



MINUTES OF THE IMPROVEMENT AND SERVICES COMMITTEE

WEDNESDAY, SEPTEMBER 9, 2020, 5:00 PM

PLEASE NOTE TIME CHANGE

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

C. APPROVAL OF THE AGENDA.

Moved by Ald. Randy Scannell, seconded by Ald. Jesse Brunette to approve the agenda of the Wednesday, September 9, 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. Jesse Brunette to approve the minutes of the Wednesday, August 12, 2020 Improvement and Services Committee meeting. Motion carried.
Vote: Yes- Chris Wery, Jesse Brunette, Lynn Gerlach, Randy Scannell, No- None, Abstain- None

E. REGULAR BUSINESS.

1. Consideration with possible action on request by Bryan Hoff to appeal the nuisance, litter and solid waste materials invoice of \$411.89 at 1019 Velp Avenue.

Moved by Ald. Randy Scannell, seconded by Ald. Lynn Gerlach to deny the request by Bryan Hoff to appeal the nuisance, litter and solid waste materials invoice of \$411.89 at 1019 Velp Avenue. Motion carried. Vote: Yes- Chris Wery, Jesse Brunette, Lynn Gerlach, Randy Scannell, No- None, Abstain- None

2. Consideration with possible action on request by Dan Schmidt for an exemption to the provisions of Section 9.41 (1) (d), Green Bay Municipal Code, regarding repayment of deferred special assessments on Parcel 21-6668-55-1.

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

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

Moved by Ald. Randy Scannell, seconded by Ald. Lynn Gerlach to approve the request by Dan Schmidt for an exemption to the provisions of Section 9.41 (1) (d), Green Bay Municipal Code, regarding repayment of deferred special assessments on Parcel 21-6668-55-1 and have Developer pay \$11,604.24. Motion carried. Vote: Yes- Chris Wery, Jesse Brunette, Lynn Gerlach, Randy Scannell, No- None, Abstain- None

3. Consideration with possible action on request by Kapla Enterprises LLC for permission to employ City trash and recycling tipper carts at an apartment complex located at 1747-1749 Oakdale Avenue.

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

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

Moved by Ald. Lynn Gerlach, seconded by Ald. Jesse Brunette to approve the request by Kapla Enterprises LLC for permission to employ City trash and recycling tipper carts at an apartment complex located at 1747-1749 Oakdale Avenue allowing 8 garbage carts and 6 recycling carts. Motion carried. Vote: Yes- Chris Wery, Jesse Brunette, Lynn Gerlach, Randy Scannell, No- None, Abstain- None

4. Consideration with possible action on request by the residents of the Eaton Heights Subdivision for a sidewalk study on the east side of N. Huron Road from Humboldt Road to the south STH

54/57 Interchange. (Ald. Dorff)

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

Moved by Ald. Randy Scannell, seconded by Ald. Lynn Gerlach to approve the request by the residents of the Eaton Heights Subdivision for a sidewalk study on the east side of N. Huron Road from Humboldt Road to the south STH 54/57 Interchange. (Ald. Dorff). Motion carried. Vote: Yes- Chris Wery, Jesse Brunette, Lynn Gerlach, Randy Scannell, No- None, Abstain- None

5. Consideration and possible action on request to rescind or reduce the long grass/weed compliance cutting charge of \$178.30 on Invoice 133126 for Rexford Buxton at 311 N. Oakland Avenue. (Ald. Johnson)

Moved by Ald. Randy Scannell, seconded by Ald. Jesse Brunette to hold the request to rescind or reduce the long grass/weed compliance cutting charge of \$178.30 on Invoice 133126 for Rexford Buxton at 311 N. Oakland Avenue. (Ald. Johnson). Motion carried. Vote: Yes- Chris Wery, Jesse Brunette, Lynn Gerlach, Randy Scannell, No- None, Abstain- None

6. Consideration with possible action to direct Department of Public Works staff to present to the Improvement and Services Committee a few options for more effective downtown snow bank management. It's requested that examples be provided from the 10 largest municipalities in the state. (Alds. Johnson and Scannell)

Moved by Ald. Lynn Gerlach, seconded by Ald. Randy Scannell to refer back to Department of Public Works staff to present to the Improvement and Services Committee a few options for more effective downtown snow bank management. It's requested that examples be provided from the 10 largest municipalities in the state. (Alds. Johnson and Scannell). Motion carried. Vote: Yes- Chris Wery, Jesse Brunette, Lynn Gerlach, Randy Scannell, No- None, Abstain- None

7. Consideration with possible action to look at the layout plan of the Green Bay Metro Boat Launch to see if there are potential renovations/updates to enhance efficiencies of the facility. Also, to take a look at Brown County boat launch facelift including the potential vacant Eagles Nest location on Nicolet Drive, as to how they may affect or enhance the Green Bay Metro Boat Launch locations. (Ald. Steuer)

Moved by Ald. Randy Scannell, seconded by Ald. Jesse Brunette to refer to Park Committee to look at the layout plan of the Green Bay Metro Boat Launch to see if there are potential renovations/updates to enhance efficiencies of the facility. Also, to take a look at Brown County boat launch facelift including the potential vacant Eagles Nest location on Nicolet Drive, as to how they may affect or enhance the Green Bay Metro Boat Launch locations. (Ald. Steuer). Motion carried.

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

8. Consideration with possible action to review Zoning Code 13.541 pertaining to “fence location and heights” in order to seek updates on revisions to increase the efficiency of the ordinance. (Ald. Steuer)

Moved by Ald. Randy Scannell, seconded by Ald. Jesse Brunette to refer to Plan Commission to review Zoning Code 13.541 pertaining to “fence location and heights” in order to seek updates on revisions to increase the efficiency of the ordinance. (Ald. Steuer). Motion carried. Vote: Yes- Chris Wery, Jesse Brunette, Lynn Gerlach, Randy Scannell, No- None, Abstain- None

9. Consideration with possible action on request to review policy for reimbursement to property owners who repair tree-damaged sidewalk (referred to staff at the August 12, 2020 Improvement and Services Committee meeting and to bring modified policy back). (Ald. Wery)

Moved by Ald. Randy Scannell, seconded by Ald. Jesse Brunette to approve the revised policy as read for reimbursement to property owners who repair tree-damaged sidewalk. (Ald. Wery). Motion carried. Vote: Yes- Chris Wery, Jesse Brunette, Lynn Gerlach, Randy Scannell, No- None, Abstain- None

10. Consideration with possible action on request by Matthew Johnson for additional compensation related to replacement of tree-damaged sidewalk at 1420 Frank Street (referred back to staff from the Common Council meeting on August 18, 2020). (Ald. Wery)

Moved by Ald. Randy Scannell, seconded by Ald. Lynn Gerlach to approve the request by Matthew Johnson for additional compensation related to replacement of tree-damaged sidewalk at 1420 Frank Street and granting additional compensation up to \$7.75 per square foot in accordance with new policy. (Ald. Wery). Motion carried. Vote: Yes- Chris Wery, Lynn Gerlach, Randy Scannell, No- None, Abstain- None

11. Consideration with possible action on request by Department of Public Works to award a Professional Engineering Service Contract to McMahon Associates, Inc for Hydrologic / Hydraulic Analysis for Storm Basin 342 & 342A (Mason Street to Timberland Drive, Sandstone Place to Crestwood Drive) to investigate potential high water complaints during intense rain events around LaCount Creek (Parkway), Shepherds Path, Sorenson Drive and East Sorenson Drive in the amount of \$33,400.

Moved by Ald. Randy Scannell, seconded by Ald. Lynn Gerlach to approve the request by Department of Public Works to award a Professional Engineering Service Contract to McMahon Associates, Inc. for Hydrologic / Hydraulic Analysis for Storm Basin 342 & 342A (Mason Street to Timberland Drive, Sandstone Place to Crestwood Drive) to investigate potential high water complaints during intense rain events around LaCount Creek (Parkway), Shepherds Path, Sorenson Drive and East Sorenson Drive in the amount of \$33,400. Motion carried. Vote: Yes- Chris Wery, Lynn Gerlach, Randy Scannell, No- None, Abstain- None

12. Consideration with possible action on request by Department of Public Works to award a Professional Engineering Service Contract to McMahon Associates, Inc., for Hydrologic / Hydraulic Analysis for Storm Basin 581 including all subbasins, with specific emphasis to look at the high water issues during intense rain events along East Shore Circle, East Shore Drive from Irwin Avenue to Danz Avenue, and Irwin Avenue adjacent to Bay Beach Amusement Park in the amount of \$79,700.

Moved by Ald. Randy Scannell, seconded by Ald. Lynn Gerlach to approve the request by Department of Public Works to award a Professional Engineering Service Contract to McMahon Associates, Inc., for Hydrologic / Hydraulic Analysis for Storm Basin 581 including all subbasins, with specific emphasis to look at the high water issues during intense rain events along East Shore Circle, East Shore Drive from Irwin Avenue to Danz Avenue, and Irwin Avenue adjacent to Bay Beach Amusement Park in the amount of \$79,700. Motion carried. Vote: Yes- Chris Wery, Lynn Gerlach, Randy Scannell, No- None, Abstain- None

13. Consideration with possible action on request by Department of Public Works to award a Professional Engineering Service Contract to Collins Engineers, Inc. for waterfront modifications for Leicht Park to investigate and complete preliminary design of fender and mooring systems for cruise ship docking in the amount of \$26,200.

Moved by Ald. Randy Scannell, seconded by Ald. Lynn Gerlach to approve the request by Department of Public Works to award a Professional Engineering Service Contract to Collins Engineers, Inc. for waterfront modifications for Leicht Park to investigate and complete preliminary design of fender and mooring systems for cruise ship docking in the amount of \$26,200. Motion carried. Vote: Yes- Chris Wery, Jesse Brunette, Lynn Gerlach, Randy Scannell, No- None, Abstain- None

14. Consideration with possible action on request by Department of Public Works to award a Professional Engineering Service Contract to Walker Consultants for the analysis of post-tension structural members at Pine Street Ramp and design of repairs in the amount of \$22,085.

Moved by Ald. Lynn Gerlach, seconded by Ald. Randy Scannell to approve the request by Department of Public Works to award a Professional Engineering Service Contract to Walker Consultants for the analysis of post-tension structural members at Pine Street Ramp and design of repairs in the amount of \$22,085. Motion carried. Vote: Yes- Chris Wery, Jesse Brunette, Lynn Gerlach, Randy Scannell, No- None, Abstain- None

15. Consideration with possible action on request by Department of Public Works to award annual contract with 4 annual renewals for chemical root treatment to Duke's Root Control, Inc.

Moved by Ald. Randy Scannell, seconded by Ald. Lynn Gerlach to approve the request by Department of Public Works to award the 2020 contract for chemical root treatment to Duke's Root Control, Inc. in the amount of \$47,411.31 with 4 annual renewals. Motion carried. Vote: Yes- Chris Wery, Jesse Brunette, Lynn Gerlach, Randy Scannell, No- None, Abstain- None

16. Consideration with possible action on ratification of the Agreement Between Green Bay Packaging Inc. and the City of Green Bay regarding the Transfer of TSS Waste Load Obligations Under the Fox River Total Maximum Daily Load.

