



MINUTES OF THE PARKS COMMITTEE

WEDNESDAY, SEPTEMBER 29, 2021, 5:00 PM

Virtual Meeting. Public may join via Zoom.

**Immediately following Improvement and Services Committee
which begins at 5:00 P.M.**

A. ZOOM MEETING INFORMATION.

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

B. ROLL CALL.

Present: Alder Randy Scannell-Parks Committee Chair, Alder Chris Wery-Parks Committee Vice-Chair, Alder Jesse Brunette, Alder Lynn Gerlach

Others Present: Alder Barb Dorff, Alder Mark Steuer, Director Dan Ditscheit, Assistant Director James Andersen, Forester Brian Pelot, Park Planner Kaurie Mihm, Park Engineer Emma Browne

C. APPROVAL OF THE AGENDA.

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

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

D. APPROVAL OF MINUTES.

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

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

E. REGULAR BUSINESS.

I. Consideration with possible action on the request by Ald. Steuer on behalf of the property owner at 1236 Thrush Street, for the City to reimburse the property owner \$3,500 for the removal of 3 street trees.

Moved by Ald. Jesse Brunette, seconded by Ald. Chris Wery to open the floor for discussion. Motion

carried.

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

Moved by Ald. Jesse Brunette, seconded by Ald. Chris Wery to close the floor for discussion. Motion carried.

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

Moved by Ald. Jesse Brunette, seconded by Ald. Chris Wery to refer to the Finance Committee for consideration to reimburse the property owner at 1236 Thrush Street \$1,077.93 for the removal of 3 street trees, to be funded out of the Contingency account. Motion carried.

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

2. Consideration with possible action on the request by Ald. Wery to review drainage concerns in the baseball fields at Colburn Park.

Moved by Ald. Chris Wery, seconded by Ald. Jesse Brunette to open the floor for discussion. Motion carried.

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

Moved by Ald. Jesse Brunette, seconded by Ald. Lynn Gerlach to close the floor for discussion. Motion carried.

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

Moved by Ald. Jesse Brunette, seconded by Ald. Chris Wery to open the floor for discussion. Motion carried.

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

Moved by Ald. Lynn Gerlach, seconded by Ald. Chris Wery to close the floor for discussion. Motion carried.

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

Moved by Ald. Chris Wery, seconded by Ald. Jesse Brunette to open the floor for discussion. Motion carried.

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

Moved by Ald. Chris Wery, seconded by Ald. Lynn Gerlach to close the floor for discussion. Motion carried.

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

Moved by Ald. Lynn Gerlach, seconded by Ald. Jesse Brunette to table the review of drainage concerns in the baseball fields at Colburn Park and discuss at the first Parks Committee meeting in June 2022. Motion carried.

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

3. Consideration with possible action on accepting the donation of outdoor furniture currently located on CityDeck by Downtown Green Bay Inc.

Moved by Ald. Jesse Brunette, seconded by Ald. Lynn Gerlach to approve the donation of outdoor furniture currently located on CityDeck by Downtown Green Bay Inc. Motion carried.

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

4. Consideration with possible action on the staff recommended City of Green Bay - Emerald Ash

Borer 2021-2023 Tree Removal Plan.

Moved by Ald. Chris Wery, seconded by Ald. Lynn Gerlach to refer to staff to provide budgetary projections to maintain all current Forestry services in addition to the extra tree removals listed in the City of Green Bay - Emerald Ash Borer 2021-2023 Tree Removal Plan. Motion carried.

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

5. Consideration with possible action on donating 1229 St. Clair Street (Parcel 14-68) to the Green Bay Redevelopment Authority.

Moved by Ald. Chris Wery, seconded by Ald. Lynn Gerlach to approve donating 1229 St. Clair Street (Parcel 14-68) to the Green Bay Redevelopment Authority. Motion carried.

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

6. Consideration with possible action on the approval of the purchase of a Demo, Toro 16' Groundsmaster 5900 riding mower for the sum of \$94,899.27 from Reinders.

Moved by Ald. Jesse Brunette, seconded by Ald. Lynn Gerlach to approve the purchase of a Demo, Toro 16' Groundsmaster 5900 riding mower for the sum of \$94,899.27 from Reinders. Motion carried.

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

F. INFORMATIONAL.

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

Moved by Ald. Jesse Brunette, seconded by Ald. Chris Wery to receive and place on file the Director's Report on updates and recent activities of the Parks, Recreation & Forestry Department. Motion carried.

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

2. The next Parks Committee is scheduled for October 13, 2021.

G. ADJOURNMENT.

Moved by Ald. Lynn Gerlach, seconded by Ald. Jesse Brunette to Adjourn.

Motion Passed.

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

VERBATIM MINUTES

- Committee for September 29th, 2021 is now in session. Let it be noted that the whole committee is present. Alder Wery, Alder Brunette, Alder Gerlach and myself, Alder Scannell. So, I will take a motion to approve our agenda.

- Motion approved.

- Second.

- Motioned by Alder Brunette, seconded by Alder Wery. Any changes anyone wants to make? everybody approved?

- Aye.

- Aye.

- Disapprove? That passes. Make a motion to approve our minutes from our last meeting.

- Motion to approve.

- Second.

- Motion by Alder Gerlach seconded by Alder Brunette. Any changes there? All in favor?

- Aye.

- Aye.

- Aye.

- Opposed? OK, that passes unanimously. Before we get onto regular business, let me state that everything we do here, is just a recommendation to the full council which meets next Tuesday, where everything will be taken up and passed. And are we ready for regular business, Dan?

- Yes, we are.

- Okidoke. Item number one. Consider with possible action on the request by Alder Steuer, on behalf of the property owner at 1236 Thrust Street for the city to reimburse the property owner \$3,500 for the removal of three street trees. We took this up last time, staff was going to come back with some information. Staff?

- Yeah, so just to give you a brief recap, so, this issue was discussed at the September 15th Parks Committee. On August 25th, our forestry supervisor drove by the residence at 1236 Thrush St. and witnessed a contractor removing three street trees. So, our supervisor told the contractor that they had to stop work because, these were not private trees. By the time we had notified the contractor, all three trees were taken down, and one of the three stumps were partially ground out. We did discuss this with the homeowner, and he indicated to us that he was not aware that these were street trees. He thought they were private trees, therefore, he contracted those services out. At the last Parks Committee, he requested that the city reimburse him the full amount of \$3,500. What was requested of the parks staff was to talk to our forestry department and determine how much it would have cost our staff, our forestry crews, had we removed the trees ourselves. So, in the agenda packet, you'll find a summary of what those fees would have been, and those were real costs. Those were not a profit on top of it. So, these were real expenses that were calculated out. So, for labor, there would be a four-person forestry crew. The total cost for the time that we would estimate that would take would be about \$400 or \$398 in labor to remove those three trees. And then, there would be a cost and wear and tear on the equipment. So, that would be gas, that would be mileage, stuff like that. The cost for the equipment would be \$679. So, the total cost to remove all three street trees, had the city done the work ourselves, would have been \$1,078 rounding up. I do want to mention also, that we did not calculate out the cost to grind out the stumps, because they were not ground out. So, they're still in place. Only one of the stumps was partially ground out. So, our forestry crews will come back there at a later date and grind those three stumps out of there, replace it with top soil and seed it. So, therefore, we did not calculate a cost for grinding down the stumps. So, now the question that's being asked is: does the committee want to reimburse the homeowner in full? Partially reimburse the homeowner based on what our expenses would have been, because we would have removed the trees later on this winter? Or, to decline the request all together?

