



MINUTES OF THE IMPROVEMENT AND SERVICES COMMITTEE

WEDNESDAY, JUNE 24, 2020, 5:00 PM

PLEASE NOTE TIME CHANGE

**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. Lynn Gerlach, Ald. Chris Wery, Ald. Jesse Brunette, Ald. Randy Scannell

C. APPROVAL OF THE AGENDA.

Moved by Ald. Randy Scannell, seconded by Ald. Jesse Brunette to approve the agenda of the Wednesday, June 24, 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, June 10, 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 General Ordinance No. 19-20, an ordinance creating section 9.17, Green Bay Municipal Code, relating to responsible bidder criteria.

Moved by Ald. Randy Scannell, seconded by Ald. Lynn Gerlach 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 Brunett 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. Lynn Gerlach to approve General Ordinance No. 19-20, an ordinance creating section 9.17, Green Bay Municipal Code, relating to responsible bidder criteria. Motion carried. Vote: Yes- Chris Wery, Jesse Brunette, Lynn Gerlach, Randy Scannell, No- None, Abstain- None

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

A. Request approval to purchase two (2) Utility Vehicles for \$117,326.00 from Bobcat Plus Inc., the lowest responsive, responsible vendor.

B. Request approval to purchase two (2) Refuse Trucks for \$529,875.94 from R.N.O.W., Inc., the lowest responsive, responsible vendor.

C. Request approval to purchase one (1) Tandem Axle Plow Truck for \$205,796.00 from Packer City International, the lowest responsive, responsible vendor.

D. Request approval to purchase two (2) 1-Ton Dump Body, Tailgate Spreader, & V-Plow from Olson Trailer & Body, the lowest responsive, responsible vendor.

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

A. To purchase two (2) Utility Vehicles for \$117,326.00 from Bobcat Plus Inc., the lowest responsive, responsible vendor.

B. To purchase two (2) Refuse Trucks for \$529,875.94 from R.N.O.W., Inc., the lowest responsive, responsible vendor.

C. To purchase one (1) Tandem Axle Plow Truck for \$205,796.00 from Packer City International, the lowest responsive, responsible vendor.

D. To purchase two (2) 1-Ton Dump Body, Tailgate Spreader, & V-Plow from Olson Trailer & Body, the lowest responsive, responsible vendor.

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

3. Consideration with possible action on request by Department of Public Works to award the following contracts:

A. SEWERS 4-20 BASIN REPAIR

B. SIDEWALKS 2020

Moved by Ald. Randy Scannell, seconded by Ald. Lynn Gerlach to receive and place on file the following contract:

A. SEWERS 4-20 BASIN REPAIR - no bids were received.

To approve the award of the following contract:

B. SIDEWALKS 2020 to the low responsive bidder, Al Dix Concrete, Inc., in the amount of \$242,240.

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

4. Consideration with possible action on request by Department of Public Works to award construction contract SOUTH BAY SHORE DIKE REINFORCEMENT at a staff level and report the award at the next regular meeting of the Improvement and Services Committee.

Moved by Ald. Randy Scannell, seconded by Ald. Jesse Brunette to approve the request by Department of Public Works to award construction contract SOUTH BAY SHORE DIKE REINFORCEMENT at a staff level and report the award at the next regular meeting of the Improvement and Services Committee. Motion carried. Vote: Yes- Chris Wery, Jesse Brunette, Lynn Gerlach, Randy Scannell, No- None, Abstain- None

5. Report of actions taken by Department of Public Works

A. Granting of Licenses

I. Sidewalk Builder

- a. Delrar, Inc.
- b. Douglas J. Maurer Concrete LLC
- c. Evraets Concrete Const. LLC
- d. N & L Concrete Const. LLP
- e. N.E.W. Concrete
- f. SMA Construction Services

2. Tree & Brush Trimmer for S & D Tree Service.

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

F. INFORMATIONAL.

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

Moved by Ald. Jesse Brunette, seconded by Ald. Randy Scannell to receive and place on file the 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 July 15, 2020.