Moved by Ald. Randy Scannell, seconded by Ald. Jesse Brunette to approve ratification of the Agreement Between Green Bay Packaging Inc. and the City of Green Bay regarding the Transfer of TSS Waste Load Obligations Under the Fox River Total Maximum Daily Load. Motion carried.

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

17. Consideration with possible action on approval of the Tripartite Agreement between New Water, the City of Green Bay, and Green Bay Packaging regarding discharge of pretreated process wastewater from the new paper mill to NEW Water's mill interceptor.

Moved by Ald. Randy Scannell, seconded by Ald. Jesse Brunette to approve the Tripartite Agreement between New Water, the City of Green Bay, and Green Bay Packaging regarding discharge of pretreated process wastewater from the new paper mill to NEW Water's mill interceptor. Motion carried. Vote: Yes- Chris Wery, Jesse Brunette, Lynn Gerlach, Randy Scannell, No- None, Abstain- None

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

A. MONROE AVENUE RETAINING WALL

B. RFB #3251 GREEN BAY METRO EXTERIOR SIGN REPLACEMENT

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

A. MONROE AVENUE RETAINING WALL to the low responsive bidder Highway Landscapers, Inc., in the amount of \$46,369.

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

Moved by Ald. Randy Scannell, seconded by Ald. Jesse Brunette to refer to Transit Commission the following contract:

B. RFB #3251 GREEN BAY METRO EXTERIOR SIGN REPLACEMENT.

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

19. Report the award of the following contracts:

A. SEWERS 7-20 MINI SEWERS

B. SEWERS 8-20 FINGER ROAD SANITARY SEWER

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

A. SEWERS 7-20 MINI SEWERS to the low responsive bidder, Kip Gulseth Construction Co., Inc., in the amount of \$157,620.

B. SEWERS 8-20 FINGER ROAD SANITARY SEWER to the low responsive bidder Advance Construction, Inc., in the amount of \$387,403.49.

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

20. Report of actions taken by Department of Public Works

A. Granting of Licenses

I. Sidewalk Builder

- a. Al Dix Concrete LLC
- b. Concrete Solutions, Inc.

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

A. Granting of Licenses

I. Sidewalk Builder

- a. Al Dix Concrete LLC
- b. Concrete Solutions, Inc.

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

2. The next Improvement and Services Committee meeting is scheduled for September 23, 2020.

G. PUBLIC HEARINGS.

H. ADJOURNMENT.

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

VERBATIM MINUTES

- We will start the improvement services committee of September 9th. And we'll note that Alderman Scannell, Johnson. Here, I'm sorry , Alderman Scannell, Brunette, Alder Gerlach and Wery are all present. I keep thinking Brian's on our committee. Sorry Brian, maybe next time . Can I have a motion to approve the minutes?

- So moved.

- Second.

- Motion by Alder Scannell. Second by Alder Brunette. Any changes to those, those in favor? Aye.

- I switched it around here. Now we can do approval of the agenda.

- Move to approve.

- Second.

- All right. Any changes to that? All right, we have an alder, motion by Alder Scannell, second by Brunette to approve the agenda. Those in favor.

- Aye.

- Motion carried. Onto regular business. Number one, consideration with possible action on request by Brian Hoff who appealed the nuisance, litter and solid waste materials invoice of \$411.89 at 1019 Velp Avenue. Steve, do you want to take this first and kind of lay the groundwork?

- Sure, included in the packet, we have provided you with a copy of several photographs of the property when we, when staff was out there to complete the cleanup and some email correspondence that went back and forth between the property owner and our office, our administrative folks, getting him on the agenda. Mr. Hoff did indicate that he was looking to appeal

this invoice, and he did reference some confusion that he had regarding what was consider, what was being cleaned up and what was not. This is what we refer to colloquially as a nuisance lot cleanup. And those are ordered by the inspection department. DPW simply provides the heavy lifting. We've got the trucks and the equipment to go out and complete those lot cleanups, but they are ordered from the inspection department. So, we would actually ask that the inspection department discuss this from a perspective of the necessity for the lot cleanup to discuss the merits of Mr. Hoff's request. So, I know that we do have both Bill Poppe and Paul van Callister representing community and economic services here, is, would one of the two of you like to take the first stab at this?

- Who would like it? Bill, Paul?

- I'll give it a go if you want.

- Okay.

- Nice.

- So, Bill Poppe will take the discussion at this point.

- Never had the trigger for unmuting my mic. So, this was, the previous inspector, Brenda Sidle, who's no longer with the city, she handled this lot cleanup and was handling this case. Lot cleanup was necessitated after complaints were received at the property, but I've been working with the property owner, Mr. Huff, now, tenants had some issues in terms of garbage storage, litter. There are items, they have a fire pit in the back and they were burning a lot of garbage, which includes some items that would be considered to be interior in nature. The main crux of the discrepancy, I believe, was in regards to some chairs that were out there. There were a couple of chairs that were interior design chairs, which means they had a fabric on it and they were designed for use in either office or interior furniture that had been sitting outside. So, the big item of contention during the conversations, the previous inspector, Brenda did give them notice to abate the nuisance, clean up things around there, that that did not occur. So, we moved forward with a lot cleanup. I believe she conducted that in July and had the DPW crews remove those items, so. Our normal procedure, which we do pretty much every Wednesday, we were out there today actually doing the same thing, so. Not on that property, but on other ones as well, so.

- All right, thank you Bill. Any questions for Inspector Pappe from the committee? Anybody here for this item? In the public? I don't see anybody.

- I have a question.

- Sure, Alder Gerlach, go ahead.

- I just, because this is my first lot clean up case, I just don't quite understand this. I'm reading what he wrote. And he says, one of his concerns is, no, the inspector didn't seem to know the difference between an indoor and outdoor chair, but then after they cleaned up, they left the chairs and the table. Would the cleanup crew take furniture away?

- The cleanup crew will take whatever the inspector onsite tells us to take away.

- Okay. Would the inspector

- Correct.

- Instruct the crew to take people's furniture?

- If the furniture is outside, Alder Gerlach, and it is considered an interior design, so let's for, or for instance, let's say there was a couch that's sitting outside, couches are designed for interior use. If that couch sits outside, it becomes a nuisance to the public. Also an attractant for rats, rodents, to burrow in there, things of that nature. So, we don't let a couch sit outside, so that would have to be cleaned up and removed. So, that's what we'd do

- Okay, I see.

- In this situation.

- And let me ask you too, please. So, when I look at these pictures and I see what, what this gentleman wrote, do you, as the inspector feel confident that this was done the way it was supposed to be done? Are you happy the way it was at the end?

- I was, yeah. I looked at the case and if the chairs that are in question were, in my opinion, interior design chairs, that they were given multiple opportunities to remove those. To him and the tenants the day before, I did make mention that those, if they are a value to them, you need to put them inside the garage. So, they were, had given multiple opportunities. If they were of value to put them inside, they did not. We did leave the chairs that were designed for exterior use. Those were left outside, but ones that are designed for interior, which like I said, they have fabric on it and things like that that can lead to other issues. We did remove those.

- Okay. Thanks.

- Thank you Alder. Any other questions from the committee? Alder Scannell, is this your district?

- Yes. Yes. And I just wanted to say, I knew we were not going to get through this without using the R word. So, it had to come from Bill.

- I did that, I did this specifically for you, Randy.

- Oh thank you, thank you.

- 'Cause I knew you would appreciate that.

- But no, I think they've done a good job from what I can tell and I have not heard from this constituent at all. So, it doesn't appear that he's here. So, motion to deny.

- Second.

- Motion by Alder Scannell. Second by Alder Gerlach to deny any discussion on that. Those in favor?

- Aye.

- Opposed? That motion carries. The appeal is denied and we'll note everything that happens today goes to council next week, Tuesday, if any party wants to show up and then speak to the full council, and now we will move to item number two, consideration with possible action on request by Dan Schmidt for an exemption to the provisions of section 9.41 section one, subsection D, Green Bay Municipal Code, regarding repayment of deferred special assessments on parcel 21-6668-55-1. Steve?

- Okay, what I'm going to do, just quickly, I'm going to share the screen with you so you can get a feel for the parcel. For those familiar with the far east side, Christa McAuliffe Park is located on Sitka Street at the head of Sitka Street and Ontario Road. Mr. Schmidt owns the property immediately to the west of that, of that park. And. Okay, now we can, we can see. So, this would be the driveway into Mr. Schmidt's property. So, Christa McAuliffe Park would be over in this area someplace. There is a parcel here on the south side of Sitka that Mr. Schmidt would like to subdivide and turn into a three, with a three lot CSM. So, there'll be three single family homes that are to be constructed on that parcel. When Green Bay water utility constructed water main through this area back in 2000, and because this parcel was vacant and undeveloped, that part, the assessments for that, for the water main were deferred until needed for that parcel. Again, as I indicated, Mr. Schmidt now wants to subdivide that parcel into three lots and turn that in a single family residential. In order to record the CSM, that outstanding assessment needs to be satisfied. When the property was assessed originally back in 2000, the original assessment value was \$7,901.20. The ordinance provides that a deferred assessment needs to be at the rate in effect at the time that the assessment is paid. So, using current assessment rates, that \$7,900 assessment has now blossomed to in excess of \$33,000. So, Ms. Parkos is here to request an exemption or a waiver to the assessment language, the ordinance, assessment ordinance language, to reduce that price down.

- All right. Thank you, Steve. Any questions for Steve, committee? All right, and I think Ms. Parkos, you want to just speak to the sign them? If I, if I could,

- Well, in, I'm sorry.

- I just, that's all right. If I could get a motion and a second to open the floor.

- Motion to open the floor.

- Second.

- Motion by Alder Scannell, second by Alder Brunette to open the floor for interested parties. Those in favor.

- Aye.

- Opposed? Motion carried. Thank you for waiting, I just had to make it official there. The floor is yours, Ms. Parkos.

- Sorry. Don't know the protocol exactly.

- No, no, it's all right. I just want to make sure you want to speak.

- So actually, you know, Dan really forgot about the deferment, it's from 2000. At this time, just looking into doing some projects over there. I'm not sure if you're familiar with them all, but we're doing the piece at some point next door too. And so, we'd like to split that into three lots, as I said, he had forgotten about it and today's costs, if we, you know, he's willing to pay the assessment, plus what it costs for the city to hold it, which comes to \$11,604.27. But at the 33,000, you know, it gets kind of expensive to produce these three lots and then split it into single family homes, build on them. We have since then looked at getting a permit, but we have to get this recorded first, before we can go forward to put homes on there. And the first permit that we have applied for is for a 2,200 square foot home. So, we're trying to incorporate a tax base for the city of 1.2 million, roughly. What, you know, once we build on it. But we have some big expenses over there currently with all the assessments, 'cause he owns a lot of that land over there. So, we're trying to get that down, to make it feasible, to build on it and sell these spec houses. That's what we do. That's, we have a couple projects going right now that we're trying to get through. Steve's been helping with some of these projects get going forward in Green Bay. So, he's asking for, you know, he's proposing to pay that if that's possible and go forward with this three lot CSM. We have everything done. We just need to pay the assessments to go forward to start building.

