



MINUTES OF THE TRAFFIC, BICYCLE, & PEDESTRIAN COMMISSION

MONDAY, JANUARY 17, 2022, 5:30 PM

Virtual Meeting. Attendees and public may join via zoom.

A. ZOOM MEETING INFORMATION.

I. This item contains Zoom information, instructions, and a link to the Virtual Comment Form.

B. ROLL CALL.

I. *Members:* Chairperson Matt Kuepers, Vice Chairperson Daniel Theno, Alder Craig Stevens, Lieutenant Mike Sobieck, Melissa Flucke, Kasha Huntowski, and Patrick Sorelle.

Present and Voting: Craig Stevens, Daniel Theno, Kasha Huntowski, Melissa Flucke, and Patrick Sorelle

Present and Not Voting: Matt Kuepers

Excused: Mike Sobieck

Others Present: Alders Dorff, Gerlach, and Johnson

C. APPROVAL OF THE AGENDA.

I. Approval of the Monday, January 18, 2022 Traffic, Bicycle, and Pedestrian Commission meeting agenda.

Moved by Ald. Craig Stevens, seconded by Daniel Theno, to approve the agenda of the Monday, January 18, 2022 Traffic, Bicycle, and Pedestrian Commission meeting.

Yes- Craig Stevens, Daniel Theno, Melissa Flucke, Kasha Huntowski, Patrick Sorelle No-
None, Abstain- None.

Motion carried.

D. APPROVAL OF MINUTES.

1. Approval of the Monday, November 15, 2021 Traffic, Bicycle, and Pedestrian Commission meeting minutes.

Moved by Kasha Huntowski, seconded by Patrick Sorelle, to approve the Monday, November 15, 2021 Traffic, Bicycle, and Pedestrian Commission meeting minutes.

Yes- Craig Stevens, Daniel Theno, Melissa Flucke, Kasha Huntowski, Patrick Sorelle
No- None, Abstain- None.

Motion carried.

E. REGULAR BUSINESS.

1. *General Business*: Report by the Police Department of the 2021 4th quarter serious injury and fatal crashes. (All Alders)

Moved by Ald. Craig Stevens, seconded by Melissa Flucke, to receive and place on file the report by the Police Department of the 2021 4th quarter serious injury and fatal crashes.

Yes- Craig Stevens, Daniel Theno, Melissa Flucke, Kasha Huntowski, Patrick Sorelle
No- None, Abstain- None.

Motion carried.

2. *General Business*: Report by the Green Bay Police Department on the monthly Traffic Enforcement Unit Traffic Safety Plan. (All Alders)

Moved by Ald. Craig Stevens, seconded by Daniel Theno, to postpone to the next meeting the report by the Green Bay Police Department on the monthly (January) Traffic Enforcement Unit Safety Plan.

Yes- Craig Stevens, Daniel Theno, Melissa Flucke, Kasha Huntowski, Patrick Sorelle
No- None, Abstain- None.

Motion carried.

3. *Initial Request*: Consideration with possible action on the request by a resident at Highland Park to have the speed limit reduced on Morrow Street from 35 mph to 25 mph between North Henry Street and North Danz Avenue. (Ald. Stevens - District 5)

Moved by Ald. Craig Stevens, seconded by Daniel Theno, to refer to staff for study the request by a resident at Highland Park to have the speed limit reduced on Morrow Street from 35 mph to 25 mph between North Henry Street and North Danz Avenue.

Yes- Craig Stevens, Daniel Theno, Melissa Flucke, Kasha Huntowski, Patrick Sorelle
No- None, Abstain- None.

Motion carried.

4. *Initial Request*: Consideration with possible action on the request by the Green Bay Police

Department and Parking Division to modify the existing NO PARKING TAXI LIMO BUS PARKING ONLY 10 PM TO 2 AM zone on the north side of Cherry Street and the existing NO PARKING TAXI LOADING ONLY 12 AM TO 3 AM SATURDAY AND SUNDAY zone on the east side of Washington Street to include food truck vendors. (Ald. Johnson - District 9)

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

A. Remove the NO PARKING TAXI BUS LIMO ONLY 10:00 PM TO 2:00 AM zone on the north side of Cherry Street from Washington Street to Adams Street.

B. Establish a NO PARKING TAXI BUS LIMO FOOD TRUCK ONLY 10:00 PM TO 2:00 AM zone on the north side of Cherry Street from Washington Street to Adams Street.

C. Remove the NO PARKING TAXI LOADING ONLY 12:00 AM TO 3:00 AM SATURDAY AND SUNDAY zone on the east side of Washington Street from a point 100 feet south of Doty Street to Doty Street.

D. Establish a NO PARKING TAXI FOOD TRUCK LOADING ONLY 12:00 AM TO 3:00 AM SATURDAY AND SUNDAY zone on the east side of Washington Street from a point 100 feet south of Doty Street to Doty Street.

Yes- Craig Stevens, Daniel Theno, Melissa Flucke, Kasha Huntowski, Patrick Sorelle

No- None, Abstain- None.

Motion carried.

5. *Held from Past Meeting*: Consideration with possible action on the request by Ald. Stevens to review and/or create bylaws for the Traffic, Bicycle and Pedestrian Commission.

Moved by Daniel Theno, seconded by Melissa Flucke, to adopt bylaws as amended for the Traffic, Bicycle, and Pedestrian Commission. (No action required by Common Council. Informational only.)

Yes- Craig Stevens, Daniel Theno, Melissa Flucke, Kasha Huntowski, Patrick Sorelle

No- None, Abstain- None.

Motion carried.

6. *Referred Back From Study*: To refer to staff for study the request by Ald. Dorff to review the 40 mph speed limit on Church Road and reduce it to 35 mph. (Ald. Dorff - District 1)

Moved by Daniel Theno, seconded by Kasha Huntowski, to:

A. Receive and place on file the speed study of Church Road from Nicolet Drive to Bay Settlement Road.

B. Install pedestrian advance warning signs along Church Road between Nicolet Drive and Sussex Road.

C. Relocate the STOP AHEAD advance warning sign on westbound Church Road in advance of Nicolet Drive to be compliant with proper stopping sight distance.

D. Decrease the speed limit on Church Road from Nicolet Drive to Bay Settlement Road from 40 mph to 35 mph.

Motion carried.

7. *Termination of 90-Day Trial Period:* Remove the NO PARKING zone on the north side of Cass Street from Webster Avenue to a point 60 feet west of Irwin Avenue.

Moved by Kasha Huntowski, seconded by Ald. Craig Stevens, to remove the NO PARKING zone on the north side of Cass Street from Webster Avenue to a point 60 feet west of Irwin Avenue.

Yes- Craig Stevens, Daniel Theno, Melissa Flucke, Kasha Huntowski, Patrick Sorelle

No- None, Abstain- None.

Motion carried.

8. *Termination of 90-Day Trial Period:* Establish a NO PARKING zone on the north side of Cass Street from the cul-de-sac between Webster Avenue and Clay Street to Roosevelt Street.

Moved by Kasha Huntowski, seconded by Ald. Craig Stevens, to establish a NO PARKING zone on the north side of Cass Street from the cul-de-sac between Webster Avenue and Clay Street to Roosevelt Street, and adopt by ordinance.

