MINUTES OF THE IMPROVEMENT AND SERVICES COMMITTEE

WEDNESDAY, AUGUST 25, 2021, 6:00 PM

Virtual Meeting. Public may join via Zoom.

Immediately following Park Committee which begins at 5 P.M.

A. ZOOM MEETING INFORMATION.

1. This item contains documents which provide call in information and instructions for the Zoom meeting.

B. ROLL CALL.

Present: Ald. Randy Scannell, Ald. Lynn Gerlach, Ald. Jesse Brunette

Ald. Chris Wery arrived late and meeting was started by Vice Chairperson Ald. Randy Scannell.

C. APPROVAL OF THE AGENDA.

Moved by Ald. Jesse Brunette, seconded by Ald. Lynn Gerlach to approve the agenda of the Wednesday, August 25, 2021 Improvement and Services Committee meeting.

Motion Passed.

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

D. APPROVAL OF MINUTES.

Moved by Ald. Jesse Brunette, seconded by Ald. Lynn Gerlach to approve the minutes of the Wednesday, August 11, 2021 Improvement and Services Committee meeting.

Motion Passed.

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

E. REGULAR BUSINESS.

1. Consideration with possible action on correcting erosion issues on the 1000 block of Lacount Road (referred back to the Improvement and Services Committee from the August 17, 2021 Common Council meeting). (Ald. Brunette)

Moved by Ald. Jesse Brunette, seconded by Ald. Lynn Gerlach to hold the request on correcting erosion issues on the 1000 block of Lacount Road.

Motion Passed.

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

2. Consideration with possible action on how the City of Green Bay can achieve an annual 3% replacement rate of its roads. The action plan would include anticipated increased borrowing requests (held at the May 26, 2021 Improvement and Services Committee meeting). (Ald. Wery)

Moved by Ald. Randy Scannell, seconded by Ald. Chris Wery to approve a plan to increase the annual target goal for resurfacing/reconstructing local roads from 1.45% to 1.6% beginning in 2022. The action plan would include anticipated increased borrowing requests.

Motion Passed.

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

3. Consideration with possible action on request for a 20-year history of road repairs, including alleys (2001-2021), with total expenditure, miles (distance) completed, type (reconstruction vs. resurface), and to denote if the projects were cooperative with County and/or State (held at the August 11, 2021 Improvement and Services Committee meeting). (Ald. Wery)

Moved by Ald. Randy Scannell, seconded by Ald. Chris Wery to approve the request for a 20-year history of road repairs, including alleys (2001-2021), with total expenditure, miles (distance) completed, type (reconstruction vs. resurface), and to denote if the projects were cooperative with County and/or State and request that it be updated annually and presented to the Committee every March.

Motion Passed.

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

4. Report of actions taken by Department of Public Works

    A. Granting of Licenses

        1. Sidewalk Builder

            a. Chris Marto Concrete LLC

Moved by Ald. Randy Scannell, seconded by Ald. Lynn Gerlach to receive and place on file. Motion carried.
Yes- Chris Wery, Jesse Brunette, Lynn Gerlach, Randy Scannell, No- None, Abstain- None

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

A. Granting of Licenses

1. Sidewalk Builder

a. Chris Marto Concrete LLC

Motion Passed.

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

F. INFORMATIONAL.

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

Moved by Ald. Randy Scannell, seconded by Ald. Jesse Brunette to receive and place on file the Director's Report on recent activities of the Public Works Department.

Motion Passed.

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

2. The next Improvement and Services Committee meeting is scheduled for September 15, 2021.

G. ADJOURNMENT.

Moved by Ald. Randy Scannell, seconded by Ald. Jesse Brunette to adjourn the Improvement and Services Committee meeting.

Motion Passed.

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

VERBATIM MINUTES

- The Improvement and Services meeting for August 25th, 2021 is now in session. A roll call. Alder Gerlach?

- Here.

- Alder Brunette?

- Here.

- Alder Scannell the Vice-Chair is here and the Chair Alder Wery is excused, though he may be joining us. Unless we really get done quick. I'll take a motion to approve our agenda.

- So moved.

- Second.

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

- Aye.

- Aye.

- Opposed? Our agenda is approved. I'll pick a motion to approve our minutes from the last meeting.

- So moved.

- Second.

- Okay, moved by Alder Gerlach, seconded by Alder Brunette. All in favor.

- Aye.

- Aye.

- Opposed? Okay, that passes unanimously and I will pause to make sure staff is still with us.

- We're ready.

- We're good okay. Onto business. Item number one. Consideration with possible action, on correcting erosion issues on a 1000 block of lockout road. Referred back to the improvement and service committee from the August 17th, 2021 common council meeting. Alder Brunette--

- I just--

- Go ahead.

- If you don't mind. I have been corresponding with the constituent who had the concern. Unfortunately, he was unable. He is unable to attend the meeting today. So instead of discussing it, I simply would make a motion to hold. I think what we can do is, if Director Grenier will allow a member of his staff to meet me out at the property with the homeowner, he can kind of explain his perspective regarding the erosion issues and maybe we can just to that level rather than here. So, just a motion to hold.

- Okay, motion to the hold by Alder Brunette.

- Second.

- Second by Alder Gerlach, any further discussion.

- Aye

- All in favor?

- Aye.

- Aye. Opposed? Okay, we are holding that item.

- We are ready to go.

- Item number two. Consideration with possible action on how the City of Green Bay can achieve an annual 3% replacement rate of its roads. The action plan would include anticipated increased borrowing requests, filled at the May 26/21 Improvement and Service Committee meeting. This is Alder Wery. Does staff have anything they care to add on this or?