Because, you know, that that's not something we've ever done in the past where a homeowner has removed city trees, and then we've reimbursed them. That doesn't mean we can't consider it in this situation, it's just not a past practice we've done in the past.

- Anyone? Alder Brunette.

- I see Mr. Kampens online, I would be happy to hear from him if he wants to address the committee, but before doing so, Director Ditscheit, the amount was \$1,033?

- \$1,077.93.

- Okay, just one note for the committee. If you recall, last time we met, Director Ditscheit mentioned that there is no line in his budget to remove these funds from. My recollection. So, we'd have to, if we go ahead to approve any reimbursement, it would have to come from the contingency account. Is that correct Director Ditscheit?

- Either that, or we could potentially overspend our budget, which in essence, changes how much contingency would go into the account at the end of the calendar year.

- Okay, but, whatever the motion, if we were to make one to that effect, we would have to put the funding source in the motion.

- Correct.

- Is that correct? Okay, all right, thank you. Unless anybody else wants to address now, I would make a motion to open the floor.

- Anybody else want to say anything before we open the floor? Yeah, we have a motion on the floor by Alder Brunette.

- Second.

- Seconded by Alder Wery. All in favor?

- Aye.

- Aye.

- Aye.

- Opposed? Okay, the floor is now open. Is there anybody here to speak on this? Okay, just please state your name and address.

- Luke Kampen, 1236 Thrush Street.

- Go ahead.

- Yeah, I don't actually really have any further comments. I appreciate the committee taking the time to listen to my requests. I guess, just in terms of the budget line, if that's an issue, I would certainly be fine waiting until next year's budget if it needs to be fit into a separate line item for next year. There's no emergency here. So, thank you.

- Motion to close the-

- Oh, Alder Steuer, you have a question?
- Yes, thank you Chair.
- A question or questions?
- A question, yes.
- Okay, okay.
- Yes, I know you watch like a hawk
- Promised the neighbors,
- Anyway, yeah, yup.
- Oh yeah!
- Okay.
- Luke, thanks for coming back in, you know, it was stated that you were looking for the entire reimbursement, and, from what I remember last time, you were looking at whatever may be equitable you weren't saying "I have to have it at all costs". Correct?
- Absolutely. I'd be, I'd be very happy with the \$1,078. I'm not asking for the full 35 at this point.
- I wanted to just clarify that fact, 'cause I know the agenda item states it as such, but depending on what the committee says, you know, that could be an equitable decision. So, thank you.
- Any other questions? Mr. Kampen?
- Yeah, I would just say too, I know that there was some concern at the last meeting that this reimbursement could incent other people to take down trees, you know, without permission and get the reimbursement. I think that in this case, if I'm only being reimbursed, the actual cost as the tree that was already marked to be taken down, people aren't going to just take down trees at their own cost when they can wait for the city to do so. So, I think that it kind of, mitigates that reasoning, but, that's all I have to say.
- Thank you. Alder Gerlach, Question?
- Yeah, I just wanted to be clear because, I thought last time we said the trees, although they were on the list to be taken down in winter, they were not marked. Is that right?
- That is correct.
- Yes, that's correct.
- Yes?
- That's correct, yes.
- Thank you.

- Any other questions?
- A motion to close the floor.
- Okay, and nothing else to add Mr. Kampen, you're done? Okay. Motion to close the floor by Alder Brunette.
- Second.
- Is that a second, Mr. Wery? I couldn't-
- Yeah.
- Alder Wery? A second by Alder Wery? All in favor?
- Aye.
- Aye.
- Aye.
- Opposed? Okay, the floor is now closed.
- Alder Brunette.
- I would like to put a motion on the floor and then hopefully it gets seconded, and I would like to speak to that motion. A motion to refund one thousand seventy, well, reimburse, property owner of \$1,077.93 with the funds coming from the contingency account.
- I'll second that.
- Okay, motion by Alder Brunette, seconded by Alder Wery to reimburse the amount stated. We'll just discuss that now. Alder Brunette.
- Yes, you know, it's a tough issue, I know that. I don't want to set a precedent tonight. I think the criticism would be that we are. I do think the gentleman here is rather sincere. I commend Alder, er Director Ditscheit for preparing this analysis for the city so we can understand the cost that it would have cost the city to do this in a short amount of time. One thing too, and this is a further agenda item we'll be discussing a little bit, but, Emerald Ash Borer infected trees in the 10th district, Alderman Steuer's district. there are 111 high priority trees, which would place his district number three out of the 12. So, you know, Mr Kampen made a mistake, but it actually benefited the city, and it would have cost the city this much anyways. So, in government, we make these tough decisions, and I know the criticism would be that we're setting a precedent, but I don't want to be overly rigid on these sorts of things. Overly rigid in a way that harms the very people who we have been elected to serve and represent. So, I feel very comfortable with this motion. That doesn't mean I'm gonna approve every single one moving forward. Hopefully this is an isolated incident. Certainly seems that way, but let's be real here, Mr. Kampen, in an accidental way, did the city of favor by removing these trees, and I think a fair reimbursement of \$1,077.93 is warranted. Thank you.
- I do want to just mention one thing. If the council were to recommend this and the motion carries as recommended, and you don't need to add this to the motion, but I would just request that Mr. Kampen provide either an invoice or a paid invoice, showing proof that that is in fact was paid.
- Yep. Good point.

- Prior to us reimbursing him, obviously.

- Any other comments? Alder Gerlach.

- As you know, gentlemen, I do not approve of this. I think this is setting a dangerous precedent, and this is why: even though we call it a mistake, Mr. Kampen was perfectly willing to pay \$3,500 to have those trees removed. He paid it. And then when he found out they belong to someone else, he said, "oh you pay for it." Even if we give him just the amount it would have cost us just to cut them down, the message we are sending to people. And you know, I mean, we just saw that huge report just that came to us last night about these trees all over the city. There are people who want those trees down, who are desperate to have those trees down, who are terrified they're going to fall in their houses. I've already had a constituent say to me verbatim, "Who will I sue when it falls on my house?" And, I just think we are definitely setting a precedent. I think it's going to be hard for you all to say no when the next person comes back and says, "Well, all I'm asking is for how much it would have cost the city." I think you are creating a wild, wild west where so many people want so many trees down, and we have a Forester who is experienced and trained, who has a plan. I believe we should simply support that. And, you know, nothing personal, no hard feelings. I mean, Mr. Kampen has certainly been a very respectful person and has offered his case very respectfully and logically, but I think this is a mistake, I do not think we should do it.

- Anyone else? Alder Wery.

- Thank you Mr. Chairman. Yeah, I seconded the motion and I do support it. I don't feel that it's... I've seen, in 20 years on the city council vote on both sides of issue multiple times. So, the precedent is whatever the new council wants. You know, the wind can change pretty quickly with each new council. So, I think here we take them on an individual basis and, this one in particular with the way the trees were on those sidewalks, it's easy to see where the was picked up. I'm fine with it, thanks.

- Alder Steuer.

- Thank you chair. I concur with Alder Wery and Alder Brunette on this, but I have a concern with the contractor who should have been aware of this. So, granted it comes on to the homeowner, but, what about the contractor? I mean, I'm not asking to find out who it was, but, I think that, that should be something that we should consider as well, that, you know, the contractor came out and did that, do you think they would have been aware of it? And, I would be remiss to see this contractor do more work with the city if they have done that. I just want to make that a point for discussion or clarification if you will. It's just one of my concerns. Thank you.

- Alder Dorff.

