



MINUTES OF THE IMPROVEMENT AND SERVICES COMMITTEE

WEDNESDAY, AUGUST 12, 2020, 6:00 PM
Virtual Meeting. Public may join via Zoom.

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. Randy Scannell, Ald. Jesse Brunette

Excused: Ald. Chris Wery

C. APPROVAL OF THE AGENDA.

Moved by Ald. Lynn Gerlach, seconded by Ald. Jesse Brunette to approve the agenda of the Wednesday, August 12, 2020 Improvement and Services Committee meeting. Motion carried. Vote: Yes- Jesse Brunette, Lynn Gerlach, Randy Scannell, No- None, Abstain- None

D. APPROVAL OF MINUTES.

Moved by Ald. Jesse Brunette, seconded by Ald. Lynn Gerlach to approve the minutes of the Wednesday, July 15, 2020 Improvement and Services Committee meeting. Motion carried. Vote: Yes- Jesse Brunette, Lynn Gerlach, Randy Scannell, No- None, Abstain- None

E. REGULAR BUSINESS.

I. Consideration with possible action on request by Dave Baumgart to rescind invoice in the amount of \$89.10 for a lot cleanup at 858 Shawano Avenue.

Moved by Ald. Lynn Gerlach, seconded by Ald. Jesse Brunette to approve the request by Dave Baumgart to rescind invoice in the amount of \$89.10 for a lot cleanup at 858 Shawano Avenue. Motion carried. Vote: Yes- Jesse Brunette, Lynn Gerlach, Randy Scannell, No- None, Abstain- None

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

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

2. Consideration with possible action on request to review policy for reimbursement to property owners who repair tree-damaged sidewalk. (Ald. Wery)

Moved by Ald. Lynn Gerlach, seconded by Ald. Jesse Brunette to refer to staff to review policy for reimbursement to property owners who repair tree-damaged sidewalk to revise the current policy and bring modified policy back to the September 9, 2020 Improvement and Services Committee meeting. (Ald. Wery) Motion carried. Vote: Yes- Jesse Brunette, Lynn Gerlach, Randy Scannell, No- None, Abstain- None

3. Consideration with possible action on request by Matthew Johnson for additional compensation related to replacement of tree-damaged sidewalk at 1420 Frank Street.

Moved by Ald. Jesse Brunette, seconded by Ald. Lynn Gerlach to approve reimbursing the material cost only on request by Matthew Johnson for additional compensation related to replacement of tree-damaged sidewalk at 1420 Frank Street. Motion carried. Vote: Yes- Jesse Brunette, Lynn Gerlach, Randy Scannell, No- None, Abstain- None

4. Consideration with possible action on request for status update on plans to address chronic flooding in the vicinity of Main and East Mason Streets and Department of Public Works staff to report back to the Committee on feedback from designer on phasing the project (held at the July 15, 2020 Improvement and Services Committee meeting). (Ald. Nicholson)

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

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

Moved by Ald. Lynn Gerlach, seconded by Ald. Jesse Brunette to refer to staff the request for status update on plans to address chronic flooding in the vicinity of Main and East Mason Streets and Department of Public Works staff to report back to the Committee on feedback from designer on phasing the project. Motion carried. Vote: Yes- Jesse Brunette, Lynn Gerlach, Randy Scannell, No- None, Abstain- None

5. Consideration with possible action on request by Brown County for the City of Green Bay to accept dedication of regional storm water management infrastructure for the Fox River Papermaking Corridor.

Moved by Ald. Jesse Brunette, seconded by Ald. Lynn Gerlach to approve the request by Brown County for the City of Green Bay to accept dedication of regional storm water management infrastructure for the Fox River Papermaking Corridor. Motion carried. Vote: Yes- Jesse Brunette, Lynn Gerlach, Randy Scannell, No- None, Abstain- None

6. Consideration with possible action on request by Green Bay Public Arts Commission to commission a mural on the east abutment wall for the Tilleman (Mason Street) Bridge at the intersection of East Mason Street and Monroe Avenue.

Moved by Ald. Lynn Gerlach, seconded by Ald. Jesse Brunette to approve the request by Green Bay Public Arts Commission to commission a mural on the east abutment wall for the Tilleman (Mason Street) Bridge at the intersection of East Mason Street and Monroe Avenue. Motion carried. Vote: Yes- Jesse Brunette, Lynn Gerlach, Randy Scannell, No- None, Abstain- None

7. Consideration with possible action on General Ordinance No. 23-20, amending Section 21.09, Green Bay Municipal Code, relating to Cross Connection Control Program.

Moved by Ald. Lynn Gerlach, seconded by Ald. Jesse Brunette to approve the General Ordinance No. 23-20, amending Section 21.09, Green Bay Municipal Code, relating to Cross Connection Control Program. Motion carried. Vote: Yes- Jesse Brunette, Lynn Gerlach, Randy Scannell, No- None, Abstain- None

8. Consideration with possible action on request by Department of Public Works to execute Amendment XI to the Brown County Municipal Recycling Agreement.

Moved by Ald. Jesse Brunette, seconded by Ald. Lynn Gerlach to approve the request by Department of Public Works to execute Amendment XI to the Brown County Municipal Recycling Agreement . Motion carried. Vote: Yes- Jesse Brunette, Lynn Gerlach, Randy Scannell, No- None, Abstain- None

9. Consideration with possible action on request by Department of Public Works to award construction contracts at a staff level and report the awards at the next regular meeting of the Improvement and Services Committee for the following:

A. SEWERS 7-20 MINI SEWERS

B. SEWERS 8-20 FINGER ROAD SANITARY SEWER

Moved by Ald. Lynn Gerlach, seconded by Ald. Jesse Brunette to approve the request by Department of Public Works to award construction contracts at a staff level and report the awards at the next regular meeting of the Improvement and Services Committee for the following:

A. SEWERS 7-20 MINI SEWERS

B. SEWERS 8-20 FINGER ROAD SANITARY SEWER.

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

10. Report the award of the contract SEWERS 5-20 S. GRANDVIEW ROAD SANITARY SEWER.

Moved by Ald. Lynn Gerlach, seconded by Ald. Jesse Brunette to receive and place on file the award of the contract SEWERS 5-20 S. GRANDVIEW ROAD SANITARY SEWER to the low responsive bidder, PTS Contractors, Inc., in the amount of \$1,826,994. Motion carried. Vote: Yes- Jesse Brunette, Lynn Gerlach, Randy Scannell, No- None, Abstain- None

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

A. RFB #3255 HVAC INSTALLATION AT PARK SHOP

B. SEWERS 6-20 BASIN REPAIR

Moved by Ald. Jesse Brunette, seconded by Ald. Lynn Gerlach to approve the award of the following contracts:

A. RFB #3255 HVAC INSTALLATION AT PARK SHOP to the low responsive bidder, AMA, Inc., in the amount of \$39,929 base bid and, if needed, Alternate Bid I in the amount of \$10,996.

B. SEWERS 6-20 BASIN REPAIR to the low responsive bidder, Michels Corp., in the amount of \$1,219,465.

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

12. Report of actions taken by Department of Public Works

A. Granting of Licenses

I. Sidewalk Builder

- a. Howard Immel, Inc.
- b. SD Ellenbecker, Inc.
- c. Total Construction/Joe Mains Concrete

Moved by Ald. Jesse Brunette, seconded by Ald. Lynn Gerlach to receive and place on file the report of actions taken by Department of Public Works

A. Granting of Licenses

I. Sidewalk Builder

- a. Howard Immel, Inc.

- b. SD Ellenbecker, Inc.
- c. Total Construction/Joe Mains Concrete.

Motion carried. Vote: Yes- 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. Jesse Brunette, seconded by Ald. Lynn Gerlach to receive and place on file the Director's Report on recent activities of the Public Works Department. Motion carried. Vote: Yes- Jesse Brunette, Lynn Gerlach, Randy Scannell, No- None, Abstain- None

2. The next Improvement and Services Committee meeting is scheduled for September 9, 2020.

G. PUBLIC HEARINGS.

H. ADJOURNMENT.

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

VERBATIM MINUTES

- And we are recording.
- Okay. The I and S Committee meeting for August 12th, 2020 is now in session. The Vice Chair, Alder Scannell is here running the meeting, 'cause our Chair Alder Wery is excused. Alder Gerlach?
- I'm here.
- And Alder Brunette?
- Here.
- Okay, the rest of the committee is here. We have a quorum. Let us begin. I'll take a motion to approve our agenda?
- I move that we approve the agenda.