- Well, if it's your pleasure, I'd be more than happy to, to go through the memo that we provided, that's in the packet. And we actually provided that to the committee ahead of the packet even being published, to make sure that you folks had time to review that and formulate or ask any questions that you may have.

- Anybody got any. Anybody from the committee? That's all we got here, It tends to be anybody else. Any questions or comments from anyone? Okay and I'm just wondering you know, if this is something as far as an action plan, if we need to almost like put this on hold to see what kind of money we're gonna be getting from the feds and how that might affect and where were all that might go on and maybe we'll need to borrow less. Or maybe, I don't know what. I mean, there's some variables out there that I would certainly wanna be taken into account before moving forward on this item. Does that make sense Alder Grenier? Does that?

- Well I know, and it may just be the terminology that was used. But I don't know necessarily that this is an action plan per se. We don't have any, any type of authorization or any way to deliver a program of that size at this point in time. So instead what we did was we put together information that would demonstrate what it would take to increase the amount of infrastructure projects we're doing, specifically resurface reconstruction. So what we did was laid out the criteria or the assumptions that we made in developing the financial analysis. And then we provided you with the results of what our estimation would be to increase up to 2% from the current 1.45, up to two and a half and up to three, and then what those financial or fiscal impacts would be. So it's not necessarily an implementation plan. What this is is an economic analysis of what it would take from each of the contributing financing sources and what those impacts would be. Our feeling on this is at that point, once the committee has that information, it would be up to the committee to make a recommendation to the council on what the next step would be. That's not really a staff decision. So that's our intent, just to present that information in that context, and then seek guidance from the committee and council on what the next steps would be.

- Right, so I don't know I think probably we wanna hold this until Alder Wery can at least take a bite at this, if he's got the interest to do so.

- Well, I would feel more comfortable if Alder Wery had input in the discussion, absolutely.

- Now.

- May I ask why it was held in May? I don't remember. It says it was held in May, but I just don't remember it.

- Originally when we did this, we were painting with a rather broad brush as it were. So what we wanted to do was take the opportunity to refine some of those numbers and it took us quite a while to do that.

- Okay.

- So a motion to hold.

- Sure. Move to hold.

- Second.

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

- [Together] Aye.

- Opposed? Okay, well that item is also hold. That's two hands, hopefully we're not gonna hold anything else, we're gonna need a third hand.

- We're good to go.

- On to three. Consideration with possible action on request for a 20 year history of road repairs, including alleys 2001 to 2021. With total expenditure, miles, distance completed, type, reconstruction versus resurface. And to denote if the projects were cooperative with county and or State, held at the August 11th, 2021 Alder Wery. Again, I don't know.

- Well, this was an item that was on the agenda last time, but Alder Wery wanted it. My recollection, my understanding of what Alder Wery said at the last meeting, this item is for consideration side-by-side with the discussion on item two. And there's Alder Wery.

- Yeah.

- So it's kind of, I don't necessarily wanna say supporting documentation, but it's items to also be taking into consideration. That's my recollection of it at least.

- Yeah.

- So.

- We can almost take the two items up together?

- That would be the Chair's pleasure.

- Hello, good morning.

- Hey, thanks for hanging in there. What did I miss?

- We're on to INS. So I now get up from the Chair, and it is vacated for you to sit in and we just did item two and we're onto item three. So if we could go back to item two, if someone wants to reconsider their vote. Or do you wish to discuss items two and three Alder Wery?

- Boy oh boy, let's see here. Bear with me.

- Yeah.

- I'm not getting an agenda up.

- Just the roads.

- Yeah, well what--

- I don't know that you're. That Alder Wery is signed into civic clerk yet. We're not showing you on our screen.

- While he's doing that, do we need to do something now, because we already voted to hold number two? Do we need to do something to go back and undo all this?

- Anyone who voted in the affirmative to support that action could ask for reconsideration of the item, which would open it back up.

- I ask for reconsideration of that item.

- That needs a second doesn't it?

- It is a motion. Seconded a vote, yeah.

- Seconded by Alder Brunette.

- Second.

- All in favor of reconsidering that vote?

- Aye

- Aye.

- Opposed? Okay, we are now reconsidering item number two. And we could take two and three together if you'd like Alder Wery?

- Yeah, that'd be great. I'm having a little password issue getting in. So just, if you could mark me as present, and let's kind of wing it.

- Yeah.

- Okay.

- And we can take care of any vote information for you.

- Okay, some reason that's--

- Oh, it looks like you're in now. You just popped up on the screen.

- Okay, how about a motion to take item two and three together?

- So moved.

- Second.

- Motion by Alder Gerlach to take times two and three together, seconded by Alder Brunette. All in favor?

- [Together] Aye.

- Opposed? Okay, we're gonna take two and three together Alder Wery. And you are now the Chair and take it away.

- Great, well thanks. Apologies for the delay I have an Achilles tendon that apparently is not gonna wanna cooperate so.

- Your Achilles tendon is your Achilles heel?

- Achilles tendon, yes it is. But, we walked fast over here. Well, I missed I guess the report. How much did you discuss it?

- We didn't discuss it.

- All right, everyone had a chance to look at it and? Okay. And Steve, I appreciate it. A lot of good data here and information. My first question and not in any particular order, would be the federal funding that is going to be coming. Right, does that? I know it applies maybe to maybe the storm sewer and sanitary sewer. Is that correct? Just those two or one of those two?