- Thank you chair. So, I'm just going to reflect back on to a couple of council, we were having a discussion about something and it happened to be a restaurant, I think a liquor license or something. And, you know, we were making a decision on that and one of the Alders brought up, "But wait, back in 2016, we've voted this way on it, and now, we're looking like we're going to vote that way on it." And, so, precedents do happen. Can, we add something to this motion that this is not precedent setting, that this is a one-time issue? I mean, what, or, could I ask Director Ditscheit does he have a concern about it; setting a precedent?

- Yeah, as I mentioned at the last Parks Committee meeting, I do have some concerns with the precedents that this would set. If there's an option to add something to the motion, I would be in favor of that, but, that being said, like I mentioned at the last meeting, I do believe Mr. Kampen, that this was an honest mistake, and, you know, hopefully it won't happen again, but you just never know when the next request is gonna be.

- Well, I just hope the committee will add something to their motion.

- Alder Brunette.

- I'm fine with that, I'm just struggling for the words to add that would fit the situation.

- Is Legal available?

- There is nobody on here from legal.

- I appeal to the great Randy Scannell. Chairman Scannell and his wisdom here.

- Okay, well, let me, just share my thoughts on this before we get there.

- Sure. So, the fact that the constituents gonna still be paying more out of pocket than no one's going to be doing this unless they do a mistake. You know, I don't think, I think the only precedent we're setting is, I don't think people are going to purposely get out there and pay, when they don't have to pay at all. The city's gonna do it for them with their tax dollars, as opposed to paying a few thousand and getting maybe some of that back. I think, not many people are gonna go there unless they accidentally, as in this case, honestly think it's their responsibility and they're taking care of it. On that score, I was prepared to not support this if it was coming out of Park's budget. I don't think it should come out of Park's budget. I don't think that's appropriate, 'cause it doesn't match up dollar for dollar. I mean, it's not like our Forester is now, you know, can recoup that \$1,000 somehow. He can't. I mean, it's not like we're going to say the Foresters can take two hours off, you know, and balance things out. It just doesn't work that way. So, I don't think it'd be fair for parks to take a ding on this. I think we should look at it as the city. As a city, well, how do we feel about this? It was an honest mistake. It's a little over a thousand dollars. And I'm not sure that any language we add is going to make a bit of difference in the future, 'cause I think as Alder Wery mentioned, Alders can do whatever we want. Even if we put something on this, then we certainly can still do that, but that still doesn't bind Alders, I mean, we can't. We can't bind up Alders in the future. They're going to do what they want to do. They have that authority, they have, you know... and I wouldn't want them to do anything else really. I mean, we could maybe make some kind of guidelines to help to future Alders. You know, what were they thinking? Well, you know, that's what the minutes are for. To go back and look and see, you know, why did they make this decision? How did they make this decision? So, as a city, as a taxpayer, am I okay telling my fellow constituents that "we're going to take some of your tax money to reimburse Mr. Kampen for an honest mistake, that still benefited the city, because we have so many trees that need to come down. So, like, it was kind of a benefit to the city." If I tell that to my constituents, what is my constituents can say back to me, "Okay."? Or is he gonna say "You kidding! Not my tax dollars. It shouldn't go to that"? And I'm just thinking that the amount is so, I mean, what would it be a quarter of a cent if you distribute that across the whole city? or what, you know? What are we really asking from our constituents on this? So, I'm kind of leaning back into perhaps granting this. I haven't completely made up my mind yet I wanna hear some more discussion. But I'm thinking that, as long as it's not coming out of parks, parks should not have to bear the responsibility for this 'cause it really doesn't benefit parks to reimburse Mr. Kampen. He didn't even do parks a favor. He did the city favor perhaps, that's an argument that can be made, but it didn't help out our Forestry Department at all, from what I can see, especially financially. So, first I saw Alder Dorff's hand up first. And then-

- Thank you. So, if you don't identify a funding source, you're going to refer this to finance, because, if you think it can come out of contingency, it's going to have to go through the finance committee. Otherwise, you will need to identify a funding source, in any case where you want this to come out of. And then, it can't end here if it's not coming out of parks. It can't end here, then it has to go to another committee.

- Right. And I'm thinking maybe that's where it should have gone to begin with 'cause I don't really don't see this as a... and I'm sorry, I'm cross-talking here.

- Alder Dorff?

- No.

- Alder Brunette, you have the floor.

- I appreciate that, but I see a Director Ditscheit did raise his hand and I think he might have insight.

- Yeah. I just wanted to remind the council and the committee here that the forestry budget is 88% funded by our stormwater account. So, I don't know if that has any bearings in your recommendation moving forward.

- Okay, and anything else Alder Brunette?

- No, that's a good point. I think that was mentioned last month. Yeah, I understand how some of us are conflicted on this. The reason why it's a little more easier decision for me, a couple of things I go back to is that, I remember, you know, I don't know how, how long Mr. Kampen has been a homeowner, but, many times in the early stages of home ownership for me, even now, sometimes things are not always clear. And I know that it's an expectation of a property owner to get answers, to investigate. And maybe he should have looked a little further into whether or not if the absence of a sidewalk means the trees were on his property or the right-of-way. I've been an Alder for a while and trying to 100% understand right-of-way and what's city property and what's not. It is confusing. It's even more confusing out here being on the reservation. There's some, you know, issues there with some of the land out here. So, I do feel for any property owner, not just Mr. Kampen, but sometimes engaging making decisions as a homeowner, not always black and white, it's not always as easy for us, who have the inside knowledge, as it is for the general public. I just don't want the City of Green Bay for property owners to ever get a reputation that we're too rigid on some things, that we can't look outside the box and understand each situation's a little different, whether that happened now, a year from now, or 10 years from now. I agree with Alder Wery that each council, each council person makes decisions at that moment. And I, myself, have been not 100% consistent. I acknowledge that and it is what it is, I think we all that. One thing I will say, though in regards to the Forestry Department, the fact that the private contractor paid well over \$3,000 in our city staff through the Forestry Department you know, would have cost the taxpayer or the Stormwater Utility, only a \$1,000. Just those show how efficient they are and how productive they are. That's a great, great story for the taxpayer that we are getting outstanding benefit for the work that they do. So, I support the motion as it stands. I think that we can move on from this. I agree with Alder Dorff, maybe it needs to go to the finance department. So, my original motion was to approve in taking the funds from the contingency account. I guess, I don't know if I need to amend that motion.

- Yeah, since you asked my help before, how about a motion, refer to finance with the recommendation in that we found Mr. Kampen to have made an honest mistake and that we think he should be reimbursed from contingency fund.

- In the amount of \$1,077.93.

- Sure.

- I would like to make that motion by substitution.

- Okay. Is there a second for that? Seconded by Alder Wery. Any further discussion? Alder Dorff.

- I would just encourage you strongly to make your case at finance. Okay. So, please show up to finance to make the case when it gets on the agenda.

- Do you understand Mr. Kampen?

- Well, not just Mr. Kampen,

- But, yeah, whoever else.

- Alders too. Yes, Alders too.

- Well, it'll sneak its way back around to council, So.

- Yeah.

- And it will!

- Yeah, yeah. And, for me, this is a much better... because, as long as... my big to-do on this, which, I really didn't think Parks should be taking the hit for this financially, I think it should be a citywide, from the city levy as a whole, as a community. Are we going to help each other out when an honest mistake is made, or are we not, and of course that is by, for me, an individual, the same basis, 'cause it all depends on what kind of costs we're talking about and all the other circumstances around it. So, for me it is case by case. And I think that no matter what language we put, it will always be that way. I tried to craft something so that the council would never have to take up fluoride again.

