- Steve or Matt, do you know the answer to that one?
- The process was actually pretty arbitrary, initially, and that was all based upon our inspections that we started in 2018. But for the most part, the intent was to try and get equal or as close to equal segments as possible, and utilize the state streets where practical. In and around Nevada towards the East Mahon Creek, obviously there's no side streets there, so again the segments are a little bit longer, but in some cases it was based upon arbitrary delineation.
- Okay. I'll keep going here. Depending on what methodology is used, and you have four different options out there, and we have to look at monies and all that good stuff with that, but with the methodology from zone 10 through zone 21, would that stay consistent all the way through? And I guess one reason I'm asking that is it mandatory that the citizens sign for this? What if a few people decide not to do it?
- The short answer is, if any resident who does not sign the paperwork, no work on their section of the dike will occur.
- All right, and I guess the problem I see with that is that if a few people don't do it, it'll cause problems all the way around. I'm just seeing that as an issue.
- I don't disagree with you, Alder. I can't force somebody to sign the paper.
- I guess, well, with that being said, were the citizens all made aware of this permitting process, and what kind of responses are you getting to this right now?
- I'm glad that Alder Lefebvre mentioned the eagerness of her neighborhood association because we are going to be relying on them quite heavily. That is part of our plan, not only because it's expeditious, but also because I believe it to be good governance for staff to reach out and utilize and interact with those neighborhood associations. We're out there trying to improve the quality of life for people who live there. If they've got a mechanism where we can more expeditiously get things completed and get information disseminated, we would be foolish not to utilize that. So we do intend to use the East Shore Neighborhood Association to assist us in public outreach and to get those signatures.
- All right, I'll defer in a minute here, but I just, there's four different options that are brought up, and I'll be happy to hear what some of the other alders and staff have to say to that. So I defer for now, thank you.
- Thanks, Alder Steuer. All right, if I don't see your hand, just say your name and I'll recognize you.
- [Kathy] Can I kind of answer that, a little bit of that?
- No. Yeah, you can, go ahead.
- [Kathy] Thanks.
- There's only so many times you can tell your mother-in-law to just--

- [Kathy] I can't promise that there might be some people who are going to be, not against it, but I talked to a lot of people, I had people calling me, emailing me, and I did go out after and I did talk to some people. And I tell you, I think they're eager for something to be done. I don't think we're gonna have a problem. And I think one thing that we mention exactly, Bill Dean told us, after the December flood, our property values went down 20%. If this continues it'll go down 50%. And I think people will, I think they'll be eager to have something done. So, yes, and Steve, we will definitely, we will be working with you in pushing this, and getting this done, okay?

- Thanks, Alder Lefebvre. All right. Alder Brunette.

- Yes, thank you, Chairman. Question for Director Grenier or Mr. Heckenliable. Did I read correct that there are 25 properties along the dike that are most affected? I saw that in the report. How many properties are we looking at, affected when the water over-goes the dike?

- That all depends on the directionality of the wind. But the 25, the number of parcels, 25, was indicative to properties that have private improvements within the easement section, which could make it more challenging for a contractor to place this armament in and along the dike. So there's approximately 152 individual parcels that have to be accounted for, and that's from the east side of Bay Beach all the way up to Mahon Creek.

- Okay, so the 25 properties I saw was for one particular, I think it was option four or something on the?

- The 25 is for any option selected. And right now the only option that we are moving forward with at this time is option four, the taking advantage of the DNRs willingness to allow us to do work and permit second. If we look at any other option we need to obtain permits first, which again is at 145 day minimum permitting process. And prior to even a clock starting, we have to obtain and fill out all the applications, which is anywhere from eight to 24 staff hours per permit.

- Okay, Director Grenier, when we had the most recent flood two weeks ago, how many properties were affected directly.

- Off hand I don't know. And then, also to clarify and expound a little bit upon what Matt said, the current, the 2020 plan, involves option four. Now what we need to do is we need to get that dike back to 1973 conditions. And of what we've evaluated, the four options are what we've evaluated to date. Of those four options, option four is the only one that's gonna get us there in a timely manner, so that's what we're pursuing now. That doesn't preclude us from considering something else as a long term solution. But longterm comes after we get that thing back into shape. We gotta get the dike fixed first. So I just wanted to clarify that.

- Yeah, thank you, Director. No other questions, Chairman.

- Okay, thank you, Alder Brunette. Any other alders? If I don't see your hand, just shout your name out.

- Alder Scannell?

- There we go. There we go, Alder Scannell. You just need to hit your mute button.

- Yes, Alder Dorff, I've been looking, rereading and reading, there's a lot here in your communication. What exactly is the action you want us to take at committee tonight?

- Alder Dorff?

- That you can take... I guess it would be to approve, to approve it? Director Grenier? He needs money, too, so you can take some action, but he needs to get the money to do it, so--

- Right, that's why I'm asking what action we can take tonight that works? Do we need to hold this or do we need to--

- Alder Wery's the Chair, I think he knows that one.

- Okay, well, I would like to know exactly, as far as the discussion for honing in on, what exactly is the action we need to take and what do we need to discuss to get that action taken care of?