- My understanding is that there may be applicability for some of the ARPA funds to potentially be used for sanitary, storm, and possibly water.

- Okay. Because especially if it could be used for all three, that's a big chunk of the expense, right? I mean, if you're just looking at some of the numbers here. Obviously you couldn't maintain it every year, but you could at least bump it up and set a new level.

- And I see Brian Powell and General Manager Quirk from Green Bay Water and Utility are now joined into the meeting as well.

- Awesome. Well, also in addition to that question under water main , a 10% rate increases. Is that a 10% rate increase to the water bill?

- That would be a great question for Nancy she. General Manager Quirk provided her information, we just simply incorporated all her numbers directly in.

- Okay.

- Yeah, so what we. You're asking about the 10% rate increase?

- Right, right?

- Yeah what we did was calculate what our current rates were, and then we calculated the additional money that needed to be done to increase each of those years or those percentages, and then calculated what that rate increase would be just for that water main work. We would not include any other updates to our operating budget. That's just for the water mains.

- Okay and that would be. I mean without knowing the roads I mean. Is that just a guesstimate, right? I mean, there might be some roads that need less work than that or?

- What we're calculating Alderman Randy is about. We have a history of about 60% of all of the roads that get done, we put water mains in and we need to be increasing water mains anyway. So yeah.

- So I know you had mentioned internally or as part of the committee for the water commission, you had talked about how to get there? Do you have any kind of preliminary plans or ideas how you want it to? Or is this kind of a starting point?

- What we were trying to do is get you data associated with what you would ask Steve in DPW that, if he was going to increase his program, that we would do that along with him. Because it's certainly the most cost-effective way for both of us to get those infrastructures replaced. We have a commitment that we're gonna be replacing more infrastructure. And we have been. RCIP shows right now about an extra $200,000 every year to increase some of the main replacements right now. We will have to have rate increases for that so.

- Right, okay. And that would be just a one-time increase? Once you got to that level would it be steady after that? This isn't a yearly increase, it's just to get to that level? The 2% or 2.5% of roadwork?

- That would be correct.

- I guess, the committee do you have any questions for Director Grenier or Director Quirk? Or I see Brian's here too. I hold her scandal.

- I'll tell them--

- I think he's waving his hands?

- Yeah, I know in the past when we've talked about getting more roads work and everything, one of the hiccups was the staffing to do that. If we do get some ARPA money or we do get more bonding or something, how would we handle that at the staffing end Director Grenier and and manager Quirk?

- Well, I can speak to DPW. The way we've got the cost sheet broken down, project management, construction administration, consultant management. We would have to hire additional staff on a permanent full-time basis to manage those. To manage the consultants who are doing the extra design work and do the construction admin and project management, once the projects actually went to construction because this is more than. If we go to 3%, it's more than doubling the current workload. So, there's a combination of full-time staff here at DPW to oversee that work. And then the actual design, we would hire that out to consultants. It would be contracted consultant services. And the way we've accounted for that in this financial analysis, is the way that we currently contract for those types of design services. The design service is a. It's a function of that project. So, what we do is we utilize the bonded money to hire the consultant because then you spread the cost of that consultant over the life of the project. So it's a combination. The actual design would be done by a consultant that's paid for through bonding and then one engineer can manage multiple consultants and one engineer can oversee multiple construction contracts. But we have to hire engineer, we have to hire another construction manager. We're gonna have to hire several aides and probably one technician to oversee the actual field work and then the assemblage of plans and letting of the document. Or letting the contracts and doing the contract administration with a consultant during construction. So again, those would be fixed costs that would not be bonded for. Those would be levy supported costs. So that's why we're showing, under any of the options down below. We've got a construction, that's bonded. Project management, that's levy. Design is bonded. And we talk about what the increase is, or what the fiscal impact is. There's a levy increase, but roughly half that levy increase counts against expenditure restraint and levy limit, because it's a direct expense. The other half of the levy impact that's shown there in the fiscal impact or levy increase shown in fiscal impact, is debt service which does not count against. That's the debt service associated with the borrowing for the design and construction. Make sense or do you have any further questions?

- No, no. It sounds like we'd be able to get the personnel if we got the money. One way or another. I mean it's not--

- If you have the money.

- Yeah, yeah. It'd be a bit of a headache.

- I think General Manager Quirk is gonna be able to back me up on this. The one thing that we are finding exceedingly difficult to do is to hire staff. They're just. They aren't out there. We don't have a lot of people going into the engineering trades. And those who do are going into computer engineering, electrical engineering, mechanical engineering. The number of civil engineers out there is it's minuscule compared to when I was in college 30 years ago.

- I think when we just registered. When we just hired our last engineer, I think she was the only one who applied. Yeah, so we are not having a lot of people in the engineering field applying for that. So our engineering tech, what did we have Brian for that? Do you remember?

- Yeah, we had two. Two applicants. And then in both cases, we're lucky we got very good people, but there just wasn't a lot to pick from. Or we kinda lucked out. But yeah, there's just not the applicants that we're used to seeing.

- Is that why don't we don't have the internal capacity, there's still the external to hire out. The hired guns is that the case, do you feel?

- You still have to have people inside the organization who know what your specifications are and to direct the contractor. I've done contracts where, you know, like a big project. I have big transmission mains. You hire a consulting engineer to design it, but you're with them every step of the way. So it does take additional staff time. Maybe not a hundred. It's not one for one, but you do have additional staff time to direct them and oversee them.

- And if they also other scandal?

- Yeah Nancy, I wanna be where you are.

- It's in Scotland.

- Wow, wow.