- Second.
- So moved by Alder Gerlach. Seconded by Alder Brunette. All in favor?
- [All] Aye.
- Opposed? Okay, we have an agenda. I'll take a motion to approve our minutes from our last meeting?
- Move to approve.
- Second.
- Moved by Alder Brunette, seconded by Alder Gerlach. All in favor?
- [All] Aye.
- Opposed? Okay, and that passes unanimously. And I'll wait for a wink to know if we can start?
- We're good.
- We're good, okay. Item number one, consideration with possible action on a request by Dave Baumgart to rescind invoice in the amount of \$89 and 10 cents, excuse me, for a lot cleanup of 958 Shawano Avenue. Shall we start with staff?
- Sure. I'm not seeing that Mr. Baumgart has joined us, unless he is the telephone number down on the bottom. But, what I can tell you is that on May 20th, the Inspection Department sent a notice to Mr. Baumgart's address, which is not the same as the address that we did the cleanup. Address that we did the cleanup is 858 Shawano Avenue. We sent to the property owner address on record, which is 1009 Shawano Avenue, on May 20th, indicating that a cleanup was required. Typically the way this works, Inspection has a 72 hour notice that needs to be adhered to. So the notice was sent 72 hours before they can actually perform the cleanup. You have to give them three days in which to attempt to remedy. So notice was sent on May 20th. However, due to COVID-19, Inspection Department has been giving a longer than 72 hour notice period between notice and cleanup. So they mobilize to the site on June 3rd, which is 14 days later. And when Inspection orders these lot cleanups, it's an inspection function, but they utilize DPW staff to perform the cleanup. So they brought DPW to the site on June 3rd and completed the lot cleanup. An invoice in the amount of \$89 and 10 cents for the effort put forward by DPW staff was then sent to Mr. Baumgart. Mr. Baumgart responded to the city, specifically through DPW, indicating that he was informed that a cleanup was required and that the notice was sent to his address at 1009 Shawano Avenue. However, he vacations for the winter in Florida and got caught down there due to COVID. He indicates that he has some underlying conditions that he didn't feel safe trying to come back. So they stayed later and by the time he got back, which was very near the date, either the day before or the day of the cleanup activity that we did, the mail, which presumably was being forwarded to his Florida address had not gotten down there yet. So he's claiming that he was not informed. And the post office in Florida has not forwarded back to Green Bay. He said that he would have cleaned the property as soon as he got back, but we were already there, and that he does, just goes on to explain that he does do a good job of keeping the property clean. And as a matter of fact, one of the items that was

cleaned up from the property was a flower box that he has out to help keep the area looking nice. So I guess the short version of it is Inspection Department went over on complaint, noticed that there was material that needed to be cleaned. They sent their notice out. Received no response or no action in more than what the requisite time period was, so they ordered a lot cleanup. Had DPW out there to complete the lot cleanup. And now Mr. Baumgart is contesting that charge, saying that he was in Florida and didn't receive adequate notice.

- Alder Gerlach?

- [Dave] Hello, can anybody hear me?

- Oh--

- Hello?

- Alder, is this Mr.--

- I just wanted--

- Is this Mr. Baumgart.

- [Dave] This is Mr. Baumgart.

- Okay, yep--

- Yeah, there was a question whether it was on--

- Hang on a second.

- Okay, Mr. Baumgart, you're gonna have to wait a second, please.

- Yep. We need to open up the floor.

- Motion to open the floor.

- Motion to open the floor by Alder Brunette.

- I know this is out of order, but let me just tell you what I was going to simply move that we approve this. I don't think, this gentleman has gone to great lengths already to explain this in writing. And this is absolutely no fault of anyone's. It's a small amount. I don't think that he even has to explain this. He's explained it twice to us in writing. I would like to move that we simply approve this refund.

- Okay, I withdraw my motion and second that motion.

- Thank you.

- Okay. Motion to approve the appeal. I think, staff isn't responsible for the mail, and this has happened in the past and I, that's really nobody's fault. And I think staff did a good job here and did

the right thing, and it is a small amount, and it seems just an unfortunate set of circumstances. And the only question I have for Steve is, you kind of indicated it, but I wanted to make sure, there hasn't been no problem with this property in the past? This is not an issue?

- I don't have any information about that. I did not look to see whether there were priors or not.

- Okay. It would appear that this has been a well-kept property and not an issue. So I support the appeal. All in favor?

- [All] Aye.

- Opposed? Okay, that has been approved.

- And for Mr. Baumgart's information, this goes to the full city council on Tuesday. Alderman Steuer wanted me to make that statement for him, so he knows that this is a recommendation, that the full council will vote on it on Tuesday.

- Oh, I forgot about that one, yes, I'm sorry.

- That's fine.

- Yeah, everything we do here is just a recommendation to council. Council will have final approval.

- [Dave] Okay.

- Yep.

- [Dave] Can I ask a question now? I don't know what the procedure is for this.

- There's nothing that, like I said, it'll just go to council next Tuesday. This committee reports out to the council and the council will then, if anybody on the council wants to pull this item and discuss it, that could happen. It usually doesn't, but it could happen. So you might want to check into the council meeting next Tuesday. But normally council follows committee's recommendations and this'll probably, I can't guarantee it, it'll probably be accepted by the full council. But that's the next step.

- [Dave] Okay, then I would like to make one clarification on the first alderman's statement.

- Then we'll have to open up the floor.

- I move that we open the floor.

- Second.

- Motion to open the floor by Alder Gerlach. Seconded by Alder Brunette. All in favor?

- [All] Aye.

- Okay, the floor's now open. Go ahead, Mr. Baumgart. Well, please state your name and address.

- [Dave] Dave Baumgart. And the address is 1009 Shawano Avenue, Green Bay, Wisconsin, 54303. And the only clarification I wanted to make, or correction, is the information I got, the first alderman said that this was brought about by a complaint. The information I got from the, Donna, I can't find her last name here right now, that does it, she said it was done as a random draw, a drive by inspection that the city does. It was not done because of a complaint.

- Okay.

- [Dave] So to me that does make a difference. It wasn't like anybody was complaining that the property was trashy. Donna Rosenthal.

- Okay.

- [Dave] That they do random drive-bys. And then, so the other thing is is when they have the council meeting on Tuesday, that is something, do I log in this same way in case they do bring it up, and I do want to make a statement or not?

- It'd be pretty much the same procedure. It'll be a different login and password and everything, but it's basically the same procedure, yep.

- [Dave] And where would I get that information?

- That information would be, if you look at the city's website and go to the agendas, you go to the committee and look at the agenda, that information should be part of the agenda.

- [Dave] Okay, thank you very much. And I appreciate your effort from all you people there. Thank you.

- Yeah, thank you.

- Motion to close the floor.

- Second.

- Motion to close the floor by Alder Brunette, Seconded by Alder Gerlach. All in favor?

- [All] Aye.

- Opposed? Okay, the floor is now closed.

- Okay, what just--

- We did vote and everything on that, correct, already?

- Yeah, one minor point to clarification or just an informational item for Mr. Baumgart. He's more than welcome to stay on the meeting, but there's no need for him to stick around for the rest of the

meeting. If he's got other things to do, he's more than free to leave. We're not gonna be discussing his item any longer.

- Yep. Thank you. Are we ready for item two?

- We are.

- Consideration with possible action on a request to review policy for reimbursement to property owners who repair tree damaged sidewalk. Alder Wery, he's not here. Staff, do you have anything on this? Should we hold this or?

- No, I think we can go ahead and discuss it.

- Okay, all right. Staff, what do you got?

