



MINUTES OF THE TRAFFIC, BICYCLE, & PEDESTRIAN COMMISSION

MONDAY, APRIL 19, 2021, 5:30 PM
Virtual Meeting. Public may view 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.

I. *Members:* Chairperson Matt Kuepers, Vice Chairperson Daniel Theno, Ald. Craig Stevens, Lieutenant Mike Sobieck, Brighid Riordan, and 2 vacancies.

Present and Voting: Craig Stevens, Mike Sobieck, Daniel Theno

Present and Not Voting: Matt Kuepers

Excused: Brighid Riordan

Absent: None

C. APPROVAL OF THE AGENDA.

I. Approval of the Monday, April 19, 2021 Traffic, Bicycle, and Pedestrian Commission meeting agenda.

Moved by Commissioner Daniel Theno, seconded by Ald. Craig Stevens, to approve the agenda of the Monday, April 19, 2021 Traffic, Bicycle, and Pedestrian Commission meeting.

Yes- Craig Stevens, Daniel Theno, Mike Sobieck

No- None, Abstain- None

Motion carried.

D. APPROVAL OF MINUTES.

I. Approval of the Monday, March 15, 2021 Traffic, Bicycle, and Pedestrian Commission meeting minutes.

Moved by Commissioner Daniel Theno, seconded by Ald. Craig Stevens, to approve the minutes of the Monday, March 15, 2021 Traffic, Bicycle, and Pedestrian Commission meeting.

Yes- Craig Stevens, Daniel Theno, Mike Sobieck

No- None, Abstain- None

Motion carried.

E. REGULAR BUSINESS.

1. *General Business*: Report by the Police Department of the 2021 1st quarter serious injury and fatal crashes. (All Alders)

Moved by Ald. Craig Stevens, seconded by Commissioner Daniel Theno, to receive and place on file the report by the Police Department of the 2021 1st quarter serious injury and fatal crashes.

Yes- Craig Stevens, Daniel Theno, Mike Sobieck

No- None, Abstain- None

Motion carried.

2. *Initial Request*: Consideration with possible action on the request by Gandrud Auto Group to remove the NO PARKING zones on Auto Plaza Drive. (Ald. Gerlach – District 3)

Moved by Commissioner Daniel Theno, seconded by Ald. Craig Stevens, that, on a 90-day trial, to:

A. Remove the NO PARKING zone on the east side of Auto Plaza Drive, from Auto Plaza Way to a point 140 feet south of Auto Plaza Way.

B. Remove the NO PARKING zone on the east side of Auto Plaza Drive, from a point 215 feet south of Auto Plaza Way to a point 303 feet south of Auto Plaza Way.

C. Remove the NO PARKING zone on the east side of Auto Plaza Drive, from a point 483 feet south of Auto Plaza Way to a point 584 feet south of Auto Plaza Way.

D. Remove the NO PARKING zone on the west side of Auto Plaza Drive, from a point 200 feet south of Auto Plaza Way to a point 275 feet south of Auto Plaza Way.

E. Remove the NO PARKING zone on the west side of Auto Plaza Drive, from a point 440 feet south of Auto Plaza Way to a point 515 feet south of Auto Plaza Way.

Yes- Craig Stevens, Daniel Theno, Mike Sobieck

No- None, Abstain- None

Motion carried.

3. *Initial Request:* Consideration with possible action on the request by Ald. Lefebvre to install a Rectangular Rapid Flashing Beacon (RRFB) pedestrian crossing system on East Shore Drive at the crosswalk connecting Bay Beach Park and the Wildlife Sanctuary (Reference – RRFBs on South Webster Avenue at the hospitals). (Ald. Lefebvre – District 6)

Moved by Commissioner Daniel Theno, seconded by Ald. Craig Stevens, to refer to staff for study the request by Ald. Lefebvre to install a Rectangular Rapid Flashing Beacon (RRFB) pedestrian crossing system on East Shore Drive at the crosswalk connecting Bay Beach Park and the Wildlife Sanctuary (Reference – RRFBs on South Webster Avenue at the hospitals).

Yes- Craig Stevens, Daniel Theno, Mike Sobieck

No- None, Abstain- None

Motion carried.

4. *Initial Request:* Consideration with possible action on the request by the Traffic Engineer to establish parking zones in the Rail Yard District. (Ald. Scannell - District 7)

Moved by Ald. Craig Stevens, seconded by Lieutenant Mike Sobieck, that, on a 90-day trial:

A. Remove the NO PARKING zone on the east side of Donald Driver Way from a point 290 feet north of Dousman Street to its north terminus.

B. Remove the NO PARKING zone on the west side of Donald Driver Way from a point 310 feet north of Dousman Street to its north terminus.

C. Establish a NO PARKING zone on both sides of Kellogg Street from Broadway to Donald Driver Way.

D. Establish a NO PARKING zone on the east side of Donald Driver Way from a point 290 feet north of Dousman Street to a point 285 feet north of Kellogg Street.

E. Establish a NO PARKING zone on the west side of Donald Driver Way from a point 310 feet north of Dousman Street to a point 285 feet north of Kellogg Street.

F. Establish a NO PARKING zone on both sides of Donald Driver Way from a point 370 feet south of Bond Street to Bond Street.

G. Establish a NO PARKING zone on both sides of Bond Street from a point 70 feet west of Donald Driver Way to Donald Driver Way.

H. Establish a NO PARKING zone on both sides of Bond Street from Broadway to a point 70 feet east of Broadway.

I. Establish a NO PARKING 30-MINUTE LOADING zone on the north side of Bond Street from a point 70 feet west of Donald Driver Way to a point 140 feet west of Donald Driver Way.

J. Establish a 2-HOUR PARKING 7 AM TO 7 PM MONDAY THROUGH FRIDAY zone on the north side of Bond Street from a point 70 feet east of Broadway to a point 350 feet east of Broadway.

K. Establish a 2-HOUR PARKING 7 AM TO 7 PM MONDAY THROUGH FRIDAY zone on the south side of Bond Street from a point 70 feet east of Broadway to a point 420 feet east of Broadway.

L. Establish a 2-HOUR PARKING 7 AM TO 7 PM MONDAY THROUGH FRIDAY zone on both sides of Donald Driver Way from a point 285 feet north of Kellogg Street to a point 440 feet north of Kellogg Street.

M. Without a 90-day trial, remove the I-WAY STOP condition on Bond Street at Broadway.

N. Without a 90-day trial, establish a 2-WAY STOP condition on Bond Street at Broadway, and adopt by ordinance.

O. Without a 90-day trial, establish a I-WAY STOP condition on Kellogg Street at Donald Driver Way, and adopt by ordinance.

Yes- Craig Stevens, Daniel Theno, Mike Sobieck

No- None, Abstain- None

Motion carried.

5. *Initial Request:* Consideration with possible action on the report by the Police Department and Traffic Engineer of the 2020-2021 adult crossing guard locations. (All Alders)

Moved by Lieutenant Mike Sobieck, seconded by Ald. Craig Stevens, to receive and place on file the report by the Police Department and Traffic Engineer of the 2020-2021 adult crossing guard locations.

Yes- Craig Stevens, Daniel Theno, Mike Sobieck

No- None, Abstain- None

Motion carried.

Comment by Commissioner Daniel Theno supporting the motion to receive and place on file the report by the Police Department and Traffic Engineer of the 2020-2021 adult crossing guard locations.

6. *Referred Back from Staff*: Consideration with possible action on the request by Ald. Scannell to move the truck route from North Broadway to McDonald Street between Mather and Alexander Streets. (Ald. Scannell – District 7)

Moved by Ald. Craig Stevens, seconded by Commissioner Daniel Theno, to open the floor for discussion.

Yes- Craig Stevens, Daniel Theno, Mike Sobieck

No- None, Abstain- None

Motion carried.

Floor open with three gallery speakers: Edd Tadulan (137 James St.); Todd Christian (305 Amy St.); Cole Runge, Brown County Planning Director (305 E Walnut St.).