- No I think. I think that was one of the big things I always thought kind of hampered us in the past, was you know, even if we kind of came up with the money one way or another, beg, borrow, or steal, there was still a problem of staffing to get the work done. That's all.

- Steve or Director Grenier, you wouldn't be in Nancy, because this is De Pere. You don't really deal with that much with your water work. How does De Pere do it? How do they do the three to almost 4% every year? Now I know the tough part was getting there, but they've seem to have been able to maintain it.

- They're also a lot smaller. They're only a quarter of the size we are. So using a similar number of staff. I mean if we cut our facility size by a quarter or and did the same lineal footage, we'd be at 6% or five right now.

- But would it be a bigger percentage of our budget? If we shrink who we are and then we still do the same amount of roads, that's gonna be a bigger percentage of our budget. So what I'm saying is, we're doing a smaller percentage of our budget for roads, right? They must be doing a bigger percentage?

- That I don't. I don't know, I've never asked that question of them.

- 'Cause if you simply shrunk us obviously, then all our revenue coming in is gonna shrink and we'd have to adjust. But Alder Gerlach?

- I was going to say something very facetious. I was going to say, if you could just wait my third grandson started his civil engineering course at University of Missouri on Monday. Just give him four years. He's a good boy.

- If he gets out in four years, he's a great boy.

- Yeah . Maybe we need to advertise for uncivil engineers?

- There we go.

- Rude, but they get the job done.

- Alder Scannell, I did wanna comment that you had said about the ARPA funds, and Steve and I have talked about, you know. If we could get a couple of million dollars, we can do more projects together and and we can do the water and the sewer and then do the streets with it too but, we can increase while we have the funds available, but then you have to go back to, you know. And in the water utilities case, we pay basically cash for all of our water main work. We don't bond for water mains. We bond for like towers or buildings or things like that. We do not bond for that. We pay cash out of that. We can get it out of our capital budget. And that we use from rates, because we have to do so many a year, we do not wanna bond them. Put an extra interest costs on that money.

- And Steve, and maybe it was miscommunication, but I honestly thought after the wheel had gone up to about 2% of our road work and maybe that was just miscommunication somewhere along the line. But I honestly thought, and I've used it in my flyers that that allowed us to get to do 2% of our roadwork for three. And when I read through the documents right after at 1.4, 1.45. So that was, that was kind of like, "Whoa."

- Yeah, when we came forward with the plan for the vehicle registration fees, we gave you a 10 year looking back window. And in that 10 year window, I think the highest year was a 2%. So that that number was discussed at committee. But I think somewhere between you and I, we just got our wires crossed.

- Okay.

- It wasn't that we were moving up, it was looking back at the previous 10 years, the highest we had been was 2%.

- Now I. Forgive me, I don't have that report right in front of me. But the one you gave us at the last committee meeting that had great data in it, did that have the percentage in it by year also? What percent we did of roads?

- I don't know, and that one wouldn't necessarily be a one for one translation because we gave. The report that we provided last meeting and that's in the packet again this time. That's all in, that's not just city type projects.

- Great,

- We didn't. When we were looking at these kinds of things, we didn't wanna artificially inflate the numbers by trying to include Monroe Avenue or Avelp Avenue where that was. It was a city project but it wasn't, if that makes sense? It was federal money that came in. Or you know, we were paying some of the projects, Avelp, Monroe, . Avelp and Monroe, because they were connecting highways. The pavement portion of that was almost a 100% covered by the feds. So a lot of the ancillary stuff, sidewalks, lighting systems, things of that nature became city funded. Projects like Webster and half of military, I don't know if you remember that Alder Wery, when we did Military Avenue, we separated that into two projects roughly split near Mason street, and one was a DOT project and one was a city led project. And the DOT portion of that, that was an 80-20 cost share, because it was a local road not a connecting highway. Same thing on Webster, that started off as an 80-20 cost share. So because it's not an apples to apples comparison, we didn't necessarily include those numbers in all the analysis. But they are in this report.

- I remember it in a roundabout way. Those were some fun discussions right Steve?

- Seven roundabouts as a matter of fact, I think .

- Any other questions from the committee? I guess Director Grenier and Quirk, do you feel increasing what we do is a good goal and you know, well how do you suggest we get there? I mean, I know money right? .

- Money is what it is, yeah. You know I know a lot of prices right now for materials have been inflated and they're starting to come down just a little bit. You know, if we can get our contractor prices lower, I don't know how we'd do that. But there, you know. We had guys leaving the water utility bay. We had three distribution guys leave us in the last couple of months. Ernie and Ron, with $30 an hour and they went to $60 an hour in the contractor. So, you know, we're not gonna be able to compete with some of that when they want that money.

- I'm in the wrong job.

- Pardon?

- I'm in the wrong job.

- Me too . So, we have to look at the balance of life when we work in our municipal settings. But yeah, it's. No, we have to make a purposeful thing. We also, you know. Between the sewers. like the sanitary sewer and the storm sewer, which go on your water bill and then you know, our water is all combined to half of your water bill. We need to be very mindful as we're increasing that so that we don't all increase, you know, a highway. And I will just say when you talk about De Pere, De Pere's water bill is probably double to triple what ours are.

- We told them it would be. We told them it would be.

- I mean, when we were negotiating with. When we were negotiating with Wrightstown, our wholesale rate was at $2.20 per thousand and Central Brown County was at $4.40 a thousand. So, they were double us. And yeah, so their water bills are higher and maybe, I don't know what. I've not.

Brian, have you talked with. Scott and Steve I know our best friends almost, but have you talked with their water department about how much they're replacing water over there?