- Thank you, Alderman Scannell.

- If I may, Alder Scannell?

- Go ahead, Director.

- I hate to do it, because it's understood, it's misunderstood by the community far too often. If we've addressed Alder Dorff's concerns, if we've answered at least most of her questions, because we've already, the council has already, adopted our Capital Improvement Plan, and the Capital Improvement Plan does have the money in there for us to pursue an active project associated with the dike repairs, and we have explained to you, I hope, what that plan is. I don't know that the council needs to take any additional action to direct us to execute that plan, by adopting the CIP you've already done that. We can't take any action which would commit city funds until we have those funds available, so upon adoption or execution of the bond issuance, then we can move forward, and that definitely is our intent, and I hope that's well understood within the community. If that is the case, and we have addressed the questions Alder Dorff has brought up to her satisfaction, this was a report on funding and what our plan is, and if we've given those answers, I think it would entirely be appropriate to receive support.

- Yeah, that's what I was kind of thinking, but I wanted to make sure. And so I make the motion to receive and place on file, and when it comes to bonding--

- [Man] What a tasty treat. Club sandwich, which is everything. Someone who eats everything. Because I know exactly--

- Can we...

- So I make the motion to receive and place on file.

- Second.

- All right, there's a motion by Alder Scannell, second by Alder Gerlach, to receive and place on file. Alder Brunette?

- Yeah, thank you, Chairman. I'm in favor of the motion. I think it's a good motion. I agree with Director Grenier, and I'm actually very thankful for Alder Dorff and Alder Lefebvre for bringing this up to this committee because it's good to have this discussion, visibility to the public and to hear from the folks that are most affected. So I feel very good about the conversation we had, and I think we all have a better understanding of the issues out there, and I feel relieved to know that the city has a variety of plans to help address it. So thank you to Director Grenier and Mr. Heckenliable. So I'm in favor of the motion, I think it's a good one.

- Thank you, Alder Brunette. Alder Dorff?

- Yes?

- At your committee, was money approved or are you taking this up at your next meeting?

- Yeah, we went over, we spent a few hours going over the first section of it, and we were gonna do it altogether, so we got the equipment part and the fleet part left to do. That can be done at the very next Finance meeting. Council meets Tuesday, Finance meeting is the next Tuesday, and then if we could get on the fast track. There's a problem to just approve part of it because it costs so much more. You can't just, if you approve part of your bonding, then it costs more to come back and then approve the rest of the bonding. So we've got to, as a council, take it as a package. And it's in there, but it's gonna be up to the whole city council to approve that. So we'll try to get it. My goal is to get it by June 3rd. Maybe we will have to dispense with that Finance and Council meeting and have that at the Council meeting? Do you know what I'm saying, in the joint meeting?

- Your last meeting, was it the intent to get through all of the bonding request?

- No, it wasn't, it was not. Because it was a 400 page document. So the intent was to get through the first portion, because we had other business, and then I said, let's keep the other business really low for the next meeting, if we can, and get through the whole rest. So we have about 300 pages left. Okay? Which we will get through, we can do that. We'll sit there and we'll get that done. And then we've gotta bring that to council. And then council's gotta get through it all. So, but we'll come with a recommendation.

- Okay, well that does help to set the stage. Thank you, Alder Dorff.

- Okay.

- Director Grenier, is it, from what I'm hearing, number four really is what you're moving forward, what you would like to move forward with, that emergency plan?

- That is correct. As Mr. Heckenliable indicated, the permitting requirements that the DNR would impose, and Corps would impose on us, would put this into 2021 for anything but option four.

- And that takes out options one and three--

- Again, that option four is what we're pursuing this year.
- Right.
- There's nothing that would preclude us from taking something more extensive in the future, but we want to get that dike stabilized immediately.
- I don't think it would be out of order if we endorsed that plan and received and placed on file. I don't know if the motion maker would be fine with that, receive and place on file with the understanding that we're endorsing the fourth option presented? That would help give some--
- Well, I've got no problem with it. I don't know if it makes any kind of difference at all. We'll be endorsing it when it gets to council, that's when it's really gonna count. But if you want to add something like an endorsement, if that's not inappropriate or, I've got no problem with it, that's all right.
- I think that's fine. I think it does show that our committee handled the issue and did endorse that option. I think it gives some direction from our committee. Otherwise it looks like, you know, received and placed on file and didn't do much. And maybe listened, which was important, but I like giving direction and positive enforcement. So if that's okay with you, Alder Scannell, was that your motion, or was that Alder--
- I can amend the motion, the motion is so, my motion is so amended.
- Okay, so we have a motion by Alder Scannell, seconded by Alder Gerlach to receive and place on file--
- Alder Gerlach, sorry, Gerlach?
- Oh, that's you, Alder Gerlach--
- Did she second that amended motion?
- I'm fine, I second it.
- Okay, thank you. So we have an amended motion to receive and place on file with the understanding that the committee endorses the emergency option number four that was presented. Is that all right with the committee?
- Yep.
- Discussion? Those in favor?
- Oh wait, Alder Steuer is waving his hand.
- Is he?
- I have a quick question.

