



MINUTES OF THE PARKS COMMITTEE

WEDNESDAY, NOVEMBER 4, 2020, 5:00 PM

a. 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: Parks Chair - Alder Randy Scannell, Parks Vice Chair - Alder Chris Wery, Alder James Brunette, Alder Lynn Gerlach

Others Present: Alder Barb Dorff, Alder Mark Steuer, Alder Kathy Lefebvre, Director Dan Ditscheit, Assistant Director James Andersen, Parks Planner Kaurie Mihm, Attorney Eric Duncan

C. APPROVAL OF THE AGENDA.

Moved by Ald. Lynn Gerlach, seconded by Ald. Jesse Brunette to approve. Motion carried.

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

D. APPROVAL OF MINUTES.

Moved by Ald. Jesse Brunette, seconded by Ald. Lynn Gerlach to approve. Motion carried.

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

E. REGULAR BUSINESS.

I. Consideration with possible action on the request by Michael and Holly Goza to grant a perpetual easement in the Mahon Creek Greenway for residential yard expansion purposes at 2100 Emmalane Drive (Parcel 21-8116).

Moved by Ald. Lynn Gerlach, seconded by Ald. Jesse Brunette to open the floor for discussion.

Motion carried.

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

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

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

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

Moved by Ald. Lynn Gerlach, seconded by Ald. Jesse Brunette to refer to staff to explore options and negotiate a sale price for .04 acres of greenway for residential yard expansion purposes in the Mahon Creek Greenway at 2100 Emmalane Drive (Parcel 21-8116) and bring back to a future Parks Committee meeting for discussion. Motion carried.

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

2. Consideration with possible action on the request by Ald. Lefebvre to look into where the playground equipment and splash pad are located in relation to the parking lot at Farlin Park. As the park parking lot is almost a block away, it is causing illegal parking on the 1500 block of Smith Street.

Moved by Ald. Chris Wery, seconded by Ald. Lynn Gerlach to refer to staff to work with the Department of Public Works and the Police Department on additional signage and parking enforcement on the 1500 block of Smith Street. Motion carried.

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

3. Consideration with possible action on the staff summary of the research and cost estimates for the necessary floodway studies to reopen the East River trails within the City limits on both sides of the East River.

Moved by Ald. Jesse Brunette, seconded by Ald. Chris Wery to hold for discussion the research and cost estimates for the necessary floodway studies to reopen the East River trails within the City limits on both sides of the East River and present it at a future Parks Committee meeting. Motion carried.

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

4. Consideration with possible action on hiring McMahon for \$19,800 to complete stormwater management engineering for a parking lot expansion at the Wildlife Sanctuary Nature Center.

Moved by Ald. Jesse Brunette, seconded by Ald. Chris Wery to approve hiring McMahon for \$19,800 to complete stormwater management engineering for a parking lot expansion at the Wildlife Sanctuary Nature Center. Motion carried.

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

5. Consideration with possible action on the approval of allocating \$72,910 from the existing beach funding for an amendment to the scope of work for Patrick Engineering to complete the engineering associated with the beach, pier and boardwalk project at Bay Beach Amusement Park.

Moved by Ald. Lynn Gerlach, seconded by Ald. Jesse Brunette to approve to allocate \$72,910 from the existing beach bond funding for an amendment to the scope of work for Patrick Engineering to complete the engineering associated with the beach, pier and boardwalk project at Bay Beach Amusement Park. Motion carried.

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

F. INFORMATIONAL.

1. Director's Report on updates and recent activities of the Parks, Recreation & Forestry Department.

Moved by Ald. Jesse Brunette, seconded by Ald. Chris Wery to receive and place on file. Motion carried.

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

2. The next Parks Committee is scheduled for November 18, 2020.

G. ADJOURNMENT.

Moved by Ald. Jesse Brunette, seconded by Ald. Chris Wery to adjourn. Motion carried.

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

VERBATIM MINUTES

- November 4th is hereby in session. Let it be noted, that all the park committee members are present. Alder Brunette, Alder Wery, Alder Gerlach, and the Chair Alder Scannell. I'll take a motion to approve our agenda.

- I move to approve.

- Second.

- Moved by Alder Gerlach, seconded by Alder Wery. All in favor?

- [Committee members] Aye.

- Paused, okay, we can have an agenda. I'll take a motion to approve our minutes from our last meeting.

- Move approved.

- Move approved

- Second.

- By Alder Brunette, second by Alder Wery, all in favor.

- [Committee members] Aye

- Folks, okay, we are onto regular business, as soon as I get a thumbs up. Okay, consideration with possible action on the request by Michael and Holly goes up to grant a perpetual easement in the main Park Greenway, for residential yard expansion purposes, at 2100 Emmalane? Emma... Emmalane, yeah, that's right, drive. Parcel 21-8116 staff.

- Yeah, so it was recently brought to our attention through a complaint that the owner of 2100 Emmalane Drive, infringed on the Greenway by converting the natural landscape to manicured lawn, with manicured landscaping also as an expansion to their backyard. So we did go out to the property and verified that that was in fact accurate. And we then reached out to the property owner, and informed them of this. They weren't aware that they had infringe. They thought that they were within their property line boundaries. But if you look on the agenda packet, you'll see a map showing where the property lines are located in relation to the area that was disturbed within the city owned Greenway. But like I said, they were very apologetic and they thought that they were within their property lines. So per the city ordinance, we told them that they need to convert that lawn to natural landscape because it is city owned property, and that per city ordinance, we couldn't just let the grass grow or grow long, because that would violate the city ordinance for turf grass and the length of turf grass. So they had to actually till it up and plant a natural seed mix. So our park planner did work with the property owner to provide them information on the appropriate way to convert it back to a natural landscape, and gave them a seed mix. So the owner was extremely cooperative in resolving this issue. They hired a contractor very quickly, and the area was tilled up and planted with prairie seed to the city satisfaction. My understanding is that Michael and Holly Goza are no longer the property owners anymore. They did sell the house but I believe they are on the phone for questions. But I'd like to talk a little bit more about the issue before we open up the floor. So although the vast majority of the property was converted back to Greenspace, the owner did opt to leave a 0.4 acre area of the property as turf grass. And the reason is you can see that the patio was built right up to the property line and the landscape around the patio, is actually on city property. So initially staff or myself, I did deny this request as I usually do when similar requests come forward, but they requested that we grant a perpetual easement, allowing them to use that 0.4 acres in perpetuity care so that they would retain that property for personal use. I did check with the inspection department to see if the appropriate permits were pulled when they built the patio. I did hear from the city inspector's office, that if a patio is over 100 square feet, the property owner is required to submit a permit