- No, I have not. I'm not sure what percentage of water main they replace.

- But going back to Alder Wery's original question. I think both General Manager Quirk and I would be of the same opinion. Yes, that is a goal. We agree that, you know. Getting more done would be a good thing. I was very careful when I drafted the memo and put the information together to try to give you facts and then leave the discussion up to you. That's really where it belongs it. I'm trying not to steer the decision in one direction or another. I mean you guys are the policy makers and I wanna respect that. Yes, I agree. Doing more is definitely a goal we should all be shooting for, I just wanna give you, to the best of my ability. What I really see as the potential fiscal impact, so you're making an educated decision.

- Two follow up questions and I saw your hand up Alder Gerlach, sorry I'm hogging all the time here. One would be, is it early enough now to look at next year? Or are you already kind of planned out for next year? And then two, what's your realistic guesstimate or goal that you think we could reach? If it's not two, is it 1.8? Or is it, you know what? And I know the ARPA money or whatever the. That money is gonna play a big factor obviously in there.

- Well, for that you know. The unfortunate answer is, it gets complicated really, really quickly. For the most part we have submitted what we expect our program to be for next year, but that discussion will occur with the finance department now. That's all part of the initiative for both the one-year and the five-year CIP and going with a more holistic one-year CIP. I think DPW, with the improvement and service committee, we always have had a pretty detailed and pretty robust discussion relative to an annual program. Parks has been pretty darn good about it as well, but maybe not all departments had that same forward look. So it was kind of catch us, catch you can, with some of the other departments at budget time, and then again when it came time to bond. So with making the plans for a five-year program and realizing that the first year of that five-year program is the most accurate of the five years. That discussion has shifted away from the individual departments and come under the umbrella of the finance department. Now, I know director Ellen Becker has been talking about, bringing that five-year CIP and annual CIP discussion earlier in the year. She wants that tied together at the same time as the budget discussions, because the amount of bonding we're doing has a direct impact on the debt service and bond requirement or budget impacts, for the following year. So, I don't wanna say that the ship has sailed for 2022. I will say we turned in a program that is about that 1.45. When we came up with the the vehicle registration fee, what we were attempting to do was figure out how much more money that generated. And then that became our new benchmark. That 32, 33,000 lineal feet of road. So that's what. Until we're given direction to change that, that's the target we're looking at each year. So, 2022's program is targeted at about 30 to 33,000, as are the next four years that we have in our five-year plan that we've turned in as well.

- Appreciate it. Alder Gerlach, did you have a--

- I jut got a question Alder Wery, just for some context for me to understand and I think I've got it figured out now. So, items are both from you, and I think that your motivation is to try to get more roads, you know, repaired here and you think 3% is like kind of a target that you have in mind?

- I put that target out there, you know, realistic or not. But I want, it sounds like everyone's in agreement that we want to do more so, it's just how do we get there? When do we start?

- Okay.

- And that's kind of where we're at right now.

- And then one last question, I asked earlier before you got here, why we held this in May? And I'm thinking it was to get that 20 year report. Am I right? Is that why we held it? Because you, we want to know your history before we talked it?

- That was part of it yeah. And some of the reports weren't ready quite yet. And there were vacations and Steve and I agreed let's wait until we can have already at once.

- Okay.

- present that mishmash.

- If you go back in--

- Thank you, I'm just trying to understand.

- If you go back and you look at the data that we presented back in May, that was done largely off of the numbers we had in the capital improvement program. So those were bottom dollar, bottom line dollars. That included things other than roads. For instance, the pavement numbers had bridges in there. Okay. What we've done here. And that was because we were trying to pool large amounts of information together in a relatively short period of time and give you something to chew on, okay? So that, there there's. I was very happy with the work Jim had done on that. When we got into this discussion and I was able to have a little bit more conversation with Alder Wery, what we did is we started parsing some of that out and we concentrated solely on resurface and reconstruct. So that's why you see the numbers are substantially lower, now than what we had presented back in May. And it took a. It took a fair amount of work to pull some of that stuff out. But again, we wanted. We didn't wanna bring you numbers that were overinflated, because that makes it look like we're trying to pad the ledger an we wanna give you the best information we can. So we got it down to as accurate as possible for you.

- Any other questions from the committee?

- But I'm wondering if we. Can we really, Shouldn't we wait and see what the ARPA, what we're going to be getting with ARPA. What we're gonna be able to do with ARPA before we go forward? I mean--

- Do we have a timeline on that?

- If we don't need to bond.

- Do you know all this Scannell or Director Grenier? Do we have a timeline on that? Any, inkling?

- I do not know. I do know that the mayor has held some listening sessions or public forum of some sort, to solicit input from the community on where the community would like to see those, those money spent. I'm not sure where that sits. It doesn't through INS, so I'm not as up to speed as you know, say Finance Department may be. I know finance has been working pretty tight with the mayor on those types of issues so they, you know. I don't, I don't wanna send you off to somebody else, but I think, you know, Director Ellen Becker at the mayor's office would have a better answer for you. I would be guessing.

- Will do. I was on the finance committee. I'm sorry Alder Grenier.

- I was just gonna say I was on the finance committee meeting. So you talk about it, 'cause you're gonna talk about a lot better than I was.

- No, I just. I know that they had a policy in there of how they were gonna spend the ARPA money. And I guess I don't know if they, did they pass it Alder Gerlach?