Moved by Ald. Craig Stevens, seconded by Commissioner Daniel Theno, to close the floor.

Yes- Craig Stevens, Daniel Theno, Mike Sobieck

No- None, Abstain- None

Motion carried.

Floor closed.

Moved by Commissioner Daniel Theno, seconded by Lieutenant Mike Sobieck, to accept staff recommendation to deny the request by Ald. Scannell to move the truck route from North Broadway to McDonald Street between Mather and Alexander Streets.

Yes- Craig Stevens, Daniel Theno, Mike Sobieck

No- None, Abstain- None

Motion carried.

7. *Termination of 90-Day Trial*: Remove the NO PARKING zone on the west side of 12th Avenue from Clinton Street to a point 110 feet south of Mason Street.

Moved by Ald. Craig Stevens, seconded by Commissioner Daniel Theno, to remove the NO PARKING zone on the west side of 12th Avenue from Clinton Street to a point 110 feet south of Mason Street.

Yes- Craig Stevens, Daniel Theno, Mike Sobieck

No- None, Abstain- None

Motion carried.

8. *Termination of 90-Day Trial*: Establish a NO PARKING zone on the west side of 12th Avenue from 3rd Street to Clinton Street.

Moved by Ald. Craig Stevens, seconded by Commissioner Daniel Theno, to establish and adopt by ordinance a NO PARKING zone on the west side of 12th Avenue from 3rd Street to Clinton Street.

Yes- Craig Stevens, Daniel Theno, Mike Sobieck

No- None, Abstain- None

Motion carried.

9. *Termination of 90-Day Trial*: Remove the 2-HOUR 7 AM TO 7 PM MONDAY THROUGH FRIDAY parking zone on the east side of Broadway from a point 430 feet south of Third Street to a point 90 feet south of Third Street.

Moved by Ald. Craig Stevens, seconded by Commissioner Daniel Theno, to remove the 2-HOUR 7 AM TO 7 PM MONDAY THROUGH FRIDAY parking zone on the east side of Broadway from a point 430 feet south of Third Street to a point 90 feet south of Third Street.

Yes- Craig Stevens, Daniel Theno, Mike Sobieck

No- None, Abstain- None

Motion carried.

10. *Termination of 90-Day Trial*: Remove the 2-HOUR 7 AM TO 7 PM MONDAY THROUGH FRIDAY parking zone on the east side of Broadway from Third Street to a point 60 feet south of Clinton Street.

Moved by Ald. Craig Stevens, seconded by Commissioner Daniel Theno, to remove the 2-HOUR 7 AM TO 7 PM MONDAY THROUGH FRIDAY parking zone on the east side of Broadway from Third Street to a point 60 feet south of Clinton Street.

Yes- Craig Stevens, Daniel Theno, Mike Sobieck

No- None, Abstain- None

Motion carried.

II. Termination of 90-Day Trial: Establish a 2-HOUR 7 AM TO 7 PM MONDAY THROUGH FRIDAY parking zone on the east side of Broadway from Mason Street to a point 60 feet south of Clinton Street.

Moved by Ald. Craig Stevens, seconded by Commissioner Daniel Theno, to establish and adopt by ordinance a 2-HOUR 7 AM TO 7 PM MONDAY THROUGH FRIDAY parking zone on the east side of Broadway from Mason Street to a point 60 feet south of Clinton Street.

Yes- Craig Stevens, Daniel Theno, Mike Sobieck

No- None, Abstain- None

Motion carried.

F. INFORMATIONAL.

I. Next meeting: Monday, May 17, 2021.

G. PUBLIC HEARINGS.

H. ADJOURNMENT.

I. Adjournment of the current Traffic, Bicycle, and Pedestrian Commission meeting.

Moved by Commissioner Daniel Theno, seconded by Ald. Craig Stevens to adjourn the current Traffic, Bicycle, and Pedestrian Commission meeting.

Yes- Craig Stevens, Daniel Theno, Mike Sobieck

No- None, Abstain- None

Motion carried.

Meeting adjourned.

VERBATIM MINUTES.

- Over the meeting of the Green Bay Traffic, Bicycle, and Pedestrian Commission for Monday, April 19th, 2021. We'll start with Item B, roll call of members. Chairperson Kuepers, here. Vice Chairperson Theno?

- Here.

- Alderman Stevens?

- Here.

- Lieutenant Sobieck?

- Here.

- Commissioner Riordan? Brigid, are you aboard yet? Must not be here yet. Let's go ahead and start the meeting. Move down to Item C, Approval of the Agenda for Monday, April 19th, 2021. Traffic, Bicycle, Pedestrian Commission Meeting Agenda. I think we'll just keep it in order. I don't have any requests to move things around, so we'll just keep in the order that we have right now.

- Mr. Chairman, I would move C and D Agenda in the minutes.

- D, is that what you--

- C and D.

- Okay, all right.

- Okay.

- Motion has been made to move Items C and D. Do I hear a second?

- Aye.

- Aye.

- Aye.

- We move down to item E, number one, General Business. Report by the police department of the 2021 first quarter, serious injuries and fatal crashes. Dan, I'll turn it over to you.

- Yeah, it's good to announce that the first quarter of 2021, we had no fatal accidents or severe injury accidents within the speed limits of Green Bay. And I believe that's county-wide, they didn't have any fatalities for the first quarter. And going back in stats, I don't think there's a recent year where they went a quarter of a year without a fatality. So hopefully that holds true and we can go this year with fewer fatalities than we've seen before.

- Very nice, that's a great report. We'd like that then throughout the city and the County. So, thank you for your reports.

- I'll make a motion to receive and play some file.

- Okay, and do I hear a second?

- Second.

- All in favor?

- Second.

- Motion carries. Number two, initial requests consideration was possible action request by Gandrud Auto Group through the no parking zones on Auto Plaza Drive.

- Yes, excuse me. Yeah, there's a series of no parking signs on the roadway. In essence, they're there around a number of driveways. And it was our understanding that those were there to keep those driveways open for when vehicles were coming in and out, especially, you know, the larger trucks when they're loading/unloading larger vehicles. I did have an extended conversation with the requester and they had stated that, at the time, there were actually two different auto groups across the street. And I think they kind of had a little falling out. And I think some of it had to do with that as well. So, you know, the need for the signs is certainly going away. And, you know, it's our understanding as well that the loading/unloading of vehicles from those vehicle carriers are actually, it's all taking place in the curb lanes anyway of the roadway, which is acceptable by staff. So, for that staff really has no issues with the request. So I have a five-part recommendation that on a 90-day trial to remove no parking zones on Auto Plaza Drive at the following locations. east side from Auto Plaza Way from a point 140 feet, south of Auto Plaza Way, east side from a point 215 feet south of Auto Plaza Way to a point three. And three Auto Plaza Way, east side from south of Auto Plaza Way to a point 584 feet south of Auto Plaza Way. west side from a point 200 feet south Auto Plaza way to a point 275 feet, south of Auto Plaza, west side from a point 440 feet south of Auto Plaza Way to a point 515 feet south of Auto Plaza Way.

- So move?

- I'll second that.

- Motions are made and seconded, all in favor?

- [All] Aye.

- Motion carries. Number one, item three, initial requests consideration with possible action and request for Alder Lefebvre to install a Rectangular Rapid-Flashing Beacon pedestrian crossing system on East Shore Drive at the crosswalk connecting Bay Beach and Wildlife Sanctuary.

- Do you like me to go first?

- Yeah, or do you wanna go first, Alder Lefebvre or?

- I guess it doesn't matter in a way. Maybe I can explain a little bit. I've had different. I'm sorry, I've had different conversations with Dave and trying to figure out something. You remember, was it last year or the year before that the motorcycle accident that happened there, it was really bad. And if he hit a car that was pulling off on the motorcycle and he crashed, but what if there're pedestrians were crossing at that time? You know, there are a lot of, from the Bay Beach, the sidewalk that comes over to East Shore Drive and you cross over into the Wildlife Sanctuary. There's in summer, when the parks open and you know, we're coming up May 1st, it's gonna open up again. So I'm really concerned. I'm surprised some. I've seen some people are paying attention and they've actually stopped and let people cross, but that doesn't happen a lot. And we have a lot of speeding going on out here. I just think all the other things that I brought up with Dave, he said just won't work but I would like something. And this only operates when there are people crossing. It's not like something that you have flashing or it's, you know, constantly. So Dave can come up more on that issue, thank you.