- Now, now.

- And, it just can't be done, unfortunately. So, we can't, you know, it's up to the future Alders if they're gonna put themselves through that or not. So, but I'm done. We have a motion to send this to finance under the referral conditions stated. All in favor?

- Aye.

- Aye.

- Opposed?

- Me.

- Okay, so that passes 3 to 1, with Alder Gerlach in the negative.

- Chair, can I make one point after the fact.

- Alder Steuer.

- I just want to, I appreciate the work that Director Ditscheit did and his staff to put this together. Just looking at what Mr. Kampen paid and what would have cost the city, there's still over a \$1,400 difference that he had to pay for a private contractor, that I'm still a little upset about. So, I'm just saying there was an eye opening, learning experience for me just to see that difference. And, if nothing else, it's something that we learned in that, our city can be very efficient with this type of thing, and I appreciate that. Thank you.

- Alder Gerlach

- I wouldn't normally ask to speak after the fact, but I would just like to respond to what Alder Steuer said. We have to remember that this man was perfectly happy to pay \$3,500 to a contractor. When he thought it was his own trees he was cutting down. When he found out it was someone else's trees, he said, "They're your trees. You pay for it." Just remember that. And remember that when the next person makes an honest mistake and comes to this committee and says, "Oops! Give me some money."

- Okay. Valid point. We done with this now? Okidoke. Can we move on to item two?

- Yes, we're ready.

- Okay, Item two. Consideration with possible action and the request receive to review bring your concerns in the baseball fields at Colburn Park.

- Staff?

- So yeah, as you recall, this issue was discussed in great detail at the last Parks Committee. The motion of the meeting was to hold this item for two weeks and discuss it again today. And, the reason for holding it is Alderman Wery wanted to have a chance to meet with the adjacent property owners to determine if they had any interest in granting an easement to the city, so that a berm could be constructed on their property versus city property. If you recall, there isn't room to install a berm on city property without relocating the drain tile that was recently installed. Alderman Wery and I both met with two adjacent property owners that would be affected by the berm construction on September 23rd. So at that meeting both owners discussed not only their concerns with the past drainage issues, but they also address concerns that the drain tile that was installed might not be adequate solution to the drainage issue that they've had in the past. So, from there, I don't know if Alderman Wery has anything to add to that. And I believe there's somebody here from the public who might want to speak on this?

- Alder Wery, anything?

- Yeah, just briefly. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I wanted to thank Director Ditscheit and then, Bruce Cantrell and Janet Angus who met out on the site last week and must have spent, I don't know, a half an hour, or hour walking it, and looking at it and talking about it. So, I believe they are both here tonight, so, I would make a motion to open the floor.

- Is there a second?

- Second.

- Okay. Motion by Alder Wery to open the floor, seconded by Alder Brunette. All in favor?

- Aye.

- Aye.

- Opposed? Okay, the floor is now open. If you'd like to speak on this just please state your name and address.

- Hi, my name is Bruce Cantrell. Can you hear me?

- Yep.

- 1419 Shirley Street. And am I allowed to share my screen to show a photo pose of water...

- I don't know if we've got that capability. Director?

- Well, I believe I do, but, I'm not sure. Hold on.

- Okay, I believe that you can share your screen now.

- Okay, thank you. So, we're talking about the backside of Colburn Park that goes all the way to the edge of the houses here. And, what we've kind of noticed is that there's a stream that runs down here that you've

filled in, and the water from the park runs across the park and runs down behind my garage, plus runs down between Janet Angus' property and my property. So, there is a lot of the city's Park Department's water that runs across and fills up that those ditches. But that's kind of what we're talking about how that, we're just worried that it'll continue to run even more because, you've changed the grade, can you see the screen here? You've changed the grade of the... This is the Park's property behind my mother-in-law's house next door, and she's lived there since '67. And so, the water runs to the creek and you see the creek has got water in it where the drain tile is now. And the water also runs here, and then runs across my property. So, I get water that runs across, in front and behind my property. I also get, this is the entire, between the two, water that actually runs from that drain tile area, and basically makes a stream that goes all the way to Janet Angus' front of her house. So it looks like this when it's running down, and running into, the drains down here. So, it's a substantial amount of water, so much that my children floated a canoe in here. And we have it from 2010. This is when that intersection flooded for something else, but we have 2015, we have 2003, we have 2002, so we have it from different years, the amount of water. So I'm unsure that the people that designed the drain system understood how much water actually comes off here, especially when you've raised the grade of this entire area by three feet. So that's what we're very concerned about. So that's all I really need to say about that, but this is what naturally happens with the water coming off the park and crossing both of our properties.

- Okay, well, the agenda item has to do with a berm on your property.

- Right.

- Do you have anything to say about that?

- I would consider that, it's unfortunate that when the Parks Department created the swale or the drainage ditch, that they put it so close to the property line, that, there wasn't a berm that could actually go to the edge of the, could actually go to the edge of the, you know, that could go to the edge of the actual park area. So, but anyway, I'm willing to discuss that but I believe the small amount of drainage that's in here is not going to be enough with the size of the hill going down from the baseball fields. So, I would be up for discussing a berm to try to alleviate some of the park water crossing both properties to get to the storm drains on Shirley Street. Thank you.

- Any questions?

- I'm gonna take the screen-sharing off.

- Okay

- Thank you.

- Do you have anything else you want to share before I do that?

- Nope.

- Okay.

- I have a question.

- Go ahead Alder Brunette.

- Thank you, Chairman. Sir, I don't know your last name, I'll just call you Bruce. I prefer to call people by their last names when they appear, but anyways, Bruce.

- Yeah

- Were you able to meet with the Parks Department with Alderman Wery and Ms. Angus?

- Yes.

- Were are you happy with, you know, how it was presented with the solution? I know he's going to get to that part, but I just, while the floor is open, I just want to know, are you happy with the compromise or the solution provided?

- It would've been nice if they would have known how much water already comes across the properties and built a berm into the edge of the park property as part of the design. So, even the section, which is the lowest part by my corner of my fence, I mean, this, I don't think that berms going to even help that at all.

- Yeah.

- So, I'm not sure that small pipe that's in there capping this creek, you know, this temporary creek that's always there. I guess we'll have to find out.

- Yeah, and so some of the water flooding issues have existed as your pictures showed.

- Yeah.

- Well, before this project.

- Right.

- The question is, does the project add to flooding, because, the worst thing, well, not the worst thing, but one of the worst things as a property owner, is when you have water approaching your property and water just does not stop. So, if we're adding to that water flow, rather than preventing it reasonably on a city park, then that's really the situation we're dealing with.

- Okay. Thank you for your time.

- Well, this year we had one of the worst floods going down between the two properties. It went past the soil dam. It basically broke past the soil dam and went down the property, and that was what, two months ago? The construction. So.

- Okay.

- Well, thank you. Those were my questions.

- Thank you.

- Yep.

- Alder Gerlach, question?

- Yeah, I got a question for Mr. Cantrell. So, that really bad flooding was two months ago, I can't remember when we were told the drain tiles were put in?

- The drain tile was the drain tile was installed after that flooding event.

- Okay. So, has there been another big rainfall since then to test it out?