Yes- Craig Stevens, Daniel Theno, Melissa Flucke, Kasha Huntowski, Patrick Sorelle

No- None, Abstain- None.

Motion carried.

9. *Termination of 90-Day Trial Period:* Establish a NO PARKING zone on the south side of Cass Street from Roosevelt Street to a point 60 feet west of Irwin Avenue.

Moved by Kasha Huntowski, seconded by Ald. Craig Stevens, to establish a NO PARKING zone on the south side of Cass Street from Roosevelt Street to a point 60 feet west of Irwin Avenue, and adopt by ordinance.

Yes- Craig Stevens, Daniel Theno, Melissa Flucke, Kasha Huntowski, Patrick Sorelle

No- None, Abstain- None.

Motion carried.

10. *Termination of 90-Day Trial Period:* Remove the ONE-WAY YIELD condition on Peters Street at Basten Street.

Moved by Kasha Huntowski, seconded by Ald. Craig Stevens, to remove the ONE-WAY YIELD condition on Peters Street at Basten Street.

Yes- Craig Stevens, Daniel Theno, Melissa Flucke, Kasha Huntowski, Patrick Sorelle

No- None, Abstain- None.

Motion carried.

11. *Termination of 90-Day Trial Period:* Establish a ONE-WAY STOP condition on Peters Street at Basten Street.

Moved by Kasha Huntowski, seconded by Ald. Craig Stevens, to establish a ONE-WAY STOP condition on Peters Street at Basten Street, and adopt by ordinance.

Yes- Craig Stevens, Daniel Theno, Melissa Flucke, Kasha Huntowski, Patrick Sorelle

No- None, Abstain- None.

Motion carried.

F. INFORMATIONAL.

I. Next meeting: Monday, February 15, 2022.

G. PUBLIC HEARINGS.

H. ADJOURNMENT.

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

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

Yes- Craig Stevens, Daniel Theno, Melissa Flucke, Kasha Huntowski, Patrick Sorelle

No- None, Abstain- None.

Motion carried.

VERBATIM MINUTES

- [Jim] I'm still waiting for... Still waiting for a lot of people to check in on CivicClerk. It's the only one I've got a signed in on the CivicClerk is Alder Stevens.

- We should be fine with that Jim. Like I said everything is done off of voice vote. So we typically we'll do roll call as part of the item. And as long as they are present in the Zoom meeting, that would constitute presence in the quorum.

- [Jim] Okay.

- Ultimate quorum.

- [Jim] So the only person I think we're missing is Mike and then Dan, I believe.

- Well, as we had discussed Mike is going to be an excused absence, he's not feeling well. And what was the other?

- [Jim] Dan.
- [Matt] Dan Theno.
- [Jim] Okay, Dan is admitted.
- I just admitted Dan in a second ago.
- [Jim] And Matt too and Melissa?
- Yep, he's here, she's here and then Pat. I thought I saw Pat too.
- Okay, and I am recording now Jim just so you know the Zoom meeting.
- [Jim] Yeah, I will.
- Okay, are we ready to go on then Dave from your end?
- [Dave] Jim are you ready?
- [Jim] I was ready as I'm gonna be.
- Okay, yes, I think we're ready to go Matt.
- Okay, I will call to order the Green Bay Traffic, Bicycle, Pedestrian Commission meeting from Monday January . We'll start with Item B roll call. Members present just say, yay. Chairperson Kuepers. Here. Vice chairperson Theno.
- I think he's on camera--
- [Participant] I think he left.
- But I see he's as part of the meeting, I would consider that yes.
- That's okay. Alder Stevens.
- Here.
- Excused.
- Excused. Okay. Commissioner Flucke.
- [Flucke] Here.
- Commissioner Huntowski.
- [Huntowski] Here.
- And Commissioner Sorelle Patrick. Help me name if I'm incorrect. Sorelle. Sorelle.
- Yes, here.

- Oh, okay.

- I'm Sorelle. Yap.

- Sorelle, thank you for clarifying your name so. Okay, we'll move on to Item C, approval of the agenda. Do I hear a motion to approve the agendas as noted here for our meeting tonight?

- Motion to approve.

- [Participant] Second.

- Motion made and second. All in favor.

- [All] Aye.

- Okay, motion carries. Moving on to Item D approval of the minute. We'll hear a motion to approve the minutes from our last meeting Monday, November 15th, 2021.

- Make motion to approve.

- Motion made. A second?

- [Participants] Second.

- Motion made and second. All in favor.

- [Participants] Aye.

- Hey, motion carries. Let's go on to regular business. Under item one Report by the police department on the 2021 fourth quarter serious injuries and fatal crashes. All of them are and just there's to nothing to view. I don't think so. A good fourth quarter how should we handle that with the absence of the Lieutenant?

- I emailed him briefly and I asked, if he's sending a proxy? He said, no. 'Cause that would be actually part of the rules for the ordinance that it's actually the operations commander or his designee which is Mike in this situation, but he was not sending a proxy. And I asked him what he'd like done with the reports and... Yeah, I can probably speak to the basics of them, seeing how I've already looked at them as to whether or not I can respond to questions that's a whole other thing, but at least with respect to this Item E1, I believe you had already alluded to it, Chair Kuepers that there are no reportable serious injury or fatal crashes or were, I should say from the fourth quarter of 2021. So that would be very good news to hear and with that I would make a recommendation to the Traffic, Bike and Ped Commission for receiving place on file that report.

- file.

- Do I hear a second?

- [Participant] Second.

- Motion made and second. All in favor.

- [Participants] Aye.
- Okay, motion carries.
- And Chairman I have a question.
- Yes, go ahead.
- Okay. So if the Lieutenant from the police department was unable to come, how come there wasn't a designee from the Police Department to come for traffic tonight?
- I do not know that answer. I did not know Lieutenant was not gonna here tonight. Dave, can you shed any light on that? I don't know Alder Stevens.
- I honestly just found out. I mean, I had emailed him earlier in the day and I got this response back at 4:52, but that he was responding to my initial email which had nothing to do with being at tonight's meeting. But then he had added to that email that he was not feeling well and won't be at the meeting. I asked him if I wanted to go through the report are you sending the proxies? He says, I don't have a proxy. If you could go through it, it's pretty straightforward. If anything else is needed please let me know. And just actually reading his email exchange between he and I. So that's all I can really tell you Alder Stevens in regard to your question.
- Okay. The reason why I ask is the next item. There may be some questions and there is nobody here to represent the police department.
- Yeah, that one I think we should postpone till next month would be my thought.
- But I see Alder Dorff in.
- Alder Dorff, yes, go ahead.
- Chair, I've been requested by Alder Gerlach so someone could let her in please to the meeting. She's... Oh, wait trying to get in.
- Oh.
- Okay.
- I just hit the admit button. She should be in.
- Okay.
- [Participant] And thank you, Chair.
- Very good. Yeah, I would... It's important for the Lieutenant to be here for item two. So I'm thinking we should postpone that for this month.
- So move.
- [Participant] Second.

- A motion was made. Do I have a second?

- There was a... Steve.

- Motion made and seconded. All in favor.

- [Participants] Aye.

- Okay, we'll postpone two. Let's move on item three, consideration possible action request by a resident at Highland Park to we have the speed limit reduced miles per hour to 25 miles per hour between North Henry street and North Danz Avenue. Dave, would you like to take over that one?