application. There is no application on file for this patio that was constructed, and we don't know the exact size of it but by measuring off the air photo, we're assuming it's about 200 square feet, but that's just a guesstimate on our end. If a permit had been applied, this issue would have been resolved at the time because that would have been caught during the permit application process. So this area that they are proposing to secure an easement for, is considered part of the Mahon Creek Greenway. So this Greenway was acquired by the city to provide a natural buffer to the creek. You can't see the creek on this air photo and we're not zoomed out far enough, but there is a creek that runs right through this property. And then the vast majority of the property is heavily wooded with the exception of basically what you see here with what's been disturbed. I don't know what was there before it was disturbed. We have no records and I did not go back on the historic files to see if trees were cut down or not. So it could have just been open grass area to begin with when it was converted to yard. So as I mentioned before, similar requests do come forward occasionally, but it doesn't happen that often. I've been involved with similar requests with the Westside Trail, and also He-Nis-Ra Park where homeowners wanted to... they built too close to the property lines and they wanted additional property for their backyards. All of the requests that I've been involved with have been denied. And I truthfully can't remember any requests where it has been approved but I haven't been with the city forever, so there may be cases where it has been approved. The reason that it's denied for the most part is because the property is acquired for purposes of either natural preservation or public enjoyment purposes. So when there's an infringement issue, the public loses the ability to enjoy that property. Which is usually the primary reason the property is acquired in the first place. So although that this request is very minor in relation to the larger parcel, I am concerned, director of the precedents that this could set moving forward. So if we were to approve this met request, there might be a snowball effect throughout the entire city where other similar property owners who are not aware of where their property lines are and they develop something either over the property line or close to it, I'm concerned that we would get very similar requests throughout the entire city. And that is why we initially denied it on the staff level. 'Cause ultimately it is up to the individual property owner to know where their property boundaries are when they purchase a house and when they improve on it. So, like I said before, I would recommend denying this request, but the home or the previous homeowner who we worked with in restoring this property is on the phone. I think it definitely would be beneficial to open up the floor to hear from them.

- Before we open the floor, is there anything that the Alder from the district would like to say?

- Yes, thank you chair. So while Holly's no longer a constituent of mine, she really, she and her husband really feel that they wanna make this right for the people that purchase the home, because when they purchase the home, it wasn't known that they maybe couldn't get this small portion. And if perhaps an easement wouldn't work, is there something else that would work? I think the hardship is tearing up the concrete, that little tiny, if you look at it on the patio there, like if there's a way to get that or just if there's any other way. I do hear what you're saying about an easement saying the precedent. Absolutely I hear that, and to be concerned about that as well. These are some very sincere people, very nice people. They didn't mean to do anything wrong. They didn't know. And I believe they also had an attorney like tried to call but I could not get hold of him. It was Mr. Duncan and so the attorney is as here as well. Would you please open the floor? Thank you.

- I move that we open the floor.

- I just have one question before we do that. Director Ditscheit, I'm looking at the picture with the patio and is part of the patio into the...

- Even I'm not 100% sure, but I believe the patio is entirely within their boundary and its just landscape surrounding it, that would fall on the Greenway. But where the patios installed, they can't really even walk around the patio without going onto the Greenway.

- Oh, so it's that tight?

- Yeah, and you can see that on the air photo. I'm not exactly sure because we did not get it surveyed. All we did was go off of the air photo. In order to know the exact Bobby would have to get a surveyor out there to mark the locations.

- That is what Holly had told me that they'd have to tear it part of the patio but perhaps I misunderstood.

- And for me, it's difficult to tell on just the air photo, so we would have to hire a surveyor to determine if that's a possible or determine exactly where the patio falls in relation to the property line.

- Okay. That's finally question anybody have any other questions or should we just go open the floor? Okay, motion open the floor? Alder Gerlach

- Okay.

- Alder Burnett, all in favor?

- Aye.

- Pause, okay, the floor is now open, please just wave off I can't see everybody. So if you could just... I'll start with the lawyer and Mr. Duncan.

- Yeah,

- Okay, please state your name and address, and then...

- Yeah, my name is Eric Duncan I'm attorney Duncan. My address would be 416 George, St, De Pere. And the Gosas has had asked me, to speak for them on this issue. The first thing to just sort of jump ahead, I recognize that the request is just for the perpetual easement and it stated in a way that it would be just the city granting, that for free. And I recognize, the precedent problem that that could set. So I wanted to just be clear that what the Gosas, are proposing would be either paying for the perpetual easement or paying to purchase the property outright, so that the city is not in a position of having a flood of people saying, "Well you gave free property to someone else, this is you'd be selling property for a reasonable price." And as a Alder person, Dorff mentioned, this is a situation where, well and actually, as Dan mentioned too, the Gosas hasn't been very cooperative. When this letter came from the city, it was a complete surprise to them. This all kind of happened in terms of the patio and that kind of thing. I understand that property owners have an obligation to know where the property line is, that sort of thing, or the permits are needed. But they had contractors doing this sort of thing and sort of relied on those contractors. As I understand it they at one point looked around for a boundary stake, where the actual property line is, and there isn't one out there. I don't

know, another point, I did go back through the historical areas, aerial photos of the area, and there were no trees. It was really just sort of open grassland. In fact, the Gosas built in about 2014, when they just, after they'd bought the property, and they described the area that we're talking about as essentially anthills and just sort of scrubby dirt, that sort of thing. So to a certain extent, what they've done is, probably it's a net positive for the city and restoring the conservancy to the seed mix that's been put on there, I guess it's prairie grass and wild flowers, and sort of inappropriate mix. They've already incurred roughly 3000 bucks worth of expense to tell everything up and to kind of restore that. The main issue here, is that where the actual property line runs, is putting the fire pit issue aside, it's a very aggressive angle across the back of that property. So on one end of the house, it ends up being, fairly close to the back corner of that house. And so by moving that out a little bit, you can see that it's a little pie shaped triangle. All you're doing is sort of extending from that pivot point out about 25 feet. By doing that, what you've done is restored, kind of a natural configuration to the yard, and also, taken the back line far enough back. So as Dan mentioned you could walk around the fire pit area and that the fire pit is not actually encroaching on that area. The other thing to keep in mind, Dan had mentioned public enjoyment of this, where this is situated, you can kinda tell from the aerial photo, the really... no one except whoever lives in that house could really see any of that portion of the conservancy but certainly that little triangle. So really what you'd be doing by, I guess, let's say selling the property, that hunk, to the Gosas would be, a, sort of fixing their backyard so it has a little bit more of a natural shape to it. Without harming the city in really any appreciable way or the conservancy. You can see that it's already an irregular shape, so it's not like you're introducing an irregularity, to the patio that would be left, and no one except the property owner can really see it. Honestly, if that patio is not granted, I think the likelihood that future owners are gonna continue encroaching, sort of two inches of time, every time they mow is pretty high. And so you'd kind of be fixing that problem as well. If you have, as I said, sort of a natural, roughly right angleish shape to the backyard, I think you're less likely to have an owner that's gonna, try to sort of either than that early more. So in any case, what really what we're asking for is, more of I don't know if you'd call it a kind of a customer service sort of thing buy into sell that patio to the Gosas for... they've been very cooperative, in restoring the rest of the patio, and I don't think it hurts the city very much. Well not really at all who agree, to purchase that partially. Either having to pay for these or purchase the patio. Either one would be fine. So I don't know if there are any questions?

- I was just gonna ask that. Are there any questions? Alder Brunette.

- Yes, thank you chairman. Mr Duncan, thank you for that presentation it was helpful. Have you any idea what the property owner would be willing to purchase the property for?

- I do, although I feel we would be hoping the city would tell us what they would be willing to sell it for. I don't know if any, do you guys have an idea of what that would be? If you don't I can toss out a number but...