- Thank you. Any questions for Mrs Park, is it Ms. or Mrs? Lisa?

- Miss.

- Miss? Okay, perfect, thank you. Alder Scannell.

- Yes, if we went with the assessment that's now couldn't that just be passed on to the buyers? I mean, that's,

- Not in this market.

- 20,000 more divided three ways. No? Not?

- Not in this market. From April, the same cost to build the house now, with lumber costs going up, it is 18,000 per home higher currently. That's how high costs are currently with building. So, when I ran numbers for him, I told him either leave it and just let it sit and move on to something else or B, this is what we try for, you know, is if we can get this just to the 11,000, we're going to incorporate this tax base forever for the city. Do you know what I'm saying?

- Yep.

- And we're willing, as soon as the day we can pay these assessments, we will have a permit pulled to start. We're going to build all three immediately. So, that's kind of what, you know, what we thought is a very good trade off to incorporate this tax base for the city.

- Thank you.

- All right. Alder Gerlach?

- I just want to be clear. We're moving from 7,000 something to 11,000 something and you explained what it was, but I need you to tell me again, you, so the original assessment was seven something?
- \$7,901.20.
- Okay, and then you said that you were adding on the cost of this, that the city,
- The holding cost.
- The holding cost, okay.
- The holding cost for the city would come to \$11,604.27.
- Excellent.
- And we could pay that immediately to start getting building permits going and go forward, we just, it's, we can't record until we get this paid.
- Okay. Thank you.
- Thank you, Alder. Any other questions? Anyone else here for this item? Anybody else? Anything else Ms. Parkos before we discuss it as a committee?
- No, it's just that it would be greatly appreciated to move forward with the project.
- All right.
- Alderman Wery, I have a question.
- Sure, go ahead Alder.
- Chairman. Thank you, Chairman. Ms. Parkos, the assessed property will be 1.2 million, that's over three lots, is that correct?
- Well yes, at least, probably a minimum of 400,000 per home. That's what we are currently building at in the City of Green Bay. We have two homes up on Purple Sage. That's what we're selling those for as well.
- How soon would these be completely built?
- We would be starting the day we can pay the assessment and get it recorded. We, the builder already went to the city and applied for a permit for a 2,200 square foot home. And I said, "You're ahead of the game" because we can't
- Okay.
- Build there yet. So, we already have the plans, everything ready. Actually, there probably should be a permit sitting there at the office applied for.

- Okay, thank you.
- So, we'd have them all built. We could start them all within six months, less than that.
- Okay, thank you.
- You're welcome.
- All right. Any other questions? All right, I'll entertain a motion to return to regular order,
- Motion to close the floor.
- Second.
- Motion from Alder Scannell, second by Alder Brunette to close the floor. Those in favor?
- Aye.
- Carried. What are your, the wishes of committee? Alder Brunette?
- Just a comment that, currently we're receiving some tax revenue on the undeveloped lots. You look at \$1.2 million of assessed value potentially and the middle rate for the city is \$9.46. If the lots were developed at 1.2 million total, Mike, math is correct, the tax revenue to the city for the 1.2 would be over \$11,000 a year. Obviously we're collecting some revenue on the undeveloped lots, but not to that level. So it's situation where, you know, longterm for neighborhood cohesiveness, adding value to the city, building more property in the city, collecting revenue for the city. For me, it seems like a pretty simple solution would be to grant what the person is requesting so these can be developed and we can start collecting revenue, which would exceed, you know, exceed what we're receiving now on undeveloped lots.
- Thank you Alderman. Alder Scannell.
- I agree with that. I, unless I'm missing something, Steve, it seems to me that's the way to be looking at it. I don't know if I'm missing any piece that you could point out to me, but otherwise it seems that seems logical and practical to do.
- You're not, and this is, this is a very unique circumstance in the fact that it's a 20 year old assessment and it's specifically an assessment for water. When we defer assessments for pavement, sanitary or storm, those are held in construction accounts that are charged against those three funding sources. Water utility does not have a provision to allow for deferred assessments because they are a PSC regulated utility. So, they're very unique in our context, that way. So, we have a construction fund that's set up within the city and back in 2000, as soon as that water main went in, we paid water utility and made them whole back in 2000. We have been carrying that assessment as a payable within that construction fund for the last 20 years and what we were able to do, I was able to go back and find the bond issue back in 2000 that was used to pay the, to borrow the money to pay water utility off and come up with the interest rate paid out over, and actually, it was a 15 year bond, so, that thing has been paid off for five years already. We were able, excuse me, to recalculate the

amortization schedule on that bond. And that's the \$11,000 value that Lisa provided to you. Normally, the way the ordinance is written, again, you pay those assessments off at the assessment rate that's in effect at the time when you make the payment. And that is intended to make the city whole. In this case because everybody had been made whole, except those of us who borrowed the money and they're asking to pay off and make the city whole, just not provide above and beyond, which in this case, the ordinance would provide. I don't know that you're missing anything, but that's the more complete version of the story.

- I'll make a motion to make an exemption for for the whatever else there was after that amount.

- So, you would be looking to grant the request of exemption to reduce the deferred assessment payable at this time to a total of \$11,604.24?

- Gosh, that sounded just like me.

- I second it.

- All right. Motion by Alderman Scannell, second by Alder Gerlach. Is there any discussion on that? No? All right. Those in favor?

- Aye.

- Opposed? Motion carried. This was approved four, zero. Our recommendation goes to the full council next Tuesday.

- And Lisa, if you wish to stay for the rest of the meeting, you can do that. But if you have things that you'd rather be doing tonight, you can feel free to drop off the meeting at this time.

- I appreciate it. I'm going back to paperwork. Thank you very much for your time.

- We're very entertaining.

- Yes you are . I'd like to be on my couch in two hours, just so you know. Thanks again.

- Thank you.

- Bye bye.

- All right, onto item number three, consideration with possible action on request by Kapla Enterprises LLC for permission to employ city trash and recycling tipper cart at an apartment complex located at 1747 to 1749 Oakdale Avenue. Steve let's start with,

- Sure.

- With you.

- The intent is, Kapla Enterprises has requested for 1747-49 Oakdale Avenue to move away from private collection to city provided recycling and trash collection. This is a two building complex

located on a single tax parcel. The dwelling units provided in the buildings are a mix of town homes and apartments. Each building contains six dwelling units. So, there's a total of 12 dwelling units on the single parcel. Visitor parking is not allowed on site due to parking space constraints. The property currently has two unscreened dumpsters for onsite collection of trash and recycling. Inspection department has been in communication with them to locate and fence the dumpsters per ordinance. The owner has requested to remove the dumpsters and provide city provided trash and recycling tipper carts. They have indicated that, if approved, they will ensure proper screening of the carts as required by ordinance. They have 108 feet of street frontage for the two buildings. The 12 units will require 24 tipper carts, 12 trash, 12 recycling, collection rules require a minimum of four feet between carts. If all 24 carts are set out, they would take up 94 feet of the 108 foot frontage, including the parking lot driveway apron. That's if there's only two feet of space between them with a four foot spacing, they'd require over 140 feet of frontage. Sanitation section is recommending that we not do this. One of the reasons that we provide, city only provides sanitation tipper carts at properties with no more than six residential units per lot and this is double that. Sanitation is recommending against this request because it does not meet the city ordinance requirements. There's not enough room to place the carts to the curb. DPW can't go back for a second round of collection to accommodate special needs of one property owner. They would be able to place the 12 trash receptacles out on a weekly basis, but not the 12 trash receptacles and the 12 recycling containers during recycling weeks. And there are representatives from the Kapla family here. So, I'm sure they would appreciate when the opportunity is right for you to open the floor for them.

- Thank you, Steve. Any, any questions for Director Grenier? Alder Gerlach, is this your district?

- This is my district and I know Mr. Kapla and I would like to hear from him and then I have, certainly have some things I would say.

- Sounds good. I'll entertain a motion to open the floor.

- So moved.

- Second.

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

- Aye.

- Opposed? Motion carried. Opens, the floor is open for any parties. Just raise your hand and I'll recognize you. Just say your name and address. All right. Name and address please.

- Eric and Bob Kapla, 2769 Blue Spruce Drive, Green Bay, Wisconsin. Oakdale Avenue, the 1749 request.

- All right. All yours.

- So, we are following up on a inspection complaint, for Tim, Tim in city inspection. And basically, we're lacking space to put the dumpster where it can be screened. I had asked Tim, based off of his thought process and knowing the plot where we could put it, the 1978 and they really didn't account for private collection at that time. We've had the same private collection since 2005 and we just don't

know where to put it. So, the inspector had recommended that we seek this opportunity to, for review with the committee. And that's kind of where we're at. I'm open to answering questions related to it. From my experience, I think you could actually get away with eight tipper carts on the garbage and six on the recycle, based off of other properties that I have. I have a property at 1428 through 1432 Oakland, which is a 12 unit complex of all one bedroom apartments, which has tipper cart service. And has it, had it the whole time I've owned it since 2014. So, that's where we got the idea, for lack of a better term, to address this concern that another constituent has about dumpster not being screened. That's kind of the nickel tour and I'm open to any questions on how to do it.

- Alder Gerlach?

- Hello Eric, it's so good to see you. We've talked on the phone. It's almost like meeting you. You remember? Right?

- Yep.

- Folks, I just want to tell you that I've worked with Eric Kapla. He's a very fine neighbor and I'm very familiar with this property and he's been very generous and kind with the homeowners around him. I'd like to know how you can do this with not giving everybody a garbage cart and a recycling cart? What is your plan to do, how, how you will make that work? Will they share?

- Yep, so good question. Based off of knowing what my current service is through private collection, how many yards, and realizing what typically gets used, that's where I benchmark that and having other properties that do have tipper cart service, knowing how much the usage is, that's how I benchmarked, how much I would recommend or how many, I know the formal request was for 12 and 12.

- But excuse me. So, what are you going to do? Are you going to like say to two different, you two will share this garbage can, you two share this recycling can, is that what you're going to do?

- There would be one screened area that we would put it and we would instruct people where to put the garbage.

- I see.

- All right, any other questions Alder?

- Can I, can I?

- Sure, go ahead. Bob, correct? Go ahead Bob.