- No.
- Okay.
- No.
- Thank you.
- There has been a significant rainfall, but it's been in short duration and nothing like what that rainfall was.
- Any other questions? Anything else you care to add?
- And that was some spotty range since then, and I'm way on the east side, but on the west side, so, we haven't had anywhere near that kind of rain. So, I just, you know, when the director was talking about 100-year floods and things like that, and it's like, well, my suggestion was this isn't a 100-year flood, this is pretty much every spring, and, it's a lot of, water from the park. So, it's not every 100 years. We're not talking about over building something for water retention. Thank you.
- Yeah. Thank you. Is there anyone else here to speak on this?
- Motion to close the floor.
- Second.
- Motion to close the floor by Alder Brunette seconded by Alder Gerlach. All in favor?
- Aye.
- Aye.
- Opposed? Uh-oh.
- Wait a minute I heard voice.
- Ah. Janet.
- This is Janet Angus, I guess I had to push "*6" before I could talk, so my apologies.
- Okay. Motion to open the floor by Alder Brunette seconded by Alder Wery. All in favor?
- Aye.
- Aye.
- Okay, the floor is now open please state your name and address.
- Janet Angus, 1403 Shirley St., Green Bay. I don't want to go over what I think that would be a severe waste of time. However, I did want to thank the Parks Director and also Alderman Wery for meeting with me. I think that there's no ditch back there right now on the parks property to properly drain the park. Unfortunately, what I came away from that meeting was, is realizing that the ditch that's on my property, that overflows between snow melts and also as it did severely overflow this last August, is really the only Ditscheit or the swale for the drainage from, from the park. And, I am very concerned that the drain tiles that were

installed, were installed way too close to the property line, my property line. I think the drain tiles were done further from the property lines further up the block, but, the Cantrell's and my property, I think that swale, and then, the drain tile is way too close to the property line. So, I think Alderman Wery actually had a great idea of putting in either another drain tile for their over and putting that swale in on that park's property so that you could have a berm and a swale and then the drain tile. And hopefully that would work to drain the park. My property, I can take care of all by myself, but I just don't think that the whole north side of it should drain through my property, which is why, to go backwards last August, because, I wanted to avoid this. I wanted to inform an avoid, because, like I said, I've been there since 1965. I think the house was built in 1964, 65. And when the park comes in and adds land, adds elevation, adds soil, and there was thousands of yards of soil that were brought in with this last addition of this last ball field it changes the way the water flows. And you know, I'm hopeful that maybe it will work. But, with that last storm and seeing how much water there was over 30% of my property was covered in at least a foot of water. And that had never happened before to that extreme. So, I think the Park before you finished this project, and as long as you're doing it, the Parks Department really needs to reevaluate how they handled this and figure out better solution because, the people I'm working with, when the water is flowing fast, those drain tiles are not going to be able to absorb it all, and it's gonna flat out my sidewalks because look at it. If you look at the parking lot, the drains in the parking lot that the city's put in are too high, so the water doesn't even hit them. It goes down the sidewalk, and ends up going down the street, and into the storm, the whole corner of Shirley and Locust because, the water has nowhere to go it goes down. And Shirley and Locust is the bottom of the hill, and that whole intersection gets flooded out. So, I'm all for fixing the problem. I don't want to be part of the problem. I don't want to be part of the fixing of the problem, which is why I went over for this August of 2020. And unfortunately, adjacent landowners were not notified when this was going through, which is another issue, I realized that but it does need to be a berm. So, anyway, I won't go over ad nauseum, what I've already stated two weeks ago 'cause I don't want to waste everyone's time, but it would be very nice if the city could fix the water issues that have been developing back there since the first baseball diamond was installed in the seventies, it was definitely higher than our property. Thank you for your time.

- Any questions? Alder Gerlach.

- No, I just was giving her a thumbs up.

- Oh.

- I think for that concise.

- and reasonable.

- Okay, yeah! yeah. Explanation, I really appreciated it.

- Yeah. Anything else then from anyone? Okay. Thank you, Ms. Angus. And take a motion to close the floor?

- Move to close the floor.

- There a second?

- Second.

- Motion by Alder Gerlach to close, seconded by Alder Wery, all in favor?

- Aye.

- Aye.

- Aye.

- Opposed? Okay, the floor is now closed. Why don't we kick this to Alder Wery.

- All right. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I think the reasonable thing to do here, I mean, we could obviously just sit and wait, and see what the new improvements, the new changes do. However, if it creates a big issue in spring, we're going to be right back here again and saying we should have took care of this beforehand. So, we had batted this around a little bit last week about potentially, and you can let me know when I'm out of line here, Director Ditscheit, but of having an engineering study about how the new changes will affect water runoff in that area and what we could do to mitigate it. Whether that means putting in, like Janet Angus had mentioned, a new drain tile and then a berm, maybe a swale or what it might entail, but I'm not sure, Director, if you've had a chance to look at what that might cost or how long that would take. I know there's an internal review. I'd like to hear.

- Yes. So, I can expand on that a little bit. So...

- If I may first, get a question for clarification.

- Yes.

- Are we talking about replacing the drain tile there, or, putting in new drain tile elsewhere?

- Well, there's quite a bunch. There's quite a lengthy amount of drain tiles. The portion that we're talking about is really just behind Janet and Bruce's property. It's right up tight to the property line. So, really rather than spend twice, you know, to dig it up and move it, you could just maybe put some in and leave it where it is.

- Okay, thanks. I appreciate the clarification. Go ahead Director.

- Just a couple of things to note here in regards to that. So, we really have two options moving forward as Alderman Wery mentioned. Option one is to see how the new drain tile system functions. It was engineered as best practice for a similar type athletic field. And there have been no indications that it's not functioning properly. So, there hasn't been standing water along that property edge since the drain tile has been installed. All of the concerns that have been discussed were all previous concerns. That's not to say that we might not have issues down in the future in a big rain event, because, as I mentioned at the last Parks Committee, it was not engineered to handle all drainage coming off of the site. You would need a fairly large berm to guarantee that that would happen in every instance. The other thing too, which has to be into consideration here, is if the City were to look at this as an engineered option to look at future engineering, we would only be looking at engineering the water that comes off the park. We have not explored what other areas the water is coming from other adjacent residences. So, we even couldn't guarantee that there wouldn't be standing water in the future if there's surface water coming from adjacent properties, or even from the road adjacent to it, because that would not be effected in any re-engineering. And then, if we were to consider re-engineering to take a more proactive approach, a couple of things to note one is it is pretty unlikely that that would be installed this year anymore anyway, because, per state statute, we are capped with a 15% change order to any construction contract and we're pretty much already close to that with the work that we've done adding the drain tile in the first place. So, with the cost of replacing the drain tile with something bigger, to handle a larger storm event, it would need to be engineered and bid out for reconstruction more than likely. Now, that's not 100%. I'd have to verify to see where we're at with percentages in the contract to date, but I know last time I talked to our engineers, we were cutting it close to that cap of 15%, and that is by state statute that we are mandated to stick within those parameters. So, if the desire is to get something implemented quickly before winter comes, if we're moving drain tile, that can't happen. If we're just building a berm, we could probably do it fairly quickly with our own city crews and do it fairly economically, but the only way for that to happen would be to

build it on adjacent properties. So, I guess I want to kind of expand on that a little bit in the fact that the desired timing to get it done quickly before fall, it likely cannot happen in that timeline.

- Yeah, so the soonest we'd get a berm up would be in the spring. Correct?

- The soonest we'd be able to add drain tile and increase the size of the drain tile and move it, would be next spring. We could potentially build a berm this fall if the city crews build it on adjacent property, because then it wouldn't be part of a change order cost with the construction contract, it would be city crews installing it.

- Okay, well this particular agenda item just pertains to a berm. So, let's focus on the berm. Do we want a berm, or do we want to set the berm aside and maybe wait for next year, add more drain tile? Alder Wery.