- No, that's fine. I don't want, I mean obviously it will be a negotiation between your client, yourself and the park's director. I just, I was curious. No other question, thank you.

- Okay.

- Anyone else? Or any other questions I should say? Then is there anyone else here, who would care to speak on this? You getting anybody James?

- Nope.
- Okay. A motion to close the floor.
- So moved.
- Seconded.
- Okay, motion by Alder Brunette, seconded by Alder Gerlach. All in favor?
- [Committee members] Aye.
- Paused okay, the floor is now closed and Alder Burnett.
- Yes, thank you, chairman. I'm gonna make a motion, but before I make a motion, I just wanna say that for me, setting a precedent is troubling in a way, because I have a lot of conservancies in my district. A lot whether it be He-Nis-Ra Park as Mr. Ditscheit said, French park neighborhood, area along West Point, there's a lot of wooded areas, and Alderman, where you have an area by Colburn Park as well? That I think you could add some property owners along that area that could do the same thing. But I want to be fair, and I want to explore the possibility of selling the property. So I'll make a motion, and of course, when the time is right, if you wanna just speak about the motion or whatever, other ideas each committee member has, I'd like to make a motion to refer this to the park's department, to negotiate a purchase price for the property in question.
- Just that little angle.
- Yeah.
- Is there a second?
- I do have just one thing to clarify here. Just the difference between an easement and a purchase and what the difference is between the two. Purchase and easement, the property lines don't change, you just give them a slice of the property and it's kept on file and in the records, but the city has ownership if it, but the homeowner has the rights to it. So that's how an easement works. If we look at doing property acquisition, there's another step in the process that you have to keep in the play here. So there would be the acquisition price, which would probably be the same for an easement or an acquisition. I'm guessing it would be the same price or a very similar price. But then there'd be an additional fee if it's acquisition, because you would actually have to subdivide that property off to be able to sell it to the homeowner. So there's an additional fee for selling it because you'd have to hire a surveying company to create a CSM. And then once that CSM is created, it has to go through the plan commission for approval, to adopt that CSM. Once that process is done, then you can sell the property, but you can't sell the property before. So that being said there's a cost associated with creating the CSM. I did not quote out, but I believe they're usually between one and \$2,000 for hiring a surveyor to do that, but I could be off on that. And so the question becomes, who pays for that additional fee? Would it be the homeowner or the city, covering the cost of the CSM?
- Okay chairman, I'm gonna withdraw that motion for the time being.

- Okay, Alder Gerlach.

- I have a question for Director Ditscheit. When I'm looking at this aerial photo, I don't understand, what the pink line is, where the two structured artificial thing.

- Yeah so the whole area that's highlighted was area that is all city owned. We own basically half of this map. You can see the property line that goes straight North and South on the map. We own everything East of that line. So the entire area that's highlighted in pink or blue is within the Greenway. As part of the homeowners development of their yard and landscape. The homeowner was a very cooperative on, and that's the area that they already converted back to Greenway. That has already been tilled up and it's been planted with native prairie mix.

- Okay, good I was asking-

- It's just that small triangle that's in question right now.

- And let me ask you, because you said you don't know who would pay for the survey. Is there a precedent for this?

- As I said, I mean, this doesn't get approved very often. I don't know if there's a precedence, it's just, does the city wanna cover the cost of that or not, or put it on the homeowners since it's their request? I guess that's something that would be negotiated as part of the... if that motion gets approved, that would be part of their negotiation process, as far as who's responsible to cover that cost. It's just, do you want the city to incur any expenses at all, as part of this transaction is really what you'd have to consider.

- So if we do have a motion to allow the negotiation of the sale of this property, we will assume, I think, that all costs will be borne by the property owner.

- I don't think we should assume we should make it part of the motion.

- We keep it part of the motion. I guess what I'm saying, or assume is I'm assuming that the property owner would be okay with that.

- Oh wow, yeah okay.

- Hey excuse me, we just had the formalities, I'm not sure when I'm sure it's out of order to just break in or not, but yeah.

- Yeah we have opened the floor again, so we can open the floor again, if you'd like to speak.

- If you don't mind.

- Motion open the floor.

- So moved.

- Second.

- Barbara if you like to sign of Alder Brunette on favor?
- [Committee members] Aye.
- Pause, okay the course now you can go ahead.
- Yes just so that we're clear, the Gosas are generally speaking, intending to incur all of those costs. Obviously, if it's a, \$15,000 cost or something crazy, they would want the opportunity with kind of say forget all the thing, but generally the idea is that they would be willing to incur those costs. That the existing property line is sort of so unnatural, and it's such a problem for sort of how the yard looks, that they're willing to go to some length, to correct that.
- And then a question for you then. Do you know what they prefer, the easement or the purchase of a property?
- I think they would prefer the easement, 'cause I think it'd be a lot simpler. They could get a real estate an accurate description of the real pieces of the easement. I think more it's less expensively than doing a full CSM. And then in along those lines, really the only, I think the easement it would say would be the property owner would have the... adjacent property owner would have the right to mow and walk across the easement sort of use it as a yard. Their kids could play in it, that sort of thing. And it would be up to the city, I guess, on whether you restricted any sort of building. I don't know that building makes sense out there, anyway I don't think it would have room for a shatter or anything anyway, but...
- Any other questions? All the stuff you're muted.
- Oh thank you chair. now just a couple of things here, it's an interesting case here but-
- Hey keep questions for store Alder Scannell?
- No, I don't.
- Okay well, we'll get into that then. Let me close the floor and everything.
- All right.
- Okay motion to close the floor?
- Motion close the floor.
- By Alder Gerlach seconded by Alder Brunette. All in favor?
- [Committee members] Aye
- Pause, okay the floor is now closed and go ahead with the story.
- Okay, thank you Alder. Dr Ditscheit I was just wondering, okay with conservancies, I presume that they're just passive areas of, people normally don't walk through. It's not a park, it's more of a

conservancies. So what parameters are under that would allow people to possibly utilize that? Or is it this kind of hands-off.

- It's not hands-off, I mean, it's informal use for the public. So the public has every right to be on that property, to walk anywhere they want in that property, and they use it for the enjoyment of viewing the natural landscape. So birdwatching, hiking, they could go mountain biking there if they wanted to. But obviously if you section off portions of it, they're gonna stay off of it so... I can almost guarantee you that very few people, since the house was built in 2014, that although a city had ownership of this parcel, there very few people walk through the yard because they assumed it was private property. So for since 2014, until now, the public has lost the use of that portion of the park, for their public use and enjoyment. But, we would not, right now we are not planning any active recreation in that area other than just continuing to allow passive recreation. Now, I believe that the property just for the North, you can see it's a vacant property. I believe I'm going off of memory that that's the patio we talked about at some point, possibly converting that to a parkland. Didn't we have that discussion Alder Dorff recently? I believe it was that patio.

- Is that where we met outside, for the neighborhood meeting?

- I wasn't part of that meeting.

- You weren't.

- No.

- Yeah, I can't, I mean, I know where Emilyne is, I can't remember. But I know there was some talk of a park out there, small park.