- Every year when we pass the sidewalk resolution in the spring, which identifies which sidewalks are in need of repair. There's a letter that goes off to the property owners, which advises them of their responsibilities and what actions they can take. And part of that policy, which, it is a policy that was formally adopted by the common council, there are options and one option is to do nothing. If the owner elects to do nothing, the 60 day timeframe expires, and the city's contractor will complete the repairs and bill the property owner back for any sidewalk that is not city responsibility. Option two, the property owner can complete the repairs themselves. In that case, it has to be the property owner themselves. If the work is found to be acceptable, all is taken care of. Or they can hire a licensed contractor to do the work, which is option three. And under option three, the contractor has to be an approved, hold a valid Sidewalk Builders license. Now with the, if the property owner elects to take care of the sidewalk themselves, and there are sidewalks, which are marked as city responsibility, so most often that's tree damaged walk, but there are some limited instances when it could be something other than tree damage that's a city responsibility. But if the property owner elects to repair all the walk that's marked in front of their property, including the city responsibility sidewalk, they can submit an invoice back to us indicating the amount in square feet that they have repaired, which was city responsibility, which should coincide with the sidewalk orders which were originally issued to them. We then reimburse \$1 per square foot for the city responsibility sidewalk. Now, they also have to submit a concrete, a delivery slip, verifying the mix from the concrete supplier, and a copy of the invoice they received from the concrete supplier. The intent of that policy, as it was explained to me when I started here almost 13 years ago, was to reimburse the property owner for the cost of the concrete, not necessarily the labor. Now, whether that's right or wrong is sort of irrelevant to the pertinent discussion right now. That's the way things stand. That policy has not been reviewed in at least the almost 13 years that I've been here. So we do agree that that \$1 per square foot is probably out of date right now. This is a procedure which is not often used. More often than not the vast majority of people simply let the orders go and have the city's contractor take care of things. But we do have a couple each year who do this, and periodically, when it comes up, we do get some folks who indicate, a dollar per square foot, that's really not a whole lot of money. I replaced a panel of concrete, which typically runs between 175 and \$200, and I'm only getting paid back \$25 per square foot of that. So with that in mind, Alder Wery did bring this up and suggested that maybe we need to revisit this policy. And again, I've been with the city almost 13 years, and I don't remember this policy being discussed in the time that I've been here. So, I was thinking about this when Alder Wery brought it to me, and it called to mind the discussion we had relative to setting the fees for the parklets, when that was modified on the council floor last time. And I believe

the modification was something along the line of, that the reimbursement rate should be set by resolution annually. If it's the committee's desire to modify what we're currently doing, that would be a good way to do it. It's consistent with how we set the parklet fees and many of the fees that are charged by the department. We do bring those forward to the committee for adoption, and then we can take the fee schedule that we provide to the committee, and that becomes part of the resolution that gets adopted, and it would ensure an annual review. So, I guess what we'd do is we'd open it up for your discussion on first, should the policy be modified? And if so, how should it include just the cost of the concrete? If a resident brings us an invoice from a licensed sidewalk builder, should we pay for both the concrete and the labor? And if so, at what rate? And I would suggest that if we do modify it and we do change the rate to be by resolution annually, that it should not exceed the rate for the city contract. We shouldn't be paying somebody a premium. So, a lot for you to think about.

- I liked what you just said there, that we shouldn't be paying more than what we would have paid if we had done it ourselves. I don't know why anybody wouldn't just let us do it. We can probably do it at a cheaper rate than they can get it done themselves. But we certainly shouldn't be paying more than what we would pay for ourselves. So I could see a change in the policy so that we can go over this rate every year, like you do with the other fees. But that we should not exceed the cost of what we would ourselves pay for, if we had done it ourselves. That's my thoughts. Anyone else? Alder Gerlach?

- So my immediate neighborhood is full of X's and C's all over the sidewalks. So my neighborhood is up for repairs. And throughout my district, there are so many trip hazards with the city trees pushing up the sidewalk, what do you call them, cakes, I believe? So I think that's a wonderful idea to go ahead and encourage people to get this fixed. Don't wait for the city to fix it. And we will reimburse you at a rate no higher than it would have cost the city to do it ourselves. I'm all in favor of that. Director Grenier, does that seem like we ought to, can we make that proposal tonight? Does this seem like what we ought to do?

- Well, and I don't want to get involved in the middle of the conversation until you folks are done, but with that in mind, if that's the direction that the committee would prefer, what I would suggest is that we refer this item to staff to develop a revised policy, and I can bring a revised policy back, which the committee can then take action on, and we have a formalized policy that's been adopted by the common council.

- Would you entertain a motion?

- Certainly.

- I move that we refer this to staff to create a new policy for the reimbursement for correcting tree damaged sidewalks.

- Following the guidelines we've laid out?

- Yes.

- Second.

- Would you accept a slight modification to that, to refer to staff to revise the policy?

- Sure.
- Sure.
- Yeah.
- Yeah, I still second.
- All in favor?
- [All] Aye.
- Opposed? That passes unanimously. That was made by Alder Gerlach and seconded by Alder Brunette.
- And I do anticipate that we would have that policy ready for you at the next meeting. That's a pretty easy fix to make.
- Are we ready for three?
- We are.
- Item number three, consideration with possible action on a request by Matthew Johnson for additional compensation related to replacement of tree-damaged sidewalk at 1420 Frank Street. Staff?
- We intentionally juggled the agenda a little bit because this is an example of exactly what we were talking about. Mr. Johnson did go ahead and exercise that initiative and took care of a couple of panels that were city tree damaged walk, even though the letter he received very clearly indicated that it was at a dollar per square foot. When he realized that he had paid somewhere in the neighborhood of \$200 for each panel, and he was only being reimbursed 25, he contacted Alder Wery and said, "Hey, is there something I can do to appeal this?" So we wanted to take the policy discussion first. And although we don't have a revised policy, you're asking staff to complete those revisions. Here we have an exception. So you're taking the exception on its merit, but based on the discussion that you just had under the previous item.
- Okay. Very good. Okay. I believe Mr. Johnson's here. If we wanna open up the floor?
- So moved.
- Second,
- Moved by Alder Brunette, seconded by Alder Gerlach. All in favor?
- [All] Aye.
- Opposed? Okay, the floor is now open. Mr. Johnson, do you care to speak? Please give your name and address.

- I'm not seeing a Matthew Johnson. I'm seeing--
- It's a Brian Johnson.
- Alder Johnson here, but.
- You are right. I see two Brian Johnson's, holy cow.
- I thought you were doing better, Randy.
- Yeah. . You're right.
- Motion to close the floor.
- Motion to close the floor, yes, thank you.
- Second.
- Motion by Alder Brunette, seconded by Alder Gerlach. All in favor?
- [All] Aye.
- Well, I'll take a motion. He's not here. I don't know if we want to accept it to the amount that we would normally have paid and reimbursed him a little more? Or if we just want to stick with our, if we want to make an exemption or not? If we do, I would recommend that we follow the guidelines we just made. What are your thoughts?
- Well, Mr. Chairman?
- Alder Gerlach?
- My thought is that, I want to make, be clear on this. If we go forward with this, we're reimbursing him only, what is it, how much per square foot? A dollar?
- That's what we are right now, yes.
- Right.
- We are currently at a dollar, yes.
- If we gave him this reimbursement now, he would fall under the current policy, right?
- No, the current policy is what he's getting. He's hoping to get more than that.
- Oh, additional compensation.
- He is getting a dollar.

- Additional, I see that now.

- Yep.

- Can we ask this gentleman to just wait? Can we put this on hold and wait until the new policy?

- We can make an exception. If we're gonna do it, we could do it now. There's no reason to hold it off. If we want to do it, that's the question is, do we want to do that or do we want to say, no, this isn't exceptional and we can--

- Well, in direct answer to your question. I'm going to impose a little bit because I happen to see that a Assistant City Attorney Mather happens to be on the line, so I'm gonna, and I see she's just unmuted herself.

- Okay.

- The poor Assistant City Attorney has learned that she gets a little nervous anytime I see her name there, 'cause I do this to her all the time. But what I would ask Attorney Mather is because the individual took the action under the policy as it existed at the time, even if we were to hold this, I don't think that changes anything. They would still be required to ask for an exemption.