G. PUBLIC HEARINGS.

H. 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

Alderman Chris Wery: Getting underway. The Improvement and Services Committee of June 24th will be commenced. Can I get a roll call? Alder Brunette?

Jesse Brunette: Here.

Chris: Alder Gerlach.

Lynn Gerlach: Here.

Chris: Alder Scannell.

Randy Scannell: Present.

Chris: All right and Alder Wery is here as well. Can I get approval of the agenda?

Randy: Motion to be moved.

Jesse: Second.

Chris: Motion by Scannell, second by Brunette. Any discussion on that? Those in favor?

Jesse: Aye.

Lynn: Aye.

Randy: Aye.

Chris: All's motion carried. Approval of the minutes.

Randy: To be moved.

Lynn: Second.

Chris: Motion by Scannell, second by Gerlach to approve the minutes. Any discussion on those? Those in favor?

Randy: Aye.

Lynn: Aye.

Jesse: Aye.

Chris: All's motion carried. Regular business, number 1, consideration and possible action on general ordinance 1920. An ordinance creating section 9.17 Green Bay Municipal code relating to responsible bidder criteria. Steve, this one yours?

Steve Grenier: Actually, I'm going to turn this over to Alder Scannell and assistant city attorney Mather who is here.

Chris: All right, who wants first?

Randy: I'll let legal go first.

Lindsay Mather: I defer to you Alder Scannell. [chuckles]

Randy: Okay, all right. Certainly fine. This is something that the county has done and I think it'd be a good thing for us in the city to follow their lead. I've been contacted by a number of different groups that think this would be good for the city. I think it'd be good for the city, it would help us with our local businesses, and also with the Technical College, helping with the gills there and everything. I think it's a way for us to work much more closely with our community to build our community. That's my pitch. I don't know if Lindsay wants to add anything or we could open the floor. I know there are some interested parties.

Lindsay: I don't have much to add from the legal perspective, I was primarily involved in drafting the ordinance, but as far as content, that was largely driven by discussions with different people at the city.

Randy: Did we pretty much follow the county's ordinance?

Lindsay: Is in a significant part, yes. It's largely similar.

Randy: Sure thing, yes. If there's any questions for me or otherwise, we could open the floor.

Chris: Open the floor.

Randy: Motion to open the floor motion.

Lynn: Second.

Chris: Motion by Alder Scannell, second by Alder Gerlach to open the floor. Discussion, those in favor? All's motion carried, the floor is open. If you wish to speak on this item, I guess unmute yourself and give us your name and address. Any out there?

Dustin Delsman: Yes. Hi, everybody. This is Dustin Delsman. I'm a business agent for Plumbers and Pipefitters Local 400. Been in conversations with different alders at the city level as well as supervisors at the county level. I just want to make it clear that this is not union versus nonunion. It's about the constituents of the city of Green Bay getting their best bang for their buck. It has to do with registered apprenticeships. I'm sure you've all had a chance to take a look through it and not that you want to prove this because you want to get in line with anybody else but Alder Scannell is correct. The county has passed it, it passed I believe last year as well as the city of Manitowoc and Sheboygan. Again, not a reason to get in line but ultimately to give the constituents of the city of Green Bay the best bang for their dollar on projects above and beyond 25,000. If there's any questions directly for me, I'm happy to try and answer them. Otherwise, appreciate the time and consideration.

Chris: All right. Appreciate it, Mr. Delsman. Looks like we have a question from Alder Brunette. Go ahead.

Jesse: Yes. Mr. Delsman, thanks for speaking. I guess in your words, why is this needed? Why is this a good idea?

Dustin: Well, if I was a constituent of the city of Green Bay and I asked anyone of you or anyone else on the Common Council, how are you signifying that you're giving-- you're letting your bids to contractors that are participating in registered apprenticeships that have a, I'll call it an up-to-date or ongoing safety program, I just think it bodes well for the city of Green Bay to have that answer for the constituency. Yes, we have this ordinance. Hopefully, you guys approve it and pass it but you'd have this ordinance as a leg to stand on and to answer to that resident to say, yes, we have an ordinance in place and we're trying we're doing our best to follow it.