- The only response I really have on it is no different than any of the other studies that have come forward that required by state statute for speed study to be conducted before any modification of the speed limit on any street. So my recommendation would be, first off since Alder Stevens it is his request if he has anything to add to please chime in. And after we hear if anything is said and the commission so desires, they would have to be referred to staff for studying if this were to be accepted.

- My comment on is that I would make to refer this to staff to do that study. We do it with every other street change. So we shouldn't push this one forward again.

- Okay. Do I hear a motion to refer to staff then?

- I'll make that motion.

- Okay.

- [Participant] Second.

- Motion made and seconded. All in favor.

- [Participants] Aye.

- Okay, motion carries. Let's move on to four. Consideration of possible actual requests by the Green Bay Police Department in parking division to modify the existing no parking bus. Parking only 10:00 p.m to 2:00 a.m on the north side of Cherry Street and the existing no parking taxi loading only 12:00 a.m to 3:00 a.m Saturday and Sunday zone on the east side of Washington Street to include food truck vendors. Okay. Looks like Alder Johnson I don't think he's here so Dave do you wanna take over?

- No, Alder Johnson is here.

- Oh, is he? Okay? I'm sorry I missed that. Alder would you go on record with this request please?

- Yeah, sure. Thank you, Chair. Fully support the recommendation. I guess, I just wanted show up and obviously answer any questions, but I think this was a good discussion that had been ongoing with a food truck operator and our police department. So I support the resolution that they came to. I think it's a good thing for downtown.

- I have a question for Alder Johnson.

- [Matt] Yes, go ahead.

- Alder Johnson you stated you had a conversation with the police department, but as you clearly can tell the police is not here tonight. So could you share that conversation with us?

- Yeah, it's been a while since I've had that conversation, you know, more specifically though Alder Stevens I was referring to, there was one food truck operator in particular who had, really it's to the issue that was occurring here and they had worked directly with the police department. So unfortunately I wasn't part of those direct dialogs. My conversation was kind of really early on, to say, Hey, can we please work with this operator to come up with a solution? And that's exactly so. You know, really if you're not familiar Alder Stevens what the issue was, in Washington there's that no parking zone really to keep the street clear when bars close at the end of the night and the food truck operator there is parked area. And so I think really the resolution here was to try to create an opportunity recognizing that a single food truck operator isn't what's causing a congested street or an issue there. In fact, I think they're providing a lot of value and a lot of good by being able to provide food at that hour to those that need it. So again, it's the police department and the food truck operator that worked this out and came up with a recommendation which I do support.

- Thank you.

- Mr. Chair and I would move approval.

- Okay. I've heard a motion to approve and then a second. So all in favor.

- [Participants] Aye.

- Okay, motion carries.

- Can we have a second Dan there? I didn't catch who it was.

- All those in favor.

- [Participant] It's Dan.

- So Dan you seconded who then made the motion?

- No, I made the motion, but Alder Stevens but Alder Stevens seconded.

- [Matt] Yes.

- Okay. Thank you.

- Move on item five. Consideration with possible action requests for Alder Stevens to review and or create bylaws for the Traffic, Bicycle, Pedestrian Commission. Alder Stevens do you wanna start with this or?

- Chair, I think we should talk to our attorney Mather. See if we have any comments from her.

- Okay.

- Just one minute. Bear with me here.

- But after reviewing this we have one sir. So I haven't. I think we should look at the representative for the police department that if one is not gonna be here, someone should be here.

- Okay. Thanks alder. Go ahead.

- All right. Thank you. Sorry about that. So I had worked with Dave. My understanding is that he had worked with some of the people on the commission. I'm not quite sure how many of you, but to develop some of the proposed bylaws and then I just revised so that it was consistent with our code and with statutes and that sort of thing. At the last meeting when this came up, Alder Dorff brought up a good question that I didn't know the answer to, which was why we held onto it for another meeting. Specifically, there's a provision in here that allows for one alder. So I believe Alder Stevens are you the alder appointed to the commission?

- Yes.

- So if you're unable to attend these bylaws would allow another alder to attend in your place. And that's true for standing committees, but it's not true for some of our other boards of commissions. However, because you are empowered under our ordinances to create your own bylaws, you can make that one of your bylaws and then you are authorized to do that. So there's nothing in statute that prevents us from doing that. The only thing is that it just has to be explicitly authorized. And so by putting this into the bylaws, you are explicitly authorizing it and therefore it's fine. But for a commission that doesn't have it either in our code or explicitly authorized in their own bylaws, that kind of substitution would not be as easily accomplished. Does that answer your question Alder Dorff?

- It does. I have to ask one more question about the chair declaring commissioners position to be vacant if they've missed the meetings. Since the mayor appoints and council approves can the chair just on take someone off, and they maybe can't because they're making up their own bylaws. I'm just curious.

- So again, in general, they would not be able to. And this one actually is not specific to the fact that we have bylaws or this commission, it's actually because the section of the code that creates this commission specifically says that the commission can create its own bylaws, including standards for removal of a commissioner if they don't attend meetings. I mean, it's worded more nicely than that, but that's basically what the code specifically authorizes. So that's the one exception, like basically whatever council enacted that ordinance said, we're okay with the commissioners for this particular commission setting an attendance requirement, and if they don't meet it then they can be replaced with somebody who is actually going to attend because this is an important commission. And so yes, in general, that's not a thing that's within the chair's power, but it's specifically authorized here.

- That's very interesting. And I'm glad. And that's what the committee wants to do, I'm glad they can do it. But it's interesting to find out that it is unusual as well, because it was something just specific to this commission. So thank you.

- You're welcome.

- Well, let me just add something Mr. Chairman is that, in a number three and declaring a vacancy, it's unexcused absences. Unexcused. That's an important word. If you're sick or you're out of town and you inform the chair or the traffic engineer that you're not gonna be able to make it, that would not count against you for missing the meeting which would precipitate your removal from the commission.

- All right, thank you, Dan. Is there any other questions? Maybe the city attorney yet in regards to this? Okay, if no questions.

- I have a couple of comments, I don't know if that counts, Matt.

- Go ahead Dave.

- And they're more clarification than anything else. Under duties quorum and voting. Number three quorums our commissioners. When I was reading online about Robert's rules and I guess you'd say some of the more modern interpretations of it because of, you know, virtual meetings and so forth. I just wanted to have clarity that, there's sometimes a question about presence. And I think when Robert's rules was originally developed, it meant in-person, but due to our virtual and I guess sometimes hybrid nature of holding meetings now during this pandemic, I'm going to make the assumption that quorum will also include virtual presence. So I don't know if that needs to necessarily be distinguished. And again, we do have attorney Mather here and I don't know if maybe this has come up at, for other committees or commissions, but it's something that I saw that was discussion around the internet. So I just thought maybe I would throw that out there for discussion. And if it's not a big deal, then I guess it's a nothing, but I just figured I'd throw it out there.

- Yeah, Attorney Martha does that make since you're is that... How should we handle, I guess, since we have you on with us tonight maybe you can give us your expertise there.