- [Lindsay] I believe that would be correct. I would also point out that because the policy has not yet been changed or had not been changed by the time that they asked for the exception, that the committee should apply the standards that you would normally have applied, because this new policy that you're asking staff to create wasn't in existence at the time that this person was asking for this exception.

- Right. But if we make an exception, we can accept it in any size. We can make any exception we want. We can, say, you make it a dollar and a quarter. Or we have the power to make the exception fit whatever we feel is appropriate?

- That's correct. But the whole reason I asked Attorney Mather to weigh in was specifically relating to Alder Gerlach's question about holding this versus acting on it tonight. I don't think there's a difference.

- There's really no reason to hold it. If we're gonna make an exception, we can make an exception. If we're not gonna make an exception, holding it till we made, it wouldn't be appropriate.

- [Lindsay] But Alder Scannell, I'd just like to clarify though?

- Sure.

- [Lindsay] You can set it at whatever you like, but the rationale should not be because we're about to adopt a policy that is different.

- Right.

- [Lindsay] So just to put that out there, that it should be based on the factors that you would have considered prior to asking staff to revisit this policy.

- Yep yep yep. And my two cents are, is that if we do make an exception and I'm willing to have that discussion with my fellow alders, I would not want to pay more than the city, no matter where we changed the policy or not. I don't think the city should be paying more than it normally would if it had done it itself. So that's my two cents on this. Whether we want to make an exception or not, I'm open to have that discussion, Alder Brunette?

- I'm in favor of reimbursing this gentleman for the, not the labor costs of his own labor, but the material costs. He did the city a favor, I think he did it in goodwill. I don't think he probably knew that it was only going to be a \$25 reimbursement. So, I don't know what the appropriate motion, Director Grenier, do you know the true cost of materials that he incurred?

- We would request a copy of the invoice that he received from his sidewalk builder and that invoice should list materials and labor separately. Or we would request that from the sidewalk builder.

- So a motion just to reimburse the full cost of the materials?

- Yeah, I would make that motion.

- I would second that.

- Yeah, with a copy of, exact, yeah, that's fine.

- Yep, okay. A motion by Alder Brunette, seconded by Alder Gerlach. That's fine by me. All in favor?

- [All] Aye.

- Opposed? Okay, that passes unanimously. Item four?

- Yep.

- Item four, consideration with possible action on a request for status update on plans to address chronic flooding in the vicinity of Main and East Mason Streets and Department of Public Works staff to report back to the committee on feedback from designer on phasing the project held at the July 15th, 2020 Improvement and Service Committee meeting. This was initiated by Alder Nicholson way back in the day. Staff?

- Okay, well, we did have a discussion at the last meeting to talk about the plan that was put forward. Just a quick recap. There are a total of four locations in the vicinity of Mason and Main, one of which is the current location of Wally's Spot Supper Club, immediately next door, the former location of the Packer City Motel. A currently vacant piece of property, sort of immediately north of Martin Hardware. And then, a piece down near what's currently the Razz Ma Tazz Tavern and into the corner of, can you help me with the park name, Alder Gerlach?

- Old Preble Neighborhood Park, sir.

- Old Preble Neighborhood Park. Thank you. So it was a combination of those four ponds down in that area. The installation of an up-sized sewer, a relief storm sewer, along a short piece of Mason Street, sort of crossing over that little triangle between Mason and Main and then up Main Street, about half the way to, three quarters of the way up to Lime Kiln Road. And then also the removal of, I believe six homes and creation of a detention basin up in the vicinity of Van Beek Road, Manitowoc Road, and Auto Plaza Way. Those combined alternatives were anticipated to be able to handle storm events up to approximately the one in 100 storm event, and carried a price tag of a little over \$8.7 million. Since that time, Alder Gerlach and Matt Heckenlaible, our Utility Manager, had the opportunity to have a couple of public meetings with folks who might be impacted by those alternatives, and have had those meetings. I think it's fair to say that there has been some support from the public from this, but we do have at least one of the property owners who is not necessarily as happy about it as some of the neighbors are, and that individual does control both the former Packer City Motel property and that vacant piece of property immediately north of Martin Hardware. One of the, and I'm just, I'm gonna give you kind of the engineer perspective of it. And then this is, really is, the committee, and ultimately the council's decision on how you're gonna go with this. There are pros and cons to this, okay. The pros are, this is, this is our last best effort out here. We've been, I had a conversation with Mr. Heckenlaible about this earlier today, and in one way, shape, or form, Matt has been reviewing flooding in this area for almost 20 years. We've looked at just about every option that can come to mind. We've contracted with consultants who specialize in this kind of work. The last effort we brought to you from an engineering perspective looked like it would work, but it was a very large diameter storm sewer that went the length of Main Street, all the way back to Elizabeth, and carried a price tag of almost \$30 million. This is substantially cheaper than that, but we're still talking about an \$8.7 million investment. and it will handle up to a one in 100 storm. We've had at least five storm events in the last three years that have exceeded that. So, under storms that we routinely see in Green Bay, it's still going to flood. We're still gonna have water in the road. We don't have a whole lot in the way of property damage from the storms we've been seeing down there. If we're being brutally honest about things, what we're really talking about is an inconvenience due to the loss of Main Street not being trafficable for a period of several hours until those rainwater, those surface waters do recede back down into the storm sewer. So the sewers handling the flow, it's just we're getting some ponding. Rather than building a stormwater pond we're using the street and some of those adjacent properties as a pond for a temporary nature. In discussing this with the Mayor's Office and with the Department of Community and Economic Development, I will tell you that they are both very concerned about this project because we have three developable parcels. So 4A, 4B, and number 5, along a high volume commercial corridor. They currently carry approximately \$1.3 million in tax base. That tax base would go away, and any potential redevelopment on those properties and all the associated tax base that goes along with that, would also go away, and along a very busy commercial corridor, we'd have a series of rather large detention ponds. We were tasked with providing you with a solution which had a basis in hydrology and hydraulics, and that's what we've done. I can't make the decision as to whether or not the juice is worth the squeeze on this one. But at least the indications I've received from Community and Economic Development, they have some very strong concerns about taking these commercial properties off the tax roll and putting ponds where we currently have tax base, especially when they're ripe for redevelopment. So with that, I turn it over, probably to Alder Gerlach first to see if she has anything to say.

- Okay, Alder Scannell? Okay, well, I will tell you, gentlemen, you gave me the option last time on July 15th to hold this over to till this meeting, because I found it such an overwhelming project for my district in terms of the impact it would have on people's lives. That was my main concern. I also have

a concern for the reduction of the tax base. I will always be the first person to enlarge our tax base, not shrink it. That said, I have to say, honestly, it wasn't until yesterday, after I had talked with all of these property owners, that it was brought to my attention, that there was a concern about the shrinking of the tax base by doing this. That's the first I heard of it. So I went forth in good faith and I met with, or talked to every one of the nine property owners. And of the nine property owners, only one was unhappy about and said, "No, I'm worried about selling." I went to six homeowners and told them that the city would like to buy their home and destroy it to make it into a pond or a road. It had, very interesting conversations, very nice people, once they caught their breath and got back on their feet. Mr. Heckenlaible and I met with one homeowner privately. We met with one business owner privately. One of the businesses, the Razz Ma Tazz, is already on the market. The other business owner we met with was very open to, "Yes, I'd like to talk to the city "about selling my business." We also, Mr. Heckenlaible and I, also had a meeting with, we offered a meeting with all nine of the people who live on the south side of Fern Lane who would, if this went forward, one day wake up with a lake in their backyard. And they didn't all show up, but we had a very good meeting, and they talked to us about what their concerns would be. And so, until yesterday I thought this was going forward and I certainly see the need to not give up the tax base. I also see the need to control the flooding. And I guess I'm kind of at a loss at this point. I will tell you that I spent every single day since July 15th, working on this, believing that it was going to move forward. If it's not financially a good thing for the city, I can certainly give it up. So, I would turn to you for your wisdom.