- Oh, Alder Steuer, go ahead, sorry.

- Thank you, Chair.

- I didn't hear your hand. Go ahead.

- I'll be noisier next time. Steve, I was gonna ask, with option four, do you have, it's on page seven of your memo, of the memo that you two put together, and I'm just wondering, are there prices or monies shown on this? On the bottom of the page it says challenges and what's next. Is that part of option four? I guess I just wanted clarification on some of that.

- The challenges exist regardless of which option we pursue.

- Okay.

- But the \$2.5 million that we have in the CIP for 2020 is to pursue option four.

- Okay, it just wasn't shown on the document. At least that I saw, so I just wanted to make sure that that's what that was aimed for. Okay, thank you.

- Thank you, Alderman Steuer. So, this report will go to committee next week. The week after that the Finance will meet and discuss the rest of the bonding, correct Alder Steuer, or Alder Dorff, just so the public understands? Okay, those in favor?

- [All] Aye.

- Opposed? Motion carries. Appreciate the public who stuck with us. We have a couple more items if you want to stay. This will go to council next Tuesday. And... Number two is a consideration with possible action on a request by Alder Galvin that the current process for funding sidewalk repairs contracted by the city for residents be studied with the possibility of making changes, this is referred from the April 29th I and S meeting. Alder Galvin? Most importantly, though, Alder Galvin, do you have your milk? Inside joke, right?

- Yeah. Okay, so what I had asked the committee at the last meeting to do was to look at, currently when residents contract through the city to have sidewalk repaired or replaced, they get an option to pay it back over five years with interest. I asked, the staff was to look at what that interest usually flushes out to be, and I was just asking that, if possible, when we go forward in the future, starting this year with the sidewalk replacement that the property residents or property owners are only obligated to pay back the principal and not the interest.

- Director?

- Okay, with that understanding, I did go and talk to the Finance Department. On an annual basis, between 25 and 50% of property owners do have the city financing. This year's program includes about \$103,000 worth of private walk. It is my opinion that if we offer a no interest program that more people will participate than in a normal year. So what I asked the Finance Department to do was take a look at a 50% participation rate, or about \$50,000, and a \$103,000 participation, I mean

everybody, so we know what maximum outlay would be. If \$50,000 is the number that people finance, over the five years, that comes out to an additional \$5,655 of interest that the city would be responsible for picking up. If everybody participated on \$103,000 over five years, that would be an additional \$11,649 that the city would have. I think it is worthy to note that the bond request we have submitted that Finance Committee was talking about last night, to not have this interest included in it, nor does it have the \$103,000 worth of principal, which we would also have to cover to allow these people to make the, because the first payment's not gonna be due until January.

- So there's no bonding request for this \$103,000, or 100,000 plus dollars?

- No, usually the property owners would start paying that off immediately. Like I said, between 50 and 75% of them usually pay this within the first 30 days after receiving the bill.

- All right, and, but how do you cover the other, say, well 50% of them do it, that's \$50,000, how do you cover that normally?

- The program itself has been a little bit lower in other years, so we make that up in contingency funding.

- All right. And this year, I don't know, I haven't had anyone tell me they're not participating. In fact, my understanding was, I think someone told me the other day, that if they haven't opted out, they're in. Is that correct?

- By participating, what I mean is if we offer, if we offer a no interest five year loan to somebody, somebody who otherwise may have paid the bill in full to avoid the interest payments may now capitalize, take advantage of that no interest loan and pay it off over time instead. We may see an uptick in the people who utilize the city financing.

- Okay. So?

- I do have a question, Director Grenier, I think we're all--

- What's that?

- I think, I do have a question for you, I think we're lagging a little, but I see some people moving around the screen. You can't always .

- Okay, you're breaking up really badly.

- Yeah, I noticed a lot of people's movements are breaking up as well. Is there a 10 year hardship that can be applied for?

- I don't know if that exists on the sidewalk because sidewalk is actually a fee, it's not an assessment. The assessments, under assessments, businesses have a 10 year option, and we have extended that to residential properties for pavement assessments. I don't know that that exists for the sidewalk. What we have is an unpaid.

- The only reason I ask is--

- We would have to check with Law Department to see if something like that could be arranged as well.

- Okay. The reason I asked is I do have a gentleman who has 12 or 14 cakes that were marked, and he's responsible for eight of them. Unfortunately he was diagnosed with lung cancer, and somebody, I think, did say he would qualify, should qualify for a 10 year hardship to pay. Did that come through?

- If we're talking about a hardship situation, I think a... I think that somebody could make that request at any time for any of these types of issues. I don't know that that would come through I and S or if it would come through Finance? Again, I would have to talk to Law Department. Again, the demonstration of indigency is specifically enumerated under assessments, under special assessments.

- Okay. Any, does the committee have questions or comments for Alder Galvin, anything further?

- If I could, Chris?

- Go ahead.