- Thank you, Mr. Chairman. The agenda item does state "In consideration with possible action reviewing drainage concerns." So, really, I think it does make it a little wider than just a berm.

- You're right, I'm sorry.

- That's all right.

- You're right. Okay, yeah.

- To berm or not to berm? That is the question. Okay, no, I don't wanna sound like Randy.

- You're gonna berm me with that one.

- Just one other thing that I do want to point out too, is if there is a consideration to re-engineer it and install a bigger drain tile system, as I mentioned before, that could cost tens of thousands. I don't know at this point what that dollar amount would be until it's engineered and we have a rough cost estimate, but that might have to be added to the city's bond request for 2022 for funding if it gets to be too expensive. We have a little bit of funding leftover for this project, but it's not an unlimited budget source.

- If I could, Director, we had discussed last week when we met the group, I remember the engineer who did the parking lot and the draining over there, could perhaps review the plan over here and give their recommendations.

- We did reach out to the engineering firm for \$5,000, they can do an analysis comparing the original site conditions before we graded, to the current conditions, just to see is there going to be an improvement or not, and they might even be able to put a storm an event to it saying, you know, what's there now can handle a storm event of this magnitude. That would be the extent of the \$5,000 and what it would get you. It would just be kind of a preliminary analysis to see what's there. My only concern with moving ahead with that study is if there's no desire to actually improve it, then you're not really getting a lot of valuable information from that study. If the desire is, yes, we need to improve it based on the concerns that the adjacent residents have addressed, then that's a valuable study to do, and that would need to be done as part of a bigger engineering study to determine what to do other than what's there now. So, that \$5,000 is not going to get you an engineered solution, it'll just tell you how it compares to what was originally there. If you want an engineered solution we would have to set some criteria telling the consultant that they have to engineer it to these standards. We have to pick a storm event and say, "You're engineering it to this storm event. We don't want any water beyond that storm event to go beyond the property lines." And then they would have to give us a quote for that work. I did not give a quote on that because, there's a lot of unknowns with that as far as what your standards are. I will tell you that, you know, we don't typically engineer any of our parks in that manner, to keep all storm water from all rain events off of adjacent property owners. That's not to say we can't in this situation, I'm just saying, somebody would have to define what the terms of that is, and there really are no standards out there saying what best practice is that I'm aware of.

- Alder Steuer.

- Making sure maybe Director Ditscheit you might have answered some of that. I was going to ask in your estimation, what this might cost, you know, putting in another drain tile or even a berm. I guess my concern is, you know, is the city liable or not liable in your estimation? Or is that a long, long question? As far as this flood going and the work that was done, I guess I'm just concerned about that in the future. And, if you were saying that there's no way that you can engineer things or understand what kind of floods or kind of things will happen when you do a park plan, I don't know if I'm asking a nebulous question there but, I'm just wondering if you have any thoughts that way.

- Well, an answer to your first question, that's really a legal question that we'd have to reach out to the Law Department to get an answer on. I will tell you that when the concern was brought forward, after that flooding event, we took immediate action, and we fixed the silt fence that was damaged in that rain event. We met with city engineers immediately the next day 'cause, I believe the rain event was a weekend, you know, the very next day on a weekday is when we started addressing this issue with our engineers. Our engineers came up with, what they felt was the most appropriate fix based on all of the information that they've been given, and, they do have some concerns with the installation of a berm, and so that is one of the reasons why the drain tile was selected over installing a berm to begin with as the only option, and so I mean, you know, whether or not there'd be a future lawsuit. I can't answer that if there's another big rain event.

- Okay. I have one other question. Lets see, what was it? I'm going to hold off for now. It'll come back to me. Thank you.

- Well, I have a suggestion. But first, what was the concerns about, there's concerns about actually putting in a berm Director?

- Yeah, there are some engineering concerns with putting a berm in one is right now, there's a swale there with a drain tile that collects the water. It collects the water from both sides. So, it collects it not only from the park end of things, it also collects any water that drains off of the adjacent residents properties. So, if we were to install a berm on the opposite side of a drain, we would potentially have to install a drain on the property owner side of the berm to collect any water that isn't making its way to the drain tile we put in. The other concern is obviously, where does the berm end, and can water just go around the berm? There is a parking lot that's right there with a driveway. And so, any berm that's put in, we can't make it any taller than that driveway otherwise, the water is just going to go around that berm and go onto the adjacent property owners, unless that berm is extended into, you know, beyond the park limits. So, there are concerns with the berm. I'm not saying that it's not a solution. You know, it is a potential solution. It's one that our engineers talked about, but we felt that the most appropriate fix was installing the drain tile. And, you know, like I've said numerous times there hasn't been a drainage concern since that drain tile has been brought in or was installed. And so, I do understand the concerns that have been brought forward and I'm hopeful that they've been addressed.

- Alder Steuer.

- What I wanted to ask, as far as any kind of work that would be done where you'd have to put it on these citizens property, I mean, there would be a change then, as far as size up of different things, is anybody there that can talk to that issue as far as how they might change things, or is that a legal issue as well?

- Well, obviously we would need to get an easement from both property owners. Maybe even more, depending on where that berm would go. There may be more adjacent owners and then just the two, but the first thing is, there'd have to be an easement. Then there'd also have to be some discussion about what the city's paying for versus the homeowners, because Janet Angus, she has a chain link fence along her property, which, is right where the berm would go if we were to install a berm on her property. So then, the question

becomes who's responsible to remove the fence and replace it after the fact? And then, you know, depending on what the engineering solution is, the question becomes, are we required to either build a swale on the other side of the berm or put in an inlet or two to collect the water? And if so, who would be responsible for that cost? So, you know, there, would definitely need to be more discussion with the property owners, unless the expectation is the city is going to pay all of those expenses. And, if the city's paying all of those expenses, then we'd have to, it could be fairly expensive, even if the city were to build it. Like I said, we can build the berm with city staff, but when it comes to installing fencing, when it comes to installing additional drainage or additional drains, that would all have to be contracted out. And, if you exceed \$25,000 in contracted amount, it needs to be a publicly bid project, which I don't know if it would reach that or not.

- Right.

- Because, it hasn't been engineered.

- Well, at least you're looking at it. And, like I said, there's a lot of room for discussion here, it's not just water issues, it's stuff like a number of things so I appreciate the comments. That's all I have for now.

- Alder Gerlach

- I have questions. I hope Alder Wery is there cause I'm kind of counting on him to know the history of this. I confess, I don't know anything about this area. So, Director Ditscheit or Alder Wery, I've heard some things that are confusing and saw some pictures that were confusing. We saw pictures of flooding going all the way back to 2002 and many years, and they all look pretty much the same. And so, I don't know the history of this park and its development and redevelopment and improvement. And, whether there's a relationship between the installation of the park, when it was built. I mean, cause Janet Angus told us she lived there all her life. But we've closed the floor. So, my question is historically, have we been able to trace the flooding in this area, to the park and changes in the park? And, also I heard you say, Director Ditscheit something about, you don't know what water is coming from the park and what water is coming from adjacent properties. I wonder if there's some way to know that. And, Alder Wery, can you just give a little history of this problem please?

- Certainly. Yeah. from my best recollection of what what's been told to me, how this used to be a farm, I think it was, what, Hanson, Larson? I'm having a mind blank here, but it was their farm. The farm house is still up on Fisk street and it was fields and there was, they had pigs, and they transferred it to the city. And, there was a pond at one time and perhaps a little stream, and, from what Janet and some of the neighbors are telling me, there weren't flooding problems until, I think, the first baseball diamond got put in and they put a little berm up kind of farther down. They did just put a berm in, and that's all I know of it. It used to be just a big field that was farmed.