Jesse: I'm not poking at you. I simply am trying to understand what the benefit versus the reasons not to do it. Just comment on this. If I'm on a smaller contractor one or many municipal projects, and maybe I'm not up to speed yet on-- I don't have the resources of say, larger contractor, if we were to require these elements in order to get that contract through a responsible bidder, are we penalizing or are we going to make it tougher for smaller type contractors who are ramping up their capabilities, if we only give a municipal contract to certain types of contractors who meet these criterias? Are we hurting a level playing field for smaller contractors? Yes, go ahead.

Dustin: I guess in my opinion, you're leveling that playing field so that any contractors that are bidding are playing in the same arena or they are at the same elevation. I don't see it as hamstringing this, in your words, a smaller contractor. Again, this is for projects that are over 25,000 as far as how I read it. I guess in my eyes, that's how I look at it. It's more of leveling that playing field and not hamstringing a smaller or early on contractor.

Jesse: Okay. Thank you. Thanks for answering. Nothing else.

Dustin: [unintelligible 00:06:50].

Chris: Thanks, Alder Brunette. Any other questions? Any other questions from Mr. Delsman? All right. Anything else you want to add, Mr. Delsman?

Dustin: Does Lynn have a question or is she just--?

Chris: She's waving her hand. Oh, go ahead.

Lynn: I don't know if this is a question for you or for Alder Scannell, or I don't know who should answer this. What I want to know, I would appreciate Alder Brunette's question because I needed to know that too, but I want to know what's different? What is different about this than the way it was before? Why was-- I hear everything you're saying but what [unintelligible 00:07:28] is adopted, please?

Dustin: I guess I would ask the question back to you and what do you have in place right now that defines what responsible bidder is? What does the city of Green Bay have?

Lynn: I wouldn't know. That's what I'd like someone to tell me, please. What do you think?

Dustin: Well, I guess I'm asking that question. If you do, I'm all for taking a look at it but if you don't, this again, would be a way to call it create a level of contractors bidding and essentially spending tax dollars for the city residents of Green Bay.

Lynn: This definition of a responsible bidder. Is that what you're saying?

Dustin: It's basically defining what responsible is. The word responsible is different to each one of us on this call right now as well as is the constituents around various municipalities. I guess in my own personalized if I asked you what defines responsible, that's what this lays on.

Lynn: Okay, thank you.

Chris: I'm sure director Grenier will go through it once we close the floor, right, what we have now and what we're changing.

Dustin: Thank you, everyone. Appreciate it. Appreciate your time and consideration.

Chris: Thank you. Thank you, Mr. Delsman. Anyone else here for this item? Anybody else? All right, **[unintelligible 00:08:50]** the motion to close the floor.

Randy: Motion to close the floor.

Jesse: Second.

Chris: Motion by alder Scannell second by alder Brunette. Close the floor. Those in favor?

Randy: Aye.

Jesse: Aye.

Lynn: Aye.

Chris: All's motion carried. Well, why don't we go to you first, Steve? That was a good question. What do we have right now in place for responsible bidding?

Steve: The bidders proof of responsibility requirements. The form that's used by contractors to complete the bidders' proof of responsibility which is reviewed by myself and Jim Brunette is what defines a responsible bidder. Some of the criteria that are written into this ordinance are written in every construction contract or in our general terms or conditions for the constructor contract. About the only thing that changes from current practice is on contracts of \$2 million or more, there is now a requirement as opposed to a recommendation for a apprenticeship program and this codifies as opposed to having it as construction. That's the primary differences between current practice but by and large everything, that's contemplated by this ordinance is already completed by the Department of Public Works.

Chris: You don't see any issue with that **[unintelligible 00:10:11]**? It doesn't put any hurdles or obstacles in anybody's way other than being more responsible? Yes.

Steve: All it does is it codifies current practice. Again, we have items that are in the bidder's proof of responsibility, which is not going to change. We have items in here that are part of our instructions to bidders or part of our construction documents. That's not going to change. It'll be repetitive. This simply puts it into an ordinance format.

Chris: Did you help draft this at all?

Steve: I did some review on it but no, I was not involved in the drafting.