- Yeah. I got a couple of questions here. I'd make them, we've had this for 15 years and there's never been an issue with it. And I've actually known a lot of the people around here and people at the white house next door that's changed hands several times and in across the street. And I opened up our, the dumpsters, the green boxes, to the folks in that area that they can use 'em and keep the area clean. And I struggle to understand why this is a problem now because, you know, 'cause I, we go there quite frequently and it's always picked up and people thank, neighbors have thanked me for letting put it in, bringing the garbage in when their things are full at their house. And I'm not saying all

the way down the street, but just in that little three, four proximity. And they really, they have family get togethers or whatever, at the holidays, they thanked me many times, Eric and I have our different hats in our business. I'm kind of a boots on the ground and cut the grass and keep it cleaned up around there. And I struggle to understand, to help understand why there's an issue and after all these years, 'cause it's, you know, and then are some dumpsters in the city, since this has come up, I look around, they're very close to the street, very close to the sidewalk. I just, I'm just kind of questioning why, why is this an issue?

- Well, and to build on that, Alder Wery, can you give insight as to if there was a period when this didn't have private service, when it was built and it got changed over? Or has it always had private service?

- Good question. And for that, I'm going to defer to Director Grenier.

- Okay.

- I'm going to say that this property has likely had private service for a very long time because of the number of units that are on there.

- And I, myself, I, we go by there. When I say we, I should say me, probably minimum, if I go, if it's three days goes by, that's a lot, most times it's every other day, I tend to it long before this issue came up 'cause I, you know, it's, I always say that I, who wants to live in in a junkyard? And if there's, the dumpsters heavy, when I say heavy, stuff gets in there and it's not compact, I pick up it up. I make sure the doors are shut. And then the people have been great about it, you know? I mean they, the place and we stuck a lot of money in this property that they can, I know Steve, I'm sure you're going to, I know, you, I've met you before. I'm sure you've seen, put eyes on it. And the turnaround in this property in the last 15 years, I can't help but think you would agree it's, we completely turned it around. I mean, we just put up six brand new decks on it. We have, literally, when it goes for rent, Eric's wife, she's in charge of the renting and the phone literally rings off the wall. I mean, so, we take pride in it and I'm just from the, obviously you guys have the final say so, but I fail to understand why the dumpster is a problem.

- All right. Thank you, Mr. Kapla. Alder Gerlach?

- No, I, thank you, I walk past there almost every day. I walk my dog past the apartment building at least several times a week. And I will tell you that it has bothered me, I've never said a word to anyone, but it has bothered me that these dumpsters are visible. And so, when there have been a few times, I'm afraid, when it really did look bad, not always, but there have been a few times when I thought, "Oh, my God." it really did look like a junk yard, but for the most part, no. So, my question is, it seems to me that what the inspector's asking you to do is to just screen these dumpsters, so that they're not seen. Is that, what, is that the problem? Are you saying there's not room for them, Eric? I don't quite understand.

- So good, maybe I didn't explain that well. So, with the, where it's located, we, if we go back further to meet the 20 feet ordinance requirement, we lose stalls that are allocated to tenants. So, right now, if you build a 12 unit, you're supposed to have one stall for every four stalls for visitors. So, four visitor stalls, plus the one for each bedroom. This should have had like 26 stalls of parking if it was built today, at minimum. It's got 22 and that represents the same number of bedrooms. So, it, all the

parking stalls are used. If we go back into that, we don't even have parking. It was just not a great site plan when they did it at the time. And this dumpster has been in the same place. And if we screen it, let's say put a, some type of construction around it. It blocks the right a way. And that's not acceptable either because you need to be able to see down Oakdale effectively.

- So, may I ask, Director Grenier, is, what about the alternative they're proposing, to have, to just put the carts in the back and just instruct the residents this is where you put your garbage, this is where you put your recycling, if number one is filled, you put it in number two? Can that work?

- It's a little unorthodox. I will say that it, it's not, it's not the typical way that we do things. Generally speaking, we, we provide a cart for each living unit. Now, with that in mind, I don't, DPW doesn't go around and ensure that a four-plex is putting four carts out every week. If that property owner is doing something similar to this, where they have all four carts cooperatively located and instructing their residents to fill cart one until it's full, then fill cart two and they only fill three carts during the week and wheel three instead of four out, we wouldn't be, we wouldn't know about that. We'd, okay? So I guess under a situation like this, if I'm understanding Mr. Kapla correctly, they aren't requesting 12 and 12, they would be requesting eight and six, and it would be his responsibility as the property owner to make sure he's providing proper sanitation and recycling opportunities for his tenants. Now, how he does that is up to him. I don't know that DPW is going to be in the business of regulating him to that level. I think it's a unique approach.

- But his Alder will be walking by every day and checking on him. I realize this is a good alternative and I think that the Kaplas really have, you know, they're really good property owners. They've done a good job. And I'd like to see them at least given a chance to try this.

- Appreciate it. Any other questions? Alder Scannell?

- The floor is still open, right?

- Yes.

- Yeah. So, I just want to make sure I understand, if we made some kind of exception where you could keep the dumpsters where they are right now, any screening you would put right there would be an obstruction to the right of way? Is that correct?

- That is correct.

- Okay.

- And to provide additional information that I thought when Steve was talking was, we own a six unit at 967 Belt that we use a similar approach. That's a six unit where we, obviously, we take out the garbage weekly, and I know based off of usage at that six unit, we never fill everything up there. So, it's been done at other locations. I have about five different properties to benchmark that have tipper cart service. So, that's how I got my projections.

- All right, thank you. Anything else Alder Scannell? All right. Alder Brunette, any questions? Anything else Mr. Kapla? Either one of you before we discuss it in committee?

- I don't think so.

- I don't think so. I got a question for Lynn Alderman.

- Well, you can ask me the question and go ahead.

- Well, I was just wanting to see that you, I didn't know you lived there, Lynn, but I mean, you see, how long have you been in the neighborhood and you've seen a drastic change in what we've done there?

- It's up to you, Lynn, Alder,

- I've been in the neighborhood less than two years. It's been almost two years since I moved in. I live about six blocks from you. From your, and so I wouldn't know what things were like more than two years ago,

- Okay.

- But I just have been, I've worked with Eric in the past with a fence issue. And I just know that he's been a very good neighbor.

- Thank you.

- All right. Not seeing anybody else, I'll entertain a motion to return to regular,

- Close the floor.

- Motion by Scannell.

- Second.

- Second by Brunette. Those are favor?

- Aye.

- Opposed? Motion carried. All right. Any questions for staff? Alder Scannell?

- I have a question for staff. Director Grenier is the only objection to providing them with tipper carts, the number of carts, or is there another reason to object to that?

- Well, technically right now there are 12 dwelling units on a single parcel. And the city's policy is we provide garbage and recycling to units of six or less. So, this would be an exception to that. You'd be granting an exception to, to the six unit limit on a parcel. And that, that's pretty much it.

- Okay, yeah. They . Making exemptions, you never know where you're gonna end up, but, I don't know, this, it seems practical, and I think we practical . But I think it then becomes an inspection issue. It wouldn't be DPW as far as if we issued the, was it six and eight? That the area's kept up appropriately. I don't know, I'll defer to Alder Gerlach a little bit here.

- I would move that we make this exemption as requested. And, I don't know, is it possible to do something like put a time limit on it and reconsider it in a year or something like that?

- Sure.

- No?

- Yes, unless Director Grenier sees any reason why we can't.

- I don't know that a time limit would necessarily give you anything outside of to bring it back in a year's time to review how things are working. If you're worried instead that it's not working, I think that will manifest itself pretty quickly through the inspection department and we're going to hear about it. So, I think, a no news is good news approach might be the better way to go. Either you grant the exemption or you don't. And if you grant the exemption, everything is fine until you hear that it's not.

- All right, well, we do have a motion right now. Is there a second before we proceed?

- I'll second that.

- And that's for eight garbage, six recycle Alder Gerlach?

- I believe so.

- Okay. Alder Brunette, you seconded it. And you have the floor and then we'll go to you Alder Scannell.

- Yeah, thank you. I do you feel for the property owners here, they own the property for 20 years or 15 years, and never really had an issue. I did an aerial view of the property and the position of the dumpster's unfortunate, it's by a sidewalk, but it's just the way it was built in '78, they raise a good point. We don't want to obstruct the traffic. We don't want to limit the amount of parking spaces on the property. It's a kind of, it's odd the way that the lot is situated. I don't know where else you could put it. So I think here, we need to be a little flexible on a property owner, who, as far as I'm concerned, the best of my knowledge, we haven't received any other complaints, at least that I'm aware of. So, I think it's worth looking into, and I agree with Director Grenier, putting time limits, I liked that idea when Alder Gerlach first mentioned it, but then I thought, really it's up to the landlord here to make sure that the tenants are complying with the eight and the six and if more are needed or whatever, then the onus is on them to communicate that, work out a solution. And if they don't, then the inspection department will be getting calls, I'm guessing, so it's tough. It's tough all the way around, but given the history of this particular property and what they just presented, I see no reason why not. Thinking in a gray right now, rather than just black and white, yes or no. We can, we can be a little more creative in what we do. So, I support the motion, obviously.

- All right. Thank you Alderman. And the way I haven't right now is that the motion is to approve eight garbage, six recycle, and there is no year review. That's what I have right now, that was just being tossed around, okay. Alder Scannell?

- Yeah, I was gonna say, I don't think a time limit really work, once you make the exception, you open the Pandora's box, if that's what it's going to turn out to be. So, but this is, you know, every situation is unique. And I think to just be setting away without being able, having the flexibility to, I mean, that's our job to be practical and flexible and make things work. So I'm, I think I'm going to support this. This seems practical to a situation where, actually, whatever decision we make is going to be problematical, I think. All the options, I think this is probably the most practical one, so. I support it.

- All right, thank you Alder. We have a motion and a second to approve the eight garbage and six recycle here. Any other discussion? Those in favor?

- Aye.

- Opposed? All right, that item carries. It's been approved. It will go to council next Tuesday for final approval and. All right.

- Chairman Wery, I'm going to step away for just one minute. My camp, my, I will be listening, but I just wanted for the sake of quorum to,

- Get your ice creams ready.

- No, no, not that.

- All right.

- One moment.

- Alder Wery, if I may say, I did step away too, but I was listening, so I didn't really think I was not part of the meeting. So,

- All right.

- If I've ever gone, where I won't be part of the meeting, I'll let you know.

- Perfect. Thank you. All right, let's move on to item number four. Consideration with possible action on requested subdivision for a sidewalk study on the east side of North Huron Road from Humboldt to the south SC at 457 Interchange, state highway I guess that would be.

- Yes.

- Go ahead, Director.