- Okay, thank you, Alder Lefebvre.

- Thank you Alder, the crosswalk itself, it does exist. And it connects the Wildlife Sanctuary to Bay Beach Amusement Park. It is a ladder-style crosswalk. That means a high risk crosswalk. Similar to what you, everyone probably recalls as the "Abbey Road" record from the Beatles. It looks similar to that. Signed with pedestrian warning signs and a down arrow. And for RRFBs, that is a Rectangular Rapid-Flashing Beacon. It is a warning style device that is actuated when a pedestrian pushes the button on either side of the crosswalk and that initiates the flashing operation in a wig wake style pattern on each side of the roadway. So it's a quite popular device when it comes down to compliance. However, these are not to just be installed, and there definitely needs to be some sort of a demonstrated issue. Complaint reports, crash history typically associated with a high volume of pedestrians crossing and ultimately a lack of motorist compliance to crosswalk laws that enforcement and the police department have not been able to correct. So with that said, and because there is a cost associated to it, making a recommendation for this request to be referred to staff for study for the feasibility of the RRFB at this location.

- Oh, sorry.

- Go ahead, go ahead, Alder.

- No, I think that'd be good. Yeah, have staff study. little bit about it's by solar. I know on the north side it should be okay. And I think on the other side might be up closer to the road. I think you might be okay with

the solar, that has to be checked too. But yeah, like I said, there are people who do not, people wanna cross now. And there's a curve when they're coming from the east side going to the west, there's a curve kind of. And it's 25 and there's nobody, nobody does 25. And when they're traveling from the west to the east, so many people are driving along the curb. It's not marked as two lanes and people drive there all the time. And there's so much speeding. I live right across the street from it, so I see it all the time, the speeding and that and I'm just, I don't wanna wait till a kid gets hit. So, thank you.

- Okay, thanks Alder. Go ahead, do I hear a motion to refer this item to staff?

- Don't move, Mr. Chairman.

- I'll second.

- Motion made for all in favor.

- Aye.

- Aye.

- Motion carries for initial request. Consideration was possible actual request placed by the traffic engineer to establish parking zones in the Rail Yard District.

- Thank you, Chair. As many of you know that the Rail Yard District is now open. There are a handful of developments currently along its roadways and the roads have been recently, relatively recently dedicated back to the city of Green Bay. Meaning that they're open to the public and the parking and traffic regulations now come back to the city. That being said, I am requesting some restricted parking zones and update the traffic regulation, and set some of the intersections along with it in order to preserve traffic safety and allow deliveries, move outs and similar to what we have in our downtown area. So this is a pretty long list of items. I guess, technically for the record, I should probably read them in. If everyone wants them approved I do have a graphic that shows an overview of the Rail Yard development. And it's color coded where these parking zones that I'm proposing would exist. So would that be okay if I share my screen, Chair?

- Yes, please.

- Okay. Is that something that you need to do? I'm just clicking on a few things here and I'm not . Oh, here it is, sorry. Here we go. It's getting on a second here. So this is the overview map of Rail Yard. The north arrow points to the right. So, you'll see Broadway listed here as US Highway 141. And this roadway here I'm showing is Kellogg Street which runs east and west. T is in that Donald Driver Way, which is the north-south roadway. And then we, in essence kind of have an elbow turn here where it turns into Bond Street. So what you see in red is what is being proposed as no parking. And I guess when you look at it upon first glance, it looks like quite a bit. And the reason being is that a lot of the roadways were designed and constructed to be narrow. And the intention was at that time and ultimately was to create a more pedestrian friendly environment, which as you can tell with the number of crosswalks that you can see throughout the Rail Yard District. So say let's take for example, Kellogg Street, the entire segment would be no parking on the side of the street on both sides and similarly for right? The area that's green there is actually gonna be, is being proposed as two-hour parking 7:00 a.m to 7:00 p.m, Monday to Friday. There's a few stalls in there, but we still wanna keep some opening, some visibility for the pedestrian crosswalks, and these are mid-block crosswalks. So, you know, we wanna make sure that there's plenty of visibility for the motorist to see pending and crossing. Bond Street, you'll see it is slightly wider in this area. And then on the north side, which actually we already have some developments on apartments over here, and we're actually proposing a loading zone in this area. And again, I made reference to downtown and how we handle a lot of parking and loading and unloading, next to some of the, I'll call them mid rise or high rise apartment complex. Which exists right now, on the north side of this location. So, what we're trying to do is just get ahead of the curve before that really gets populated and potentially full, is to get that in and regulate that. And plus there's deliveries there currently, anyway. So, you know, with the loading zone, I think that'll work out quite well. So, that in essence is what I'm proposing. I guess I'll get down to them with the Intersection Control that I've done with the parking. We'll start with this T-intersection with Donald Driver and Kellogg. This is being proposed as a one-way stop. So Kellogg teasing to Donald Driver and then Donald Driver would have the free flow movement. And then the two intersections, Bond Street here and Kellogg Street here with Broadway, currently now in our regulations book, because, both of these roadways teed in from the west, they were listed as one-way stops. We wanna convert those to two-way stops now, since we have now east lanes to those intersections. So, I guess before I go ahead and read my recommendations, does anyone have any questions on this?

- I only have one question, Mr. Chairman. Dave, considering the adjacent businesses there. Do you feel that there's adequate parking, that this would not interfere with the operation of those businesses?

- Not only do I not think it's gonna interfere with the business operations, but I was involved pretty much on the ground level when it came down to Rail Yard. What the proposed developments were, its traffic impacts, et cetera. And I can tell you, it's not shown on this diagram but I can tell you that there is a lot of parking that came along with this development. There's really a lot of it. Like you'll see some of these buildings here, but there is . And even over here town, you know, this is all still parking available. There's gonna be parking here. And as a matter of fact, that's why you have this mid-block over here, is that, you know, there are some, we wanna have some consideration for these people that we're gonna be crossing over to go to these various businesses and development. So, to answer your question, vice chair, I do believe that as proposed with the restrictions, I think there's still gonna be ample parking.

- Right, thank you.

- Right, do you wanna read in what you got there, Dave, for the record?

- Yes, yes. So, on a 90-day trial, we need to remove, we need to start off the clean slate, first. So there's some existing parking zones that are just north of Dousman and south of Kellogg Street. 'Cause basically that street just dead ended at one time. So we need to remove those parking zones. So on the east side of Donald Driver Way from a point 290 feet north of Dousman Street to its north terminus, and on the west side of Donald Driver Way from a point 0.3 to 10 feet north of Dousman Street to its north terminus, or we should really say it's former northern terminus. And then at a 90-day trial, we need to establish following. Both sides of Kellogg Street, from Broadway to Donald Driver Way. And the east side of Donald Driver Way from a point 208, excuse me, 290 feet north of Dousman Street to a point 285 feet north of Kellogg Street. And the west side of Donald Driver Way from a point 310 feet north of Dousman Street to a point 285 feet north of Kellogg Street. On both sides of Donald Driver Way from a point 370 feet southbound Street to Bond Street. And on both sides of Bond Street, from a point seven feet west of Donald Driver Way to Donald Driver Way. On both sides of Bond Street, from Broadway to a point 70 feet east of Broadway. And now we're gonna move on to the 30-minute loading. So the 90-day trial, establish no parking 30-minute loading zone on the north side of Bond Street, from a point 70 feet west of Donald Driver Way, to a point 140 feet west of Donald Driver Way. And two-hour parking in a 90-day trial, establish the two-hour parking 7:00 a.m to 7:00 p.m, Monday through Friday zones. On the north side of Bond Street from a point 70 feet, east of Broadway to a point 350 feet east of Broadway on the south side of Bond Street from a point 70 feet, east of Broadway, to a point 420 feet east of Broadway on both sides of the Donald Driver Way from a point 285 feet north Kellogg Street to a point 440 feet north of Kellogg Street. And the intersection control items. So, I'm not recommending these on a 90-day trial simply because, A, they've been in and B, I don't really think that there's a need to change anything at this point in time. I mean, you know, what would we be doing? You know, trying to go to a multi-way stop but to say at the T intersection, which the Rail Yard District really sees little to no traffic now, the way it is. So I can just tell you from experience, you know, when we come close to meeting the multi-way or done it. So that being said, the following items are not recommended, not recommended for a 90-day trial but rather to be adopted right away by ordinance. So first one is remove the one-way stop on Bond Street at Broadway and adapt by ordinance. So I want to establish a two-way stop condition at Bond Street and at Broadway ended up by. establish a one-way stop condition on Kellogg Street and Donald Driver Way. That concludes my recommendations.