- Yeah, obviously, if that ever becomes a park, then there be a little bit more use than there is now. But if that's not the property, then that would not apply. I'd have to look at a map to see the city of Arizona should have patio to the North. I can do that real quick.

- I believe that-

- I just had one other comment to share if I could.

- Bob, lift all the Director's looking at that up, go ahead.

- Okay, from what I've heard in the Silgosas I'm sure they do sound like very fine upstanding citizens. I have a little difficult time understanding that they do not know where their property lines were at all in the back. And I don't know if the real estate firm fell forward on this, and didn't do a correct job in showing this or delineating this. So I just have a little trouble with that, even though I know they had good intentions to make right. I still have a hard time with that. So I'm gonna just use that as a comment and that'll be it for now from me, thank you.

- Thank you Alder Wery. Alder Brunette, I'm sorry. Alder Dorff.

- This is for Andrecht. So there's a way to purchase an easement, not just to grant an easement. Is that what I understood you just to say?

- Well easements can either be done two ways. One is you can just grant it to whoever is asking for the easement. A lot of times we don't charge utility companies for easements, but the question is you charge for an easement for a private citizen or even a business, because in essence, the city is losing that space, and giving it for another use. Now the reason the city doesn't really charge for the utility easements is because that use usually involves public benefit. There's a public benefit to allowing the use of that easement for utilities to go in, it's for the general good of the cause for the public. But in this case, it's allowing an easement for private property. And so I would recommend that if you wanna go that route, I would still recommend not approving it all together. But if the park committee and city council want to look at doing that, I would recommend doing it for a sale price of either selling the easement or selling off the property.

- Then it's a one-time sale, there it's not perpetually you're paying for the easement. So what you were... what I heard you say then is, if it's selling it as a piece of property, then there's the additional expenses incurred and you go through a bigger process. If it's an easement, it still belongs to the city, but it's giving the right of use to the property owner and they can use it as part of their yard, but they still pay for it. So, and that's just a little easier to do.

- It's an easier process to go through, but when you look at a plat map, it'll show up as city property. So the only way that the easement would be the public would know if it's an easement, is if they actually look up where the easement is, because that would not show up on the city plat map. So when you're... if somebody gets onto the city website and pulls up the map, then they would not know that that's an easement for private use.

- But the owner would know.

- The owner would know and the city would know, but the general public would not.

- Okay.

- Alder Gerlach,

- If there's a little more confusion, to the public if it's an easement.

- But right now with the public is... there's not a lot of public use but if there could be someday.

- I just looked up that patio, and they said that is not the city owned property for that park that we talked about. I was incorrect so I spoke out.

- Okay. So then that doesn't even enter into it, that it's-

- So it's strictly passive use. But, at some point there might be a desire to do a pay of trail in there. I can't tell you that's never going to happen. 'Cause this actually connects to the UWI Arboretum. Maybe at some point there'll be a demand from the public to link this area to the Arboretum. Now there's plenty of room to do that where we wouldn't necessarily need the 0.4 acres in this scenario, but if adjacent property owners come by with similar requests, maybe you become limiting yourself in the future, if there's ever a trail request. It doesn't really come into play for this request though.

- Alder Gerlach.

- Two questions please for the director. First of all, that little blue triangle at the widest point of it, approximately how big is that? How many feet is that?

- I did not measure it, but when Mr. Duncan spoke, I think you said it was 25 feet.

- Okay, my second question is it seems to me that we don't wanna set the precedent of doing anything with an easement because this could open a can of worms, but I'd like to know how the park's department would feel about selling this piece outright, if the property owner pays all of the costs.

- If that's the direction that the park committee and council wish to go, I would melt rights sale over an easement because then the property lines change on all of the city maps, and it's much less confusing to the general public. But there is an additional process and there is an additional cost.

- But all of the costs would be borne by the property owners if we set it up that way.

- Yeah.

- I would make that motion.

- Okay so there's a motion to sell the property, with all costs entailed by the property owner.

- Well I think what we would have to do is with to negotiate the sale price. Because if we were to do that, I think we'd have to let you know what that price is to see if you're okay with that price. We do that for all property sale transactions. And in this case, we don't know what that price is. There's two ways to come up with a price for that, one is to do an appraisal, which the city would bear the cost for that appraisal, if we were to do that, because we would not, we would prefer that the city do the appraisal, over the homeowner paying for it, just to protect the city. Not to say that the homeowners are dishonest, but that's just the process that we always go through. The second option is to go through the assessor's office and set that value based on what the going rate is for residential property and what they would be taxed on for the square footage. I have already had discussions with the assessor's office on that. So I do know what they would charge for that just from an assessed value, based on residential land in that area. But that's not the same as appraisal. So we would have to decide, do we wanna do an appraisal or an assessed value? 'Cause the two prices would probably be different.

- To do is to refer to staff, and that you'll figure that out.

- I would say if you would like us to research it forward and not deny the request, then refer to staff to negotiate a sale price for this and bring it back to park committee for further discussion.

- Would it also be... at what time would... when would we wanna send it to planning? Would it be wise to do that first, 'cause if they reject it, then that's the end of it, correct?

- I would doubt that they would reject it in all honesty, but you never know, obviously it's another committee and another process, but we wouldn't be able to go through that process until we're sure that the homeowner or the Gosas in this situation would be interested in proceeding. So if we can't

negotiate a price, we'll have to come back and talk about it in close session and see where the park committee feels the price should be based on the information we supply for you to review. But if they're not willing to proceed with it based on the price, then there's no reason to incur costs to subdivide the property out. So, and then, as part of it too, maybe as part of this discussion, maybe it makes sense to keep the price down, to maybe talk about really how much property is necessary or needed as part of the sale. So if they wanted to keep the cost down, they could sliver it down a little bit more, so that the square footage is less, so which then means there'd be less impact to the parks and less cost for them to incur, because the purchase price would be less. So those are all things we can work through, with the homeowners in advance before we actually subdivided out.

- So is that your motion Alder Gerlach, to refer this to staff, to work out with them?

- I would be happy to put that most informative. It's just that Alder Brunette and Alder Wery have been so quiet. And I wonder if maybe they have some wisdom that they would like, if maybe they would prefer to make a motion. I don't know. They haven't said much about it. They don't wanna do.

- Give wisdom on us. Alder Wery.

- Yeah thanks Ditscheit, I don't know about wisdom. Maybe some insight.

- Wisdom too.

- Yeah, there you go. Director I brought up an aerial view of my own creek area. It's quite a big wooded area. Is that all in the conservancy?

- Yes, it is.

- Okay. All the way up to, I think it's city drive.

- Yeah it's a large area that the city owns and it abuts the Arboretum to the North, UW Green Bay property.

- Gotcha.

- So it's a large natural area.

- And I know we don't wanna start setting a precedent or the idea that we'd entertain this, I think as an elected body, we, I don't know. The citizens ever always seems to get them, as an inhibitor when we decide things. You can change your mind, you can do this, you can do that. I don't think it binds us in any way for the future. So I think it's best to try and sell this off. and I think again, we don't wanna be limiting our natural area, but this was such a small piece. And I think government can come off as just heavy handed and hard to do business with. And I think this is a small thing we can do that really won't affect any projects we do back there. So I'd be fine with motion Alder Gerlach that you were doing, like we can get in there.