- I can expand on that a little bit. So, my understanding is that there are two different times when that area was redeveloped. So, initially some initial ball fields were installed and I don't know the exact dates, but I'm going to guess at 30 to 40 years ago. And then, 20 to 30 years ago some additional ball fields were installed. And according to Janet and our discussions with her, she indicated that the drainage really became problematic after the ball fields were installed, and even after the second round of ball fields were installed, it compounded some of the issues. That is what Janet has recently told me. I'd have to go back and check historic files to see dates and accuracy of that. But, that's real briefly what Janet has shared. What I will tell you is that, based on our survey that we did initially, all of the water in the ball field area that we just recently graded drained right towards those two property owners. So, Bruce's property and also Janet's property. It was a solid slope that drained right to their properties. So, you know, when Bruce shared those photos of historical, you know, times when his property has flooded, you know, I can't answer honestly how much of that was attributed to the park, and how much it was attributed to other issues. But, based on the survey, I would say that probably a chunk of it was due to the park developments. What we did when we installed these ball fields and expanded the parking lot is we've diverted a bulk of that water away from their properties. So, not only did we install drain tile around the perimeter of both of the ball fields and behind Janet's house, which wasn't there before,

we also diverted a lot of the water away from the direction of their house. So I would say about, I'm just guessing, cause I didn't calculate anything out, but I would say probably two thirds of the site is now draining away from their property. Portion of it drains to the stormwater management that's installed in the new parking lot. So, that is now picking up all of the stormwater for that upper hillside, which historically that just sheet drain towards their house. And then, on the ball fields, how we graded those, is, those are crowned. So, there's a high point, and then, the water drains off to the side and is picked up by drain tile. So, like I said, I didn't calculate out the areas, I'm just going off of a guesstimate, but I would say previous to this ball field construction all of that entire site drain towards those two houses for the bulk of it. Now, I would say maybe one-third of it drains directly towards the houses and it's just the outfield of the closest fields. And that's it, and the rest is all diverted to the first baselines, the third baselines, will get captured by drain tile.

- Okay. Well, for myself, I'm thinking that, since nothing can be done anyway, except for a berm, and that it's perhaps not the best thing to do anyway, if we may end up trapping water on the resident side, that perhaps we should wait, since nothing else can be done anyway, to be proactive, which, not even sure what that would be, to see what happens in the spring. And, after a few rain events to see if a berm might not be a good idea, or, if we need to do further engineering than that. For me, I have no problem with receiving and placing this on file and bringing something up in the spring or summer. Early summer. Depending upon the course of events. It seems like staff has done, we have engineered this area to try and address storm water issues. Let's see if what we've engineered, how it is. I certainly think, you know, if we have a storm event that, you know, is a 100 year or, even a 10, 20, whatever year event, however you want to describe it, I think we're going to have problems no matter what, in such an event. I don't think we can engineer ourselves out of that realistically, but if we can take care of the normal drainage of winter runoff and typical storm events, I think we've done pretty good then, but the proof will be in the pudding I think. So, for me, I don't see, at first I was thinking, perhaps go with a berm right now, so we could easily do that and then see all that goes since nothing else could be done till spring anyway, but, I'm not even sure that we should do that until we see how things go since a berm may also cause some problems. But see if there is problems, and then engineered, find the best solution is my thinking. Alder Brunette.

- I was hoping there'd be some action. I don't know what that action would be. So, I know the intended motion in place, or, at least now, but, Director Ditscheit I mean, again, worst situation, one of the worst situations as the homeowners, when you see water coming onto your property and you don't have, I keep going back to, I know there's a solution that you have that you believe will work, but there's no guarantee it will. You know, you, if this motion to, receive and place on file, carries, if it's made like, can we put sandbags or some sort, if we notice like flooding may start are occurring and you know, you can't plan every sort of situation, and there's a lot of flooding all throughout the city. I get that, but are we prepared to put sandbags down, get a pump out there to divert water if the solution's not going to work, is that an option?

- We are not currently prepared for that. We don't have sandbags. Part of the issue too, is, you know, when does the storm event happen? A lot of times those storm events happen in the middle of the night for us to get staff and mobilize and do work. I can't promise we'd be able to do that. We're just not set up to do that.

- Okay. That's fine. I mean, that's what I figured, there's no hard feelings. I'm just trying to brainstorm ideas in case the intended outcome isn't what we think it will be.

- Don't say storm!

- Storm, yeah. Perfect storm. That's all chairman, thank you.

- Yep. Alder Gerlach.

- It seems to me that, receive and place on file is not what want to do here. This is unresolved. Would it make sense to have a motion to the effect that there will be some kind of method of watching and reporting back to this committee and give a deadline, you know, maybe two deadlines. We will have a report on this on this

month, and in this month, so that it doesn't just get lost. And, then, we say, "Oh my goodness, look at that it didn't work." What do you think?

- Well, I think we are going to be keeping an eye on this. I think the neighbors, certainly the residents are going to be keeping an eye on this and informing us. I don't think with, receive and place on file, this issue goes away unless what we've engineered works. But even then, some severe storm events may come, and depending upon those we may decide perhaps a berm or some other engineered solution might be helpful. Certainly if we've engineered to deal with the day-to-day drainage issues, which may be the case. We may have engineered this to the point where the typical runoff we've experienced in the past. They're not going to experience now. Then, it's just storm events and what kind of storm events, and how severe and how many and what can we do about it? And for me, those have to happen before we can figure out what to do. It'd be nice if we could be more proactive, I just don't know how we can responsibly do that. I mean, we're going to spend money on a possible solution, spend money like that, I don't think that's responsible. I think we have to make sure we know what the problem is. Have it engineered appropriately, and then take the money and...

- You froze on us.

- Active, But, I just don't think we can do it responsibly, myself.

- Well, I will support whatever good plan you folks come up with for this.

- Certainly we could like, table this until the spring or something if you feel like that would be better. I feel like either one, to me, they're the same motion as far as I'm concerned, cause if something does come up I believe someone can put in a communication to deal with this right away I would think. But, Alder Wery, what would you like to see done?

- Thank you Mr. Chairman. Sorry. I kept popping in and out there. My son has Religious Ed class coming up and I was gonna bring him, but we're going a little long so, had to get grandma.

- Okay, sure.

- Grandmas come in handy, they're number one.

- Yep.

- Yeah, this is where a crystal ball would certainly come in handy. Boy, I would like to maybe listen to what the residents have cause they spoke first and then we really threw a lot out there. Maybe we could just hear their thoughts on it and then discuss it again if that's all right I'm just going to make them from the floor.

- Certainly. Motion to open the floor by Alder Wery.

- Second.

- Seconded by Alder Brunette, all in favor?

- Aye.

- Aye.

- Aye.

- Opposed? Okay and I would ask that anybody speaking to this really focus on an immediate solution that we could do right now that you think would be helpful. If there's anybody who wishes to speak on that.

- And if I could, Mr.Chairman, Bruce and Janet, obviously it affects you 99% out of everybody over there. Are you willing to wait until Spring see if those improvements work, and if they don't it will be corrected, or you heard some of the other options that we could do in-between. Before, I you know, make a definitive decision or this committee, I kind of, would like to know your thoughts.

- Bruce, do you want to go? Can, can anyone hear me? Sorry.

- Yep. Go ahead please state your name and address. Okay.