- That was a lot.

- You've wind it.

- I'll make a motion to approve as outlined.

- Okay, motion?

- I second.

- All in favor?

- [All] Aye.

- Motion carries. Thank goodness, Dave, huh? Five, initial request, incineration of possible action report by the police department and the traffic engineer 2020/2021 the adult crossing guard locations.

- Are you referring to me then right away, Chair?

- Pardon me?

- Are you referring to me then right away?

- Yes, yep.

- Okay. Just double checking to make sure that my screen is not being shared. I believe that it is not, correct?

- Correct.

- Okay. I guess what I'm gonna do is, I'm going to Melanie Skalmoski is on the meeting with us. I'll unmute this and, or I'm asking to unmute actually when secure. Melanie, I'm not sure if you wanna go first or if you want me to go first on this. We pretty much worked in conjunction on this item but I guess as a precursor here, the way that and I know that there's some, some newer commissioners too that may have not have been around when some of this activity has taken place, but just to kind of get everyone up to speed. There's two things. Number one, historically, the requests for additional crossing guards has gone through the formerly called the Traffic Commission, now called the Traffic Bike & Ped Commission for approval of additions, as well as, usually

taken in an annual report of just where these locations. And the other thing to be known is, back in 2017, there was an agreement that was drafted and authorized signed by the various agencies that split the duties of city-owned guards versus district-owned guards, then school district guards. Because what was happening, was the school district was requesting guards. They were not being approved as city issued guards. And therefore if they could see if there was some way that potentially they could staff particular intersections. So we did come to an agreement and to condense what the provisions of that agreement are, is that, those requests come in to DPW Traffic. We review that and make recommendations. And in essence, it's an agreement between the district and public works. Once we come to an agreement on those, then the Green Bay Police Department was training those teachers, basically who were staffing these intersections with trainees, teachers on how to properly cross students. So fast forward now to, I believe it was late 2020, when the Green Bay Police Department, because they managed the Crossing Guard program, they had seen some changes. There was a retirement of the crossing guard administrator. So there was some shifting of people there. And then there was a decision that they made to go out to see private parties that could manage and staff the program, which there's a company called Cross Safe. That was not only selected, but hired and approved. And currently that is what is in place today. And we do have Kevin Warych and Mel Skalmoski from the police department that could probably address any questions or clarify anything that I said or maybe correct anything if I mistakenly stated anything about the program. But that being said, Melanie and I worked quite close together on some locations. There were some changes to some schools. And because of that, were some requests for our staff to, in essence, kind of re-engineer, determine what activity is taking place at these intersections. And at some of these intersections we had completed our hazard index evaluation for crossing. This is a process, an engineering process that's been in place since actually 1964 and has been, was approved back then by council. And we continued on with it, 'cause it's been a time tested and true process. So that being said, I actually have a long list of the total intersections that are being staffed by the police departments across it, consultant or contractor. And I'm just gonna go through the ones, there's really, I believe it was five of them here. Ones that were initially requested to be evaluated. And then there's some other ones that stuck out to us as we reviewed the list, that really should not be staffed by a city guard. And I'll explain those reasons. So the first one that we have, and this one was one just upon review. This is not a requested one, but the school is Beaumont, which is an elementary school. And the intersection is gross in 9th, it's currently a two-way stop, staffed in the morning and the p.m. And this was a recommendation that's coming out of DPW. Since we understand that there is a historically little to no student crossings at that location. But another important factor happened over the last year at this location, is that DPW upgraded that crossing to a, RRFB, which as Kathy Alder, Kathy Lefebvre's her requests came up. So I had a little explanation on that. The reason we did that, is that we actually had a flashing location at that spot. It wasn't an RRFB, but it had, we call them blinkered signs. So the perimeter lit up, rather than having these big red bars. And in essence, the location we could not find replacement parts, 'cause the product was so old, so it was actually more cost-effective to upgrade it to an RRFB, so that's what we did. So because of the low student crossing activity, plus now that we even actually have in place in our RRFB, kind of by default, that would be my first recommendation. And just so you know, I'd rather just go through this list and if anyone has any questions, it may be easier just to address them after. Second one would be for Edison, probably we have, which is middle and high school students. The intersection of Mason, Alpine, which is signalized control. And there's a morning and an afternoon guard. And currently it sounds like there's a vacancy there. Now, this one, and I know Matt Kuepers, you actually may remember, 'cause I know you were actually a traffic commissioner at the time. There's two reasons I'm making this recommendation. Number one, is that the city made a decision a long time ago that we were not to be staffing middle and high school crossings. Which is why, if you look at the district program now, they actually have some that are middle or high school. And it was just because, you know, they requested it, we looked at it and said, well, we didn't think it was going to necessarily hurt, but it wasn't something that we were going to fund with city funds. The second reason, and again, this is going back a number of years, going back probably three transportation directors ago at Green Bay Area Public Schools. These locations, identified it, by them at one time as a hazardous crossing, simply because it really had no pedestrian crossing features. There was no crosswalks, things like that. A signal was there though. So what we did is we looked at this, evaluated it and made a to have sidewalk installed between, there's one block to the north of Mason, one block to the south, and it would connect them in to some other sidewalk networks. And then we made improvements to the signalized intersection, adding some push button, countdown timers, made it ADA compliant. It was a pretty