- Oh, okay. Included in the packet, we provided an email chain that has a variety of iterations to it. So, emails that have gone back and forth between residents within that Eaton Height subdivision, Alder Dorff and myself. And for those of you who are unaware, Eaton Heights subdivision is located just north of Humboldt Road. So, if you're familiar with where the new QuikTrip went in across Huron from fire station number seven, that's the Eaton Heights subdivision. There is sidewalk on the west side of Huron Road, but not on the east side between State Trunk Highway 54-57 and Humboldt. So, those residents who are in the Eaton Heights subdivision find themselves having to cross over Huron

Road at, I believe that's Barronwood Drive where it, where it comes out, onto Huron. I'm gonna scroll up there really quickly to see if I can give you some semblance of what we're talking about here. Okay, so this Northeast corner of the two County Trunks is the new QuikTrip. Right here is fire station number seven. And this is the area that we're talking about with the resident. So, this is Watercrest Drive that, that comes out to Huron Road. Now, if you've ever driven out there, you're on a hill, so, you're elevated. And then that drops down as you head to the north. So, that's what we call a crest vertical in the alignment. And that creates vision problems, making this crossing very unsafe. We originally started talking to the residents. They had requested a crosswalk there, and that's something we definitely do not recommend. It's a four-lane facility, it's concrete, it's a County Trunk Highway. It's posted 35, but often driven well over that. And with that crest vertical exacerbating those conditions, that just makes for a very dangerous mix. A pedestrian crosswalk at this location is something we can't support, here at the stop condition, this is a four way stop when you have that stop condition and great sight lines, that's a great place for a crosswalk, but as the residents have indicated to us, you can see there's sidewalk down the west side, but no sidewalk on the east side. There was a contemplation with the properties in this location that when the subdivision was originally approved, these are commercial properties as opposed to the residential on the north side, the two parcels here were required to have a pedestrian pathway to allow residents from within the residential area of the subdivision to gain access to the corner of Huron and Humboldt. Now, very recently, with the expansion at the QuikTrip, they have put a small walkway in off of this corner of the parking lot. And what that does is that allows pedestrians to get up and gain access to the parking lot. But because there's not a designated pedestrian pathway, we now have residents walking through the parking lot of a QuikTrip in order to gain access to the corner where the crosswalk and walkways are. So, the residents have reached out and through Alder Dorff have requested that a sidewalk study be performed to determine whether or not sidewalks would be necessary from the intersection of Humboldt and Huron, north along Huron, all the way up to the 54-57 interchange location. Again, at this point, because it's signalized, you have stop conditions with pedestrian island refuge. And we have actually been in contact with the department of transportation, they are looking at doing some pedestrian crosswalk improvements associated with other points along this, along the interchange here in the near future. So, that would provide a signalized crossing for the pedestrian crosswalk here, sidewalk on the west side, possibly sidewalk down the east side, depending on what the sidewalk study shows. And then again, another stop controlled pedestrian crosswalk with the possibility for refuge at the intersection. So, I believe, I saw earlier, I'm going to stop sharing my screen so I can see what's going, yes, I believe that's Ms. Haefs who's here tonight. She is one of the residents of the subdivision requesting the sidewalk study. So, we do have somebody I believe who wants to speak tonight.

- Motion to open the floor.

- All right.

- Second.

- Motion by Alder Scannell, second by Alder Gerlach to open the floor. Those in favor?

- Aye.

- Motion carried. The floor is open. Okay, just get your name and address. And then the floor is yours.

- Hi, I'm Jackie Haefs. I live at 926 Barronwood Drive, Green Bay, Wisconsin. Thank you for inviting me tonight. I do feel that this sidewalk would be a huge benefit to myself, my neighbors. If you have been in this area, you do know how traffic can fly down Huron. I was passed by a semi-truck going at least 50 a couple of weeks ago. So, for me to cross the road or my two children to cross the road, makes me a little scared. The option to go through QuikTrip is wonderful if you're going to QuikTrip but there are no sidewalks on Humboldt for me to get then to the crosswalk, to cross that Huron and Humboldt to get onto the sidewalk on the left side. So, I don't really find that that's a safe option either. For us, on our sidewalk up, so Watercrest and then turns into Barronwood and then around the next corner turns into Satellite, which then connects with Spartan, which is by Highland Howie's, if you're familiar with the area, there's no sidewalks on that road either. So, for us to have a safe area to go for walks, go for bike rides, things like that. I just, I don't feel we have an option. The past couple years, my kids take the bus to get to school. And our bus stops have been on Bay Highland, which is one street north of us. And I've had to contact the district to get their bus stop changed because it's not safe for my kids to walk from Bay Highlands to Watercrest to get to our house with having to cross Huron. So, luckily the district has been very come that way to switch for the safety of my kids. I do appreciate you doing the sidewalk study to see if it would be a good option for us over here on the east side. And then with the addition of QuikTrip, there is more traffic, I feel, coming from 54-57, more semis, and like I mentioned before, they are not going the speed limit. They are going quite fast. So, I do appreciate you looking into this and considering putting a sidewalk in.

- Thank you. Any questions for Ms. Haefs? All right. Anyone else here for this item? No? I'll entertain a motion to close the floor.

- Motion to close the floor.

- Second.

- Motion by Alder Scannell. Second by Alder Brunette to close the floor. Those in favor?

- Aye.

- Opposed? Motion carried. Barb, I think Alder Dorff, I think you're here. You wanna,

- Yes, thank you.

- This is your district, yep.

- You know, everything that Jackie says is true and I would certainly support a sidewalk being put in. The question is to who would pay for the sidewalk? And if Director Grenier thinks that we are going to get some pushback from the people that would be asked to pay for it, that's, that's my only concern. Otherwise, this is a great idea.

- We're going to have to, we're going to have to take a look at the particulars out there. I have a feeling it's going to be a mixed bag. When we look at sidewalks and whose maintenance responsibilities, not, well, not only maintenance, but also installation responsibilities those are, a lot of that has to do with availability and contact to that sidewalk. So, what I mean by that, QuikTrip and the, I believe that's a condo property on the south side of Watercrest Drive.

- I think it's by the bunkers, maybe?
- Who owns it is irrelevant to me. It's the property itself.
- Okay.
- There are sidewalks, I believe, on both sides of Watercrest at that point. So, the condominium property has direct access to the sidewalk on Watercrest which would then connect to the sidewalk on Huron. So, it would be expected for them, that's no different than any other corner lot
- Right.
- In the city. They would be required to pay for the installation and all maintenance. So snowplowing, cracked sidewalk repairs, that kind of thing. Similar approach with the QuikTrip, on the corner of Huron and Humboldt, their driveways go directly across it. They have direct access. Now, as you get up to the north side of Watercrest, now we're talking about houses which don't necessarily front onto Huron, that's their backyard. So, they don't have direct access, as a matter of fact, some of those houses on Aldine Court have fences in the backyard.
- They do.
- Okay, so in situations like that, it has been a past practice of the city that that sidewalk is required for the greater common good. The city has absorbed some of those costs. So, we're going to have to take a look at this, number one, we're going to complete the sidewalk study and based off of what I'm hearing from Ms. Haefs and some of the conversations that we've followed or been engaged with. I also, this is my neighborhood. Okay? I only live about two miles south on Huron Road. So, I travel this quite frequently, very, very familiar with the issues out there. And I do often see school aged kids walking in that grassy terrace on the east side. So, we do have to perform the sidewalk study. So, it's a procedural step, but I'm not, I won't be a whole bit surprised if the sidewalk study comes back and supports that sidewalks are necessary. So, in the event that the sidewalks are determined to be necessary, then we will have to do a parcel by parcel evaluation, to find out who would be the responsible party for those sidewalks. So I don't, I don't think it's cut and dried any, in any one fashion.
- Thanks, Steve.
- Thank you.
- Thank you Alder Dorff. Any other questions or a motion? Alder Scannell?
- Motion to approve the sidewalk study. I don't know why we wouldn't do this study. It certainly seems there's a need. So, we should get all the information we need to make a decision on what to do up there, so. Motion to
- I second.
- Approve the sidewalk study.

- All right, we have a motion by Alder Scannell, second by Alder Gerlach to approve the sidewalk study. Any discussion? Those in favor?

- Aye.

- Opposed? Motion carries. All right, that will go to council next Tuesday and we'll go ahead from there. Thank you for attending Ms. Haefs. All right, let's move on to the next item. Number five, consideration and possible action on request to rescind or reduce the long grass weed compliance cutting charge of \$178.38 on Invoice 133126 for Rexford Buxton at 311 North Oakland Avenue. Director?

- Okay, on May 29th we did an inspection of the property. Property was rechecked on June 1st and tagged. Remobilized back out to the site on June the 3rd, at which time the property was cut. Invoice was issued to the property owner, which showed 3/4 of an hour for labor and equipment plus the administrative parcel charge and tax for a total of \$178.30, received a communication back from Alder Johnson, indicating that the property owner felt that the charges were excessive because it only takes the property owner about 15 minutes to cut the lawn. I did reach out to my operations division to ask some questions about the time. Received information back from the street superintendent, who also is the weed commissioner. He provided me with pictures for the property, and stated that according to the time stamp, they were onsite for 16 minutes plus travel time to and from the site, six minutes, 30 seconds each way. So, six minutes, 30 seconds is 13 minutes plus 16 minutes at two people on the crew, which comes out to a total of 32 that's 45 minutes worth of labor. That might be part of the confusion. So, it was about 15 minutes worth of labor on site, but there were two people on that crew and then 45 minutes worth of, or the 13 minutes worth of travel time for a total of a 45 minutes. So, this was cut or tagged, cut, and billed consistent with our billing practices. And staff does not feel that the charge levied was excessive.

- Anyone here on this one? Mr. Buxton here?

- He is not

- Otherwise, Alder Johnson?

- But I know Alder Johnson is.

- Yep, that was my next. Alder Johnson?

- Yeah, I see that there's a phone, an identified phone number on the line. I don't know if that's, if that's him or not?

- Nope. That's Attorney Chavez.

- Okay, so, this was a request that came to me on behalf of the resident. I told them that place, I believe it was his intent to join us and because he's not here, I'm wondering if maybe we could just hold this and I can follow up with him to determine if he can make the next meeting. I think obviously Director Grenier's synopsis from a staff perspective is helpful. The feedback that I received from the resident was that was maybe a little bit different, not different, but some additional information is that

he was noticed, I believe, on Friday. And then he did say that he cut his backyard on Sunday, did not have an opportunity to get to the front yard. He indicated someone from the city showed up on Monday, but then left. So, I presume, Director Grenier, that that was the, like the followup inspection, just to be sure that the problem was still outstanding. And so, again, just from the resident's perspective, he said that he had already cut the backyard and that's why he felt that the time was excessive given the situation, so. Not sure if the committee, I mean, if we can hold it, I think it would at least give the resident opportunity to come to the next meeting. And if he's not there at the next meeting, then I think obviously we'll have to proceed with an action, but that would be my request at this time.

- Well committee, any motions or questions for me? Go ahead, Alder Scannell.

- Is, the lawn is cut now? All of it?

- Yes, this was, this happened back in May I believe, or,

- Oh, May. Okay. And there hasn't been any problems since?

- Not that I'm aware of, but I would have to refer to staff if there have been additional complaints.

- And I don't have information relative to whether or not there are additional complaints. This is the only one that's been contested.

- Okay, well, I'll make a motion to hold this and we can get more information all the way around.