- Well, I don't know if I'd go so far as to call it expertise, but the most recent version of Robert's rules does include several provisions specifically about electronic meetings. And we also council not too long ago passed an ordinance to make part of our code allow for remote attendance at meetings. Not just council meetings or committee meetings but other bodies that meet as well which would include this commission. So the requirements for quorum are laid out in that remote attendance ordinance, but basically your attendance will count toward quorum. I mean, there are kind of nuances that aren't necessarily and, do you guys ever meet in closed session for anything on this commission?

- No.

- We never have.

- Okay. 'Cause there are a slightly different requirements for that as far as having your video on, and things like that. But telephonic attendance is also permissible. I had one other thing that I was going to say that I completely forgot. Oh, if for some reason you are conducting some kind of hearing or anything, I don't know if this commission does that either. But if for some reason you're taking testimony from somebody and you need to be able to assess the credibility of a witness or examine evidence in-person tactilely, then in those cases you would not count toward quorum, because only the people who are able to directly observe that evidence count toward quorum. But otherwise, like all of you here right now, you all count toward quorum. That's a long-winded

answer, I apologize for that. But.

- Yeah. No, the only thing we have, we do spend the rules to allow interested parties like citizens of Green Bay to speak to items. So that probably a little different than what you're talking about quorum there, but that was the only that would come to my mind that would be, you know, where we do something a little differently, but.

- Okay.

- Yep.

- And that's people from the public can participate by phone or video as well, obviously.

- Correct. Dave, any other comments then from your perspective on?

- The only other thing is, and I know that this has been talked about before 'cause this item has been on probably two or three agendas is the item of time limit. And I know that you have, I believe is you Matt that was making reference to a time limit of three minutes for the gallery speakers as a maximum time. I didn't see that on the last round here. I don't know if that was forgotten or if you guys just are not interested in putting that on. I just thought as a point of emphasis just because I know that it had been discussed at one time, I was not sure if you wanted that still included.

- No, I would like that included. I typically what I give people the open forum to talk, I usually try to keep three minutes to keep it going. So I think that would be important to my... At least I think put it in the bylaws from my standpoint.

- Well, that Mr. Chairman that'd be easy to correct. Number four under meetings in public participation, commission shall open up four to allow any member of the public to speak to the commission and then insert to a maximum of three minutes.

- I think that would be spot on.

- I would move that amendment.

- I have thought process. If we do a max of three minutes wouldn't we be kind of tying our hands if we do have an important subject in front of us where it might take five minutes for someone to talk? So why don't we be a minimum of three minutes?

- And then would it be up to the discretion of the chair to make it longer?

- I mean, at three minutes and 30 seconds I probably not gonna cut anybody off. I'm gonna say three minutes is a lot of time please wrap up your comments here. So I think it'd be important to me, you know, correct me if I'm wrong other commissioners or whoever may be, but I think it's really important to put three minutes in as a starting point not that you can't go over a minute or two at least. That's my take on it. It's an important subject matter.

- Mr. Chairman, there's an easy out on that. If you put a three minute limitation on it, any member of the commission could ask unanimous consent to extend the time allotment, and by unanimous consent you can do just about anything.

- Yeah. No, I think that's a good idea, Dan.
- I just wanna make sure we're not tying our hands.
- No, that's a good thought Craig.
- Right. It's nice if we have options for them or anything like that. But the initial commentary, especially when there's multiple people on the same topic, I'm in love with adding the max.
- And I think attorney Mather was trying to maybe make a comment.
- Right. Thank you. If I could Mr. Chair.
- Absolutely.
- Thank you. My only recommendation is that rather than shall, you use may so that you're not binding yourself to always opening the floor, first of all. And second of all, to opening it for any set amount of time. Because if you do ever have a really controversial item in front of this commission and you get like 50 people here that wanna speak just hypothetically and you give them all three minutes, suddenly you're looking at a really long meeting. But if you add in something that, you know, at the discretion of the chair the period maybe changed or something like that obviously more nicely worded. But if you could just include something in there that at the chair's discretion that time period can be changed, that way you can kind of protect against those kind of worst case scenarios where everybody either has too little time or too much time.
- Okay. No, good thought. Thank you for that. So I should say may instead of shall, is that what you're saying?
- Let me throw this out. This might be getting a little confusing. Upon proper motion the commission strikeout shall and put may. Okay? Open the floor to allow member of the public to speak for a maximum... Insert for a maximum three minutes to the commission about any agenda item period. The chair may allow additional time for speakers to address the commission. Just add that new sentence on the end.
- We've got a lot of heads nodding yes, so it sounds good, Dan.
- Did you get it all?
- You must have been reading your law books today, Dan. Good job.
- I spent four terms in the Wisconsin Senate. Some of it rubbed off on me.
- Make sure I'm gonna put you in for a higher rate than you got last year Dan. Thank you Dan, though. Any other comments, additions, deletions that we need to add to our bylaws? Anybody's can think of at this point in time?
- Yeah, I have a question, I guess.
- Yes, go ahead.
- So regarding these bylaws, it'll go to common council for final approval. Does the mayor have to

sign off on these bylaws or is that common council?

- I don't know that council even has to sign off on it. Give me a second to pull up the ordinance, but it's specifically gives this commission the authority to establish its own bylaws. So if you create the bylaws, you are the only authority that needs to approve it. I'm gonna double check while you guys continue your conversation. But that's my--

- The reason why I asked if we're going to vote on this, do we have physically have to sign the bylaws this committee going forward? Because someone have to sign off on?

- I would say maybe the chair can sign off on them. Yeah, I guess we should probably retain a physical copy at City Hall. So yeah, I would say we would ask Mr. Chair to sign off on a final version and then just send the original to City Hall and then we'll keep it in the clerk's office probably. But yeah, I'm still gonna pull up that ordinance.

- I just wanna make sure that you're doing everything correctly at the final stage of this, because it was brought up because we didn't know, we thought our bylaws would be good to give direction for us and the future commission. So.

- Alder Stevens is right. Read these ste... Or the ordinance. Oh, this was very months ago. It did give full permission to the commission to make its own bylaws. So I don't think it even has to go to the city council or the mayor. I would suggest that it'd be standard operating procedures, however, for the traffic engineer to make sure that any new member coming on the community has a copy. So that they're aware of the parameters of how we run our meetings.

- Do you perhaps then want to add a bulleted item that I guess you'd say the official copy will be on hand in the clerk's office and with the office of city traffic engineer?

- Well, that could be part of the motion. I don't know if that has to be part of the document.

- So now I have another question. So if we do not need common council or the mayor to do a final approval on this, then wouldn't this go in front of common council as informational only? I think that'll be it to be addressed not for tomorrow, but in two weeks so.

- I thought that this should be shared with common council.

- As information only, right?

- Yeah, we'll send...

- I'm so sorry.

- Go ahead. Sorry.

- Yeah, we would send it to council as informational with a copy of the bylaws, but I'll make sure that attorney understands or explains so that everybody understands that the commission does. And I did just double check the ordinance. It doesn't specifically say bylaws, but it does say rules regarding meetings. So it's the same thing. So you are authorized to do this basically, and you don't need approval from council. So yes, it would go as informational and I'll make sure that attorney can offer a suitable explanation at council for everyone's benefit.

- And I bring this up because this commission is unique compared to the other commissions that we have in the city. So we just wanna make sure it's clear when it goes to the common council that common council can change anything so.