Chris: Do you have any issues with it as drafted?

Steve: Not particularly.

Chris: Okay. Committee.

Jesse: Question.

Chris: Alder Brunette.

Jesse: Yes, sir. Thank you, director Grenier. I guess my question-- Okay. When we have bids out there and you then go through the different bids and make sure that they're good bid projects from time to time you give us the history, okay yes, we've had good workings with this company, this company is well-referred, no problems there. It seems to me like the current system is working just fine. Every now and then we get a bid that's not, let's just say, responsible or maybe they go way over what how other bids came in at, so obviously, they don't get the contract but some of these smaller companies, let's just say, what are some sorts of bids that come in right around the \$25,000 mark?

Steve: Well, let me back up real quick. They don't even get to bid if we don't deem them to be a responsible bidder. What would make a determination of a non-responsive bid is if they took exception to some of the contract language, if they weren't able to supply the materials that we indicated we wanted, but other than that, which are pretty rare occurrences, determination of a responsible bidder is made way before they've been allowed to bid on any contract. 25,000 is a statutory requirement. Anything that is public construction, having a net aggregate value of \$25,000 or more by state statute is required to be by open bidding. Anything that's below that can be run through the purchasing department utilizing our internal purchasing guidelines. The \$25,000 threshold for bidding has been there for quite some time. Nothing changed there.

Jesse: Right. The question I asked, Mr. Delsman, if you could elaborate on that, director Grenier, what I don't want to have happen is unintended consequences. Say, if we pass this, and some, let's just say beginning contract companies that want to bid on projects, maybe they don't have the experience bidding on contracts, but they're fully capable as in by the city of Green Bay. I don't want to penalize new companies who are let's just say, ramping up to their capabilities to provide work if it allows good return on a dollar to the taxpayer. Does that make sense? I just don't want unnecessarily punitive.

Steve: It does. Again, a lot of the provisions that are in here, they have to have a permanent place of business. We don't want somebody operating out of a truck. They got to be authorized to do business in the state of Wisconsin. They can't be debarred. We obviously don't want that not even a small contractor. A lot of these more apparently onerous provisions are if they apply. Okay? **[inaudible 00:14:01]** equal opportunity. We definitely want to have

equal opportunity. They have to have appropriate insurance notice. We don't stipulate the levels. Those levels are dictated on a contract-specific basis.

If you have worked on projects which have prevailing wage requirements, you have to demonstrate that you have met those. If you've not worked on projects which are sub-subject to prevailing wage, the point becomes irrelevant. The apprenticeship program only applies to contracts of \$2 million in aggregate value or greater, so a small contractor is not going to be bidding on those, and so on and so forth through that. I don't know. Again, the substance abuse program, that's required in all of our contracts anyway. I don't see anything in here, that in my opinion, would prohibit us from utilizing small contractors because a lot of those we work cooperatively with Calvin and the purchasing department to realize the best value in contracting for the city and our taxpayer.

Again, here, it's a requirement on a project of \$2 million or more, whereas previously, that had been a suggestion or a preference that we had indicated. We do have contracts at large, okay? Some of our sewer contractors, we're now going to be requiring that those contractors here locally have apprenticeship programs. I don't know whether that exists or not. It hasn't been a concern for us when we've not asked the question. Again, the lion's share of everything in these documents, our current state of practice, as a matter of fact, our bidder's proof process takes us far beyond what's in this new ordinance. This is simply committing it to ordinance form.

Jesse: As you said, codifies what we already basically do.

Steve: I do.

Jesse: Okay, thank you. No other questions. Thank you Alder Wery.

Chris: Thank you, Alder Brunette. Any other questions? Alder Gerlach?

Lynn: I have a couple of questions. Director Grenier, so you see no reason not to adopt this?

Steve: I have no issue with the ordinance as is presented.

Lynn: Okay. I don't know who this-- who can answer this question. As I read this, it refers specifically to public works. Is this going to be general to all bidders for any project in the city?

Steve: If it involves public construction by Green Bay Municipal code, those projects are automatically under the jurisdiction of the Department of Public Works.