- All right, we have a motion by Alder Scannell to hold this until the next meeting.

- Second. Second.

- Is there a second on that? Second by Alder Brunette. Any discussion? Those in favor?

- Aye.

- Opposed? Motion carried, we'll hold it. Present to the improvement and service committee a few options for more effective downtown snowbank management. It's requested that examples be provided from the 10 largest municipalities in the state, Alder Johnson and Scannell, a team. Well, which one of you would like it first?

- Well, I was gonna,

- Who's the brains? Who's the brawn? Or the beauty. You could be the brains, Randy'll be the beauty.

- I mean, I'm comfortable with this one if it's simply a referral to staff to come back with the information that we've requested. I think the importance of this has really risen to the forefront because of the number of businesses that are relying on curbside pickup as a result of the pandemic. I know that this has been an issue that I've talked with staff about in the past and I've received their explanation as to why we do it the way that we do it. But I think given, given some of the challenges

and demands that we have being placed in our small business community, I think it's time for us to revisit the strategy with how we manage downtown snow services.

- All right. Anything to add to that Alder Scannell?

- Yeah. This has come up before a few years back. A number of people living downtown, as well as some of the businesses expressed a concern about, you know, we've got the snowbanks separating, you gotta climb over snow banks to get from the street to the sidewalk. And we kind of looked at that and, speaking with Director Grenier again, I'm trying to remember. We kind of came up with, we would let them, you, there's going to be a fee to businesses could kick in, would, I can't remember exactly how we went. I should've wrote that down, every time I talk to you I never have a pen. I'm a lousy note taker. Anyway, the way I see this is if we have the information about how other cities do it, and then we have, we bring in the, some residents and concerned businesses. And we sit together and we figure out, can we come up with some other way to do, solve this problem or not? And what would that be? That's where I'd like to see us head out. So, let's get the information and let's get the vested parties together and hash out a practical solution for everybody if we can do that. Thanks.

- All right. Committee any questions for the Alders or a motion?

- I would move that we refer this to staff and ask them to come up, to propose a plan.

- Second.

- All right. We have a motion by Alder Gerlach, second by Alder Scannell to refer to this staff as requested. Any discussion? Those in favor?

- Aye.

- All right. Opposed? All right. Motion carried. Number seven, consideration with possible action to look at the layout plan of the Green Bay Metro Boat Launch to see if there are potential renovations or updates to enhance potential renovations, updates, to enhance efficiencies of the facility. Also, to take a look at Brown County Boat Launch facelift including the potential vacant Eagles Nest location on Nicolet Drive, as to how they may affect or enhance the Green Bay Metro Boat Launch location. From Alderman Steuer. Is he on the line with us? No? Steve, any contact with Alder Steuer?

- I have not, but I believe the attorney's office has. I'm going to take just a very brief moment to give a little bit of context to this and then explain why we're making the recommendation we have. Boating facilities at Metro City Deck and Leicht's Park. There is some overlap between ourselves and the parks department, but really what that overlap is, the parks department manages those facilities, we have heavy equipment that's able to put the in water facilities in the water, okay? So that's really where our involvement ends. We put those boat launches in, but operation of a boat launch facility at Metro is park's responsibility. We put the floating docks in when the water levels allow us to do that at City Deck, but managing City Deck as a park is park's responsibility. When Alder Steuer brought this forward as communication at council last time, he indicated he wasn't sure if this should go to INS and parks, it came to INS. We're recommending that it go to parks . A little bit of a long explanation, but now you know why.

- Thanks. All right. Well committee, what do you wish?

- Refer to parks, make a motion to refer to parks.
- Second.
- Motion by,
- Motion by Alder Scannell, second by Alder Brunette, refer to parks. Any discussion on that? Those in favor?
- Aye.
- Opposed? Motion carried, that is referred to parks. Number eight, consideration with possible action to review Zoning Code 13.54I pertaining to fence location and heights in order to seek updates on revisions to increase the efficiency. Steuer.
- Likewise, this one was debated by Alder Steuer as to whether it should come to INS or go to the plan commission. And we're suggesting that this should be referred to plan commission.
- Motion to refer to plan.
- Second.
- Motion by Alder Scannell, second by Alder Brunette to refer this item to plan commission. Any discussion? Those in favor?
- Aye.
- Opposed? That item is referred to plan commission.
- Mr. Chairman?
- Point, please.
- Yes?
- I'm going to have to get out of civic clerk and come back in. It's, my agenda's messed up. So, I just want you to know. I'll be right back.
- Okay. Sounds good. Number nine, consideration with possible action on request to review policy for reimbursement to property owners who repair tree-damaged sidewalk, referred to staff August 12, improvement service committee meeting and to bring modified policy back. It's also tied in with number 10, obviously. I brought this back from council. I really had just wanted number 10 back. And I didn't notice they were kind of both put on here. I don't have any issues with number nine of how you handled that.
- Well, actually we didn't, it was referred to staff.

- Oh, okay.

- And I apologize, we did not get the drafts out to you with everything else that's going on. And we've been, we lost a couple of staff members due to medical over the past two weeks. So, things have been kind of nuthouse around here. I did finish a draft and I'm happy to share that with you tonight, especially as far as what the changes to the policy are. So, very quickly, I'm going to share my screen with you. So, if you've seen the sidewalk letter that we send out to residents when we order sidewalks repaired or installed, the policy is actually, the letter was derived from the policy. So, I can definitely send this out. This can become part of the meeting minutes. And if you choose not to do anything tonight, if you want some time to consider this or do something with it, I'll definitely include this. But essentially when sidewalks are deemed, new sidewalks are deemed necessary or existing sidewalks to be found in need of repair, the orders are sent out by way of a resolution from the common council, that resolution provides 60 days for residents to complete the work. Upon receipt of the orders, the residents have a couple of options. Option number one is do nothing. After that 60 day timeframe expires, the city's contractor will complete the repairs or installation and send an invoice to the property owner. The property owner can complete the repairs themselves. We indicate, has to be completed within the 60 day notice period. It doesn't necessarily have to be, we need to receive a response back from the property owner that they are doing it. In order to qualify for property owner to be complete the repair by themselves, that has to be by them, not by family, not by a friend, not by a neighbor. You have to do the work. You have to notify us that it's been completed, obtain all necessary permits, signing and barricaded and complete the work in accordance with the city standards. We will inspect that work when you're done. If it's found to be unacceptable, you'll either have to remove it and replace it or the city will come in and use our contractor. And then bill you for that, or option three, you can hire a licensed sidewalk builder. Again, we indicate it has to be done within the 60 day notice period. Or you have to notify us within that 60 days that you've hired somebody and they're going to do it. We do provide a list of the sidewalk builders. They do have to come in for all the necessary permits. They have to complete all the signing and barricading and construct up to city standards. The contractor works directly with the property owner and that's how the payment is made. If everything is, if anything is found to be unacceptable, it has to be removed and replaced up to city standards. If not, the city'll replace it and bill the property owner back. We do provide, this is something that's new within the last couple of years that we're providing some repair options that not everything has to be replaced. And here we get to the crux of the discussion. If there are sidewalk panels that are replaced by the property owner, either by themselves or through the hiring of a licensed sidewalk builder, which were marked as city responsibility, there is a process whereby that property owner can apply for reimbursement for city responsibility damaged sidewalk. They'll go ahead and complete that work, either by themselves or using a licensed sidewalk builder. If the work is deemed to be acceptable, the property owner then submits an invoice to the department of public works for sidewalk credit. The invoice has to state the area replaced in square feet and the amount due. And here we get to the strike-through. This policy as drafted, and this policy has been in effect for longer than I've been with the city, which is 13 years. The amount due shall be calculated at a rate of \$1 per square foot. Again, when this policy was first adopted, the intent of that policy was to provide reimbursement for the amount of the materials used and incorporated into the work, not necessarily for the labor. Right, wrong or indifferent, that was the thought process at the time. So, what we have proposed as an alternative, revisiting this in the context of current day, the reimbursement shall be the actual cost of materials if the property owner completes the work themselves or the invoice cost, if the property owner hires a licensed sidewalk builder. In all cases, the reimbursement shall not exceed the rate established under the current year

sidewalk construction and repair contract. And that's the only change that we've made to the existing policy.

- All right. Thank you, Director. It's up to the committee if you want to, you know, wait and put this on the next agenda, I don't think it's pressing, but it's, doesn't seem like major revision. So, I'm fine with moving ahead with it, whatever your, whatever you guys wish, ladies. Yeah, go ahead, Randy.

- As it is, I think that's fine. You know, I mean, we've kind of talked about this and that's basically what we did and I think this covers it well. I'm just curious about, I guess I didn't pay enough attention before when we said that the property owner could do the work that they were actually physically doing the work not hiring somebody, but they have to do it? Not a neighbor, not, I mean, why? Do we care?

- Well, not necessarily. If you're doing the work in front of your property, that's one thing. If somebody else is doing the work in front of your property, then they have to be a licensed sidewalk builder.

- Ah. That's it.

- Yes. So, you have the option, you can always hire somebody, but if you hire somebody,

- Right, right.

- They have to be a licensed sidewalk builder.

- Great, great. But it just can't, but if you did it yourself, physically, neighbors could help?

- Yes. As long as,

- You're,

- You're willing to stand up and say you did the work.

- Sure. Yep, yep. Okay, but not just a neighbor could do it because it would be against the ordinance to have an unlicensed person doing it that's not the property owner?

- Again, I don't necessarily know that part of it. That's the way it's been since long before I got here.

- Okay. 'Cause, I mean, 'cause the important thing is that it meets specs and whoever does it, does it, and I'm not, this isn't a big deal. I don't think it really matters. I don't know. I'm just curious. I didn't quite pick up before that we were actually talking about the property owner physically doing it and then these other restrictions, it just struck me as kind of interesting, curious. But I'm for, this is fine as it is. I'm all for this. I would make a motion to adopt.

- Second.

- There's a motion by Alder Scannell. Second Alder Brunette to adopt the changes as read. Under discussion? No discussion, those in favor? Opposed? Motion carried. All right. Number 10,

consideration with possible action on request by Matthew Johnson for additional compensation related to the replacement of tree-damaged sidewalk, 1420 Frank Street, referred back from common meeting. Director, following our guideline there, this resident who contracted somebody out would be paid up to, what was it? 7.75, I think?

- Correct. Yes.

- Is what we had before. And I think that's where just a little confusion was, I think, there was a, he thought that only 'cause he didn't do it, he wasn't getting reimbursed, but obviously that's not the case.

- Correct. The, under the policy currently in effect, he would only be eligible for a dollar per square foot, regardless of whether he did it or he hired a licensed sidewalk builder, because you've taken the action on the previous item, and that's, that is why the city, the city attorney's office had recommended that we take them in the order that we did, because you've made that recommendation to change the policy, that gives you a little bit more latitude, I guess, in looking at this exemption request. The property owner replaced two panels of sidewalk, I believe, which was gave them the ability to request reimbursement for up to \$50. And they spent \$200 per sidewalk panel, which was \$8 a square foot. And they're getting reimbursed at a rate of \$1 per square foot. Again, during the 2020 contract, our sidewalk replacement cost is 7.75. So, under the new policy, they would be eligible for 7.75 per square foot, which is a lot more than a dollar.