- Well, if this is the first commission to do something like this, bravo for this commission. This might be a blueprint for other commissions to get their act together and have some sort of structure to how their meetings are run. And I think, let me just add one more thing. I think we need to thank Alder Stevens for coming up with this idea in the first place. So thank you, Craig.

- Yeah, that was good. I wanna chime in before we're done here. Many thanks and efforts through Alder Stevens and Commissioner Theno. I know you two put a lot of time into researching and getting this done. So a big kudos to you two for your time and effort. Thank you from the commission, the chairman and the commission and the citizens of Green Bay. Thank you much.

- Mr. Chairman I would move adoption of the bylaws for the commission as amended.

- Okay, hold on Dan.

- Yeah.

- Looks like Alder Gerlach would like to speak.

- Yes, go ahead Alder Gerlach.

- I just have a question because I heard other Alder Stevens say this commission is different from the other commissions and I'm learning. How is this commission unique and different from the others?

- would you like to explain?

- Were you referring strictly to reporting to counsel alder?

- Yes.

- I don't know he just said it's different. So I don't know.

- [Stevens] Yeah, bylaws. Yeah.

- I just wanted to make sure I was on the same page with all Alder Stevens. It's a good question Alder Gerlach. Most of our boards and commissions do not have ordinances that establish them, do not have provisions authorizing the creation of their own rules. And so this is kind of a new thing that council may not have seen before. Additionally, it's unusual that any of our boards or commissions send something to council as a solely informational basically like, we're letting you know but you can't do anything with this. And so we wanna make sure that like the council understands why, because this commission has a fairly unique position of being able to create its own rules without the input from council. So in a similar way, findings made in like by the ethics boards, findings and conclusions go to council as informational, but the any recommendation for any punishments or anything like that, counsel can weigh in on. So like parts of certain things go to council as informational but not, this is somewhat unique in that it's truly going to be like, we created this document and hope you like it, 'cause this is what it's gonna be.

- But my question is, why is this commission different from others?
- You would have to ask whomever created the ordinance.
- Go ahead Alder Dorff.
- Yeah, Alder Gerlach I don't think you were here when we signed on at first, but there an ordinance that was created for this commission. None of the other commissions have that, that ordinance is what gives them the power to make the bylaws. So I think you might've missed that part. That's what gives this commission... Okay, that's what makes it different.
- I wanna know why this commission is different from other commissions?
- Because the ordinance said it is. That's the reason.
- Did the ordinance just pass? Is this brand new? Did it just make it different? No, it's long ago.
- Alder I'm sorry to cut you off, I didn't mean to do that. Ordinance. Sorry. Commissions and boards have were created at various times by various councils throughout the city's history. So a handful of them when our code was written back in 1984, we had a bunch on the book for all of those were done at the same time. But I don't believe that this was one of them. So this was done sometime after that. And it would have been done by different staff, it would have been done by a different council, would have gone through different attorneys. So it really truly is just different because whoever created this commission and this ordinance wanted it to be different. I can't give you any more insight 'cause I don't know who any of those people were.
- Thank you.
- Okay, any other comments or discussion for this item five? If not I would entertain a motion to vote on it then.
- I made a motion.
- Okay, yeah. Dan made a motion to approve as amended. Dave, you have everything that you need to understand there?
- I do. And if not the recording will the rest of the story. I guess my only question is, eventually there's gonna be a final document. And do you want that then to be in the next agenda so that we all have a final copy, or are we okay with the way that it was presented tonight? It goes on the report then to common council for not tomorrow's meeting, but the following meeting as informational only I can put the propositional phrase right in front of it, and italicize text if you'd like, and then just include this, I guess, as part of the agenda packet for council.
- Well, Dave the only change was on item four under meetings and public participation. Can you just put the words together and email that to us? And then if there is a problem we'll get back to you.
- Sure, I can.
- Can't do that. Can't do that.

- Right, right. Yeah, on this.

- That's a problem open meetings wise 'cause we can have a and we can't have you guys emailing about the bylaws amongst yourselves without the public knowing about it, and having access to it cause that's technically an open meetings issue.

- We've agreed on everything tonight for the bylaws, right? I believe so. Why? I mean...

- My suggestion if I could is just to bring the version with the amendment, put it on the council agenda. It'll still be informational, but that final version will be attached to the council on the agenda. So then you guys will all be able to see the final version that council is gonna be looking at. And the agenda, sorry, words just slipped right out of my head. The agenda is posted several days before the actual meeting. So if anybody on the commission spots any problems in the version of the bylaws that gets attached to the agenda, which you can like Dave can email that to all of you, you just can't like respond and chat about it. So you could just reach out to Alder Stevens as he's alder on the commission. And if there are any changes that need to be made, he would need to pull the item and refer it back to the commission basically.

- Yeah, that works for me.

- [Mather] Okay.

- Okay, good. So we had a motion from Commissioner Theno, do I hear a second for approving the bylaws in?

- Second.

- Motion made and seconded. All in favor.

- [Participants] Aye.

- We're official. Once again thanks Alder Stevens and Commissioner Theno for your fine effort on putting that together. I know it took some time so thank you. Move on to item six. Refer to staff for study requests north to review the 40 mile per hour speed limit on Church Road and reduce it to 35 miles per hour. I know we had this back in November. Who wants to... Alder Dorff do you wanna start or do you want Dave to start or? You're pointing that Dave?

- Dave needs to start and discuss this report and then I'll respond to it. Okay?

- Okay. All right.

- Thank you.

- Okay, thank you Chair. The technical memorandum for the speed study was attached to your agenda packets. So I'm hoping that there was good weekend material to peruse. It's quite lengthy. There's a lot of information here. I do not intend to go over everything in the report. I certainly will be available for questions. I think probably the primary thing I want to do is, really just go over some of the discussion which is towards the end of the report and just hit on I guess I'd say more of the larger points on reasons behind the recommendation. So I'll just cut to the chase. The recommendation is to maintain the existing speed limit of 40 miles an hour. And the reasoning