- Anything, Alder Brunette, or?

- I know it's a tough issue, and I commend Alder Gerlach for the work she put into it. I know you and I had a discussion about it a few weeks back. I don't know. It's not my district, so I don't know it too well. I know Alder Scannell, you know that we've been talking about the flooding issues out there for quite some time, but we need to do something, whether this is what needs to be done, I'm not convinced yet. So I guess Director Grenier or Mr. Heckenlaible, if you could kind of enlighten us on what, where we go from here, or what some options are? I think that would be appropriate.

- To be honest with you, Alder, I don't know that there are a whole lot of options beyond this. We've exhausted just about everything that we can think of. Again, I hate to do this, but we're really at a policy decision now. We've done all we can do. We've given you the options, and we've explained what the pros and cons are of them. To go beyond that, I fear that we're actually starting to tread into your territory.

- I respect that. Yeah, in fact, I wouldn't want you to do that. That's fine. So the agenda item is consideration with possible action on a request for a status update. I don't know where we go from here then.

- Well, I would like to just say that there, well, I do have one of my constituents who has taken this very seriously and has had two meetings with me, including Mr. Heckenlaible, and she is present and would like to speak. So I move that we open the floor.

- Second.

- Floor, seconded by Alder Brunette. All in favor?

- [All] Aye.

- Opposed? Okay, the floor's now open. Who is the?

- Katie Kostreva.

- [Katie] My address is 2323 and 2321 Manitowoc Road. So I own the duplex on the corner of Manitowoc and Van Beek, my husband and I. Thank you, Alder Gerlach, and Members of the Council. My husband and I purchased our property two years ago in October of 2018. Two weeks before we were supposed to close on our property, it flooded, and we weren't able to close on our house because the current owner had to tear up two feet of dry wall in the entire basement and rip up all of the flooring that was down there and replace all of the doors and the trim. So, since then, our property continues to have drainage issues. We were looking into adding our own drainage solutions because our property is constantly wet. Our neighbors in the backyard have already spent \$20,000 since last year trying to mitigate their flooding issues within their home. And I know that many of my other neighbors have had a lot of property damage in, totalling thousands and thousands and thousands of dollars. I personally this, if the council decides to, if the committee decides to move this forward, it will be hard for my family. We did intend to own this property for a long time and have it as an income property. However, as a Green Bay citizen and someone who has experienced this flooding firsthand, I 100% wholeheartedly support this action. And I think that if the council, if the committee doesn't move this to the council, I think that the complaints and the damage will only continue in the future. So again, as hard as this would be for my family, I 100% wholeheartedly support it. And I hope that you consider moving it to the common council. Thank you.

- Just so you know, everything we do here is reported out to the council. So whether we this or disapprove of it, it will go to council, and anybody on council can then pick it up and argue to do whatever we did or didn't do. So this will go to council one way or another, whether we recommend moving forward or not.

- [Katie] Okay. Thank you.

- Mr. Chairman? I think there's one more person, possibly Nicole Koss might like to speak?

- Okay.

- I don't know if she wants to speak or not?

- If you do, just unmute yourself and state your name and address.

- [Nicole] Hi, this is Nicole Koss. I don't need to speak long. I'm 2346 Van Beek, Kyle Holmes is my fiance. And I know, I'm sorry, I logged on late, but I believe that was Katie speaking, and I know, the flooding is an issue there. My fiance personally goes and he cleans out the culvert whenever it rains to unclog it, just to make sure we don't have problems. So it is an issue, and I agree with what Katie said. So I don't have much to say, sorry, but I just wanted to hear everything that was also said. Thank you.

- Thank you. And is there anyone else who'd like to speak, just unmute and state your name and address? It looks, going once, going twice. I'll take a motion to close the floor?

- So moved.

- Second.

- Motion by Alder Gerlach to close the floor, seconded by Alder Brunette. All in favor?

- [All] Aye.

- Opposed? Okay, that floor is closed. Go ahead, Alder Gerlach?

- I would like to just tell you, gentlemen, about the experience I had talking with the six homeowners, because, and then, we have to look at whether it makes sense to do the piece of the project that is just down in the Van Beek area. So there are six homeowners on Manitowoc Road and Van Beek. One home is already on the market. So that gentleman is very happy to talk to us about the purchase of that property. There was no one of the other five that said, "No, we don't want to talk about it." In fact, there was one, the first one I talked to said, "Please buy my house and get me out of here." So, I think, is that all six of those homeowners would probably be agreeable to a fair and equitable price for their home, with some relocation allowance to help them make the move. And then the plan would be to move Van Beek Street a little bit, and make that a great big retention pond. So then the question becomes, is it worth doing that? We're giving up six taxable properties, but we've just heard from two of these homeowners who say, the flooding is pretty much, we can't really handle it, we need some help. And that doesn't include the one that said, "Please buy my home and get me out of here." So I wonder if we, the action we should take, is to send this back to staff now and ask them to re-look at what would be a logical move forward, would it make sense to do the Van Beek project and possibly the northern part Razz Ma Tazz or something? Ask the staff to take another look at it and see if it makes sense to do any of this, or to just cancel the whole thing? But I don't think we're in a position to make that decision.

- We can make a recommendation. For myself, even before this discussion began, just looking at what we had in our packet, I wasn't real thrilled with spending this, what was it, \$7 million or so, \$8 million, and not being able to resolve the issue. If we could spend that money and resolve the issue, that'd be one thing, but we're still gonna, we're still gonna have flooding. So to me, to spend that kind of money and still have flooding issues, we're not solving a problem. We're making it maybe a little better, and that's something, but is it worth \$7, \$8 million? I'm thinking, I'm kind of leaning no. I didn't really consider the areas that we'd lose to development or anything else. For me it just comes down to, we're gonna spend a lot of money, even if this was \$7 million, and still have a problem. I don't know what else we can do? If there's a way for further development in that area, when we develop, if there's something we can do to help alleviate, build higher, build on stilts? I don't know. I don't know what the answer is. But I just don't see how, if we could solve the problem, I would really take a serious look, more into it than away from it. But without solving the problem, I just don't see any purpose to this. We have to figure out a way to solve this problem one way or another. To just throw some money and say, "Here, we made it better." I don't think is doing much. I think this is still a problem. I think we still need to work on it. What kind of solutions we can possibly for it? I don't know. There's only so much we can do. The world is a big place. Climate change is a big phenomenon. We're getting more rain events and more serious rain events. We can only do so much unless the feds come through with a major infrastructure bill, then we could maybe then revisit this and maybe figure out something to do. I just don't know that right now, we're in a position where we can do much of anything.

- Might we hear from Mr. Heckenlaible? Because he's the one who explained to me, if we do this much, we'll mitigate this much of the flooding. If we do this much more, we'll mitigate this much more of the flooding. I would like to get his wisdom at this point, knowing now all the things we know.

- Sure.

- Okay?

- In my 20 years of looking at this problem, this is the best solution that I've seen. All along we've kind of said that we will never get rid of all of the flooding, just because of the nature of our storm sewer system, the nature of the storms that are going on, et cetera. As Alder Gerlach stated, the nice thing about this proposal is that it could be phased in. And as it's phased in, the improvements will be recognized by lesser and lesser frequency of flooding. But at no point in time, did we say we would eliminate all the flooding. For our standard 10 year storm, it definitely would manage that. It would manage the 25 year storm. But as Director Grenier stated in his opening comments, was anytime we get anything greater than the 100 year storm, which in the past three years we've seen multiple, upwards to five, we're still gonna recognize flooding. Those type of rain events are becoming more prevalent. And sometimes they hit the west side of Green Bay and not the East. Sometimes they hit the east side and not the west. Sometimes they hit the whole city. They're unpredictable. And as such, I will never, or any DPW staff, will never give you 100% guarantee that what we implement here will be a full blown solution. So there are risks to everything we go about doing. By implementing just the Van Beek area, so acquiring those six properties and putting a storm water facility up there, definitely would resolve the flooding in and around Van Beek Road, Auto Plaza, Manitowoc Road. It would have very little combined impact down on Main Street itself. So by doing the Razz Ma Tazz, Old Preble Neighborhood Park area, it would have a small benefit, again, on the Main Street corridor. The whole premise is that we need to do all of these projects to see the biggest bang for the buck.