- Yeah, and I think that's fair. I guess, I would caution people who think maybe they're getting a better deal. We do get good rates, I think, with the city to replace them. We're seeing right here, you hired someone out because his neighbor had replaced all of their sidewalk and they keep going to kicks 'cause they thought they'd got a pretty good deal, which maybe was a good deal, but not as good as we got. So yeah, I'm fine then as laid out to reimburse them, you know, the up to 7.75. We don't want to go above what we would have paid.

- So, a motion to be placed on file?

- Second.

- Is that the right motion?

- What was that motion, Alder?

- Receiving place on file?

- No, I think what you'd be looking, I think what Alder Wery would be looking for, or the resident would be looking for, would be to approve the request for additional compensation from \$1 per square foot to \$7.75 per square foot.

- Okay. But we already did that though, right? We just need to do it again?

- No. We had adopted a general policy statement in the previous item. This is a specific application of it. Before the policy,

- And for we sign it,
- Before the policy becomes effective.
- Oh, okay, we couldn't. Oh okay, I get it.
- In the future, this will be administrative, right? We won't see this.
- Oh, the, City Attorney Chavez is on the line.
- Oh, okay.
- Go ahead, attorney.
- [Vanessa] The one thing I was going to add is that when you approve it, you should approve it up to the 7.75 in accordance with the policy just adopted. And obviously, it would be contingent on council approving it, but this way, the new policy is the one being processed under.
- That all right with you, Alder Scannell? I think you had,
- Yes, yes.
- And then Alder Gerlach, was that a second?
- It's good.
- Any discussion on that? Those in favor?
- Aye.
- Opposed? Motion carried. Thank you. Number 11, consideration with possible action on request by the Department of Public Works to award a Professional Engineering Service Contract to McMahon Associates, Inc for hydrologic, hydraulic analysis for storm basin 342 and 342A, Mason Street to Timberland Drive, Sandstone Place to Crestwood Drive, to investigate potential high water complaints during intense rain events around LaCount Creek, Parkway, Shepherds Path, Sorenson Drive and East Sorenson Drive in the amount of 33,400. Director.
- Now, we get into the faster moving portion of our agenda, where I believe it's going to take Alder Wery longer to read the agenda item than it will for us to describe what's going on. With the next several, what we're, agenda items, we're requesting approval of some consultant services contract, here in the LaCount Drive or LaCount Creek Creek, Parkway, Shepherds Path, Sorenson and East Sorenson Drive areas, again, areas on the far west side that are subject to flooding during high-intensity rainfall events, we're simply requesting that you approve us to contract with McMahon Associates to complete the, the stormwater study in that basin. This is similar to work that has been performed, and McMahon's done a lot of stormwater work for us, similar projects where they've done the work on Farlan, the work on Elizabeth, the lift stations down on Broadway, things of that nature. So again, we're happy with McMahon. These are two of the next drainage basins on our

priority list to handle flooding. So, we're asking for approval to contract with a, with a consultant to help augment our engineering services.

- Motion to approve.

- Second.

- Motion by Alder Scannell. Second by Alder Gerlach to approve. Any discussion?

- Question.

- Sure. Go ahead Alder Gerlach.

- Just because there's a price tag on it, I just want to always make sure this money is budgeted for or bonded for, the money's there?

- The, yes, this comes out of the consultant services or the contractual services budget line item in the storm water utility budget.

- Okay, good. Thanks.

- All right. Any other discussion? Those in favor?

- Aye.

- Opposed? Motion carried. I think we lost Alder Brunette here along the way. I didn't see him drop out. I'm sure he'll be back. Okay, number, 12, consideration with possible action on request by Department of Public Works to award a Professional Engineering Service Contract to McMahon Associates, Inc, for hydrologic, hydraulic analysis for storm basin 581 including all sub-basins, with specific emphasis to look at the high water issues during intense rain events along East Shore Circle, East Shore Drive and Irwin Avenue to Danz, and Irwin Avenue adjacent to Bay Beach Amusement Park in the amount of \$79,700.

- This is related to the item that Alder Lefebvre brought forward a couple of months ago for us to investigate that East Shore Drive and Bay Beach area, relative to how the interconnection with that basin and, operates during flood events. And we did indicate to you that after we did our preliminary analysis, this definitely appears to be beyond the scope of our staff's ability to complete due to the rather complicated modeling. So again, we are requesting to contract with McMahon Associates to complete that hydrologic modeling.

- Motion to approve.

- Second.

- Motion by Alder Scannell. Second by Alder Gerlach. Questions? Those in favor?

- Aye.

- Opposed? Motion carried. Number 13, consideration with possible action on request by Department of Public Works to award a Professional Engineering Service Contract to Collins Engineers, Inc for waterfront modifications for Leicht Park to investigate and complete preliminary and mooring systems for cruise ship docking in the amount of \$26,200.

- At the Leicht Park location, we've got the steel sheet pile wall, which is vertical along the river. And then the fendering, that area had traditional fendering, which was creosote soaked timbers, which were mounted to the face of that wall that ships would bump up against when they were mooring. Those are not dynamic, they're, they don't change with the change in water elevation. So, those have fallen out of favor. The ones that were over there were in disrepair. We tore those off 10 years ago or so. So, in most cases, the wall is just a simple flat sheet pile and doesn't provide adequate protection against damage when ships moor up against it. As we do have representatives from the cruise industry, and matter of fact, even with the pandemic, we had folks from Great Lakes cruise, Victory Cruise Lines in here just about a month ago, inspecting the facilities. We do need to get a fendering system in here because we are going to have cruise ships coming in, assuming that the cruise industry bounces back in 2021. So, we'd like to contract with Collins. Collins is experienced in maritime engineering, to design a fendering system for us over there. This will not only be used by the cruise ships, but also during those periods when tall ships come back to visit us, we do hope to recover the cost of the capital costs through the dockage fees that the cruise ships are going to be paying when they come in.

- Any questions from committee? Otherwise?

- Nope. I did just get a message from Alder Brunette. I don't know if anybody else got that, his battery died or whoever's hosting the meeting, he's been kicked out. I'm not sure if it's his battery or something at our end,

- No, he said his battery died.

- Yeah, so.

- He was asking, whoever's hosting the meeting to let him in.

- Yeah, he says, could Steve Grenier let him in? I just got the text.

- I just see them up on the corner.

- Do we want him back?

- He is back.

- I heard that. I heard that. My battery died at like the worst possible time because the big issue of my district you probably already talked about.

- Well, we did approve the,

- We've approved everything.

- The contract.
- Yeah. We're gonna study it. I'll touch base with Steve about it. Thank you.
- Okay.
- Motion to approve this one.
- We are currently on item number 13.
- Yes sir.
- And we have a motion and a second to approve. Any discussion? Those in favor?
- Aye.
- I just want to say, I just want to say one thing. I thought this was just an awesome proposal and I love a good proposal. That's all.
- All right. I think that's an endorsement.
- Yes.
- Now, those in favor?
- Aye.
- Opposed? Motion carried, all right. Alder Brunette, did you want to revisit that one at all? Do you think you wanted to comment on it?
- No, no.
- You sure?
- I mean, no other than we've known about it. And I sent the email to the committee and Alder, so, I can touch base with public works, no worries.
- It was approved though, unanimous.
- Okay, all right.
- Okay. On item number, let's see, these all look the same after awhile, Steve?
- 14.
- Consideration with possible,

- Number 14, consideration with possible action on request by Department of Public Works to award a Professional Engineering Service Contract to Walker Consultant for the analysis of post-tension structural members at Pine Street Ramp and design of repairs in the amount of \$22,085.

- Try to keep this non-engineering for you, if I can. The way the ramps are built, it's precast concrete and there's cables running through that, that after it's placed and after, well, after the piece is cast, tension is put on those cables. So, post tension, and by putting tension on the cables, it puts that entire beam into compression, concrete's strong in compression, weak in tension. So, the cables carry the tension and keep the concrete in compression, maximizing the strength. Over time, chlorides get into that and start deteriorating those post-tensioning cables. We're starting to see some of that deterioration in the Pine Street ramp, not a big surprise seeing as that ramp dates back to the '70s. So, before we have a catastrophic event, we'd like Walker to come in, do some sampling on them and provide us with some recommendations on rehab of the post-tensioned members.

- All right. Questions from committee? I'll entertain a motion.

- I move to approve.

- Second.

- Moved by Alder Gerlach, second by Alder Brunette. Any discussion? Those in favor?

- Aye.

- Opposed? That motion carries. Number 15, consideration with possible action on request by Department of Public Works to award annual contract with four annual renewals for chemical root treatment to Duke's Root Control, Incorporated.

- And we have been using Duke's for as long as I've been with the city. Again, here over 13 years, we have brought justification for proprietary or sole source bidding with Duke's several times in my tenure here. Duke's uses a, there's a couple of different companies who can provide root treatment inside of a storm or sanitary sewer. And they do it using chemicals. Duke's is a less harmful, less aggressive to the environment, chemical than they're than their competitors. And as a result, not only have they been a better ecological fit for us, but they've also been a lower cost service provider to us in the past. We have gone out and had a contract with annual renewals on it. The longest one we have done with them in the past was a one year contract with four annual for a five year total. That current contract has expired. We, our staff did go out, did their due diligence, checked to see if there were any other service providers who could provide the chemical root treatment. There are not. So, it's still Duke's. We have compared the costs that they have been charging us versus what the anticipated costs in the future are and found those costs to still be consistent. And as far as we're concerned, a very good deal. So, we're looking at a total cost expenditure for 2020 of about \$47,450. So, staff is recommending award of the 2020 contract, and then the approval of four one-year annual extensions, pending review of the price.

- Questions from committee?

- Motion to approve.

- Motion by Alder Scannell.

- Second.

- Second by Alder Gerlach to approve. Any discussion on that? Those in favor?

- Aye.

- Opposed? That motion carries. Number 16, consideration with possible action on ratification of the agreement between Green Bay Packaging Inc and the City of Green Bay regarding the transfer of TSS Waste Load Obligations under the Fox River total maximum daily load. Director?

- And actually both this item and number 17, that is why the city attorney has been on the line with us patiently waiting. So, I'm going to turn this over to Attorney Chavez.

- Attorney.