behind that is, because I followed Wisconsin Department of Transportation speed management guidelines which was published and approved in 2009 by the department. And in essence what the process would be, and I'm speaking very generically here, would be to run over what is called the US limits to reporting by FHCWA, which is included as figure four in the report which actually makes a recommended speed limit of 45, not 40 but 45. However, they talk about reference, you'd say secondary attributes of the roadway and I identified two of those as part of the study, one would be low presence of pedestrian activity and the other one would be the crest hill that would be approximately 600 feet east of the . So with that being said, the WisDOT guidelines points to more or less recommending speed limit closer to the 50th percentile of the observed speeds which actually was 39 miles an hour. But in traffic land we always round to the nearest five. So that would be 40 miles an hour. So that, excuse me, is really the core of the recommendation behind 40 miles an hour. And I know that was obviously mentioned at previous meetings that the area has changed. I can guarantee you that that was inclusive of the study. I believe there was a total of 38 driveways that were considered as part of it, which would be an increase from over the prior years. And I know there was discussion about comparing to other roadways in the area that I guess at initial glance may have similar characteristics, but no two roads are identical. I can guarantee you that. And those other roadways definitely have some different characteristics than what Church Road would have. Probably, the first and foremost would be the amount of traffic. There's probably two to three times the amount of traffic on these other roadways and the presence of horizontal curves as well which limits sight distance which would most likely produce different results. So without them the scope of this study do not go over other roadways or was never its intention, and speed zones are not intended to be doing that as looking at other roadways per se. They need to be looking at the roadway and question and be addressed as such. Also to the guidelines is not mentioned in the report, but they do make mention that, you need not look at speeding guidelines or setting speed limits based off a future development. So that's another thing that I know that there's some discussion about some residential expansion in this area. However, it is conceptual in nature at best at this point in time. So I don't want that to be, I guess, considered at this point in time that really should be taken up at the time of actual developments completed. And who knows there could be a traffic impact analysis required for any future development that potentially could look at something like this anyway. But I just wanted to throw that out there. Overall that is really about it. I do actually... I shouldn't say that I do have a couple of more recommendations now because I did mention about the low pedestrian activity that was documented. And this is being referenced in speed guidelines as a secondary roadway attribute that I'm gonna look at more mitigated measure to recommend installation of pedestrian advanced warning signs in the corridor to identify that this presence may exist and to warn motorists of the presence. Also too because of the depressed hill that I had mentioned this just east of Drive and review of the existing signage. I noticed that the stop advance sign which obviously is a speed reduction measure, I thought was improperly placed. My guess is it's probably remnant from when the speed limit was higher cause it was. In 1992 is actually when it was reduced to 40 miles an hour. I don't know what it was prior to it. I did try to find the study which I could not. However, given that we have a 45 mile an hour speed limit east of the four way stop at Bay settlement my presumption is there was probably 45. But because of that I believe that the stop advance warning sign in the westbound direction should be repositioned and reinstalled. And lastly, because we do have an 85th percentile speed of 44 or 45 miles an hour, which would be in excess of the existing posted speed on it, that I would refer to the police department to enforce the existing speed zone. And also because I did notice that the pace speed or pace distribution which would be that highest concentration of 10 miles an hour, in the data was what I considered low. What that really means is that, we are encroaching on territory where you have speed differential. And anytime you... Like in this case if the speed reduction was approved, I would make an educated assumption that speed differential will just get worse and your pace distribution would just get worse and you'd get more or less of a disrespect of the speed limits zone out there. And

unless you had buy-in from the police department to be enforcing those speeds constantly, I think you're gonna have the non-compliance issue on your hands. So that said that pretty much summarizes what I think are the highlights of the report. Again, it's a lot of information in here. I hope everyone had the opportunity to review it in detail and I will be open for questions.

- Matt you're muted, but I think you called on me.

- Yeah, go ahead Alder Dorff.

- Thank you so much. First of all, thank you, Director Hansen for, or traffic engineer Hansen for doing this study yet again. I know that this is something that I've brought before Traffic, Bike and Ped back since I was a member of the Traffic, Bike and Ped Committee. And back when I was a member, which was about five years at four years ago, I guess. I agreed that the speed limit at that point did not need to change that 40 miles an hour because I live a half a block away from Church Avenue. I'm real aware of what goes on that road, but from Church Road. So at that point I agreed. Now, I'm an alder, there's other alders on this call and there's other people that have been Dan Theno being one of them. But as an alder, your position is in city government. You're the population, you are the closest to the citizens, they share their concerns directly with you. You're the voice of the people in your district. And I take that very seriously. And this is a request that not one person has brought forward, not two, not 3, 10, 20, 30, maybe have brought forward to me and have asked year after year Alder Dorff can you please get that speed limit lowered? Perhaps in the middle of winter there was a low pedestrian count. I'm not surprised at all that in December and January when the study was being done that there weren't a lot of pedestrians. Lots of pedestrians are there in the summer. There's a trail that is goes right up to the road and people walk that road. They walk Drive up to church and then over the trail that goes over by Red Smith Park. I mean, this is a place dogs are walking, bicycles, 38 homes now are built there. Things have changed. I heard Mr. Hansen say the number 39. 39 would be like at the 50 percentile, but let's round that up to 40. Wow! Please commission consider rounding that to 35, which is what this area has been asking for alders. I love the other two recommendations that he had about trying to get people to slow down, the awareness of pedestrians that cross to that hill. I go up that hill and then you go right over that hill you can't see what's coming, up and there's a stop sign right at the bottom of the hill going on Drive. perhaps east to the east the speed limit is higher. That's not the city of Green Bay. That's not part of District I, that's Town of Scott. A completely different feel to that area, way more rural. Where it Church Road is in District I is a completely built up community on one side of the road. The other side is still the kind of farmland. Drive, Scottwood, there isn't another road anywhere in the area that's 35 miles an hour. All the roads that join it are 35 miles an hour. And so I'm asking the commission and probably something you don't always do, but to please and listens to the citizens of District I, this is very important. It's important to the whole Red Smith neighborhood. So that's all I have to say right now. Thank you.

- Okay, thank you Alder Dorff. Any other comments from commissioners or alders on this item?

- I'm gonna jump in. I'm really glad Alder Dorf. Thank you for talking, because I know usually I bike and walk everywhere, but I haven't been going outside at all recently. So when you said that, that made a lot of sense to me when you said that out loud. And being one of the newer commissioners is not going with the referral something that happens often? It's a question.

- It depends on the circumstance.

- Yeah, okay.

- I have a comment too. So it's interesting cause I definitely see both sides. I mean, school psychologist brain says, this is the data we gotta go by the data, what we have now is what we should follow and maybe in the future we can look at it again. And then my like I relate too to Alderman Dorff. I run out there, I bike up there. It's not the biggest road in the world. I get what you're saying, but I'm totally on the fence 'cause the data's telling me one thing and my heart is telling me the other thing. So I appreciate all the information and I would like to hear what others have to say too.

- Go ahead Alder Gerlach.

- No, Alder Gerlach can go.

- Okay, go ahead Alder Gerlach.

- Thank you. I have a question for both the speakers. First of all, can you tell us why are people asking for this speed limit to be lowered? You cited there are a lot of dogs, there are a lot of... What are they saying to you is the reason they want the speed limit lowered?

- There's been so much growth along that street. There are so many more driveways now that back out onto that street, and that they feel 35 miles an hour are safe for pedestrians. So it's a real matter of safety. And I heard Dave say that there was kind of a low traffic volume. This is true, because it's mainly probably the residents that live around here that are on that street. And I was even surprised that when they did that traffic study that it was only 44, 45 miles an hour that people were going over. Because when something's posted 40, a lot of times you see them going over more than that. But they aren't. And I think that's because a lot of the people that travel are aware of the neighborhood, they're aware of the people road, they're aware of the school bus that goes up and down the road. It's a safety issue, that's why.

- And then I have a question for Mr. Hansen if I may.

- Yes, go ahead. So if you did lower the speed limit to 35, I read over your report. I'm not real good at reading those traffic studies and I didn't read every word of it, and I didn't understand everything I read. But if you did lower to 35, what is your main concern about doing that?