good job and those are now in place. So, you know, that in essence was our mitigated counter measure to a Green Bay Area Public School I brought forward and that was approved by traffic commissioner. And we went forward with that, probably I guess six to eight years ago, probably even more. That's the second location. Third is Eisenhower School Elementary, August at Lime Kiln, which is currently a two-way stop staff a.m and p.m. We went through and did a count at this location, both vehicles and students, which had little to no students crossing. Look like we had three during one period, I believe a zero on the other. So, hazard index rate, just for clarity it needs to calculate to 16 or greater. This one came up to 7.5 to nine. And the reason it varies, is different peaks that we look at. So we look at it twice during the, and once during the a.m, once during the p.m So that one had a index rating that was almost half of what the requirement was. Next, Fort Howard and that's elementary. Those were Maple, not that we're looking at getting rid of the guard there per se. But there's two of them that were staffed there and when I'm talking with Melanie, it sounds like, perhaps maybe two is not needed but could probably be handled with one. So, we're fine with that at public works. Franklin Middle. There is a mid-block crosswalk at Lore and Oneida, p.m only. And this one, again, going back to the discussion with Edison Preble. Again, this is a middle school. So, you know, based off of our policy, the city shouldn't be staffing those guards. And this one was actually approved early on as a district only staffing. So, not really sure what happened over the years, but sounds like one of our city crossing guards kind of ended up going over there for one of the two peaks, but based off of that. And I remember that that cross and I was there when they actually built it and worked with the school to get certain features on their campus in order to accommodate this mid-block cross and to make it a safe crossing. And they did so, and they did a good job at that. Howe Elementary, St. Paul Lutheran, and it looks like Chicago and Webster. There's two crossing guards. There's a question here on whether or not we really need two crossing guards. So that's more of a recommendation by PD WPD firm, at public works, in that reduction. Jackson School, Howe Family Elementary, Fisk & 9th, that's a signalized intersection, both a.m and p.m. When we did our study, again, for both peaks we encountered no students at all. Came up with a hazard index of 6.5, 6.8. So, because, first and foremost, if you got no students crossing I don't know what the need for a crossing there to be. So that in and of itself should warrant the removal. Fort Howard, Jefferson, Ashlyn and Mather, again, this is one where that was staffed for Jefferson and as many of you know, Jefferson Elementary no longer exists. There is a head start program that's at that location, but that's, you know, young students. So everyone's either bussed in or they're driven in by their. So we don't see any activity there. So that one is being recommended for removal. All right, I think I got just four more, so bear with me, please. Preble High School, Danz in Deckner, I believe there's two of them there. It's a one-way stop. And again, this is middle high school. Shouldn't be doing that. And this is also a location that upon review was another one that we made as recommendation for the school district to staff, but not city. So again, not really sure why this would be on the city's list. And actually that is the next one, which there was two of them for some reason there. So same reason. So there was no reason to have two guards there, for Sullivan Elementary, Deckner and main. This is one, a signalized intersection, two peaks, a.m and p.m. There were zero students that were crossing at this location. It does have a calculated hazard index of 10.2 to 10.7. Even with that zero in there, but there, again, there are no students crossing. And I know from my knowledge of maintaining that signal those are countdown site timers to enhance safety. And the last location is for Tank, Franklin. Again, we've got elementary and middle, which is a Mason 12th, it's a signal a.m, p.m peak. I have a hazard rating of 10.0 to 10.2. Again, shouldn't be staffing for that location. Now, Tank is written down here. So it sounds like there may have been some potentially some Tank Elementary students. Now, in our observations, this location, there were two, what appeared younger, people which were presumed students. However, they didn't go to school. And I hear they crossed the location and then they actually headed westbound on Mason Street. So, I don't know where they're going, but they weren't going to school. All this said, I guess if there's questions for me, I'll take them. I don't know if maybe it's a good time to maybe pass the torch to Melanie and then we have an overall discussion and that would be your decision, Chair.

- Yeah, why don't you have Melanie chair, what she's got the share day problem. Piggy back on your, what you stated.

- Thank you, Dave covered a lot of it. I am the person that is the city person for the crossing guard administrator when Ken Brodhagen retired. So, also on the call right now is Steven Sannes, who is the local supervisor for Cross Safe and then Commander Warych. So through this transition time, we've been taking a look at our Crossing Guard program, seeing how our program compares to others, seeing if we need to make changes. It kind of seemed like a good time to do that. So, the way we came up with some of these intersections were through cross counts that we had our officers do. If a Cross Safe crossing guard is not staffing a corner, we do use Green Bay PD officers or CSOs to have those corners covered. We can't leave corners uncovered. So, we kind of started with that. And then as well as Dave's historical knowledge was some conversations he's had in the past with the prior crossing guard administrator. So, he went over a lot of it and we'll probably continue to take a look at more intersections as we move forward in this, along with Cross Safe and have those cross counts kind of guide where we wanna go next. And then obviously bring DPW involved to do the traffic studies and kind of have them get their technical knowledge to see if they would recommend a removal or not. I don't know if I wanna, if Commander Warych, if he wanted to say anything?

- No, I just really wanna thank and show our appreciation to Dave Hansen for providing those numbers, those recommendations in those traffic studies. For the commission, I just want you to know that COVID has crippled the Crossing Guard Program since January 1st when Cross Safe took over. We have rebuilt the program and based on my evaluation, I don't know, or no one can at least tell me the last time that we've evaluated some of these inner sections, since got some excellent records as to what we've done in going forward. And, you know, God only knows how we got to the point where we are today. So, that being said, though, I hope the commission sees that the work and the diligence that we put into data behind these intersections and making the recommendations to the commission, to ensure that we're operating the Crossing Guard Program as efficiently, cost-effectively. Most importantly for the safety of all the children involved. So, please know that we have got, we're reevaluating the whole program from top down. Steve Sannes, who's the crossing guard administrator has been great to work with. And doing this, and we plan on, you know, once we have the decision tonight and then we go back and we look at other intersections, we may come back and forth in front of you to determine what the next steps are. I can tell you from the police department's perspective, you know, we do our best and ensure that these intersections are staffed, but we cannot maintain or sustain the number of intersections that are currently in place. You know, when the officers are coming to me asking me why I'm standing on an intersection for zero or one to two kids, you know, it's hard to answer that question. All that I can say is that that's the way we've always done it to evaluate this program from top down to ensure that we're doing the best job we can. So please please know, we're working hard. We're doing the best we can. And most importantly, making sure we're providing that safety for every child that goes to school.

- Thank you. Steve, did you wanna say anything?

- The only thing I'd like to comment on is that, the work that Melanie has done and officer Kevin and the whole police department has been very kind and very helpful with us. We are gonna continue having our guards doing the counts to the end of the year, because we feel that with COVID and the kids that are starting to come out to go to school again, our counts may change during that period of time. So we plan on continuing doing the counts and can produce reports at any point in time for you. Otherwise, we've really had a really great relationship with the police department.

- Right. Yeah, okay, thank you. I'm sure it's been a tough year with schools, kids not going to school and trying to figure out what's going on there. So a tough, tough situation. Dave, what are you looking for from the committee then? Do you want us to refer it to staff? What's your thoughts, your .

- Yeah, not to refer it to staff, simply because we've already conducted the studies, there's no reason to do that. Rather, at the beginning, typically there needs to be action if there are additions being made. Because that simply is, you know, it's a capital cost to the city. But seeing how we do not have any of that here, I'm simply looking for a receive and place on file this report. And just so that everyone's aware that, you know, unless we hear anything we plan on continuing moving forward the program with the removals as described today.

- Okay, any other comments from the commissioners?

- No, go ahead, I just--

- What was your motion, Dan?

- No, I think the Lieutenant was gonna effect.

- Let's make a motion. I make a motion to file the report and make those removals based on the report.

- Okay, motion made, do I hear a second?

- I'll second that

- I hope to make a comment, Mr. Chairman. This has been an enlightening conversation. I certainly think that the emotion is appropriate. I'm surprised that there's a number of unwarranted crossing areas in the city. Obviously, we're using up a lot of city financial and human resources for no avail. I guess the other thing I'm surprised at, is that, we are sending our police officers out to be crossing guards. That is not . And they have many, many other things to do. So this motion and the resulting action that the motion will facilitate is absolutely appropriate and the right thing to do for the City of Green Bay.

- Okay, thank you, any other comments? Dan, I heard a first and a second? So, all in favor of the motion?

- [All] Aye.

- Okay, motion carries. Thank you all for your work and effort and behalf of the crosswalk program, thank you.

- You're welcome.

- Let's move 'em on to item six then, which was referred back to staff consideration of possible action requests by Alder Scannell to remove the truck route from North Broadway to McDonald Street, between Mather and Alexander streets. Dave, will throw it back to you with how you wanna proceed here.

- Okay, I am seeing as the list of participants on this meeting, absent from that is Alder Scannell, who is the the initial requester to the Alder. But that being said, I do know that this was an essence motion last meeting to basically table it for a month for some discussion to happen and to study this a little bit more in depth. Which is what we have done, and I actually have a nine-page memo that was prepared that I'm willing to summarize. I'm hoping quicker than Rail Yard, even though it's nine pages. But I think that there are some good points that need to be noted before we open the floor and start having questions relative to this. So if that's the way you'd like to proceed, Chair, I can do that.

- Yes please, go ahead, Dave.