- Question for you. Up in that Van Beek area, how bad is the flooding in that entire area? How much is flooded in that entire area? How much of an impact are we having? Let's say how many other households, if we did this, how many households would not be flooded in a one in 25 year, one in 10 year event?

- Three of the homes that we would acquire are properties that get routinely impacted by flood waters presently. So the plan again, would be to relocate the existing Van Beek Road to the east, southeast, create a new Van Beek Road, and then create that pond in these residential properties. By removing those residential properties, we would have zero flooding impacting properties.

- So, I guess one of the things that, the three properties that would be impacted by, that are currently being impacted by water, would be in the pond itself. And then we're gonna have to buy up, essentially, three other properties to move the road.

- Well, I would certainly support sending this back to staff to just give us the, if we just broke this down, which should be pretty quick, 'cause it looks, it's already segmented into phases. Was that a complete phase onto itself? Or was that part of another phase?

- That's a complete phase on itself.

- On itself.

- The way we were looking at doing the whole entire project would have been land acquisition next year, and then building the ponds in a sequence, probably one per year thereafter. So it would have been about a four year project.

- Okay. So. Perhaps maybe we should just acquire the three homes and not even worry about it. If that's where the flooding is, we buy those three homes, we don't need to, and figure out some other, I don't know what, houseboats, just joking. Don't know what, maybe even just a, if we just bought those and didn't do a retention pond, what would be, we've eliminated those, that's the problem with the flooding in that area is it's flooding those three homes. If we just bought up those homes and left the street.

- So something analogous to the efforts that are currently going on in the East River basin?

- Kind of, yeah.

- Okay.

- So, I mean... That might be something to entertain. It would reduce our costs considerably. We're not moving the road. We're not buying three other houses to move the road. I don't know if there's, what all, I don't know what all, I haven't followed the East projects, what's going on that way, real close. But, so I don't know if there is monies available for that or how, where all that money's coming from or what, but that might be something I would suggest we could maybe look at. That would be something. Fairly inexpensive, I don't know. Thoughts? Alder Dorff?

- I, that might be a good idea. I guess, letting it go back to staff, to look at that idea, to come back to this committee with an amount that it might cost to do that, and unintended consequences. It sounds like a good partial plan. But maybe we don't understand all of it. And maybe the moving of the road is really important. I don't know. But I do think that it is worth it to send it back to staff to look at it. I wouldn't want to make a decision tonight or at council next week, 'cause to make a decision on all of it, it seems like we can't do all of it, we can't. But, I love the idea you came up with, Randy. I just don't. I mean, sorry, Alder Scannell, but I just think we should, staff should have some time to think through it. But I will Alder Gerlach, it's her district, so Alder Gerlach? You want to call on her, you can do that, Chair Scannell.

- Certainly, if she has anything to add at any time, she's free to speak up.

- The only thing that I can, and I'm seeing in the chat that we're having some questions from the public, and the question that's being asked is, if we did the whole thing, how much flood mitigation, because it's a huge trade off, to not only \$5 million, but to also give up all that tax base. So then the question is, if we did it all, and incurred all of those expenses, and longterm expenses, by reducing the tax base, how much would it mitigate the flooding? And Mr. Heckenlaible has given me a pretty good answer to that. He shows us with his hands, like three feet of flooding in and two feet, and it might be worth asking him to just answer that question. If we really invested all of this and gave up our tax base, how much would the flooding be mitigated?

- And then, Alder Steuer, after Mr. Heckenlaible answers.

- The modeling that the consultant did, doing nothing, we're seeing roughly about three feet of flooding in the Main Street corridor. By implementing it all, at 100 year storm, we'd be seeing somewhere between three and six inches of water in the road yet, but that's not insurmountable. And then that lasts for about an hour. And so again, it doesn't resolve everything, but our typical storm sewer design, again, is a 10 year storm, not the 100 year storm. So, that also addresses all of the flooding on the East Mason Street corridor in front of the former Cliff Wall auto dealership, which is now Bergstrom, because presently, not only does Main Street flood, but so does East Mason. So by implementing everything at once, while we go from three feet down to somewhere between three and six inches, over the course of time, again, if you would implement it in phases, as Alder Gerlach had stated, and I don't know the exact numbers, but yeah, you could be going from three feet, reducing it by nine inches, reducing it by nine inches, and then everything, the remainder. So until it would be all implemented, would you see the full impact of the fruits of the labor, so to speak.

- Thank you. Alder Steuer, did you have something?

- Yeah. I've been listening to this discussion for a while, and first I'd like to commend Alder Gerlach for all the work she's done with the neighbors and with staff on this. I started working for the city, when I worked there back in the early eighties, and we were still, that's when the Redevelopment Authority was really big in terms of purchasing properties in the downtown area. And I'm just wondering if this would fall under that purview, again, if that would be a Redevelopment Authority issue, as far, if we decided to go that route? I don't know if Alder Dorff? I think you raised your eyebrows?

- I don't think it is because it's not being redeveloped.

- Yeah, I'm on the Redevelopment Committee, why would we purchase it if we can't develop it?

- Well I'm just saying, yeah, all right. Okay. That's a good point. That's a good point. Alright. Well, I don't know. I agree with the other alders saying that maybe we should bring that back to committee, just to get the final final say, as far as what costs would be and what the possible loss of revenue would be. But a lot of work has gone into this, and no matter which way we go, it's gonna be kind of a tough decision. But the flooding there has been pretty constant for many, many years. So I'll agree to that. So thanks for your time. That's all.

- I think the only thing I would like to add is, has there been any kind of study done on the effects of the flooding as far as property values and development? Flooding has certainly gotta be an inhibitor as far as the area's tax base? It must have some effects, I would think. Some of these businesses are, if they get flooded out and they end up being properties that are no longer in use or whatever, I don't know. I don't know how bad it could get. I don't know what the effects of the flooding could end up having as, well, those kinds of ramifications.

- Well, actually where the Dollar General currently sits, that's the old Pizza Hut location. And then where Familia Dental and North Shore Bank went in, those properties were recently redeveloped in areas which had historic flooding.

- Okay.

- The developer did not exercise the opportunity to raise the foundation levels in those areas, despite known flooding opportunities. And now we are getting calls from those businesses when we get high water. The developer did have an opportunity to, during redevelopment, to raise those properties up, to get them above where we have seen water in the past. And that's not for me to decide why it was or wasn't done. But we have seen redevelopment over in that area, even after we've had these significant flooding events. Probably a better question for Dr. Vonck than me. But I can tell you, anecdotally, we have seen redevelopment over in that area, in light of this being a known area of high water.

- Okay. Is that's something we can do as a city, going forward, make requirements, zoning requirement, or building requirements, that perhaps they need to build, raise the foundations, and maybe even raise the whole area, the ground and everything? Is that something that you can do as a, not as a recommendation, as a requirement, going forward with developing the area?

- Yes and no. I don't mean to sound flip, I really don't.

- Well no, that's--

- You can lead a horse to water, but you can't make it drink. We have requirements in our subdivision and zoning ordinance requiring that grading plans be developed and adhered to in residential subdivisions. During the initial rough grading portion of it, we have our staff out there and we are insisting that those things be adhered to. By the time the finished lawn goes in and the house is built, developers are modifying those grades oftentimes. And then I was just out last week in a subdivision on the east side in, I believe Alder Corpus-Dax' district, where the subdivision plat and the individual house plans, site plans for the individual homes, very clearly indicate that there's a drainage ditch in the backyard and that drainage ditch has to go down to a yard drain to help keep the backyards clear and free from flooding. One property owner indicated there's a house under construction and asked me to come out and take a look to ensure that the drainage plans were being adhered to. And when I got out there, three houses downstream along the ditch, they had built a fence across the ditch and filled the ditch in. So we've got ordinances with people who just, it's my land, what are you going to do to me? And quite honestly, we don't have the staff to police it. So we, yes, we can definitely put provisions in the ordinance, but... I don't know how much teeth we can put on it. I wish I could be more optimistic for you, I really do.