Lynn: Okay, so this is anything that involves public construction and would go to public works?

Steve: Correct.

Lynn: Okay, one last question, Alder Scannell. I think this was before my time that this all started and how were you involved in this [laughs] please?

Randy: This is new. This is just something that some of the groups have come to me and said, they feel that if we codify this-- our current practice, this doesn't change anything really for us, but it codifies it so it keeps us on this path. All those come and go, directors come and go, businesses practices change, and this puts in place certain criteria so that we are getting

good quality work and promoting businesses within the area and our technical college which seems to be a smart way to do it. It just codifies and keeps us on a path that where I think that's a smart and good thing for us to do.

Lynn: Okay, thank you. All finished.

Chris: All right. Thank you.

Randy: That's about what I was going to say anyway, so [laughs] done, too.

Chris: [laughs] Now I do have one further question for you, Alder Scannell and you Attorney Mather. You had mentioned there might be a difference or two from the county. Do you know what that might be or what those might be?

Randy: That would be Lindsay for that.

Lindsay: Give me just a moment to find an older version so I can tell you.

Chris: That's right. I have a copy up right now also of the Coney one and nothing's jumping out at me. I didn't know if it was just a minor language thing or—

Lindsay: I believe that we took out a couple of revisions.

Chris: We didn't add to it. We might have removed some.

Steve: That is correct.

Chris: Okay, got you. That's probably why.

Lindsay: Yes. There's just a few of them. They're not popping out at me right this second, but we did remove a few that in discussions with Director Grenier and other people, we agreed that it was further than everybody was comfortable going. I did just also want to point out briefly in response to Alder Brunette's question, even the requirement for the apprenticeship programs still states that if determined in the discretion of the director of public works. Even on those programs over \$2 million, if the director determines that it's not appropriate for that project to have somebody that has an approved apprenticeship program, I'm just saying it doesn't rule anybody out if before the quotes go out or request for quotes go out if the director makes that determination. It's specifically designed to be provided for some of that flexibility.

Chris: Thank you, attorney.

Steve: I did quickly look. I was able to look at the modifications, Assistant Attorney Mather. What we had struck was specifically things that would have adversely impacted start-up contractors as Alder Brunette had indicated. There was a requirement for a successful demonstration of projects. What I used for an example when I was discussing this with the assistant city attorney and the mayor's office, CityDeck, the phase 2 of the CityDeck, the in-water portion, was completed by a local firm by the name of SMA. The principals of SMA-- That was one of the first jobs that they had been awarded after forming that company. Both of the principals had been, I believe, with Howard Immel Construction before that and were the

project managers for phase 1 of CityDeck. They were both very competent, very capable individuals probably understood CityDeck better than anybody outside of city staff, but they'd split off and form their own company. With the provisions that were in the county version of the text, they would not have been considered for that project nor would they have been considered to build the Zippin Pippin which was the very next contract we awarded to them. They did perform very satisfactorily, they did perform at much lower cost than the next low bidder so it was in the city's best interest to do that. Because of those types of justifications, there was that language of prior demonstration by the firm that we did remove-- Again, during our bidders proof of responsibility evaluations, we take into account the principals, those who were involved on a working level and prior projects that may have been completed by those individuals but not necessarily as a member of that firm. Make sense?

Chris: That does.

Steve: Thank you.

Randy: Motion to approve.

Chris: Motion by Alder Scannell to approve.

Lynn: Second.

Chris: Second by Alder Gerlach. Any discussion on this item? Those in favor?

Randy: Aye.

Chris: Opposed? All right, we're onto number 2, consideration with possible action on the report of the purchasing manager with A being a request approval to purchase two utility vehicles for \$117,326 from Bobcat Plus Inc., the lowest responsive, responsible lender. Mr. Winters is there?

Calvin Winters: Yes, I am. For all of these items, A through D, all these were bid out with official bids. I included all of the bid tabulations for you to look at to see where all the bids came in. I have no issues with any of these requests were requesting to award to the lowest bidder on all of them. I can answer questions about the process. If there's any questions about the uses forum, then I would defer to Director Grenier.