- Thank you, okay. I move that we refer this to staff to explore the possibility of selling this portion to the property owners.

- And bring it back to Park committee discussion.

- Yes.

- Seconded.

- Hey so a motion by Alder Gerlach, seconded by Alder Brunette. I agree with Alder Wery's comments. This is just such a small park and it's such a unique situation and there's still tons of room around all that. I don't think we're really hurting ourselves, and I think this is why they pay us the big bucks. I mean, if we were just gonna go by the rules without using our brains to figure out these situations where you know a robot could do this job. So we've got a motion and a second discussion.

- [Faith] Mr. chairman

- Is that?

- [Faith] Olive Faith.

- Olive Faith, all right you have the floor.

- [Faith] Yes, I just wanted to chime in that I think yeah, I think it would be better for the city to have them by the biotin easement. I wonder if there's could be some legal issues, if you have an easement. There could be some, yes, some problems with that. I just, yeah, I'd be leery of that. So yeah and I think too, by selling it to them, versus an easement, you're not really setting a precedent.

- We're setting the precedent of selling but-

- [Faith] Well yeah but that's a little different because-

- Yes it is a little different, but yeah.

- [Faith] Yeah that's what I mean so. Okay that's all I wanted to say.

- Okay, thank you. Anything else? I see nothing so all in favor.

- [Committee members] Aye.

- Paused. Okay that passes unanimously.

- Thank you Alders very much. Even though it's a former constituent, I still really care about this family. So thank you so much for even being willing to listen.

- We'll send you a bill.

- Thank you all very much. Would we, I'm a little unclear next communication on our end with the parks department does reach out to us and say, "Hey here's what we've worked out."

- More than likely I'll have Corey work with you on this. And I know you've met Corey before so.

- Yep, okay, perfect. Excellent thank you all.

- Yap thank you.

- I need to see James are we okay? You okay we're all set. Item number two consideration with possible action on the request by Oliver Faith, to take into where the playground equipment and splash pad are located in relation to the parking lot at Farland park. As the parking lot is almost a block away, is causing illegal parking on the 1500 block of Smith Street staff, do you wanna take this first?

- Yeah, I guess I'll give a brief summary and then Oliver Faith can speak and talk about any topics I've missed. 'Cause we did touch bases last week on this issue. So I do wanna start out the conversation, the existing conditions to the park. So if you take a look at the park committee agenda packet, you will see an air photo of the park, along with the property boundaries highlighted in a magenta color. The shelter playground and splash pad have been in place for years, so those are currently, although they're not labeled here, you can see them right off of Smith Street. So you can see the splash pad on the playground are literally right at the end of Smith Street. And then the shelter is located halfway between Harold and Smith Street. And then there's a basketball court right there. The playground was installed in 1994, and the splash pad was installed in 2000. So at that time there was no parking lot constructed at Farland Park. So you can see that there's a parking lot there now, right in the middle of the park. So these facilities were placed fairly close to Smith Street and Harold Street intentionally because there was no parking lot at that time. So this allowed individuals to park on these streets and then they would have a short walk to these amenities without having to lose the ball field. There's a practice ball field just to the Northwest, the basketball court. So it's between the basketball court and parking lot. At that time, when the amenities were installed, the area of the park that's currently the parking lot and the area to the West of that, which is a soccer field now was privately owned. So the city did not even own that area, that chunk of property to the West, which is about a third of the park. So the city acquired that land for park expansion in 2005, after the amenities were installed. So after that land was acquired and converted to Parkland, the Aldermen at the time, worked with a landscape architect, not a staff member, but a professional landscape architect to design a conceptual master plan for the expanded park. This was done through neighborhood meetings, they were involved in the master plan process. And at the time, what was decided is we would build the parking lot where it is along with a soccer field and that parking lot would service the soccer field. And then the playground and splash pad and shelter, people could still park on Harold and walk in. So the master plan wanted to keep those items in tack because they didn't want to incur the additional expense with relocating those. So this issue does seem to surface every so often, where we do get complaints along either Harold Street or Smith Street, where there is issues of parking, where people are illegally parking or blocking driveways. Throughout the years when that's happened, we have worked with the police department to encourage additional enforcement of that. So now Oliver Faith can speak to that when I'm done talking here, but he already has contacted the police in this situation. So option one on is to increase the enforcement out there and do ticketing where people who aren't following the parking regulations. Option two, would be to remove the street parking altogether. Right now we could put a restriction so only the residents could park there. That's an option. I have not reviewed that with public works to see or the neighborhood to see if that's something they're interested in, but that could be an option if everybody's in agreement. And the third option to resolve this issue, would be to redesign the master plan and move some amenities around. Obviously there's a substantial cost involved, we'd have to move the playground and the splash pad and the shelter closer to the parking if we want people using

those amenities to actually use the parking lot to get to them. That may or may not resolve the issue, if we don't limit the parking, because people could still park on Harold and walk in. It's not that far of a walk, depending on where you'd put that. Unless you put it over where the soccer field is. But those are really the three options that we have moving forward. So I guess I recommend you open it up to Oliver Faith, and let her speak, and if I miss something she can add to the description of the issue.

- [Faith] Okay. Yeah, there's a little faith. Yes, the big issue is Smith Street not Harold. There was no issue with the parking, illegal parking, parking driveways on Harold Street, it's all on Smith Street. As you can see, Smith Street just ends. And that's one block only. It's only a block long there. So that they park right at the end, there's signs saying "No parking," and there's a fire hydrant. And the residents have to call because a lot of times these people also park their driveways, block their driveways. And so this has been an issue going on for, with me, I think since I became older. And so I've been trying to find a way to do it. I talked to the Chief of police and I said, this is becoming such a problem that you're gonna have to have them actually ticket people. Because I bet a lot of these are repeat people because, if they park, someone calls, they find them in the park and they'll just tell them, "Go move your car." And the chief said, yeah, he said, "Probably this is just becoming so outrageous. I mean what's happening that these people don't even think. I would never think to block someone's driveway." But anyway, I was there last month. I just stopped to talk Christian Bronson. Smith was right there. And I stopped to talk to him and he was going, and here's a lady parked. She was parked, partially blocking his driveway. And the police officer was there, he brought her over and he just talked to him. He says, "Well." I said, this is becoming such an issue. And he said, "Well we're just gonna have her move her car." "You know, she didn't mean to do it," blah, blah, blah. So the police are not issuing citations. So something's gotta be done with the park. And everybody wants to park at the end. They can't even park down the middle of the block. They park on the end, and you can see because it just dead ends there. There's not a lot of room to park and move around. So they park there because that's right where the splash pad and the playground equipment is. And you can see where the parking is. Nobody is gonna park there and walk all the way through the grass, there's no sidewalk. The sidewalk is way over there. They have to go over to the sidewalk. That's even longer for them to walk. People think that they just don't wanna walk, I guess. So something's gotta be done because this is becoming such an issue on Smith Street. As I said, Harold street has no problem. Now you can see there's a cul-de-sac. And I didn't really look, but I think they can park on the cul-de-sac. But yeah, this is becoming such an issue.

- Thank you Alder Gerlach.