- Yeah. Yeah, we're all trying to be optimistic. Well. I'm of two minds, either that we send this to staff to look at just buying those three properties and what that might do. Or let's just, I would probably more to approve it and send it to council and have the full council discussion and get their opinion. They can always get it kicked back to the committee. I don't think, sitting on this, we need to make a decision now. I think we've got all the information we need, except for maybe if we want to just scale it way back to those, just acquiring those three houses. I think we should get this in front of the council. Alder Dorff and then Alder Gerlach?

- I don't feel like we have all the information we need, because I would like to have the information on what it would cost to acquire those three properties and what impact just doing that would have on this whole plan. And I would find it very hard to vote for the \$8 million plan at this point.

- The effect is, it won't have any effect on the, if just buying those three houses just has an effect on those three houses, basically. It won't have any effect on Main or Mason. It will not have any effect on that.

- But the whole Main or Mason thing is the effect is, we take a lot of businesses off the tax base, right?

- Right, that's, we've got that now. That's what we know now.

- Okay.

- Alder Gerlach?

- Just one last thing. And so we're gonna have to make a decision of what to do about it soon. It was proposed to me yesterday that maybe we could look at the possibility of retaining some business tax base along Main Street and still build retention ponds that can help mitigate the flooding, but we don't have to give up all the tax base. One of the things that was proposed was housing such as has just been done in the Whitney Park area. Now whether that would provide a pervious surface that would help, you know, water, I don't know. Another thing was the possibility of building a long narrow pond in the back of where Wally's Spot and Packer City Motel are, and have businesses along the front. And of course, I don't know about any of this, but I just wonder if it's worth sending back to staff one time to see if there's any other options, or if really this is a situation of either it's gonna work or forget it, it's not worth the money, we should just give it up. Should we ask staff to take one more look, or do staff think that's just useless?

- Staff, have you worked with ED at all as a possible how they might be able to do some development? If we did some tweak in engineering? Plans you're looking at?

- At this point, we haven't, I would be more than happy to sit down with whomever has some ideas for us to evaluate. Again, we've been trying to handle as much as we can. And as Mr. Heckenlaible indicated when he was talking to you, we used to refer to them as year type storms. And we're getting away from that because it's a misleading, it's a misleading description. So what we used to refer to as a 10 year storm actually is a one in 10 probability of happening at any time. That one in 10 storm is the basis for all of our storm sewer designs in the city. So when we design anything new or anything that's been designed by Department of Public Works for probably the last 40 years or so, that one in 10 chance is the storm we use. We were looking, if we're gonna do something, we said, let's kind of throw the one in 10 out the window and get as much as we can, and the pond, this approach that you're seeing, this \$8.7 million investment, will handle up to about the one in 100 type storm. Again, we're a little nervous about sinking millions of dollars into something, and it still floods. The general public doesn't care if it's a one in 10, one in 50, one in 500 event. All they're gonna look and say, those dunderheads at DPW don't know what they're doing. They spent millions of dollars and it's still flooding. We don't want to suffer that criticism. But, if somebody's got some alternative, and I'm happy to sit down with Alder Gerlach some more, meet with the Economic Development folks, meet with the Mayor's Office, whomever needs to be involved in those discussions, and say, let's look at something more than we have now, a one in 10, let's look at the one in 10 storm and only fix that, let's look at the one in 25 storm and only solve that. And then if Economic Development can tell us how much of those 4A and 4B parcels need to be retained for future redevelopment, and then we can have the rest of it. As long as somebody gives us something more to work with, we're happy to take another look at it. That's not a problem.

- Sorry, I think that might be worth the motion to make, to refer back to the staff to check with the Mayor's Office, Economic Development Department, whoever else, what other players there might be, to see if there's a way to tweak this to allow for more development.

- So moved.

- Moved by Alder Gerlach.

- You're muted.

- Yep, second.

- Second by Alder Brunette. All in favor?

- [All] Aye.

- Opposed? Okay, back to you, Steve. Have fun. Let me know when you're ready for number five.

- We're good.

- Okay. Number five, consideration with possible action on a request by Brown County for the City of Green Bay to accept dedication of regional storm water management infrastructure, for the Fox River Papermaking Corridor. When I first read this, I thought it was deduction, dedication, I'm not really sure I know what that means. Staff?

- As part of the, the construction of the new mill at Green Bay Packaging, various parties were responsible for various activities out there. Obviously City was involved with the TID creation. One of the items that was brought to the table from Brown County was Brown County constructed a stormwater management pond on property that had been previously owned by the Green Bay Metropolitan Sewerage District, or NEW Water. Brown County doesn't own ponds, they don't manage the ponds, so the intent always was that Brown County would build the pond, and once it was built and up and functioning correctly, they would turn that pond over, or dedicate it to the city of Green Bay. So that's actually written into the development agreement between ourselves, Brown County, and Green Bay Packaging. Brown County has completed all of that work. It's a great pond. It's functioning exceptionally well. We're very happy with it. So this is simply a formal request to dedicate, consistent with the requirements of the developer's agreement. So, staff does recommend approval.

- [Randy] I'll take a motion?

- Move to approve.

- Second.

- [Randy] Move to approve by Alder Brunette, seconded by Alder Gerlach. All in favor?

- [All] Aye.

- Opposed? Okay, that passes unanimously. Let me know when we're ready for number six.

- We are ready.

- [Randy] Consideration with possible action on a request by Green Bay Public Arts Commission to commission a mural on the east abutment wall for the Tilleman Mason Street Bridge at the intersection of East Mason Street and Monroe Avenue. Staff?

- Sure. If you are northbound on Monroe where Mason Street passes overhead, if you look to your right, off to the east, there's kind of a sheltered overhang, kind of a paved area there in between the on and off ramps for East Mason to Monroe. And there's a concrete abutment wall that's exposed there and it's kind of a quaint little area and kind of underutilized. So the Public Arts Commission reached out to us a couple of months ago and asked if we would consider that as a possible location for art. And we said, that sounds like a great idea. So the Public Arts Commission did reach out, entertained some requests for, I guess, I don't know if it's a request for proposal, but I guess it is, it's a proposed installation. And then have come back to us with the provider, the artist that they are in favor of. So I'm going to first, I'm gonna put up on the screen, the information that Deby Dehn has provided to us. So I hope I do this right. I'm not real big on this whole sharing screen thing. But, that's the wall we're talking about. So the off ramp from westbound Mason Street to Monroe is over here and then on here. So that's what the wall currently looks like. And that's the proposal for the Astor Park Foxtrot. And then just in addition to what the mock up of what the mural would look like, they did provide some additional information on the artist who was selected and some of his other work that he's created. So if you're familiar with that mural here in Green Bay. This is "The Tradition Continues at East High".

- Not sure what that is.

- So this one is in Dubuque, Iowa. So, just some ideas of what that artist is capable of. Again, we as staff think that this is a great utilization of some underutilized space and an opportunity to take just a bare concrete wall and integrate public art. So we're very much in support of this. If you have any questions or any additional information, Deby is on the line with us and she can help answer that on behalf of the PAC.

- I don't have, I'm good, I think this is great. I know Beau Thomas, I've seen his, he does great stuff, been around, I'm I'm all for it. Any questions or concerns with the other Alders?

- Is that mock-up the design that's going to be put there? With the fox?

- Yes, the fox is what they've actually selected as their preferred alternative.

- Okay. Thank you.

- I would like to say, Mr. Chairman, I'm on, believe it or not, I'm actually on the Public Arts Commission, and I would like to move that we approve this.

- Yes, I know, you took my spot.