Chris: All right, thank you. Committee, did you want to handle all these at once? There's four, A through D, or do you want to go one by one? Do you have any questions on them?

Randy: Aye, I [unintelligible 00:23:46].

Chris: Oh, you want something. Then I'll just read them off as well. B request. Approval for the purchase of two refuse trucks for \$529,875.94 from RNOW Inc. C is request approval to purchase one tandem axle plow truck for \$205,796 from Packer City International. D is request approval to purchase two one-ton dump body tailgate spreader and V-plow from Olson Trailer & Body. Those are all the lowest responsive responsible bidders.

Randy: Motion to approve.

Chris: Motion by Alder Scannell to approve.

Lynn: Second.

Chris: Second by Alder Gerlach. Any discussion on these? Those in favor?

Randy: Aye.

Lynn: Aye.

Chris: Opposed? Motion carried. Thank you. Number 3, consideration possible action on request by Department of Public Works to award the following contracts. A, sewers 4-20 and B sidewalks 2020.

Steve: Okay. With both of these contracts, we just opened the bids yesterday which is why the bid summaries were not included in the packet for you. We were trying to cram in as much in as we can. Interestingly enough, sewers 4-20. That is our basin repair. In 2019, we did a lot of televising and sewer inspection, identified sewers that needed to be repaired and put out a special sewer contract this year to accomplish that work. We had a great response as far as contractors pulling plans, but we received zero bids on the contract.

Assistant Director Brunette has reached out to various contractors. We tend to colloquialize a little bit. We refer to dig down contractors, which is your typical sewer contractor, the guys who have the backhoes, and then lining contractors which are the guys who'll do cast and place pipe. The lion's share of the work contemplated under this contract was lining. Between 80 and 90% of the contract was lining work. Our standard specifications require that the prime contractor has to have more than 50% of the work. We don't want somebody just acting as a general and not having skin in the game. Okay? The sewer contractors are dig down contractors here in town could act as a prime, they couldn't submit a bid because there was only 10 to 20% of the work that was excavation. The lining contractors elected not to submit bids because they didn't want the hassle of being a prime contractor and having to coordinate with the subcontractor for the dig down work. Based off of that information, I had a conversation with the assistant director Brunette and we are going to remove that 50% workload requirement for that and we're simply going to turn it on put it right back out on the street. We hope to have something back in three to four weeks for your consideration. That's the reasoning why we didn't receive any bids on that particular contract. I wanted to make sure that we were very clear about that. We don't expect to see a problem going forward with it. Sidewalks 2020. That's our annual sidewalks team—

Chris: Steve, it's like [crosstalk] on that item, I just have to point out that's the first time since a spelling bee that I've heard someone say colloquialize.

[laughter]

I liked it but okay, that's another—

Steve: I need to keep up with your kerfuffle.

Randy: Are you going to make him spell it?

Chris: I think he might have to.

[laughter]

Steve: The sidewalks 2020 contract. That's our annual sidewalk repair contract. The 60-day window is starting to get close to expiring. We need to get a contractor on board to get out there. Put it out. We did receive two bids back L Decks Concrete put quite a low responsive, responsible bidder. They came in at a total contrast of \$242,240. The other bid was Martell Construction here in Green Bay, who came in at \$243,575. A little over 1,300 dollars spread out 240 to \$243,000 contract that's pretty tight-shooting as far as we're concerned. We do recommend award to L Decks in the amount of \$242,240.

Chris: Does that fall where we thought it would, Steve?

Steve: Give or take, yes. There's always some fluctuation in the market. We had expected to see concrete prices go up. I don't think they necessarily went up as much as we had feared this year. I think COVID has cut into the amount of construction that's going on and there's a small glut at this time of construction materials on the market. I think we saw better pricing maybe than we otherwise may have. I do expect next year for things to go up because again, we're adding that proactive inspection program which is going to increase our cost by about 300,000. We're in the ballpark.

Chris: All right, good. That's good to hear. Any questions on either of those from the committee?

Randy: Motion to approve.

Chris: All right. Motion by Alder Scannell. Is there a second?