- The main concern is speed differential and detector twofold speed differential and non-compliance would, in essence it breeds it. If you create areas where you're not gonna get compliance and people aren't getting pulled over, it goes into other areas of the city. That's pretty widely known at least in our industry. Speed differential means that you have a higher fluctuation of low and high speeds. So this is the perfect example of you posted 35, you're always gonna have the driver that for whatever reason whether they're just, they always drive the speed limit, who knows maybe they don't have a license and they don't wanna get pulled over. They will always drive the speed limit. You always have those people. I think the number is getting smaller and smaller as years have gone on, but you will have that part of the population. And then you have what you call the 85th percentile, which is what most people drive a road and feel comfortable driving. One thing you'll find in the report that I put in there, I called it free flow speed. I didn't touch on that earlier, but what that is is when you drive a roadway and don't look at your speedometer and you just drive it on what you actually feel comfortable. When I drove it, it was 38. I found myself just looking down and it's like I'm driving 30 miles an hour. So there's a part of me as an engineer that says, I wouldn't recommend a speed limit that's higher or as lower than what I think is what I think most people are gonna safely travel at. And when I say travel, again, this is just my one person's opinion, but I've been doing this for many decades and that's what my professional opinion was on

that. The other thing I wanted to bring up, there's two points. I know that safety was brought up as a concern and I didn't really hit much on that in my summary. However, I do want to emphasize that the crash history out in this area was actually very good. I mean, it was a remarkable report to actually read. I had one runoff road crash within five years. We always look at a five-year crash history to be indicative of what is really going on. I mean, if we look back 20 years of course you're gonna find things. You're gonna find that anywhere. Five years is what we use in our industry, and I found one runoff crash and it wasn't pedestrian related, it wasn't speed related, it was nothing like that. So I'll be honest with you I was very happy with the existing crash history out there. So getting back to Alder Gerlach point about speed differential, speed differential is known to create crashes. So unless we get strict enforcement out there of 35 zone, I think this is all gonna be just by voluntary compliance. And quite frankly, you're probably not gonna see much of a difference at all. And it's just gonna be more of a good thing of 35. So unfortunately I'd really like to hear the police department's perspective would be on the recommendation, but unfortunately we don't have that presence here tonight, but they're the ones that are gonna end up having to enforce it. It isn't DPW that does it. We go out, we sign it. And the next thing that we can do would be, when it's up for reconstruction, you know, start looking at the pedestrian concerns that are out there which I do want to emphasize too, as Alder Dorff had pointed out earlier on, that this isn't the first time that we've looked at this. I can tell you, I believe it was 2018 is when we actually first started looking at this, and we did studies. So when I make reference to pedestrian activity and when I say low don't take that as an offensive thing. I mean, when we look at low versus high, high head volumes are more like what you would experience in a downtown not even really even Green Bay. This is something where you are constantly seeing pedestrian activity. You're not seeing constant pedestrian activity on Church Road, and I can tell you, because I have been studying this since 2018, my observations are based out that they are anecdotal, but they're from when I've been out in the field. I ask other staff that is evaluating and setting out equipment has to go back every day to go look at the equipment. What are your observations? I do get anecdotal information from people as well 'cause I wanna know. I mean, this is all part of the study, and you I don't wanna leave any stone unturned. So anyway, I hope I answered your questions Alder Gerlach and Alder Dorff.

- [Stevens] Chair.

- Yes, go ahead Alder Stevens.

- I'd like to answer Kasha's question. So the most recent one that comes to mind is Webster Avenue. If I recall right the study came back at a speed limit of 40 or 45 miles an hour for Webster. And this commission chose to go with 35 miles per hour on Webster. So we did deviate from what the director is asking. So yes, we could lower this to 35 if this commission chose.

- And if I can add to that statement that led to one of the commissioners leaving.

- Was that?

- Smith. Yeah, that was the reason he left.

- Okay. Okay, anybody else?

- But there was more to that situation than just that evening communication and Zoom and stuff like that.

- Chair.

- [Matt] Yes, go ahead.

- Thank you, Chair. I would just kind of add, I've been listening to the conversation here and skimming the report. And I think Alder Dorff made some really compelling arguments here and I think there was some good conversation following that. And in particular the question about, is there ever a time when the commission might look at information a little bit differently and perhaps overrule a staff recommendation. I think it's important to note that staff recommendation is just that. It's a recommendation. Ultimately, the power is vested with you as a body to really determine what is appropriate for that area outside of the data that might help drive those recommendations. And I think Alder Dorff has raised some really good points that alders are kind of the boots on the ground that really feel and understand what's happening there more than anything. And as I sit and listen to the conversation one of the things that just kind of struck me is, this debate is really being over four miles per hour, right? 39 versus 35. And if you really think about the reality of it, if you post this at 35, people are gonna go 40, 42, anyway. So you're gonna be at whatever that posted recommendation is. So one of those things if you have overwhelming support from that particular area, and I would certainly defer to the commissioner on this, excuse me, the traffic engineer on this, Mr. Hansen, if more of a road that services that neighborhood versus being like a major artery, like a Mason Street or a Monroe Street. I would tend to give more deference I think to the neighborhood than I would a street for example that has to pump through tens of thousands of vehicles because it's really meant to get vehicles out of a certain area. So I support Alder Dorff in this. I think these are never easy decisions and we do from time to time, we do overrule staff recommendations and other committees as well. Obviously, I don't come to a lot of these if I don't have an issue on this agenda, but I don't know how often it happens here. But again, recommendations are just that. The recommended data. In fact, we've seen this in other areas where if protection policy where we're Alder Stevens serves. A lot of times it's a default recommended by the police department based on what the law says, but we oftentimes overrule it to give people a second chance on a bartender's license or something of that nature. It kind of becomes a standardized practice as opposed to listening to some of the concerns that might actually exist in the neighborhood. So thank you.

- All right, thank you Alder Johnson. Anybody else?

- Well, Mr. Chairman can I make just a comment and then I'll have a motion?

- Thirdly.

- I totally agree with the comments of both Alders Johnson and Dorff. We're only talking about a few miles an hour if it's something that can help the neighborhood. And I think that city government and government in general has to respond to the constituency, and this is such a minor change but it's a change that the constituency and that area of the city of Green Bay clearly desires. And I think in most cases we as a commission and individually as commissioners generally follow the advice of the staff, but that doesn't mean we always have to go along with the staff. We have the choice of making the final determinations if we didn't have that ability, then there would be no reason for us to spend our time on a Monday evening discussing these issues. With that in mind, I'm going to make a motion that we approve of 35 miles an hour along with the two previously stated changes of the traffic engineer.

- And I'm gonna second it. This is Kasha.

- Okay, a motion has been made to approve the motion and a second. All in favor.

- [Participants] Aye.

- Any nays? No nays so motion carries.

- Thank you. Thank you. Thank you so much.

- All right, let's move on. Seven through 11 are terminations Dave. So you wanna... 'Cause you deem we need what we need to hear to make them adopt the ordinance please, Dave?

- Yeah, items seven, eight and nine are related. This has to do with the parking that is very close to the intersection of Irwin Avenue. So just west of Irwin Avenue on Cass Street this is by the former a private school. I forget its name, sorry. But this is at the request of Alder Galvin and the neighbors. And they were just wanted to switch the no parking zone from the north side to the south side. And I actually did touch base with Alder Galvin and he said everything was working well with change. So I'll make a recommendation on seven, eight and nine for approval as noted, and then not 10 and 11 this has to do with the conversion of the one-way yield sign on Peter Street and Basten Street convenient to a one way stop. And again, through email with Alder Stevens at it, this seems to be working just fine. So I will make a recommendation for approval as noted on item 7, 8, 9, 10, and 11.