- I wanna start it off with just an executive summary from the memo, and I'm gonna read this verbatim and then I will, in essence, talk through some of the highlights of the report. Request from Alder Scannell on behalf of constituent Bill Kill, who is in the southeast corner of Broadway James to move the truck route is noted. It was discussed at the March TV PC meeting. Commissioner's motion to table the item until the April meeting in order to outreach or for outreach to occur to Bell County, and potentially impacted residents and business owners. After studying both existing and proposed truck routes, while acknowledging the feedback from stakeholders and considering the roadway characteristics along all affected roadways, staff recommends that the truck route along North Broadway between Mather Street and Alexander Street remain as is for many reasons which are contained within this report. But primarily since the proposed reroute of the heavy truck routes system to Mather, McDonald and Alexander Streets would result in the inability to maintain two-way truck traffic, due to truck, sweat path, turning movement conflicts with other vehicles, buildings, fences and curb ramps. So I did email out, I apologize on the targeting. It's like put some finishing touches on this report

today, but I did send it out to commissioners. And if you'll see, I start right off the bat with some of the turning movement diagrams. And I don't know, do you want me to share a screen again on this map? This maybe I guess, you know, make it more public that everyone's seen the same thing.

- Yeah, I think transparent as we can be here, so everybody can see what you got. That's a good idea, Dave.

- Sure, I'll bring it up. There we are. Can you see that?

- Yes.

- Okay.

- All right, so I just read this executive summary. Now, here are some of the turning movements. So this is basically going north to south on the proposed route. So this is the intersection of Alexander So we used a WB-65 as the design vehicle which is what we would use. What we'll use for any truck out there. So, bottom line is that we need to maintain two-way truck traffic on our truck road system. And so what you can see here when this black line here crosses over this red line, then in essence means that the trucks would collide. And then you'll see this westbound and northbound truck is in essence clipping the corner of this building here. Now, remember, this is when two trucks are coming at this location at the same time. 'Cause I'm sure the question would be asked. Well, aren't trucks coming out of there right now, what are they doing now? Well, it's not a truck route, so we don't have to make sure that there's that access. We have very low traffic, traffic counts will shortly show. And, you know, when something was to say something like this happens, you'll probably see a truck that's westbound. They'll probably back up a little bit and allow someone to come in and make that turning movement. But again, when you see the traffic numbers of trucks that would potentially be rerouted, you'll see that there's going to be, or would be a pretty good flow of trucks and just this kind of behavior, driver behavior not be acceptable. So anyway, there's the first intersection. Second one along the route at McDonald-Alexander. Again, the two trucks would collide here, there's a fence really tight on this corner. We'll get masons clipped. This one is McDonald-Mather. See there's vehicles here kind of parking on this corner that will get clipped. And even this corner. And I haven't mentioned curb ramps yet, you know, there's pedestrian facilities in some of these intersections and, you know, if there was a pedestrian sitting there, obviously, that would not have a positive result by any means. And here's the last one, that's at Broadway and Mather. So again, you can see this curb ramp is being obstructed. And if the two paths reclined. Next, I looked into the traffic count. So, I know that some of you have seen this diagram before. This is basically what federal highways, how they categorize all vehicles. So certain classifications of vehicles. Now, the reason I wanna mention this is that I know that there was a study done in the past, relative to heavy trucks and semis. So that study was actually slightly different. In that, we were simply only looking at semi-trucks and greater size. I believe it was just a class eight or greater on the prior study. Now, with the request, you're looking at a whole reroute of the truckload system. So now that'd actually be a class four and above. So you're talking about more vehicles being rerouted. So as you can tell your passenger vehicles, motorcycles, you know, single unit kind of vehicles that are under 10,000 pounds, would still be able to go on the existing route between Mather and Alexander and Broadway. Everything else would be forced on to Mather and McDonald and Alexander. Here are the counts. I'm not gonna bother you too much of the details but just showing you

that I summarized here. If you look at the first line, there's a cycle's cars, that's you, that's for single unit, that's classes, one, two, three. And then trucks and semis, that'd be the rest of them. Which is what I just showed you on the prior diagram. This first segment here, Broadway, Mather to James, during the weekday, you got 22% trucks, almost a quarter of that traffic is actually truck traffic. On the weekends then it actually goes down between 11 and 14%. Now you can see on the reroute area. So this one, right? Well, this is Broadway between Augusta and RR crossing. You'll see these numbers are lower. Now those percentages are some of the lower, probably you're asking, why would it be that much lower? Well, number one, the car traffic, vehicle traffic is almost half. And that just means that a lot of those cars that are coming through are going into those neighborhoods, like on James Street and Augusta. The trucks are also lower, not necessarily half, but it looks like during the weekday, you're looking at 200 to 250 versus in the lower segment, it's more like 360 to 380. So that simply means that there's probably a trip generator, or a truck trip generator somewhere in that segment, which is true, KK Integrated Logistics is actually located at Phoebe Street. So that would explain why you have a drop in trucks south of there and I'll get to them later, 'cause that actually plays a significant part of this study. And then these last few here, this would actually be on the truck route around the proposed alternate truck route or reroute. So you'll see right now, you know, you have both the same percentages during the week, you know, 26, so basically 25 to 30% here and five to 10% on the weekends. Now the segment that's McDonald Street, just north of James, you really do see a significant drop-off in trucks. And trucks that are coming in. They're immediately going into the business that is immediately across from James Street. So they're really not even traversing north of James. And then this Alexander Street, Broadway to McDonald. That will be just right around the corner there. So you can see again, you know, these trucks here and vehicles. So this right here just shows you where the count locations are taken. These are identical summaries of all the traffic counts. I just wanted to put this in the report just 'cause those numbers are somewhat hard to read. So I wanted to have both of them in there. Now I do, we did get some responses back from businesses. I do see some of the names that are in my report that are actually in the gallery tonight, and I'm presuming would like to speak. But I will just summarize. I don't wanna have to go through all these, I'm sure you're gonna hear some of these But I do have a Tom Madson, owner of Madison Trucking, who was opposed for seven different reasons. Some of them are similar to what I've already concluded. Todd Christian, he is from KK Integrated Logistics. Again, confirming that they have a facility on north Broadway between Mather and Alexander. They were inquiring how a trucker change would impact their business ops and requested to participate in tonight's meeting, which I believe Tom and Todd is online here. And then Edd Tadulan was a plant manager at Graymont during the McDonald Street, work. They do have some concerns in that they actually have staff that crosses McDonald Street multiple times in a day. And in essence what they're saying is that, if this reassignment of trucker would happen that they'd be formally requesting a legally signed crosswalk to their facilities or, you know, between their facilities. One thing I wanna note is that, legal crosswalks require connections to sidewalks, of which none are present at this location. This means that a sidewalk study would be required and that if sidewalks are recommended, then the adjacent property owner assess for the cost. Again, you know, we're opening up kind of a whole other can of worms here. So here are my conclusions. I got a lot of them here and I don't have time, but I think I'll just kind of just highlight these little briefly. First and foremost, as I have already stated. And that's why it's the number one reason I'm here, is because of the truck turning templates that we superimposed on those intersections. Two semis cannot pass each other without conflict, with either the trucks themselves or other items nearby the road features such as buildings curb ramps, fences, et cetera. We also have. Yeah, I just wanted to add this, and I kind of alluded to this under the current situation, but if truck drivers are forced to take each corner one at a time. Then opposing movements throughput would be halted. And if a trucker stopped, that is stopped would back up to let this opposing truck make a safe turn. There's a much higher probability now or I should say in the future, if this was approved that they could, that just backup that would occur that they could actually, you know, potentially back up into the front of another vehicle. Which obviously is not safe. We talked about noise levels. And this is something that I think, you know, should be noted, because this is a quality of life issue that was brought up by Bill Kelp. And, you know, I guess, you know, living at a location where he does I can completely empathize with his point. So, that being said, removing the trucks from that segment would ensure decreased truck traffic and the noise levels that come with that. Now, note that the noise levels may increase at the intersections that were introduced and turns and stops. So Broadway-Mather would be one, Broadway-Alexander as well. Now, seeing how we're taking one location or would be taking one location and improving