- All I'm trying to do with this, and this is, right now I'm just talking for this year, but next year we have to look at the process that is in place to start replacing the sidewalk in 1/15th of the city every year for the next 15 years. But I have, like I brought up in the last committee meeting, I have a 94 year old woman who has lived in the same house for over 55 years, and she has 29 sections of sidewalk that either need to be repaired or replaced. Now the repairing is not that expensive. Sometimes it's just caulk and that. But I've gotta get a city employee out there to detail to her what has to be replaced and what can be repaired. But she's very, very hesitant. Her children are worried about her because now she's worrying about this thing. I have other constituents who have been furloughed due to the COVID restrictions, and they say they can somehow make it work, but I'm just trying to make this a little bit more palatable for everybody in the city as we move forward, because there's some areas of the city, as you know, the sidewalks have been neglected for 20 or 30 years. And there's been no enforcement of the sidewalks, repairs or anything else like that. And so for some people, it's gonna be a stiff bill. Other people it may just be a couple 300 bucks, which for some people is a lot of money though. So I'm just trying to make this easier for people to be able to afford it. I wasn't asking to have money taken off, 'cause I thought that could get pretty expensive for the city, and I think homeowners do have a responsibility, but I thought if they're paying the principal and the city's covering the interest, I just thought that might be a little bone we could throw people and just make it a little easier for them to swallow this pill.

- Thank you. Anyone else have a question or comment or motion? Alder Steuer?

- Thank you, Chair. Thank you for this, Bill. I think it's a great thought moving forward with sidewalks. There's any number of issues with sidewalks, but I think if, I think a lot of citizens don't realize is that out of home ownership to deal with that. I think a lot of folks, it could be an education type of process that we need to let folks know that that's part of being a homeowner, is dealing with sidewalks. So I think the biggest thing for me with sidewalks is that somebody might complain that, hey, why do I have to have my sidewalks fixed? And then somebody across the street, they're even worse. So it's kind of a complaint-driven thing, and I know this is off-topic, but I'm just saying there's

certain issues that add to this dynamic as well. But I thank you for bringing this forward, and I think I would support this. Thank you.

- Thank you, Alderman Steuer. Alder Scannell?

- Thank you. Just a question for Alder, or, sorry, Director Grenier, I want to make sure I get this right. If we go this way and we do not charge the interest, where would that come out of, in contingency funds or somewhere else?

- It's gonna come out of our bond request.

- It would come out of your bond request?

- Right, right.

- Alder Dorff?

- No, I'm supposed to wait for Alder Wery to call on me.

- Oh yeah, sorry. Well, yeah, sorry.

- Go ahead, Alder Dorff.

- Well it's to my question?

- Listen--

- Go ahead.

- I, my heart bleeds for these people too, I get it, I get it. And we have to cut at least \$2 million out of the bond request that we have right now, if not more. And we want these pavement projects to be done. And the storm sewers, we cut that in half for this year. And all of this is coming out of the DPW budget. We this to our people in our city and we understand that they're going through a hard time, and I feel really bad for the lady with all the sidewalk cakes, I do. And you guys, where are we going to get the money? Unless we ask for it from somewhere else, it's coming out of DPW. We're trying to fix the dike. We're trying to surface roads. We're trying to put in sidewalks. I don't know, I guess I'm just expressing where are we gonna get the money? It's not there. It means something else won't be done if we do this. But maybe it's not a lot of money. How much money is it? Does anybody know?

- Yeah, Director Grenier mentioned--

- My internet went out, so I couldn't hear anything.

- For \$50,000 over five years it was \$5,000, correct? Something like that? Yeah, so five years, \$5,000 if it was 50, and that's half of, that's 50%, 50-50-50.

- And because we will pay interest. We will pay interest because it's in bonding. So it's not like it's just money laying around or anything, we have to borrow this money, put it into the sidewalks, then we, as a city, have to pay interest. And it's all interconnected, it's all interconnected.

- It is, and if I may?

- Alder Dorff, did you have anything further?

- Well, I've still go the floor, but I'll, but if they're answering my question, I don't mind interjection. I'll concede the floor or open the floor, you can have the floor as long as I get it back.

- All right, Alder Galvin.

- If you're answering my question.

- All right.

- Alder Galvin and then back to Alder Scannell.

- All right, thank you, Alder Scannell, thank you, Chair. I struggle with this too, and that's why every meeting we sit at in Finance where we're forgiving people's property taxes, we're forgiving people's fines and assessments, and we keep trying to be the nice guy, and we feel sorry for these people, and so we keep giving this money back, storm, I mean storm sewer, we just cut from 970 to \$500. In the back of my mind while I'm thinking about this project I've been pushing for three years to move forward, in the back of my mind when we're forgiving all these debts that people have incurred with the city, I keep adding this up in the back of my head thinking, well, all the money we've given back to citizens this year would've more than paid the interest on this project right now. And so, these are the things we struggle with, and I sat through that meeting yesterday before my brain went numb from looking at all those numbers and trying to figure out all the goesintos. Where are we gonna get it, where are we gonna get it? How're we gonna pay for it? But this is a project that I feel very strongly about. I look at the claims from people that fall and injure themselves on our sidewalks. I look at the people walking in the roadways because they can't walk on the sidewalks. Now, we've got a real problem here. We've got a real problem with the dike. We've got a real problem with the roads and the storm sewers, and we've got a litany. So I'm just asking for consideration here. That's all I'm doing. And I'm not asking to cut the cost of replacing the sidewalk. These people are still responsible for paying the principle, okay? Whereas in the mini storm sewer, they're not. They're having part of that principle is being picked up by the city. People that we've forgiven taxes on. This dike. Okay, now their property value went down 20%, but it's like, okay, but it's 125 homes or 150 homes, compared to how many homes in the inner cities of east and west side Green Bay that we need to be thinking about. So, yeah, it's a balancing situation, so thank you.