- Okay, motion made to approve. Do I hear a first? Or a motion I should say?

- I'll make a motion to approve.

- Motion made. Do I hear a second?

- [Participants] Second.

- Okay, motion made seconded. All in favor.

- [Participants] Aye.

- Okay, motion carries. Let's move down to F, informational. I got a couple things here. I noted early in the media everybody was out of the media at the time, but ought to be a resident of the city of Green Bay. So I've mentioned the day before. Dave, I don't know what the proper way to handle this is, but if you need to run it by the mayor's office to see once I'm willing to continue, but on the other hand if I need to be a resident of city I understand that I can't be the commissioner. So that I would throw that out there. And then also was mentioned where we typically in January elect chairman and vice-chairman for the year. So in coordination there, I guess first we need to figure out if I would be allowed to continue as the chairman, Dave. I know I've mentioned this to your prior I don't know if you've the powers that would need to make a decision or voices at or not or maybe what I'll let you expound on that.

- The best of my knowledge, I mean, obviously the bylaws say nothing about it now, but there's nothing that I'm aware of in our local municipal code that would require you to be a resident. I know that it's been somewhat loosely talked about like where there may have been commissioners in the past that have moved, but they've moved significantly far. I mean, we're talking like out of the county kind of far, and then they would just resigned. So that was just more just inferred that if you're not going to be able to physically attend a meeting because it's gonna take you awhile to travel that you just resign. But it appears that you're simply just moving into, was it Howard I believe or just...

- Howard. Yes.

- So it doesn't appear to me that travel was to say that if we assume back to in-person meetings that this would be an inconvenience to you, and it sounds like rather it would really make no difference in whether or not you would your willingness and continuing on as a commissioner. So with that being said, I don't think there's anything that holds you back from that. I do know also from other committees and commissions that there are people that are voting members of those bodies that are not members or I should say residents of the city of Green Bay proper. So that being said with those two items in play, it's just my opinion that I don't think it really makes a difference if you live in Howard.

- Do you think we need to run it by the mayor's office or get a legal opinions and the city attorney? I mean, I don't wanna have to come back at some point and say that I shouldn't have been the commissioner or chairman, I'm sorry. I don't know what the next step is. I just wanna do it the right way here. And they'll be fair disclosure where we're at here. So how do you think we gotta go forward Dave or any other commissioners, alders wanna speak to it please do.

- I think we should be clarification from the mayor's office? 'Cause I think we're a little indulged so.

- Right. That kind of lack of an ordinance on it. And I think you've answered your own question commissioner that you just wanna get the kind of that blessing just to make sure it's okay. So I have no problem making that contact with the mayor's office just to make sure that's proper. If they defer to the legal or a lot of permit then, I guess, you know, we'll find out about that. But if you'd like we can put as an informational item on the next agenda election of chair and vice chair, seeing how you had mentioned that the beginning of the year we should be holding those elections given your state of flux I guess you'd say if everyone's comfortable with that, we'll just postpone it to next month. I'll make sure to put the informational item on, and I'll have an answer to report back.

- Yeah, I'm good with that. I think you'll know by the next meeting whether I would be able to continue or not, right? If so then the vote could be made for a chairman and vice chairman at that point. So I'm good with that. Anybody else? Any other alders or commissioners have any comments on doing that?

- Yes, I do.

- Go ahead Dave.

- Don't move.

- Don't move.

- Don't move.

- The money is in my pocket already today. We actually closed today. So the money the money is in my pocket.

- Oh, okay.

- [Participant] Well, congratulations.

- If I'm forced to move, Oh, not forced that was my own choice but--

- Your wife probably has something has say about that.

- More than willing to stay on. It goes back to 2002, so it's been a few years, but and then I enjoy the, you know, it's my little give back to the community to try to do the right thing here. So I'm more than willing to continue, but like I said, I know there's know things that I think it was kind of unwritten when I first started you moved out of the city or you weren't to be on the commission. That's kind of what it was, at least the unwritten rule back in the day Dave, I think was that. But I like I said, I'm more than happy to continue forward here so, but I just wanna make sure we're doing it the right way. So I think, yeah, as mentioned, why don't you run it by the mayor's office to make sure the next meeting one way or the other and let's plan on for the chair and vice chair at the next meeting.

- [Dan] Okay.

- Now that I got that next meeting will be Monday, February 15.

- That's a wrong date, it should be the 14th.

- Oh, it's the 14th?

- I know that because I'm running for the county board and I might have a primary on the 15th.

- Okay. All right. We'll need to...

- I'm gonna be watching election results. I wouldn't show up anyways.

- Okay, so we will make it Monday, February 14th at which I think looking at my calendar that is correct. So we'll wind our meeting at that point then. Probably, at this time we don't know Dave about having a virtual meeting or meeting in-person, I don't know. I would guess so. I mean, the virtual meeting goes pretty well so maybe we should kind of plan on that for February yet, because I don't think the world we're living in is gonna be a drastic change to allow in-person meetings, it probably make sense at that point yet so.

- Right. Well, and just so you know that it was actually, it came from our human resources department that we are not to have any in-person meetings here at City Hall through the end of the month. So that was obviously the driving force for not having a hybrid meeting in the month of January, but that does expire at least temporarily that's where it's at right now as the end of the month. And then I believe it's probably just gonna be reassessed, reevaluated just based on state of the pandemic. So I guess we'll just kind of hold tight and we'll see. I would just assume that we're gonna go virtual in February. And I guess if things change Matt I can certainly get a hold of you, and just if the option for hybrid is there. And of course, if I think we have some of the other issues resolved that we had at the last meeting in November. And it sounds like the remedy for that is that, we would be meeting in council chambers because the property equipment exists. That was part of the problem from the November meeting and yeah, that was pretty difficult to work through and I know a lot of people on the virtual end really had a difficult time hearing the discussion and that's not really conducive to a good meeting. So I guess I'll make a recommendation to continue virtually unless things change, and then I'll let you know Matt and then we can make a determination after that.

- Yeah, I think everybody, alders and commissioners, everybody's pretty good at having virtual meetings? I mean, I think we're all, I'm pretty good with it. I hope everybody else is and I think on the side of caution with the world we're living right now is probably the right thing to do. That we can do it safely. And you can let me know Dave like you did this month When you maybe get some direction from staff at City Hall.

- Will do.

- Okay with that I would entertain a motion to adjourn our meeting for tonight.

- I just have a follow-up question on the next meeting date. Sorry.

- Thirdly. Yap, go ahead Melissa.

- So the third February or the third Monday in February is actually the 21st. So is it supposed to be the 21st or is it indeed the 14th?

- That's a good catch 'cause I think our normal meetings are on the third Monday of the month. So a good catch.

- Yes, you are correct Melissa. It is the 21st. So is a good one.

- good to hear you on the commission.

- I did not think of that until you mentioned it. So good. So it is the 24th, sure. Correct. Keeping us on the right path. Thank you Melissa.

- Absolutely.

- Any other calls tonight if...

- Move to adjourn.

- Motion been made to adjourn, do I have seconds?

- [Participants] Second.

- All right, we're adjourned. So February 21st. Take care all and be safe. We'll see you next month.

- Thank you.

- [Dan] Take care.