- The policy wasn't about how. It wasn't the policy for spending the money, it was where the money would go. They're setting the policy for. To make sure that Green Bay is in accord with the government regulations and therefore this is how it will work. The grant person that was hired to do this spoke, and she did a wonderful job I thought. Talked about exactly how you will apply for funds and you know, how everything will be, how the records will be kept and that sort of thing. And then we did ask, if there had been any plans? If anybody was starting to put together ideas for how this money would be spent. And I can't remember who told us that. I think it was Diana Ellenbecker. told us that the staff so far had come up with, had floated the idea enough for $80 million to be spent. And it's $23 million total. So, I guess people are thinking about it. But I believe they passed finally, and it will come to council next time. If I remember correctly. But it's just policy, it has nothing to do with how the money. What money will be allocated where.

- Director Quirk and Grenier, assuming let's say we weren't getting any federal money, what would be a good goal to try and bump up to next year? You know, minimal 1.5, 1.7, 1.8? But what's something that we could say, "Hey you know what, we're gonna walking in that direction." Maybe not running, just kind of. And then if we get the money, hey that'll help a great deal or do more. I just wanna kinda keep it moving instead of file it, because filing always spills things.

- I know we. Go ahead Brian.

- I was gonna say, from a water main perspective Alder Wery, the last two years we've been able to do 3.7 miles a year of water main relay. And then coming up in the next four years of the five-year program, we're going to be averaging about four miles a year, which is a pretty good bump up. We were at about 2.7 miles a year from 2003 to 2019. And a rule of thumb is we have 440 miles of distribution main, and rule of thumb is to do 1% of your system a year. So that would put us at 4.4 miles. So as you can see, you know, we're getting up to four miles a year without any ARPA funds or are changing the program. We still need to do roughly half a mile more a year at some point to be a little more in the, you know, the optimum range. So that would, you know, isn't necessarily a half mile long streets 'cause we'd do about two thirds of the streets that are selected that we have water main to work on. So I guess--

- And we had a master plan done in 2017 that had us replacing by around that three miles of main, because we were replacing all of our lead services. They were balancing the money that was going out to that, versus our replacement main. But we've been able through Brian and Steve's cooperation, been able to increase our main replacements. And like Brian said, we're shooting for about 4.4. But in the existing master plan for our medium range, which we're coming up to pretty soon. They want us to get up to about five miles of main a year. So we are trying to increase that slowly. You know, a couple of hundred thousand a year, as I said. We're gonna. We're trying not to do a rate increase in 2022, We will probably have one in 2023, to help us get a little bit farther ahead with that.

- Thank you, Steve, because they're doing the. Doing what? Can we do more?

- Well, I think I've told you in the past with the existing staff that we've got, we're pressed pretty thin. Other departments are doing more projects than they ever have in the past as well. And all of that funnels through the engineering staff here at DBW. So unfortunately, we can't dedicate all of our efforts towards road and sewer infrastructure projects. I think we have some capacity. We may have to subcontract some of that work out. Maybe not all of it. Especially if it's a smaller bump. Can we start moving in that direction? Again from an. From a manpower perspective, we've got some limited capacity to keep going up. I hate to do it, but I'm gonna turn around and ask you the same question, okay? And the reason I say that, taking a look at you know, especially those fiscal impact pieces. If we wanna take a real big swing at things and have just a huge rule of thumb. For pavement alone, every 0.1% we go up is a penny on the levy and that's exclusive of normal budget. So, think of the discussion we have every end of October beginning of November, and we're talking about what the tax rate's gonna be and where things are going. And you know, wages went here and fringes went there and we gotta buy this for equipment and, you know, throw all of that out the window, just to go up 0.1%. We're gonna add a penny to the levy and that never goes away. That's a permanent hit or a permanent increase on the levy. So if you want to go up 0.2%, go from 1.45 to 1.65 maybe 1.7. That's gonna be another two cents on the levy and that will never go away. So it's that. If you guys make that call, we will do everything in our power to deliver the program that you've asked us to deliver, okay? You're gonna have to make that decision and whether or not we can either carve that out of somewhere else or if you guys are gonna support increasing the levy to accommodate the work. I mean, unfortunately that's the real answer.

- Thanks Steve. Alder Scannell?

- Yeah, would that be? Are you? Do you have a position now to fill? Or does that need to go through personnel? Do we need to create an opening for you to fill a position to do this work?

- If the decision was to go forward, at some, you know. Increase from 1.45 to 1.6, we would attempt to handle that with existing staff and supplement as necessary. But I think, you know, by the time we get up to 1.7 and above, we're looking at adding permanent staff.

- And does that then have to go through personnel or?

- Yeah, well we would have to go to personnel committee to amend the table of organization and then get authorization to fill, and we'd have to do a budget amendment to pay for that.

- Okay. And would that absorb that? Would the levy be paying for that position? Is that part of the reason the levy goes up? Because we need to?

- Well, a portion of it. The way the engineers and project development, the aides, the technicians, and I believe the construction manager as well. Those are jointly funded, a third, a third, a third by the levy, by the sanitary and by the storm. . And this already takes that into account, okay? So, the full cost of those bodies, are not being put on the levee. That's what we see with that project management column, that's in the tables. We're taking the costs that that $729,600 to go up to 3%. That's being split amongst the pavement, the sanitary and the storm, based on their contributing amounts of construction funding. So, not all those costs go to the levy that would also require obtaining additional funding out of the sanitary and storm utilities for our staff and then, as General Manager Quirk has identified in her numbers, she's anticipating some staffing increases. I don't know where her break points are. But again, you know, one, four or five. Just off the cuff, if I had to guess, we would probably try to push it with existing staff up to, you know, about high as 1.6, 1.65 and once we start hitting 1.7, we're gonna need some additional bodies.