- Oh, is that what happened?
- Yeah yeah yeah. Motion by Alder Gerlach.
- Second,
- Second by Alder Brunette. All in favor?
- [All] Aye.
- Okay, that passes unanimously. Thank you.
- All right, thanks, guys.
- Thanks.
- Bye now.
- Ready?
- Yes.
- Okie doke, number seven. Consideration with possible action on General Ordinance numbers 23 through 20, amending Section 21.09, Green Bay Municipal Code, relating to Cross Connection Control Program. Staff?
- Included in your packet are the proposed revisions for General Ordinance 23-20. A lot of this is procedural and just cleanup type language. Stephanie Rogers from Green Bay Water Utility is here representing the Water Utility, and Assistant Attorney Mather, who was the author of the language, are here to answer any technical questions you may have regarding the ordinance.
- Looks good to me. Good language.
- Yes, I move that we approve. I read it all. I thought it was great.
- Second.
- Motion by Alder Gerlach, second by Alder Brunette. All in favor?
- [All] Aye.
- Opposed? Okay, that passes unanimously. Thank you.
- Thank you.
- [Lindsay] Thank you. By the way, Alders, since there are only three of you and you need all three of you to maintain a quorum, if you do turn your video off, can you just make sure that before you do that, you tell everybody that you're still there, you're just turning your video off so that it doesn't

seem like you went away from your computer, 'cause I just don't want it to look like we're losing quorum.

- Okie doke.

- I promise you, if I leave, it's only to take a bite.

- [Lindsay] Fair enough. Thank you, Alders.

- Yep. I left, but I did have the computer with me, but anyway. Yep, good to know, thank you.

- Good to go.

- Eight? Eight it is, consideration, speaking of a bite, eight consideration possible action on a request by Department of Public Works to execute Amendment XI to the Brown County Municipal Recycling Agreement. Staff?

- This is largely procedural. Each and every year, we bring an amendment in just to refresh your memories, and for those of you who have not served on Improvement and Services in the past, Brown County is the responsible party for recycling in our area. So we contract with Brown County to provide our recycling services, and every year we re-up, or at least bring a proposal, to contract with them again. So Brown County has been a fantastic partner. Within the amendment that we provided to you, you see all of the other municipal partners here in the county who are part of that collective. And this has been mutually beneficial, both for the county and for the city, so staff does recommend execution, approval of the execution of that amendment.

- So every year you recycle this amendment?

- Yes, we do.

- I'll take a motion?

- Move to approve.

- Second.

- Move to approve by Alder Brunette, second by Alder Gerlach. All in favor?

- [All] Aye.

- Opposed? Okay, that passes unanimously Nine. Can we do A and B together?

- Yes we can.

- I'm sorry, I couldn't hear.

- Yes we can.

- We can, okay. Consideration with possible action on a request by Department of Public Works to award construction contracts at a staff level and report the awards at the next regular meeting, of the Improvement and Services Committee for the following. A. Sewers, seven through 20 mini sewers. B. Sewers, eight through 20, or is it eight dash?

- Eight dash, yes.

- 8-20 Finger Road sanitary sewer. Staff?

- Again, we've brought similar requests forward over the last several years. This is simply a function of a summer meeting schedule and being able to get the contracts bid, awarded, and work starting as soon as possible. So again, staff is requesting that you give us that opportunity to award those contracts at the staff level and report out as has been the character in the past. We obviously know what money we have to work with within the CIP limits that you've approved for us. And if we don't have the money available for those projects, we wouldn't award them.

- I'll take a motion?

- Move to approve.

- I move to approve.

- Second.

- Motion to approve by Alder Gerlach. Seconded by Alder Brunette. All in favor?

- [All] Aye.

- Opposed, okay. Passes unanimously

- Okay.

- 10, Report the award of the contract Sewers 5-20, South Grandview Road sanitary sewer.

- And we have included in your packet a summary of the bids for the contracts Sewers 5-20. Five bidders on the project. Low bid was \$1,826,994 from PTS Contractors, up to a high of \$2,970,672.20 from Soper Grading and Excavating. We do recommend award to the low responsive bidder, which is PTS in the amount of \$1,826,994.

- Move to approve.

- Second.

- Motioned by Alder Gerlach, seconded by Alder Brunette. All in favor?

- [All] Aye.

- Opposed? Okay, that passes unanimously. Number 11, and can we take A and B together on this one?

- We definitely can.

- Okay, let's do it then. 11, consideration with possible action on the review and award of the following contracts. A. RFB number 3255, HVAC installation at the Park shop. B. Sewer 6-20, Basin repair.

- Included in your packet are a couple of documents, the first of which is a bid summary for the vendors responding to the HVAC install at Park shop RFB 3255. There were two vendors who responded. AMA Incorporated was the low responsive bidder at a base bid lump sum of \$39,929. If they get, and the reason that there was an alternate bid is if they get in and start doing the HVAC install, and they find that it's necessary to install new piping on the condenser, they're not gonna be able to tell that until they start tearing the old condenser out. There's just not a way to physically inspect that. So, if that work becomes required, we put an alternate in there so that we wouldn't have to entertain a change order request, which could exceed 15% of the contract cost. So, just to get those numbers figured out up front, we asked for the alternate bid. So, the second page is a memo from Kaurie Mihm in the Parks Department to myself, indicating that they do support the award to the low bidder for the HVAC install at Park shop to AMA, in the base net amount for \$39,929. And if it becomes necessary, they would also recommend the award of the alternate bid in the amount of \$10,996. So that's the first one. The second one is a little easier. This is the second time we've bid the basin repair out. Because of the nature of the work, we've got some pretty large pipes that need to be lined. I don't know if anybody remembers, but last year we had a sanitary sewer collapse out on Main Street between, between Grove and Elizabeth, sort of in front of the Riverside Ballroom. Part of this contract is to line through that repair that we made and some other pipes in the nearby area. So we're talking some pretty large sanitary sewers that have, there's a significant effort that's gonna be involved, both in the traffic control and in doing the bypass pumping out there. We do think that that's kind of scaring some of these folks away. We did not get any bidders on the first go round. So we did revise the project scope and put it back on the street. We did get one bidder who was Michels Corp., in the amount of \$1,219,465. It's a little bit higher than what we were expecting. However, with some of the earlier contracts that we let in the season, we do have some money that was left out of our CIP, that we can cover the cost of this contract. And I will be very upfront with you, I do not think, and I've had this discussion both with Assistant Director Brunette and with Utility Manager Heckenlaible, we are firmly convinced that putting this out for bid another time is not going to result in any better pricing. As a matter of fact, it will probably go the other way, and we may not get any bidders again. So we do recommend award of the Sewer 6-20 to Michels Corp. in the amount of \$1,219,465.

- Move to approve.

- Second.

- Motion to approve by Alder Brunette. Seconded by Alder Gerlach. All in favor?

- [All] Aye.

- Opposed? Okay, that passes unanimously.

- And we're good.
- Okay, 12, report of actions taken by the Department of Public Works granting of licenses. One, Sidewalk Builder. A. Howard Immel, Inc. B. SD Ellenbecker, Inc. C. Total Construction Joe Mains Concrete.
- And again, we have awarded those licenses. So this would simply be a receive and place on file.
- So moved.
- Second.
- Motion by Alder Brunette to receive and place on file, seconded by Alder Gerlach. All in favor?
- [All] Aye.
- Opposed? Okay, we're on to the informational, whenever you're ready.
- And actually this meeting I don't have much in the way of a director's report, just simply wanted to let you guys know that at the last meeting, I think I informed you that we, after 41 years, Debbie Epping had retired. We were successful in finding a new superintendent. We had an individual by the name of Dustin McMullen, who served as a supervisor, who has been doing a great job, and he has taken the appointment as a superintendent. So he's moved up and taken that position. So sanitation is well-staffed again. So just wanted to make you aware that, especially as we start heading down towards fall loose-leaf collection, that we are properly staffed in the sanitation department.
- Okay. Congratulations to Dustin.
- Move to receive and place on file.
- Second.
- Motion by Alder Brunette, second by Alder Gerlach. All in favor?
- [All] Aye.
- And our next meeting is September 9th. Same bat-time. We're all set to--
- Move to adjourn.
- Okay, motion to adjourn by Alder Brunette.
- Second.
- Seconded by Alder Gerlach. All in favor?
- [All] Aye.

- Okay, thanks, Steve, Matt, Lindsay. Great job. Appreciate it.
- Thank you.
- Thank you, everybody.
- Good job.