- Thank you, Alder Galvin. Back to you, Alder Scannell.

- Yeah, well, then, if I may, do I have the floor?

- Alder Scannell, you have the floor, then Alder Gerlach, you had your hand up as well.

- Mm hm.

- Okay. So then just to be--

- Okay.

- So just to be clear, let's use the \$5,000, but we'd also be paying interest on that \$5,000, 'cause it's bonded money and we'd be paying interest on the bond, correct?

- 5,600 is the interest. We'd also be paying, we'd also be fronting the 50,000.

- Ah. Okay. I see. I got the numbers in my head now, thank you.

- All right, thank you. Alder Gerlach?

- I just wondered if it's, I know that, I have read that for the storm sewer program there is, you said, qualifying as indigent, you get it interest free over five years or something like that? Can that possibly be done for the sidewalk repair so that this 94 year old woman, if she really can't afford, I mean, I'm sorry she's worried about it, but that's not necessarily money. If she really can't afford to pay for it, then can that program be extended to the sidewalks, also? And then people who can afford to pay for it will pay for it and if they want to do it over five or 10 years they'll pay the interest, can that happen?

- I am more than happy to have that conversation with Law Department, but as I indicated, currently, the only place that we address an allowance for a demonstration of indigency is for special assessments. Sidewalk is not a special assessment. Sidewalk is the financial responsibility of the adjacent property owner, so it's more analogous to an invoice that somebody would receive for long grass and weeds or snow and ice on the sidewalk. It's that adjoining property owner's financial responsibility to address the sidewalk that's deficient adjacent to their property, and if they fail to do so, within the 60 day window that we give them by resolution, then the city performs that work and bills them the actual cost for it. So it's not an assessment, okay? Again, indigency is only referenced under the assessments. But I'm more than happy to have that conversation with Law Department to see if that can be extended.

- Okay, thank you.

- Thank you, Alder. All right, any other hands? Alder Scannell?

- Alder Galvin, would you mind if we held this one more time 'til we got that answer? That might help with the decision.

- That's fine. I don't know if I want to force people to have to pull out all their financial records and beg indigency for this. Looking forward, I just think it would be a good program for the city to offer everybody. I mean, let's face it, I personally, I think the city owns some responsibility here, that they haven't been going around and making people maintain their sidewalks. When we had road assessments, people were certainly being held to task for that, well the road's coming in, and it if you vote it down, then you're responsible for the road. But when you have people that call it in because they have a tree that uprooted the sidewalk and they're told, well, if you want to complain about that tree then we've gotta look at your whole sidewalk, and obviously what's everyone gonna say? I don't

wanna do it. And so we end up with what we have, which is buckled, cracked, deficient sidewalks. There's no way they're ADA compliant. And like I said, you've got people in the roadway. I have elderly, I have mothers with children in strollers, joggers, nobody can use the sidewalks. And in the wintertime, they're so dysfunctional that they collect water, they turn into ice, and anyone who's ever worked finance can talk about the claims they've seen from the people who have fallen down. I just think this is something we should offer everybody and not make them claim indigency for that.

- Thank you, Alder.

- Well then let's just see how it flies, how 'bout I'll make a motion to approve the communication to, how is it worded here? Well, it's making the changes, it doesn't say the changes, the changes would be to not to, not charge interest, correct? Right, so make a motion that we do not charge interest for sidewalk repair.

- For this year?

- Yeah, let's do it by that, that's a good idea.

- I'd be okay, let's do it this year, see what the response is, and then next year, then this summer, we're gonna have some interns go out and start checking the two sections of the city, and I think DPW will have a pretty good idea after this summer what they're looking at for next year. And then seeing what the response is this year, I think would also give us a pretty good indication where we might be going.

- All right, thank you. Thank you, Alder Scannell. Is there a second to that motion? Is there a second to the motion? I will second it. So we have a motion and a second. Under discussion? Alder Brunette?

- Thank you, Chairman. It's tough, I'll be honest, it's a tough vote because my heart, my instinct, everything says yes, but as Alder Dorff said getting through that Finance Committee and looking at the bonding and issues we have in the city, and how are we gonna cut to get down to an acceptable amount so we can hopefully, eventually, start paying down our debt faster than we're taking it on. I'm conflicted, but I'm gonna vote no on the motion. With with very conflicted thoughts, thank you.

- Thank you, Alder. Any other comments? I'll comment. Director Grenier, I know you stated that we do take this out of contingency, right, our portion of it, or whatever part we need to come up with?

- Historically we have done that out of the contingency that's built into the CIP. This year, in order to try to get the CIP down to a manageable level, we had to shave that off.