- Don't say break when you're talking about water though.

- Thank you Alder Scannell.

- Maybe Alder Wery we should make the push so you know, 1.6 to begin? You know, we can always amend and adjust as we go along, but that certainly gets the ball rolling.

- Yeah, I agree.

- We could see what you know, with ARPA and everything else, how things roll out and, and I'll make a motion to to pursue a goal of 1.55?

- Oh no, no, no, that's too low.

- 1.71.

- Yeah, there you go. That sounds good.

- 1.6 Steve, does that sound? I don't wanna break backs.

- Again, you guys set the goal--

- Right?

- We will do everything that we can to hit it.

- I'll second it.

- All right, and when it comes to the budget, you know, we'll just see what happens then too.

- Could you. Alder Scannell just to piggyback on here with a question. Director Grenier, is it possible to bring that back and to show us what that would mean financially?

- To take the--

- Right now it says, I think the lowest was 2%.

- To take the existing tables and put a 1.6 in there?

- Yeah.

- Yeah, we could do that.

- I mean, it's okay. Just so we have for next time so we can, then forward that on maybe to finance or the mayor or both or everyone , and say, "Hey, here's what we wanna do."

- Yeah, a matter of fact if you're taking an action item, we could take that 1.6 impact sheet and have that as an informational item at the next meeting because you've already taken an action here.

- And that's obviously I'd love it to be 3%, but I'll take us baby step . I'm not, even, I'm not that greedy. And Director Quirk, you disappeared for a minute. And I thought the Lochness monster got you.

- No, the sun was coming into my eyes I couldn't see, I had to take the shade down. So no. But yeah, we definitely work alongside Steve and do the best we could and--

- It's not a. It's not a great increase, but is that something that you could work with him? If we went from that 1.45 to the 1.6? You could work, you know, between the two of you to accomplish that? Or Brian, whoever?

- We'd do everything we could to do that, yes. 'Cause we certainly wanna be replacing more infrastructure. I'm sick of going to the claims committee so.

- Any other questions from the committee? I mean, is that a good goal, bad goal? Are you comfortable with it? I mean.

- I'm comfortable with it right now.

- Yeah.

- For tonight.

- And like you said--

- Going forward who the heck knows? You know, we just don't have a crystal ball.

- We also have the. If the federal government passes the infrastructure bill, there maybe money coming towards streets and things too, which we don't know yet. And it hasn't passed anything in. So we're kind of up in the air with those things that are going on and both Steve and I and well Brian too, we're all keeping in track with, with what's going on at the federal level and trying to get into those programs as quick as we can.

- I wanted--

- That's greatly appreciated. And I think it's good that we're planning that that's not even going to be coming, because the federal wheels grind so slowly, we could get those funds in two years, right? I mean, maybe they'll go quicker and we get it in a year and a half, but I think we should plan like we're not gonna get any and then if we do, "Oh hey, that makes it a lot easier."

- I'm gonna go upstairs and get the glasses you gave me Nancy.

- No, no thyre on your head Steve Grenier, they're on your head.

- No.

- We got him some rose colored glasses.

- Nancy got me a pair of rose colored glasses several months back. I'm a little bit of a pessimist by nature. When I remember the. The ARRA funds, which predated ARPA by a decade. But the, that that was. the federal government wanted to hit shovel-ready projects. There was $751 million that came to the State of Wisconsin for transportation. Solely dedicated to road projects, roads and bridges. $751 million. We are the third largest municipality in the state of Wisconsin. The City of Green Bay received $220,000 out of 751 million that came to the state. So when it comes to federal programs, trickling down to the locals, I'm not overly enthused .

- I remember my first year or two in council, we got money from the federal government to do the walkway underneath the bridge downtown. Was that that money? That's how I said we had ready to go. So we put that tunnel underneath.

- Is that tunnel is still there?

- Yeah.

- Or did it get completely filled in? It's still there.

- But he fish, the glowing fish?

- That's the tunnel that goes underneath the Walnut street bridge on the east side part of the city--

- Who else has seen.

- Our star bridge, oh boy. Yeah, sorry. Any other questions from the committee or any other comments? Or should we along and? Can't imagine we're gonna get a whole lot of feedback from the rest of the council, but you never know. Maybe they don't like roads as much.

- I think there's so many variables here you know, who knows how this is really gonna play out. But for tonight, I think you know. Let's get the ball rolling and see where we end up. Hopefully we're going backwards.

- No, don't .

- All right, well we have a motion and a second to direct staff I guess to , increase the road repair work to 1.6%.

- Yeah, what I would--

- Clean it up and make it pretty--

- What I would do is I would clarify that. For the local street resurfacing reconstruction program. That way know exactly where the money is going.

- You beautified it for me. Is that okay with you? I'll just skip.

- Those words were exactly what I had in my mouth. I just you know, my mouths a little dry.

- It's not gonna be for a 2022 program?

- Right.

- Okay. We just turned our CIPS in last Friday, so we're gonna have to amend those Brian.

- What else were you gonna do tomorrow?

- I'm going to Madison to testify on some bills at this thing.

- To give us more road money. All right, any other questions from the committee? Those in favor.

- Aye.

- Aye.

- Aye

- Aye.

- Opposed? That motion carries. All right, I appreciate it Brian and Nancy. Thanks very much.

- Thank you guys. Appreciate being included, 'cause I think it's important that we collaborate on this stuff. So, thank you Steve. Take care.