Lynn: Second. You better tell Alder Brunette he's been muted for a long time.
[laughter]

Chris: I didn't think he was still here.

Jesse: I'm here. I'm here.

Chris: He's playing music in the background. All right, there's a motion and a second to approve A and B, for the sewers and the sidewalks. I guess sewers will be rebid, right?

Steve: Yes.

Chris: Those in favor?

Crowd: Aye.

Chris: Opposed? Motion carried. We are on to number 4, consideration with possible action on request to award construction contract South Bay Shore dike reinforcement at a staff level and report the award at the next regular meeting of the Improvement Services Committee. This is a juicy one. How do you have it for, Steve?

Steve: There were significant questions on this that were brought up at a pre-bid meeting so we're having to respond to those questions, making sure that contractors have good information to bid on. As a result of that, we were forced to push the bid back by one week, so that will open next Tuesday. Taking a look at the calendar, if we open bids next Tuesday,

we won't be able to bring that forward to Improvement Service Committee until July 15th for possible council action until July 21st. I think we're all sensitive to the nature of the work out there on the bay and getting that dike repaired so that work we are requesting that the council give us the authority to award that at the staff level once we receive the bids and get the work moving as fast as possible.

Chris: Any questions for the director on this one? Anybody?

Randy: Motion to approve.

Jesse: Second.

Chris: Motion by Alder Scannell, second by Alder Brunette. Those in favor?

Crowd: Aye.

Chris: Opposed? Motion carried. Steve, when do you think that will start hopefully? Sometime mid of this summer?

Steve: We're hoping to get moving sometime in July if possible.

Chris: Okay. Perfect, that's great. All right, onto number 5. Reports of actions taken by Department of Public Works. What actions have you taken?

Steve: Again, it's just the order of the licenses for the sidewalk builders to Delray Incorporated, Douglas J Maurer Concrete LLC, Everette's Concrete Construction LLC, N&L Concrete Construction LLP, NEW Concrete, and SMA Construction Services, and then a tree and brush trimmer license to SMD Tree Service. Again, all contractors either we have knowledge of or have worked with in the past and we did recommend granting those licenses so the [inaudible 00:32:41] can also start doing the work.

Chris: All right. Questions from the committee. I'll entertain a motion—

Randy: [unintelligible 00:32:48] that file?

Chris: Yes.

Randy: Motion received.

Crowd: Second.

Chris: Motion by Alder Scannell, second by Alder Gerlach to receive and place on file discussion. Those in favor?

Randy: Aye.

Lynn: Aye.

Chris: Opposed? Motion carried. Informational director's report.

Steve: Actually, seeing as we have a director's report two weeks ago, there's not a whole lot to report but I did want to make everyone aware of one quick thing and as luck would have it, it happened this morning. A few weeks ago, I did receive a phone call or a message from a parent who lives out on Paula Street in Alder [unintelligible 00:33:27] district. She identified that her son was going to be turning five yesterday morning and his goal in life is to become a garbage man. We did put together a short parade this morning on Cathy and lined the trucks up and brought them down to wish good morning, happy birthday to our newest teammate, Mason. We've made him an honorary member of the Department of Public Works. There's a video on the City of Green Bay Department of Public Works Facebook page. We did receive a notice from his mother later this morning saying that he was just ecstatic and we made his day. We're very happy to welcome our newest member of the team on.

Chris: Excellent. Good. Thanks, Steve. That is good to have some good, happy, pleasant things to talk about.

Steve: I think my staff enjoyed it more than Mason did because the same reason there's far too much negativity going on right now and it gave them a chance to put a smile on a five-year-old's face this morning. They were as happy as anybody.

Randy: Now I want to be a garbage man.
[laughter]

Chris: All right. So there, next committee is scheduled for July 15th. That's all we have, folks.

Steve: That's it.

Randy: Motion to adjourn.

Lynn: Second.

Chris: All right. Motion by-- I'm not sure if I heard Brunette or [unintelligible 00:34:54] or Scannell.

Steve: Brunette and Scannell is what I've got.

Chris: There we go, okay. Those in favor?

Crowd: Aye.

Chris: Opposed? Motion carried. See everybody in—