- I'd like to ask Oliver Faith a question, please. What do you think is the solution?

- But you should ask the Chair.

- Oh Mr. Chairman, would you please ask Oliver if she can give me a chance, what does she think is the solution to this?

- Oliver Faith, do you have a solution to this?

- [Faith] Well, I know Director Ditscheit, did mention that every year they replace old playground equipment and they could put this on the list and we could move it. Move the playground equipment away from Smith Street. So anywhere that would be closer to the parking lot, it could be, let's see

that would be, I think, South. South of the parking lot. There's a big area there. I don't think that's where the soccer fields are. I can't see on the map here. Director Ditscheit, are the soccer fields in... there's a 25, 24 and 23. Is it in 25 or 24?

- Soccer fields is in 25.

- [Faith] Okay so what is in 24?

- 24 is at the Northern end, that would be practice ball field. So you can't see the backstop, but the backstop for it, I believe is in 23. So it's not heavily used, but it is a practice baseball field or little league or softball field.

- [Faith] Yeah. Well, then we could really put it down in 23, but up closer to the parking lot. You would not be interfering with 25, 24, 23, right?

- Yeah I mean, there's places you could put it. I mean, I couldn't guarantee that people wouldn't still park on Smith Street and walk in, or cause a bigger problem on Harold Street, cause if you put it in that location, you're now moving at closer to Harold Street. So I can't-

- [Faith] No I'm saying, I thinking more closer to where it looks like that's the railroad track's coming through. At the end of the parking lot, but over more by the railroad tracks, if you could, it looks like there's enough room there, you could put something right in there. That wouldn't mean that the people in Harold and Smith would have to walk. So they're probably going to use the parking lot.

- Yeah and so that's something that we would flesh out as part of a master planning process when we get on eatery amenities. So, I'd be hesitant to tell you right now where the best location would be for that playground. Could it be relocated further away from Smith street? Yes. But we'd still wanna put it a location that's convenient for the neighborhood. I think a lot of people walk in from Harold Street and Smith Street, so even if they're not parking, you still get a lot of children coming from that area. So you don't wanna make it too inconvenient for children to get to the playground off of those streets either. So I think you can make it less inconvenient and maybe encourage people to park at that parking lot, but you still wanna make it fairly convenient for park users so.

- [Faith] In both Harold and Smith Street, I don't think there's a lot of children. I think it's more older, older couples people, there aren't a lot of children. I do know at the end of Smith Street, I think the one house has some children, but it's not... there's a lot of more older people that live in that, on both of those streets. There's not a lot of children. And because there's a busy street at the other end of Harold and I think is that Elizabeth Street? I'm trying to think with my map here. Smith Street that's a busy street. There aren't many people I think walking all the way down.

- And as Oliver Faith said, this is one of our older playgrounds in the park system, it was installed in 1994. And that is the same age as some of our other oldest playgrounds that we're currently replacing. I believe the one at Gagnon Park that we're replacing this year was installed in 1994 also. As far as our five-year CIP, or capital improvement plan, we did put a draft of that together already and submitted to the finance department. It will be reviewed at the finance committee probably in December or January. And in that plan, we do have \$100,000 budgeted to replace Farland Park playground in 2024. And we also put money in in 2025 to replace the shelter at Farland Park. So if you wanted to bump up the timeline to replace the playground sooner, you would have to make

some amendments, to our five-year capital improvement plan. And just so you know, Oliver Faith, I did tell you that we'd like to replace two playgrounds a year. And so when I looked at that plan, we do not have any playgrounds plan for 2021 at all, because of other priorities in our apartment. And in 2022, we only have one replacement scheduled. And again, that's also an old playground with a similar age. So if you wanted to switch out the playgrounds, you wouldn't be able to do so for 2021, unless you had for the CIA.

- [Faith] Okay, so I'd have to be okay in two years okay. I would, 'cause this isn't my district, I would prefer, yes, that being done as it is one of the oldest ones. And then maybe two and off also on Smith Street, then make a recommendation, would have to go to VPW, I guess that Smith Street and Harold Street be restricted to residents only in the meantime, because that would help. And I would think, and I would hope I should say that if people that are illegally parking and blocking driveways, that's the main concern, the driveways and the fire hydrant with people parking there that the police would actually then start ticketing.

- Alder Gerlach did you have a comment or question?

- I was just going to say so we could, move forward and come to a resolution. If this is really because we're not gonna be replacing the playground equipment in the near future. If this is really a parking issue, and we just wanna restrict parking, what does our committee do? How can we just move this into parking room, let them take care it?

- well, there's two things. So if you're looking for support from the police, to just encourage or do additional enforcement, all that you do as you direct staff to work with the police department to enforce parking restrictions on the roads adjacent to Farland Park. But if you wanna actually look at restricting parking, I would say that would probably have to be referred to INS for them to review and make a determination, if that's feasible. I don't know what the process is for that. I did not talk to Director Grunia about that possibility. I would imagine we'd have to survey the block and see if it's something the residents would be supportive of and not just one or two people. Because if you put those restrictions on it, although it benefits some, it's also a hassle for others. Like when people come to visit, they have to call that in and take that care, and get that taken care of, or else those people that are there to visit them will get a ticket. I don't know if the neighborhood's supportive of it. I don't know if public works is supportive of it.

- I'm just wondering if it really is something that Parks committee... I don't know. This just needs to go to somebody else.

- Yeah and those INS people don't know that committee okay. I got my doubts about that committee.

- What do you mean?

- I would say now for the signage out there now, is there, I mean, is could part of this problem be that people are not as aware of there's a parking lot there. Is there anything saying... any signage saying "No parking on the street," or "For park, use the parking lot," anything like that to help maybe educate or redirect?

- I don't know that offhand. I did not go out there to look at the signage on Smith Street.

- [Faith] The street, it has signs at the end, "No parking."

- So there is no parking and they're being violated. I mean-

- [Faith] Oh all the time.

- Yeah, so I, excuse me, this really is an enforcement issue. I mean, we've got to solve, as far as the parking issue goes, we're just not enforcing. And then perhaps we could add to it if we could add a sign, 'cause maybe people aren't aware of a parking long after that. I don't know if you can see it from Smith or whatever people are-

- [Faith] No.

- Yeah, so maybe have a sign saying, "Use a parking lot in off of Eastman," maybe that would help alleviate the problem too. But I really feel it's an enforcement issue from what I can see here. I mean, we were telling people not to park in their parking, they should be ticketed. And maybe we need to add violators will be ticketed or told. I don't know. That's my thoughts.

- [Faith] Yeah it just says no parking. And I don't know if the signs could be.

- Possibly the motion. Maybe what the motion could be is to direct staff to work with the police department and the Department of Public Works to review signage and enforce parking restrictions on roads adjacent to Farland Park.

- [Faith] Mr. Chairman, would you entertain a motion to that effect?

- Sure.

- [Faith] Mr Chairman.

- I'm wondering if we should open the floor here. I see Bronson's here.

- [Faith] Oh yes okay.

- If your speech, he just texted a little message to all of us. Bronson would you like to speak? Could you just give me a heads up for that? If you do, and we'll look on the floor or I don't have a camera on microphone. So I guess not. Okay. I think we're gonna be ended up making the motion as directed by the director. And that's if unless anybody else has a better idea?