- [Vanessa] Thank you Director Grenier. So, for both of these items, I sent you guys an email earlier or late last week explaining why these ones are on the agenda, the way they are. So, when we passed the packaging development group agreement, I think it's been almost two years at this point, there were a number of issues contemplated with it, with that transfer. One of which was the TSS wastewater allocations. It was something that they approached us, asked if we were interested in purchasing and the city was interested in purchasing. It was contemplated as a separate agreement. Fast forward a couple of years, we went ahead, drafted the agreement, got all the terms finalized, executed it. And then as we were putting this together, the tripartite agreement, we realized that it was never actually formally approved by council, it was discussed by council, but not formally approved. So, we're asking for approval on this one as ratification, simply because we've already executed it, so, we could bring you a fresh copy. But the idea of this one was always said it would be backdated or the effective date essentially would be as soon as the agreement was executed. And so we were, since we were backdating it anyways, there was no point to bring it a new life. We would just ratify this one with the council approval.

- All right. Questions from committee? All right, what are your,

- Should we take 'em both together? Does it?

- Attorney Chavez, does it matter? Or should we take them separately, or can we take them?

- [Vanessa] It doesn't matter if you take them separately. They basically refer to almost the same concept. Like the TSS is one where it's in agreement with us, actually stating what are our role is going to be as far as purchasing those credits go. And then the tripartite agreement is actually the agreement between us packaging and New Water. And it's primarily between TSS and New Water allocating how they're actually gonna make all of their payments and everything work. And then we're mostly acting as like a fiduciary for them since they are the customer or we're the customer, Director Grenier can correct me if I'm saying this wrong. But essentially since we're the customer, that's how we're making that flow properly. So, there's no issue with taking them either together or separate.

- Motion to approve both.

- All right, unless you want to read number, we have a motion and a second to approve both. I'm just going to read number 17 for the record. Consideration with possible action on approval of the Tripartite Agreement between New Water, the City of Green Bay, and Green Bay Packaging regarding discharge of pretreated process wastewater from the new paper mill to N-E-W Water's mill interceptor. So, that'd be 17. So, we have a motion and a second to approve both of those 16 and 17, any discussion? Those in favor?

- Aye.

- Opposed? Motion carried. Thank you, attorney.

- [Vanessa] You're welcome.

- Number 18, consideration with possible action on the review and award of the following contracts, A, Monroe Avenue retaining wall, B, RFB 3251 Green Bay Metro Exterior Sign Replacement.

- Okay. We opened, opened the bids for the Monroe Avenue retaining wall just yesterday. So, I apologize, I was not able to get a summary out to the council. We received one bid. The bid was from Highway Landscapers, Incorporated in a value of \$46,369. That was substantially below what we had estimated the project at. So, even though we only got one bid, the one bid we got was a super bid. So, staff does recommend award of that contract to Highway Landscapers, Incorporated, in the amount of \$46,369.

- All right. Any questions for committee on that item?

- Motion to approve.

- All right. We have a motion by Alder Scannell.

- Second.

- Second by Alder Gerlach to award to, what Director Grenier just stated. Any discussion on that? Those in favor?

- Aye.

- Opposed? Motion carried. Item B.

- And B, I'm not finding any information on. So, I would recommend hold on that item, if I can track down the bid summary through, 'cause that was let through the purchasing department, not through public works. If I, and I do anticipate that tomorrow or Friday I will be successful in having a discussion with the purchasing manager on that, we will get those summaries off to the committee. It will become a part of the minutes from this meeting. And then somebody will be able to pull that item on the council floor and change the hold to a recommendation to award.

- Can I get a hold?

- Make a motion to hold.
- Motion by Alder Scannell.
- Second.
- Second by Alder Brunette to hold this item. Discussion? Those in favor?
- Aye.
- Opposed? Motion carried. Number 19, report the award of the following contracts, A, sewers 720 mini sewers, and B, sewers 820 Finger Road sanitary sewer.
- Okay, included in your packet, we have provided bid summaries for sewer 7-20 mini sewers and sewers 8-20 Finger Road sanitary sewer. 7-20, looks like we had eight bidders ranging from a high of \$280,566.80 to a low of \$157,620. Kip Gulseth Construction was the low bidder. So, a contract was awarded to Gulseth. I believe they've actually started construction on that mini storm project already. Sewers 8-20 is a continuation of the Grandview sewer project that we have been talking about out on the far east side. The Grandview sanitary sewer project is an interceptor sewer that was funded by TID dollars, out there, providing necessary infrastructure for future development. That runs north-south on Grandview Road. The Finger Road sanitary sewer is actually gonna run east-west. And as opposed to being an interceptor sewer, it's actually a local collection sewer providing for direct access to properties. This will run off to the east from the intersection of Grandview and Finger. If you remember, when we constructed the extension of East Mason Street several years ago, it contains a couple of split S corners out there and then ultimately joins back up, East Mason becomes Finger Road again, where we terminated that portion of Finger just immediately east of Grandview Road. There's a cul-de-sac there. So, from that intersection past the cul-de-sac through the ditch line, and then back out into Finger at Mason Street, that's where this Finger Road sewers 8-20 contract comes into play. And that provides direct sewer access, makes developable parcels out of four city owned parcels out in that I-43 industrial park. So, we've got this, we've got the interceptor out there to provide for future development and we're actually putting a local collection sewer in to make those properties sewer serviceable, and ultimately, they now become a saleable property, ready for development. Total of eight bids received here from a high of \$586,542.75 to a low, from the low responsive responsible bidder, Advanced Construction, \$387,403.49. Staff did award the contract to Advance Construction in the amount of \$387,403.49. And we have held a pre-con for that and we expect what, or construction to start very, very shortly here.
- Thank you, Steve. Since these are just a report of actions taken, I need to receive and place on file motion.
- Receive and place on file.
- Motion by Alder Scannell.
- Second.
- Second by Alder Gerlach. Any discussions on those? Those in favor?

- Aye.
- Opposed? Motion carried. Director's report.
- Okay, if we can go back and reconsider that, that request for bids for Metro?
- It's been found . I'll entertain a motion to reconsider 19 B. Or no, was that, 18 B, sorry.
- Motion to reconsider.
- Second.
- Motion by Alder Scannell, second by Alder Brunette to reconsider 18 B. Those in favor?
- Aye.
- Opposed? Motion carries. Okay, Steve, what do you have?
- Okay, better than being found. Jim just reminded me, the reason we don't have it is because it's a Metro contract and it goes before the transit commission and did not need to appear on our, on our agenda, that was mistakenly put on, so that hold can be changed to a receive and place on file.
- Or would it just be a refer to Metro?
- That would be fine too.
- Refer to Metro.
- Refer to transit commission.
- Yeah, or transit. Yeah, yeah. Refer to transit commission.
- Referral to transit commission, by Alder Scannell.
- Second.
- Second by Alder Brunette. Any discussion? Those in favor?
- Aye.
- Opposed? Motion carried. All right. Informational. What do you have for us, Steve?
- Did?
- Well, I,
- Did we do number 20?

- Oh no, I jumped right over it. Good catch.

- I don't want to miss that .

- No, we want those sidewalks built. Report of actions taken by Department of Public Works. A, granting of licenses, sidewalk builders, A, Al Dix Concrete LLC and B, Concrete Solutions, Incorporated. They good to go?

- Good to go.

- All right.

- They, Again, this is a report out.

- Yeah.

- So, a receive and place on file.

- Yep, motion to receive and place on file.

- Second.

- Scannell and Gerlach to receive and place on file, discussion? Those in favor?

- Aye.

- Opposed? Motion carried. All right. Now, informational, Director?

- Sure and a very short director's report tonight, thank you for your time and your patience working through a rather long agenda tonight. Just wanted to let everyone know that construction is moving forward towards the completion. We've made a lot of really good progress this year and had a rather aggressive construction schedule and things are really moving forward. And we are looking forward to getting things done within the contract construction season. Had a conversation with water utility earlier today, and I'm definitely not going to steal their thunder, so, I want to make sure that you know, they will be coming out with a press release in the very near future, announcing a date and time to have kind of a celebration for removal of the last public side lead water service in the City of Green Bay. So, they will complete before the end of this year. Been a pleasure to work with them on that, but they've carried the heavy lifting. They've done a fantastic job in getting the lead out. And then just wanted to let you folks know, I will be meeting with the mayor, I believe on Friday afternoon, to go through the department and mayor level discussions relative to the budget. We did sharpen the pencil as much as we could. And I'm coming in as absolutely dead flat from 29, or the 2020 to 2021 budget as we could. There were some minor cost adjustments. So, even taking into consideration cost of living adjustments on salary and fringe, we've still been able to keep our DPW levy supported budget pretty much dead flat. So, it's been through a lot of hard work and I got to, I definitely need to recognize division managers, Jim Brunette, working with the engineering and traffic sections, Chris Purelot in operations and traffic. And then Matt Heckinlabel on the utility side of things. All three of them have really taken the load this year, taking a very, very hard look at service

lines and how to continue to serve the residents here in the City of Green Bay and try to keep those costs contained as much as possible. So, I hope you're, I'd like to say I'd hope you're as pleased as I am. I don't know that I'm necessarily pleased. I'd love to have the budgets higher than they are, because I think there are additional things that we could be doing and Lord knows we're kind of just scraping by, but I am happy, very happy, very impressed with the work that my staff has been able to do in bringing forward a very responsible budget and look forward to having those discussions with each of you relative to our budget and what value we bring to the city. So, that concludes my report.

- Thanks Steve. I know and Alder Scannell, I can go to you too, I appreciate all the work your staff does. It's been a tough year, you know, from COVID to all the flooding we've had and the different manning techniques you've had to do with one person instead of two here and there. You've always been very responsive to all my residents and myself, so I think I probably email you daily. And you're always, you know, right on top of it, you've done a bang up job. Alder Scannell?

- Yeah, just kudos and much appreciated. And I'm glad when working with water utility, you could go with the flow.

- May I ask a question, please?

- Yeah, go ahead.

- Just totally unrelated and thank you for all the fine work, but as for work that needs to be done yet, my immediate neighborhood seems to be the next one that's going to get all the sidewalk repairs. And so, where all the Xs and Cs are, should people assume that's going to all be done yet before winter?

- Not necessarily. There are certain areas within your district that were not marked out as part of this year's sidewalk repair contract, but instead were part of the program that you, as a council adopted that was brought forward to do a forward looking, more comprehensive, sidewalk inspection program. So, some of those were marked out by summer students for repair or replacement in 2021.

- Okay, and may I also ask, oh God, what was the other thing I was going to ask? If it's going to be done, it has completely slipped my mind. It wasn't important.

- Well, when you think of it, just drop a line, give me a call,

- I will.

- Or send an email, be happy to address it.

- All right. Any other questions from committee? All right, I'll entertain a motion to receive and place it on file?

- Motion to receive and place on file.

- Second.

- Motion by Scannell, second by Gerlach. Under discussion? Those in favor?
- Aye.
- Opposed? Motion carried. Looks like our next meeting's tentatively scheduled to the 23rd and,
- Motion to be adjourned?
- No public hearings, so. We have a motion to adjourn.
- Second.
- And a second. We're out.
- Aye.
- I assume we're out. It could've, we might've tied, I guess. All right. Have a good night.
- Thank you, Alder.
- Good night.
- Thank you.