it. What you're really doing is you're pushing that concern, the truck traffic and the noise levels on to other streets. So it would be the ones that are being proposed Mather, McDonald and Alexander, all would see more truck traffic and higher noise. Now that being said, looking at those traffic numbers. If trucker compliance is 100%, then that would be about 370 trucks, less those destined to, or coming from KK and others. See item 17, I had a note on. Would be rerouted to Mather-McDonald-Alexander on the weekdays, between 90 and 130 trucks on the weekends. Next point is pavement failure. Although we've got similar pavement structures on both the existing trucker and the proposed trucker. There's one segment of concern, which had a pavement rating of four, a pass rating of four. And that would be on McDonald Street, between James and railroad crossing. And this figure five is just one of many pictures I took that shows the damage already on this roadway. So, obviously adding, you know, those 370 trucks per day, et cetera on a constant daily basis that the easel loading is going to, it's certainly not gonna improve this. It's gonna make it deteriorate at a faster rate. And obviously then the city would be asked to repair. I guess two points that were brought up at the last meeting was, that the County do have oversize/overweight truck routes that use James Street, which is within the segment being requested for removal. They also have a high clearance truck route that also uses that same route. But that being said, you know, we've worked with the County on that, but, you know, whatever happens to Mather really doesn't change what they do, because that's their approved routes. So if that's our approved routes, that's the way that they're gonna continue to go. I already talked about the multiple stops. I guess the only thing that really, you know, we talked about the noise and turns, et cetera but also think about the addition of a fuel consumption and the environmental impacts that would happen because of the addition of the length of the route, which is to my next point. The reroute segment is actually, I calculated the distance, it's 2,905 feet. And without the reroute, it's 1,640. So that difference is 1,265 feet or about a quarter mile. So in essence, you're adding a quarter mile to the truck route. Just a few more points here and I will be done. You talked last time about sending traffic past a NEW Community Shelter, which has, you know, the vehicle heads that are at that location. Then there's drop-offs et cetera that occur at that location. Another thing that, this not engineering but I was noted in privy to this information, which really is public information. Because I was accosted by a reporter from NBC 26, which basically wanted to find out some information about this. So I went to their Facebook page and found out that they had that story. I was not interviewed for this story. So, you know, a lot of it was the requesters that commented on it. However, when I went to the social media page, this was on March 22nd, by the way, I found 302 comments and 48 shares to that story. Kind of a popular story that they had. And perusing the comments was highly favored against this traffic reroute. I'm an engineer, it's not really my duty, I just figured that since I came across this I should make you aware of that. Again, I talked about the businesses impacted. I added about the additions returns. One thing we haven't talked about yet is railroad crossings. Adding or going on to this reroute, actually there's two separate crossings versus an existing route there's one. On the existing route, we actually have gates. So it's an improved crossing. The, well, proposed route, it's actually two separate crossings that are unimproved, no gates, which has yield and stop signs at them. So again, adding more stops, braking, et cetera for the truck traffic. I talked about stops, we're gonna be adding two one-way stop conditions. Because as you're going southbound on the truck route, you'd have to stop at Broadway and Mather and vice versa going northbound, you'd have to stop on Alexander and Broadway. So two additional stops there. One thing I didn't talk about you yet is the intersection sight distance at Alexander. I don't have a picture of it here, but when driving, the building is tight on the intersection. So if you're a truck driver and you're looking for gas, it can be difficult. Now, can you see it? Yes, but I think that it's limited and because trucks have full acceleration, I think it could become an issue. I talked about KK on Phoebe Street. So just knowing that, let's just presume that this goes through and it is changed. You are not going to eliminate truck traffic in that area. As we cannot deny KK Integrated Logistics access to Broadway because they still would be compliant with our heavy truck ordinance, which allows origins and destinations that have truck traffic to be able to take the shortest, most practicable path off of a truck route. The other thing to think about too is any of the municipal County and state vehicles, city buses, school buses are exempt on that same ordinance. So, you know, you're still gonna see dump trucks from public works, parts department, which actually has a shop real close by. Delivery trucks, FedEx, all that. You're still gonna see them. My last point. And I think this is one that it kinda came up. But again, this is something that I know commissioners that have been on the commission for awhile, probably remember back about 10 years ago we did a city-wide evaluation of removing traffic signals. And I know that some recent discussions we brought this up. Well, Broadway and Mather used to be signalized and it's now a two-way stop.

It's been working very well as a two-way stop. But if we rerouted traffic, I do have a concern that if this is as significant as if we get this 100% compliance, that we potentially might be looking at reinstalling the traffic signal, which by, you know, just using planning estimates would be about 200 to \$225,000 to furnish. So that being said, that really concludes my study. And I guess, I don't know where we wanna go, Matt, on this. If you want to take questions till the end or if you want me to answer questions on the report now, open up the floor, that would be your choice.

- Okay, I stepped away for a second, Dave. So you completed and we're ready to open the floor up then?

- Yeah, if that's your decision, then, yes, that'd be fine.

- Do you have anything else you wanna add before we open the floor up to the interested parties?

- No.

- Nope, okay, Dave. All right, I'll entertain a motion to open the floor up to interested parties to speak to this item.

- I'll make a motion to open the floor.

- Second.

- Second?

- Motion made, second all in favor?

- [All] Aye.

- Okay, we will open the floor up. I don't know, is there an order. I can't tell how many people speak to it. Dave or Matt, can you tell how we're gonna start?

- Yes, well, I do see Cole Runge from Brown County Planning. I do see him on the call here. I also see Edd Tadulan and Todd Christian on the call who are associated with businesses in every route.

- Okay. Why don't we pick one of them to start with. Dave, you need their information or do you have their names and address, or you would need that at this point?

- I mean, we have the names obviously here in the Zoom meeting. Addresses, their business addresses would be fine. So as we ask them to participate, we just ask for their name, spell it for the record and then to provide their address. Business address is acceptable. I would say probably listening to what they have to say and then probably maybe closing it out with Cole Runge from Planning to get his perspective.

- Okay, all right. Why don't you pick one of them to go then Dave, whoever, I can't see both .

- I'll go with Edd.

- Okay.

- [Edd] Yes, good evening gentlemen and good evening, Mr. Chair. Thank you, Dave, for inviting me to listen to this meeting. I represented Graymont here, and our plant is situated on the east side of McDonald Street. But opposite that street, we have our warehouse, we have a fuel depot and a maintenance shop. So we purposely cross that street just to get parts, to refuel our vehicles and to do maintenance job. And that would like create hostiles to our guys who are either on foot or driving a vehicle. Some vehicles are as small as a golf cart or as huge as a payload, because our fuel depot is on the west side of the McDonald Street. So our concern is that if the trucks will be rerouted from McDonald's and going through our plant, our guys will be like in a disadvantaged position because we cross that street every single day. That's my concern.

- Okay, thank you, sir. Next speaker.

- Can I ask, can I interject real quick? We did not get an address from Edd Tadulan.

- [Edd] Yes, our address is 137 James Street. Corner of James and McDonald Street of Green Bay.

- Okay, thank you. Who was the other party, Dave, I

- That would be Todd Christian from KK Integrated Logistics.

- Todd, if you wanna go ahead and speak and your address, please.

- [Todd] Good afternoon, everybody. Thank you for allowing us to speak tonight. Plus I wanna thank Dave for the conversations that we've had recently regarding this. So I'm the director of operations with KK Integrated Logistics. And the address is 305 Phoebe Street. As Dave alluded to, you know, we have trucking operations daily from approximately 6:00 a.m to 4:00 p.m. There are also typically Saturdays that we deliver. We do local shuttle trucking for our customers in Green Bay. And we also have over the road drivers coming in to deliver product to our warehouse. We're probably talking 30 to 40 trucks a day that bring product in and out of our warehouse. So, you know, there's a good amount of traffic that is still gonna be on that roadway. The other option that we need to keep open too, is we do work with the port. So, northbound on Broadway, we need to have access to the port, 'cause in the past we have had deliveries from the port to our warehouse on Phoebe Street. So, you know, if that truck route is changed, you know, potentially it could change that option we have. So, we just wanna make sure that we're able to access the port, and we're able to continue, you know, obviously with our trucking operation. You know 'cause we don't wanna affect that for our customers.