- Okay. Thank you. Any other discussion? All right, the motion by Alderman Scannell, second by Alderman Wery is to approve the request for 0% interest on the sidewalk replacement fees, loans, I guess. Those in favor?

- Aye.

- Aye.

- Opposed?

- No.

- No.

- All right, that is two to two, that motion failed. What are your wishes? We could pass it two to two to council if you'd like?

- Yeah, I think we should pass it onto council.

- All right, we will go two to two to council.

- If I could, just to get it back before the committee? The way that we will have this reported would be a motion by Alder Scannell, seconded by Alder Wery to not charge interest for unpaid sidewalk, unpaid sidewalk repairs financed by the city for the 2020 program year.

- Okay.

- All right, thank you.

- Perfect. Thanks, Steve. Thanks, Bill. All right, number three. Consideration with possible action on a request by Alder Gerlach to have staff collect and analyze data regarding the number and cost to both the city and the residents of mini storm sewers requested and installed during the spring, summer and fall of 2020 for the purpose of evaluating the impact of the reduction in fee hook-up. Alder Gerlach?

- Well, I tell you what. I'm just really, really sad about this. 24 hours ago I was sitting through the Finance Committee meeting, and Alder Dorff, I think, is being kind when she says we were supposed to take \$2 million off. I believe we were encouraged to take \$3 million off. Tonight we hear about the need for the dike. That's not really an option, that has to be done. And we just talked about forgiving the interest for sidewalk payments that aren't made. And now, passed against my wishes. It's a small amount of money. And the sidewalk interest is a small amount of money. I just believe it all adds up, and I believe that it's just, it's very sad to see that the city is, is bleeding money when, and Alder Galvin just talked about the fact that the sidewalks are in such bad shape. People constantly talk about how the streets are in such bad shape. And little by little, we're just letting it all dribble away. I was totally against this. We now have from, if you saw in your packet, we have from Director Grenier the financial implication. Okay, it's not a lot, it's \$23,500. But I guess what really makes me sad was this was proposed as an incentive program. I asked if there was any evidence if this would incentivize anyone. I was given no evidence by anyone. I asked who would communicate this to citizens as an incentive program. Nobody is going to communicate it. In fact, the 50 households that are going to be asked to hook up were already chosen. We as alders had already received which ones in our districts were going to be hooked up. I don't see that it's an incentive, and it just again is a little way to make the city less fiscally solvent. And so there's nothing I can do about it but have it received and placed on file, but I do that with great sadness.

- Second.

- All right, there's a motion by Alder Gerlach and seconded by Alder Scannell to receive and place on file. Any other discussion on this item? I don't see any hands, so those in favor?

- [All] Aye.

- Opposed? Motion carried. Number four is consideration with possible action on the request by Alder Lefebvre to look at residential policy per storm water runoff, residences are experiencing rain water runoff from elevated houses because of floodplain building elevation requirements, FEMA, referred from February 25th. Are you still with us, Alder Lefebvre? All right, Director Grenier, do you know what Alder Lefebvre is looking for here?

- I do, I did have an opportunity to have a conversation with Alder Lefebvre. What we're dealing with here, there are certain properties where when a property is developed or redeveloped, because the prior structure was before the floodplain elevation or below the current floodplain elevation, that property then needs to be raised up to meet the new floodplain requirements. When you do a redevelopment or develop a vacant parcel to meet those requirements, what you wind up with that's higher than the surrounding properties, and it sort of winds up on an island and it directs its water to the adjoining property owner. So we did hear from a resident under item one that was talking about all the properties around her that are higher in elevation than her and creating a lake on her property. So once I had the opportunity to discuss this with Alder Lefebvre to find out what exactly she was looking for, I did sit down and have a conversation with Director Vonck on this. As it's a private property issue, it doesn't occur within the public right of way, it actually is not under the jurisdiction of the Department of Public Works. I did offer to Alder Lefebvre to leave it on our agenda so that if she desired she could have some discussion here to start that conversation, but this does belong at Plan Commission. So our recommendation is to refer this communication. Director Vonck is ready to take that up.

- So moved.

- All right.

- Second.

- There is a motion by Alder Brunette, second by Alder Scannell, to refer this to Planning Commission. Alder Lefebvre, I'm searching through here, I don't see you.

- I see--

- Yeah, there you are, but you're muted.

- Yeah.

- There she is.

- There we go.

- [Kathy] Okay, okay.

- Darn.

- Okay.

- I mean good, good, good.

- [Kathy] Okay, you muted me again, sorry.

- Go ahead.

- [Kathy] Yes, it started with a properties on, it's either Berner or Reber, I keep forgetting which street that is. Anyway, the gentlemen, there's two houses between two that had to raise up, so he's really, last year with all the rain, he's not getting part of the problem now, but he was having so much flooding, his whole back yard was getting full of the rainwater, running off their properties. And then yes, now with the house down along East Shore Drive here, people are, new houses have built up. And then there's another one where they built up the lot, they were going to join the next one who had raised up. They raised up higher but they did not join up to their property, so they have about a five foot area where all that debris just filled right in and all the water ran in. So there are issues with this, and because the city has no regulations on this when they do build, I believe there has to be something put in there where anybody who has to raise up their house when they want to build, remodel, whatever, from the FEMA regulations, that they have to mitigate any runoff of water from their property. I just think it's common sense. So, yes, thank you for letting me just to explain that, and yes, I will plan on, would the committee putting the communication in, or do I have to put the communication in?