- Well, I don't know that. I guess I don't know how this works, but they did put a communication in the chat box and then they said they don't have a microphone. Sorry, I'm getting feedback. They said they don't have a microphone or a camera, but they did put a communication in the chat box. Does that have anything... does that need to be bred at all or anything?

- That's what I've been reading.

- So, she.

- I kinda like the motion we got that put them as anybody else has any other ideas or discussion, Alder Wery.

- Thank you, Mr. Chairman. If I heard correctly director, we wouldn't even be doing a new playground or shelter for a couple of years, right? So we could try, right there's first and it doesn't work next year.

- Correct, yep.

- It always sounds like an easy answer. I think those of us who have been around a lot, let me know when we say we're just gonna try more enforcement I don't know. That's hit or miss, right?

- Sometimes it works well, other times it doesn't, I'm not gonna lie.

- Yeah.

- And you know, from Russia Aquatic Center there are more situation.

- So we do have time here. Where are you going to, or were we going to be doing the shelter and playground area at the same time? Or was it two different years?

- It was two different years is what's in our five-year CIP. So obviously that still has to go through the process and you still have to get the funding approved before we can really plan for that. But right now we have the playground requesting funding in 2024 and the shelter requesting funding in 2025.

- I think short term why don't we try the different signage and enforcement. And if that doesn't work, I think we do bring this back and we seriously look at doing something different to, there's not a cul-de-sac here, that's kind of unusual. It's kinda ends like that but...

- Well if the playground and splash pad is moved, then you can put a cul-de-sac there. The reason it was never put in is because the splash pads in the way. The cul-de-sac on Harold Street was added after the playground and splash pad we're in.

- Okay, well...

- That was done maybe 15 years ago.

- So there's some possibilities there. It's used to be called Pickle Park.

- Yes, it was.

- I played a lot of football here at St. James playing against you and Paul .

- The dirt smelled like pickles when we-

- [Faith] Yeah I missed that smell.

- Yeah believe it.

- [Faith] I miss that smell.

- So I don't, it's kind of... I don't wanna say it's feels good. I hope something would come of it with signage and enforcement. I think we tried that first, everything we could think of. If we give it a year, and we started looking at how we can reconfigure the park. I hope is not cheap and everybody has art projects they wanna do. I'm thinking of another pool.

- [Faith] Got a pool there.

- What's going on this side.

- [Faith] Okay.

- You wanna throw a motion?

- [Faith] Yeah I think that would be a good, yeah, thank you very much. I think that let's try that first and then we can always bring it back, thank you.

- Yeah, and we can maybe even move up some dates perhaps maybe but they'll come later. So your motion.

- I'll make a motion to refer this to staff to work with Department Public Works and police department on additional signage and enforcement.

- Again.

- Oh, motion made by Alder Wery, seconded by Alder Gerlach. Any further discussion? Okay all in favor.

- [Committee members] Aye. Paused. All right, that passes unanimously.

- [Faith] Okay thank you very much. This might be another one that I got done after two years working on something thank you.

- It's the way it goes sometimes.

- [Faith] Yes, thank you very much.

- James mute on. Yeah Okay. I believe it's items three, consideration of possible action on the staff summary of the research and cost estimates for the necessary flood way studies to reopen the East River Trails within the city limits on both sides of the East River or spec.

- So Alderman Galvin originally brought this request forward. We talked about it, I think two park committees ago. Alderman Galvin is not here at this meeting, so I'll leave it up to you. If you'd like to have the discussion at a future park committee and we can do it, bring it to a committee that he can attend or I can present it now, and we can see where the conversation goes. I'll leave it up to you. I did not discuss this with Alder Galvin in advance so.

- Alder Burnett?

- I'll make a motion to hold until our next parks meeting.

- The motion to Alder Brunette, the holes think of Alder Wery. And I think we need to charge Alder Galvin for this. All in favor?

- [Committee members] Aye.

- Paused, okay. That passes unanimously. And two item four; consideration as possible action on hiring Mick Mahan for 19,800 to complete stormwater management engineering for parking lot expansion at the Wildlife Sanctuary Nature Centers staff.

- So in 2019, the friends of the Wildlife Sanctuary fundraised over \$3 million for an expansion, to the nature center at the Wildlife Sanctuary. So the law, as you know, the lower level, how's new classrooms for the 4K program and the upper level is a large rental space with a caterer's kitchen. So the rental space can accommodate 200 people, but due to COVID-19, we have not been able to open that facility yet to the public because of concerns with a large public gathering. But when it does open, we are gonna have a large parking problem at the nature center. So right now there's about 80 parking stalls that are there, which accommodates us for the most part, the old nature center. Now, if you ever have the old nature center opened the same time as the rental space, we are gonna have a large parking lot problem there, and people are gonna have to walk quite a distance or park illegally on other sanctuary properties-

- And ease short circle.

- So we are gonna have to expand that parking lot size. So we'll need to double or triple the size of that parking lot to adequately provide the number of stalls that we're gonna need. So last year the city did bond 400,000 to begin this project. So one of the first steps to start the engineering is to hire a consultant to design the stormwater management associated with the project. So we did issue a request for proposals to five engineering firms. Of the five, three companies provided a quote for this work. The low quote was from Riechert Milky for \$19,550. Unfortunately, their company did make a few exceptions to the required scope of work listed in the RFP. So they did not include the following in their quote. So, we asked for all companies to dig test pits, provide geo-technical reports and to do the associated permitting allowing us to construct the project. Other items in their scope of work too, but those three items, the low bidder omitted from their proposal. So staff is actually proposing to hire McMahon for a little bit more for 19,800, so, there are \$350 more expensive, they didn't make any exceptions to the required scope of work, and in our opinion, what was missing in the low quote is valued at more than \$350. We have worked with McGran in the past, and we have no issues and concerns working. You approve hiring McMahon for \$19,800 to complete the engineering.

- Move to approve. Is there a second?

- Second, sorry. My battery was almost dead I had to plug in.

- Just put your finger in a socket Alder Wery.

- Almost dead, blew my head off.

- Yeah motion by Alder Burnett, seconded by Alder Wery any further discussion? Alder Gerlach?

- I just have a question, the same question I always ask of the rest of the committee. Where's this money coming from and are you okay with it?

- Yeah, so this money would come out of the 400,000 that we pick last year.

- Okay, so it's okay?

- Yeah, the money is there through bonding in 2020.

- Okay thank you.

- Okay, so we have a motion and a second. All in favor?

- [Committee members] Aye.

- Paused, okay. That passes unanimously, and we're on to item number five. Well, I'm sorry, six yeah no five. Six there is no six. Need my spectacles. Consideration with possible action on the appeal of allocating \$72,910, from the existing beach funding for an amendment to the scope of work for Patrick Engineering to complete the engineering associated with the beach pier and boardwalk project at Bay Beach Amusement Park staff.