- Okay, thank you. I think you said there were two parties to speak. Dave, then you wanna finish off with Cole Runge, is that correct?

- Actually, the two have already spoken and we can have Cole speak next. I just wanted to respond to one question that Todd had. And that was relative to, he just wants to preserve access between the port and his facilities. Regardless of what would happen, if it was rerouted or not. Again, coordinates, as long as those routes are on the shortest path between the port and your facilities, they would be legal. So, really no change in operations. But hopefully that answers your question and with that then, I think, I believe Cole is available to speak.

- Yes, go ahead, Cole.

- Okay, can you all hear me?

- Yes.

- Okay, great. Thanks for having me here tonight. I'm Brown County Planning Director, Cole Runge. Our address at the office is, 305 east Walnut Street in Green Bay. I'll start by saying that. I agree with staff's recommendation not to remove trucks from that portion of Broadway. I think Dave covered the issue very thoroughly. A couple of things I would add, include, as the port grows, I only see truck trips increasing in that area. I think it's important to maintain that efficient connection all the way through there. Again, Dave covered a lot of the reasons why that connection needs to remain in place. I'll also talk a little bit about something Dave mentioned, which is the oversize/overweight truck routes we put together. We put those together in about 2017 and we did work with city staff and other jurisdictions throughout the area. And the idea was to make sure that over time that the port had routes in and out of the area to be able to transport and receive those large loads. And so when we establish those by code or anything. It's basically a cooperative effort between the County, specifically the port and the affected jurisdictions to make sure those routes are clear for those oversights. Basically, the area you're discussing tonight is one of our incoming and outgoing routes for oversize/overweight loads. Not the over-height ones, but the oversize/overweight loads to get between the port's north terminal and Interstate 43. So I guess one of my concerns would be, if you were to remove trucks from that portion of Broadway and those loads had to be taken out and brought in from I43, via a different route. The other most viable connection we would be looking at would be Mather Street. And that creates its own issues. So, I believe if you have to choose one of those two routes, the Broadway route that exists today is by far the best route to get those large trucks and those large loads to and from that north terminal at the port. Again, I support Dave's recommendation for the reasons he's mentioned, in addition to the reasons I've talked about here.

- Okay, thank you. I see, I've got a finger, a hand up, Alder Lefebvre.

- Yes Dave, they are talking about, you know, and developing the former Pulliam plant more of the hub for the Harbor. Would that change things at all, with the full, you know, for the trucks?

- Kind of like what Cole was talking about, that as the port grows and, you know, like if you're saying like presuming that that's an expansion area. Of course, yes, we'll see truck traffic, not only being increased, but, you know, the safety issues that I brought up would just be amplified on that reroute. So it definitely, I mean, I don't know what the status is of that. I know it's been somewhat tossed around by agents and people outside of my circle. But it certainly would have, I guess a negative impact if the reroute was approved.

- I can say something. I think that probably will be a little few years down the road, because there's a lot of logistics still to work out with all that. But, this is something I think, yeah, that should be in the mix to think about.

- If I could add to that, Mr. Chair.

- Sure.

- So, yeah, the county's intention is to purchase a portion of the former Pulliam site. There's a chance the coal piles could be located there, but as the Alder person says, that could take some time to work out if it occurs. The county's main purpose in doing that is to facilitate port growth. Now, that could include moving the coal piles up there in the future. If that doesn't happen, we'd be seeking other tenants up there. And there's a good chance that those tenants will be moving commodities in and out of the area via truck, at least in part. Even though there will be a rail component to it, we expect truck traffic as that development occurs up there to grow. We're also already, we know that an existing tenant intends to purchase a portion of that site, as well, to expand his operation up there. So, again, we're trying to really do all we can to grow the ports over the next several years. And with that growth we expect additional truck trips to occur. So, having that route in place is critical to that growth.

- Can I make one thing? I don't know if the people on the commission, know that I'm also Brown County supervisor, so I got a dual role. And so I kinda know a little bit on both sides what's happening.

- Okay, thank you for sharing. Do we have any other interested parties or have we one of you that wishes to speak to this item as had their time, Dave? So we're good to go back to regular business?

- Yeah, I'm looking at, it looks like we have 10 participants and everyone that I see here that wants to speak, most likely I spoken, unless there's more feedback of course from the commissioners. The other thing is too, is we need to officially close the floor.

- I make the motion to close the floor.

- Okay, motion to go back to regular business, do I hear a second?

- Second.

- Motion seconded, all in favor?

- [All] Aye.

- We're back to regular business then. So, all right, Dave, what were you saying, I'm sorry.

- All I was saying is that if there's, you know, commissioners that, you know, there's discussion, and if you have questions on my study or whatever, I'm more than willing to answer any questions.

- Any questions from the commissioners or Lieutenant? No, okay, all right

- Mr. Chairman.

- Yes, go ahead, Dan.

- I would move the recommendation of the traffic engineer to deny the request to move truck route from North Broadway to McDonald's street, between Mather and Alexander Streets. I think we all sympathize with people in the neighborhood with their concern about noise pollution, what have you. But after listening to all of the evidence here for tonight, I just don't see where we have an alternative that is practicable to solve any issues that do exist. So that would be my motion, Mr. Chairman.

- Okay, we've had a motion, do I hear a second to the motion-

- I second.

- Motion made and seconded, all in favor?

- [All] Aye.

- Okay, motion carries, looks like unanimous. So that will take care of items six. Thank you for your report, Dave, your time and efforts and all the parties who spoke to that item, thank you.

- Most welcome.

- Let's move on to over on item seven, which is the start-up determination of 90-day trial. I'll let you Dave, seven to 11, I'll let you kind of break them out how you want there for approval.

- Sure, thank you. First item E-seven, which is removing the no parking zone on the west side of 12th Avenue from Clinton to a point 110 feet south of Mason. From what I understand, everything is working fine. I do believe that, I don't know if that was the business. I think it was the business on the corner had some questions which I simply forwarded off to Alderman Brian Johnson. Because, really it was more of a, I don't wanna call it a neighborhood issue. But I mean, I really did not have any sort of. I mean, my position did not change, I supported the request. If anything, it made the operations by the signals safer. So, I'm making a recommendation for that item to be moved forward. Actually some you move forward the ordinance. It's just a removal from the ordinance item eight. To establish no parking zone on the west side of 12th Ave from 3rd to Clinton. Oh, that zone, sorry. There was a shorter zone and now we're taking the whole block. So yeah, everything's still pertains. Certainly approve of that. E-nine move the two-hour 7:00 a.m, 7:00 p.m, Monday to Friday parking zone, at least at Broadway from a point 33 feet south of 3rd street to a point 90 feet south of 3rd Street. Again, no issues on this one. I have not heard that from the Alder either in their request, so, no news is good news. I will make a recommendation to move that forward as well. Just moving it from the ordinance. And it looks like Eleven's another removal. It's all in the same area. So removing the two-hour 7:00 to 7:00, Monday through Friday parking on the east side of Broadway from 33 to point 60 feet south of Clinton, and then E-11 again same thing establishing, just going ahead and reestablishing zones as requested to our 7:00 to 7:00, Monday through Friday parking. Eastside Broadway, from Mason to point 60 feet south of Clinton Street. go ahead and make one motion, one second and approval for all five of them.

- Okay, I'll entertain a motion to approve?

- Motion to approve.

- Second?

- Second?

- All in favor?

- [All] Aye.

- Okay, got item seven through I I approved. Informational next meeting Monday, May 17th. We have anything under public hearing, any? Matt, do you have anything else to add to the cause tonight? If not, I will entertain a motion to adjourn.

- To a vote.

- Second.

- Okay, motion made to adjourn and seconded, all in favor?

- Aye.

- Aye.

- Aye.

- Okay, motion carries, we're adjourned. Be safe and we'll see you all in a month.