- We'll be referring it there.

- [Kathy] Pardon?

- We're referring it directly there.

- [Kathy] You will, okay, thank you.

- Yes. At least that's what the motion is right now.

- Yeah.

- [Kathy] Okay, thank you.

- Thank you, any other discussion?

- Just one quick--

- I will, yeah, go ahead, Alder Scannell.

- Yeah, just, I also have a constituent that also has a similar problem. I believe it's on Gallagher or over that way by Velp, everybody around them had to build up and now he's their swimming pool. So yeah, I'm glad this is finally getting looked at. Thank you.

- Thank you, Alder Scannell. I'll chime in, it's not in a floodplain, but on Shadow Lane right now, some houses are being bought and rebuilt as a luxury condo or Airbnb or whatever it is, and they're a couple of feet higher. So people on Thorndale, behind, now are getting a lot of water runoff, so we're just starting to experience that, with the elevation change and mitigating runoff. They're not mitigating it, they're just sending it to other people. So I don't know if under this communication if any elevation change can be handled, but we'll send it there and see what they can work on. Steve's nodding his head yes, so good. Any other comments on this item? All right, those in favor?

- [All] Aye.

- Opposed? Motion carried. We are onto item number five. Consideration with possible action on General Ordinance 14-20, an ordinance to amend Section, sorry, I clicked on the wrong area, to amend Section 29.21 I, GBMC, relating to penalties for parking violations. Steve, is this yours?

- Yes sir.

- Or is Director Pirlot here?

- I've got Assistant City Attorney Mather is here with us again tonight in case we have specific questions. The short version of this is, as we have updated the parking citation rates over time, taken that through committee and then gotten council approval on that, it's been brought to our attention, it actually does also require an ordinance change. The parking violations are written in the city ordinance, Green Bay Municipal Code. So all this action does, is updates Green Bay Municipal Code to be consistent with the actions already approved by the committee and council, it's really a procedural step.

- Okay, perfect. Any questions from the committee? Anyone else?

- Motion to approve.

- Motion to approve.

- [Kathy] Chairman Wery?

- One second, I do have a motion, I'm gonna handle that first,

- [Kathy] Okay, okay.

- Hold on, Alder Lefebvre. We do have a motion to approve by Alder Scannell, is there a second?

- Second.

- Second.

- Okay, you seconded it, Alder Brunette?

- I seconded, either myself or Alder--

- That's fine.

- Yes, yes.

- Okay. Now we'll have discussion, Alder Brunette.

- Yes, thank you, Director Grenier, I want to be very clear for the sake of the committee. I did contact Mr. Pirlot and Director Grenier by email, and Chris mentioned the reason for the timing of it all. I think, the timing, in my opinion, is necessary to bring it forward. I'm glad it's here now. Perhaps maybe it should've been brought forward a few months ago. And the reason I say that is some of the belief in the community is that somehow Parking Utility is being overzealous in issuing citations, which we know is out there circulating. And so when the public sees this, we understand as a committee that this was made, this decision was made months ago, but the way that it's coming forward now, it makes us appear as though we're looking to collect more money to offset city revenue. So I just want to make sure we're clear as a committee that we understand that this was voted on a long time ago. And for the public who may be listening or watching in on this, this is just simply an update of an old ordinance that is consistent with what we do in any situation when we update through vote. Is that correct, Director Grenier?

- That is correct. And actually, when we did a little bit of research to find out, okay, how did we make this oversight? What we found out was, due to retirement, we had an individual that was working down in the Law Department who would monitor our I and S Committee minutes, and when we would take an action like this through at the committee level, he was automatically doing the ordinance revisions and adding the ordinance to the next regularly scheduled council meeting, and it was being handled procedurally without any action. With her retirement, there was a knowledge gap that fell in there, and we just sort of found out about it, and we went, oh geez, we need to correct that. So, now that we know about it, we'll make sure that that doesn't happen again.

- Hey, again, Director Grenier, it happens. We like to think that we run things perfectly as a city, but things fall through once and a while. I just want the public to be aware that we're not looking to capture revenue by pushing this thing through. And I know we know that's true, but I'm just saying, public perception is a lot.

- Great point.

- [Lindsay] Just to provide some additional context for that if anybody is just wondering about the dates. This was passed by committee on September 25th and approved by council on October 1st. So I understand Alder Brunette's comments about timeliness, but I just want to emphasize that this was in fact the change was made months ago, the ordinance update just didn't happen at that same time.

- Okay.

- Thank you for that clarification. Brought to you by Attorney Mather, correct?

- [Lindsay] Oh, yes, I'm sorry, I didn't introduce myself. I apologize.

- No, no, that's okay. Good to hear your voice. All right, any other comments or questions?