- Thank you.

- Quick side question for either one of you or Steve. Raymond Street, there's a bunch of road work being done. Is that just sewer or is that also water?

- Brian, you would know us.

- No, okay. If you don't know, that's fine. I though maybe you knew off the top of your head.

- No.

- No, I don't think that's us.

- Unfortunately , by the time you get up to Nancy and Brian and Jim and myself, we tend to lose. You lose that touch with the accurate projects that are going on.

- It's called delegating.

- Yeah, we're gonna talk to people about that.

- All right, but I appreciate it.

- Alder wery

- Thank you.

- We're gonna increase--

- You guys take care.

- And constituents aren't gonna complain that all the roads are being .

- They're all being torn up.

- Its crazy.

- Well, I am experiencing that with the sidewalks right now. Right Steve?

- Yep.

- Yeah, everybody wants better sidewalks till it's their sidewalk. Let's see we are. Could you read the next item for me?

- All right you guys take care. Bye bye.

- Okay thank you.

- Have a good one.

- It's still not pulling my agenda up so--

- We were, so we were discussing both items two and three at the same time. Three was consideration and possible action on the request for the 20 year history of road repairs, including alleys from 2001 to 2021 with total expenditure, miles, distance completed, type, reconstruction versus resurface and to denote if the projects were cooperative with county and or state, held at the August 11th, 2021 improvement service committee meeting.

- Director, now that we do have this, you know, you've put a lot of work into it, is this something that you could roll out, every year to the committee, when it's time to do our roads and say, "Hey, boom. Here's where we're at. Here's where we're at." We can clearly see, okay, we're going down or up, or we're staying even I think.

- Now that we've got the. Now that we've got the bulk of this document to keep it updated on an annual basis, I think we could definitely do that.

- Okay, I don't know what the committee thinks, but I love that kind of data and information just to see how we're doing and compared to the past and where we're going, When would be the best time to roll it out to us Steve. When do you bring us our streets? That's usually January or?

- Well now. Again, because we're taking the capital improvement program up that's coming through finance now, and that's coming up, at least what the target is to do that in the Fall. I don't think it would be a problem. January might be a little preemptive, 'cause we don't have the contracts finalized at that point. But to bring it to you in March as an update item.

- Yeah.

- You know, update the table and show you what we did last year and what those costs are? By and large I think most of these contracts will be closed out by March. So we could do that in March.

- And then for next year, when you bring forward the proposed road projects, you could bring this forward again and say, "Hey, here's where we're proposing the next year be." Does that make sense? When you're showing the history, then you can have the line saying next year, you know, here's kind of where we're moving to.

- Sure.

- Okay.

- And before we actually bring the, the report to you, if there are particulars that you'd like to see in the report, just get touch with me and we can talk before we before we publish it.

- Any questions on that committee? Or I guess if you don't mind, I'll make a motion to bring this back for an update in March, our next year's numbers. And then to annually have this part of the proposed roadwork report.

- I'll second it. Sounds like you're rolling down the right road there.

- Putting the brakes to that right now.

- You don't wanna curb my humor do you?

- Any second to that? Or did you second that?

- I seconded.

- Okay. Any other questions on that, comments? Those in favor?

- Aye.

- Opposed? Motion carried. All right thanks. Are we informational now? No.

- Would you like me to read it Alder Wery?

- If you could.

- As action item. The last active item is four, report of actions taken by department of public works, a granting licenses. one sidewalk builder. a Chris Marco Concrete LLC. So, I don't know if there's much to say there other than receive a place on file.

- Correct?

- Exactly.

- Receive a motion.

- Motion by Alder Scannell.

- Second.

- Second by Alder Gerlach. Any comments on that? Those in favor.

- [Together] Aye.

- Opposed? Motion carried.

- I'll write the informational.

- Informational, all right.

- Director's report?

- Okay, a pretty short director's report. We've got a lot of staff out over the past week or two. We're continuing on storm cleanup. Matter of fact last week we did no crack sealing, joint sealing, no mastic deployment at all. We took all street section employees and we had all hands on deck assisting the sanitation folks out doing brush collection. With the weather pattern that we've been stuck in over the past couple of weeks, I'm sure you've noticed it at your own house. But there's a lot of grass growing out there. So, in addition to the routine grass cutting that we have on our own properties, last week we investigated 71 complaints of long grass. 50 were resolved by the owner, but that required us to go out cut 21 properties. With the amount of debris that has been deposited due to the storm events that we've suffered, our street sweepers have been exceedingly busy. So we've completed, I think we're about 90% through round 19 for the year. That's also been. We've noticed some issues with investigating complaints of Street ponding and flooding. So, the utility section has been out putting some pretty long hours in both with some maintenance on storm sewer and dealing with calls on flooding and backups and investigations on things of that nature. So, staff has definitely been busy and a lot of it's been weather driven over the past two weeks or so.

- Thank you director. And I appreciate your help with the sidewalk callbacks.

- Oh, not a problem.

- Yeah, just to explain it. And then I look forward to your revised informational guide or whatever you're working on. Because I think that'll help a great deal to head off some of these questions.

- Right.

- Motion to receive and place on file.

- Motion to receive and place on file by Alder Scannell, seconded by Alder Brunette. Those in favor?

- [Together] Aye.

- Opposed? Motion carried.

- Next meeting September 15th.

- All right. Let's do it.

- Motion to adjourn.

- Motion to adjourn by Alder Scannell.

- Second.

- By Alder Brunette. Those in favor.

- [Together] Aye.

- Opposed? Motion carried.