- So a few months we discussed revising the phasing plan and refinancing plan for the beach project at Bay Beach Amusement Park. Modifications to that plan included reducing the length of the pier in order to stay within a \$2.1 million construction budget for the pier. And it also entailed modifying the engineering documents to accommodate a two phase construction plans instead of a single phase in production project. So both of those changes will require additional engineering fees in order to complete the associated engineering. So for the pier modifications, the consultant is required to redo all of the structural calculations for the entire pier. They've already done those calculations for the longer pier, they have to redo them for the shorter pier. So although it seems like a very simple easy fix, they do have to run all their numbers again, just to make sure that the short and pier is engineered properly. In addition, the consultant will incur additional costs to split the projects into two phases. So they have to create two bid documents instead of a single bid document package. So this an additional engineering is needed to ensure that what's built in phase one, accommodate easily to phase two construction without having to rebuild portions of phase one. So because you're phasing it, you have to really put a lot of thought in how the two projects correspond and how you end the first project fits well with how you begin the next project. So there is additional engineering. In conjunction with that additional meetings will be required to work through the changes, and they're also gonna have to work with the DNR on modifying them. So, in our original phasing plan, we did put an estimate of \$30,000 for this, additional engineering fees, for the pier modifications. Unfortunately, we really didn't consider that are at the additional fees for the phasing plan modifications that would need to be done. So after we approved the phasing plan, we did work with the consultant that's already hired to do the work and ask them for a revised fee schedule, and they came out with 72,910. We did review this with public works engineering staff and the assistant director there. And all of us feel that the engineering associated with the fee is acceptable in our opinion. So the engineering was just much more involved than what we thought it was going to be

when we brought the original phasing plan together. So there is enough money in the phasing plan through the \$5 million that was bonded initially, to cover the costs for this, so I would recommend we approve allocating the \$72,910 from the existing beach funding for an amendment to the scope of work.

- Alder Brunette.

- Thank you, Chairman, Director Ditscheit just refresh my memory. You might've mentioned this just a few minutes ago. What was the budgeted costs that you anticipated?

- Originally it was \$30,000, but that was just for the pier engineering. We didn't take into account the additional engineering for restructuring the plan documents to change it from one phase to two phases.

- Wait, how does it happen? I mean, I don't mean this to sound in a disrespectful way to you, but how does that happen?

- That was an error on my part when I put the phasing plan together.

- Okay, thank you. We'll read any more into that question I just-

- Nope that's fine, it's a fair question.

- That's it?

- Sarah, is there a second... is there a motion in? If that would be a motion.

- I'll make a motion to approve.

- I'll second it.

- Motion by Alder Brunette second hit by Alder Gerlach. Any further discussion? All in favor.

- [Committee members] Aye.

- Paused. As unanimously, then we are on to the informational part of our agenda, director's report and updates, parks recreation, and Forestry Department. We have that a wonderfully comprehensive document. I don't know if there's anything that Director cares to add, or if anybody has any comments or questions?

- I would just like to point out two things. Well yesterday's election, several wards voted at the new rental space at the sanctuary and also at the main pavilion at Bay Beach Amusement Park. And it really went off without a hitch. So it went well. We really didn't receive any complaints and things ran very smoothly at both locations. So I just wanted y'all to be aware of that. And then secondly, I do wanna point out that this year, if we haven't previously mentioned it, we're mentioning it now. This is the 100th year anniversary years of the Green Bay Parks Department. So we're very proud of that. We had initially planned on doing a lot of different events throughout the years to celebrate that occasion, but with COVID-19, it really has been pretty quiet in the Parks Department. So, but one thing we are doing is we did plant 100 trees at Dan's Park to symbolize the 100 year anniversary of

our department. So we did it in a very artistic manner, in a circular pattern, and then we have a walkway that cuts through the middle of the grove of trees. And then there's a gathering space right in the middle, and we're planning on putting some artistic benches. So you know that was funded through the RDA. They gave us money to implement this project. It's under construction right now, it's almost done, and tomorrow there is a ribbon cutting ceremony at noon, to commemorate this new amenity on our parks. So I just wanted to let you or make you aware of that ribbon cutting tomorrow. Other than that, that's all I have to add to what's already in the report.

- [Faith] Mr. Chairman.

- Yes, Oliver Faith.

- Can I ask Director Ditscheit, under your design and development division here, you got Bay Beach Amusement Park, shoreline improvements. Does this have anything to do with the dike itself?

- No the shoreline improvements is in regards to the beach and pier project. It's not about the shoreline improvement. That project is all funded and run through public works not parks.

- [Faith] Yeah, so are you looking at anything to improve the dike? Seriously, I brought this up several times. I don't know if it's because it has a filter so that you're not very high going out there. If you come to my property, I'm three hours over.

- That's not parks is it? That's PPW isn't it?

- I think she's referring to our beach project.

- Okay, I'm sorry. Go ahead, I'm sorry.

- [Faith] Yeah, but the dike itself, which protects the beach is gonna... I think you really need to look at that because there's a difference in height. There's not a lot of heights there, and these storms are getting worse and as the water's coming up more, more and more every year, it seems like it's going up. That's something that I think you better look at and have engineers or somebody look at your portion of the dike. Nothing's been done to that dike in years, in years. And there's a lot of damage, rocks moved, different things. So I really think this is important for protecting Bay Beach.

- Okay, thank you Oliver Faith.

- [Faith] Alright that's all I got.

- Alder Gerlach.

- I just wanna tell the director that I have... I went to Danz Park, I looked at the tree planting, it's just really lovely. And because I'm on the Public Arts Commission, because all the scandal isn't, I saw the design for the benches, I'm really excited about it, and I just also want to tell you, I was in Preble Park today and the Forestry Department was just doing an efficient and wonderful job of trimming those great big trees, and before I turned around, they were all done and they were gone, good job.

- Thank you I'll pass that onto the Forestry Department.

- Thank you.
- Wouldn't wanna leave them out of this. Director, it seems to me that eventually someday we'll get out of COVID, whether it be a year or two down the road and all. It might be 102, is there still plans? I think we should still celebrate 100 years. It's 102, but we feel like 100 something, whatever. I hope all those plans that were... came up with to celebrate, we don't shell those. We just hang on to them for a year or two.
- That's a really good idea. So we'll keep that in mind next year and hopefully it will be gone then.
- Any other comments, questions from anyone? Alder Burnette. You're breaking up Alder
- Oh, a motion that is in place on file.
- Okay a motion is here place on file by Alder Brunette.
- Second.
- Second by Alder Wery. All in favor?
- [Committee members] Aye.
- Aye, paused, case received in place on file.
- Alder James.
- Well I'm waiting for James to give me a thumbs up here. Okay our next park meeting is scheduled November 18th, 2020. Motion to adjourn by Alder Brunette.
- Conclude under discussion. 7:40 next meeting. 7:40, We'll give a 10 minutes that'll allow everybody to switch over and there's somebody who's trying to log in for that meeting. They keep messaging me why they can't log in so, it's cause we're going on. So I'll talk to you.
- Isn't it 6:40?
- Its 6:40.
- Still I at seven My little city computer here says 7:30. Wow that really went well.
- 6:40.
- Okay so we'll meet, I guess in about 10 minutes. Motion to turn on Alder Brunette that was seconded by Alder Wery. Yes okay all in favor?
- [Committee members] Aye.
- Paused. Then really thank you Director. Thank you, James, everyone good job. See you in a few.