- [Kathy] Alder Lefebvre.
- Oh, Alder Lefebvre?
- One thing--
- Go ahead.
- [Kathy] Because I'm newly on the Protection and Policy, I did ask for what the classifications, what they stand for. Can I ask somebody to send me the definition, what is class A parking violation, class B, C. I don't understand what those entail. Could somebody send that to me?
- Director Grenier, can you make a little note and have somebody send her those?
- We will be happy to do that.
- Thank you.
- [Kathy] Thank you, appreciate it.
- Is that good, Alder Lefebvre? Okay, thank you.
- Yes.
- Any other comments? Alderman Steuer? You need to unmute.
- I'll get better at this, anyway. Thank you, Chair. Just a point of clarification on E, \$302, going up from 150 for a class E, I just need to know what class E stands for again.
- Director? Test your memory here.
- If at all.
- If memory serves, that's the parking in a handicapped zone.
- Okay.
- [Lindsay] That's correct.
- All right.
- All of the, all of the citation rates that are listed seem to be a little odd because they are in \$2 increments. That \$2 was something we had talked about, there's a pass-through cost that comes from a vendor that constitutes that extra \$2. The violations are not in \$5 increments.
- Right, but it just seemed like it was over double for that last one. I just was wondering why, and I know we passed that, but I was just wondering why.

- There was significant discussion that occurred at the committee level, and it was with regard to parking in a handicapped zone.

- Okay.

- Yeah.

- I'm good, thank you.

- [Lindsay] So this is Attorney Mather again. That conversation also occurred among the entire council at the October 1st meeting when the entire updated numbers were adopted.

- Okay, thank you.

- Thank you. We might need to have Attorney Mather with us all the time. She's our fact person, I like that.

- [Lindsay] I did a lot of research on this one.

- Keep your Wednesdays open. Any other discussion? Those in favor?

- Aye.

- Aye.

- Aye.

- Opposed? Motion carried. All right, we are onto director's report.

- Okay, a pretty brief director's report tonight. Just reminding everyone that this is the last week of spring curbside yard waste collection. For the past two weeks or so we have had a pretty aggressive, by that I need daily. We have been updating our social media page to let people know that yard waste, or spring curbside is ending this week, that the material had to be to the curb by Sunday to guarantee pick up. And we've also been telling people, both on the east side and the west side of the city, what garbage routes we are in each day so that they can gauge when they can be expecting curbside to be coming through. So, one thing I did want to make the committee aware of, we did have some conversation regarding to our annual consumables with regard to hot mix asphalt, and the decision was made by the committee to contract with Brown County for the purchase of our hot mix asphalt, they were the low responsive vendor that came to us. We were advised by Brown County this week, two days ago, that when they submitted their pricing to us, they neglected to include a 5% service fee that they charge people. Too late.

- I did go back and check with the purchasing department. Even with that 5% service fee, they are still the low responsible responsive vendor. And what we had approved was to go with them up to the dollar value that was stipulated in the budget. So there's no extra expense. We might be getting a ton or two less of asphalt for the price, but they are still the low vendor. And the total expenditure, the total outlay on behalf of the city has not changed. So I did want to make you aware of that just as a

procedural issue. And then the last item on the agenda, or on my report for tonight. It is with extremely mixed feelings that I have to inform you, I received paperwork from Debbie Epping in the Operations Division, Sanitation Section. After 30, I think 38 years, Debbie's been with the city, she has announced her intent to retire on June 16th. So, I am more than a little bit jealous of her and her ability to enjoy her retirement. And nice to have somebody who's retiring young enough to be able to enjoy it. But we're certainly gonna hate to lose her and all the institutional knowledge she has in running that sanitation section. So we're gonna be on the lookout for a new sanitation superintendent soon. And that concludes my director's report.

- Thanks, Director. Any questions, Alder Scannell?

- Yeah, not a question, just a comment. I've worked with Debbie Epping, Debbie Haines Epping, did I say that quite right?

- Yes.

- Debbie, she was wonderful, she was very helpful, she was always great to work with. And please extend our gratitude for her years of service and wish her the best.

- Yep.

- We will do that.

- And Director Grenier, you sure have lost a lot of good employees to retirement the last few years, and transfers, and you name it so. I know you'll keep things moving along smoothly, but we wish her well, big loss, of course, to the city.

- Yes it is.

- I concur.

- All right, any other questions or comments? Can I have a motion to receive and place on file?

- Motion to receive and place on file.

- Second.

- Motion by Alder Scannell, second by Alder Brunette. Any discussion on that? Those in favor?

- [All] Aye.

- Opposed? Motion carried. Our. Scheduled for May 27th, Wednesday May 27th.

- 6:15, right, so I'm not late?

- Party time, party time.

- We'll move the login to 4:00.

- I'm curious if we'll be meeting in person at some point in the next...
- Yeah. Motion to adjourn.
- I hope so.
- Yeah,
- I do think the--
- Well, the Supreme Court ruled, did you hear that?
- Yeah, I saw that today, yeah.
- That doesn't mean we have to follow it.
- Well, whatever.
- We'll figure it out.
- Motion by Scannell to adjourn.
- Second.
- Second by Brunette. Those in favor?
- [All] Aye.
- Opposed? See you later.
- Thank you.