- Janet Angus. It's Janet Angus, I don't know if Bruce is still there.

- Yup.

- Or if he wants to speak to it.

- He is.

- I don't even know what to say. This, it's caused me so much mental anguish and stress over the fact that the ditch that is there, it just overflows when it rains. And, the fact that the City did not address this and I know it's water over the dam right now, so to speak, it can't go backwards, but it should have been addressed. And, I go back to the policies the City and, I just really would like it if the City would give adjacent landowners notice so that this doesn't happen to somebody else going forward. I have hired an engineer. I'm going to meet with the engineer I've hired again. The person that I retained has opined that, the drain tiles are not sufficient to take care of fast water moving across them, with snow melt and in big storms. We haven't had snow melts, we haven't had a big storm since August 10th. We would have had no storm water management at all on the north side of the park, but for the fact that I got upset. So, I think going forward, what I would like just committee to consider even more so than my initial issues here. I don't want this to happen to some other citizens who may not speak up, who may not come forward. You've got to get people involved in these processes so that the engineer knows the history behind the property going forward. Do I want all the city's water from the park going down my ditch? No. I have a chain link fence, I don't know what I'm going to do about it. It's a lot of money. And, if you put the berm on my property, my fence goes away, and there's 300 feet of it I think. So, I'm sort of up in the air on what I'm going to do, but I got to tell you one thing, and I think many of you know my reputation, I'm not going to have 30% of my land covered in water and out there with a pump at 10:30 at night, protecting one of my buildings. It doesn't make any sense, and with spring, it's going to be cold and the water's going to be high, and I'm gonna be even more angry that this wasn't taken care of. And do I think it's going to be taken care of by what I can see out there with my eyes and looking at the elevations and talking to an engineer? I do not believe that the drain tile that's behind my property is going to take care of it. I think the only thing that's gonna to take care of it is the drain tile, a ditch on the park side and a berm. Stop the water flow from all of the park coming towards the north side. And, like I said, you know, the die is sort of cast now because, of the amount that you can spend, because, you've already spent the 15% over the top of the project. This is a \$700,000 project. There's a lot of dirt back there so I don't even know what to say. I don't think a berm and a swale and drain tile on the park side is a solution, but it's not going to happen 'cause you know what, the city doesn't have the money to make it happen. And it's very unfortunate cause it's sort of been, this could have been something that was worked into the plan, I believe, you know, before, but anyway, that's all I have. Thank you.

- A question for you we could do a berm. Would you, do you think, it'd be on your and Bruce's property. Would you, we could do that now. That's something that could be done now. You're not concerned about, maybe the berm trapping water on your side of the property? You feel like a berm would be beneficial?

- I don't think my property has enough water coming off of it to be trapped on that side. If you look at the lay of the land, which I've watched for years, it comes from the park. It comes from, the you know, the different

areas. My property is sloped down and taken care of. So, I'm not too worried about my property. And, if I have a sway on the side of the berm on my side of the property and it's my water, I have no problem with taking care of that. But I think I sent most of you photographs of the amount of water that was there. It was unbelievable, the amount of water that was there on August 10th, and there was no stormwater plan. No stormwater plan, and that was the problem. That's why I got so upset because, there was no plan. And, if you put the berm in, if the city puts the berm in then what are they going to do with my fence? It's an old fence, but it's still a fence. So, that's the issue cause the berm would be over way on my property and, you know, I'll probably just end up taking care of it myself, because, it's not going to get done timely anyway. So, I don't know if that answers your question or not.

- It does. Thank you. I'm sorry if I was not concise and to the point. But then again, you know, just don't allow this to happened to anybody else. Not a fun position to be in. Very stressful. It wasn't in my budget for this year, it wasn't in my plan for my time and how I'm spending my time, you know, taking care of these water issues. So, you know, there are a lot of people who don't come forward, who are intimidated, who don't talk. And, you know, for those people, you really have to get out into the community and ask more questions on projects like this going forward. My humble opinion. So, I'm about changing systems, making systems better for people and for citizens. And, you know, I just feel like I was the neglected person out of this whole equation. So, anyway that being said, I think I've talked enough. Thank you for your time, I appreciate it.

- Thank you. Any comments, Bruce, on a berm? Do you think that'd be beneficial this year yet? Or,

- Can I ask her a question?

- Certainly. a question for Janet Angus?

- Please.

- Okay, yes, go ahead.

- So, sometimes a yard has to be fenced. There's a reason that it has to be fenced. If the solution would be to take your fence down and put a berm on your property, would that in and of itself cause another problem, does your yard need to be fenced?

- My yard does need to be fenced. Yeah.

- Okay.

- Thank you for asking that question. There are so many people that parked on Shirley St. and in other areas. They would just walk right across my property and go to those baseball diamonds and go directly across my property. You know, they wouldn't go over the sidewalks. It wouldn't be good. You know, when you find dirty diapers and garbage on your property and things like that on the edges of it, I can only imagine what it would be like if I didn't have a fence. So, yeah, I do need a fence on the backside of that property.

- Okay, thank you.

- Thank you.

- So, my comment is, we're talking about the lowest part of Colburn park, and I heard they're going to put a retention pond there and I'm like, well, okay, maybe they'll take care of this river that runs through Janet's property, and the retention pond is just between two parking lots. And I thought they, when they were talking about taking care of water, it would be you know, the parking lot is above us, the baseball fields are above us, Colburn hill, the woods, it's all above us. So, it's all water that comes down the hill to the lowest part, and it's been a known problem. So, if somebody had talked to us, when I saw multiple piles of dirt that is larger than my house being continuously dropped and then spread, I didn't understand why, you know, this is a similar use

of the park, if you're changing the grade substantially by adding two baseball fields, times 3 feet to the lowest part of the park. So that's my issue. But, I mean, you know, you can use my property to put... You know, I just don't understand why, you know, you won't say, "Hey, you've got a river in the back of this park, what are we gonna do about it?" So, but yeah, I'm willing to talk about putting in a berm. It's just unfortunate they didn't measure the property lines, and made the drainage tile so close. So, it's just very unfortunate that we found out so late in the process. Thank you for your time.

- Thank you. Any questions for Bruce? Anything else, Alder Wery, you need?

- No, I'll make a motion to close the floor.

- Motion to close the floor by Alder Wery.

- Second.

- Seconded by Alder Gerlach. All in favor? Aye. Okay, floor is now close. Alder Wery.

- Well, we've got a little bit of a conundrum here, right? We've got no time, no money and no crystal ball. So. .

- Yeah.

- Other than that, we're all good and I do appreciate, Bruce, that you offered use your property but it wouldn't help, I think, just to put, you know, a berm there, right? 'Cause then, it would just go around it the other way. So, we would either need all or nothing. And, we really couldn't just put it on the city property behind Janet's house because, then that just totally covers up the drain tile we put in. It would be buried under a berm. So, the only way that would work is if you put in new drains on the side of it. Any idea Dan, of what a drain tile would cost just for that length of the fence, a new one to be put in?

- No, I don't. I don't know that.

- Okay. I don't know if that would still fall within our 15%, we said we didn't use it all up yet.

- I don't have an answer for you on that. I mean, it'd be the installation of another drain, in addition to the installation of a berm, all I can tell you is we spent 40 to 50 to install that original drain tile. I would just be guessing. And then, the question is, can it even fit? Possibly, but, those ball fields, you know, there's not a ton of room in between that last ball field and Bruce's property.

- I would be interested to hear what the rest of the committee thinks on this one.

- I think I'm sitting where I sat before. I'd like to see what happens in the spring, since we wouldn't be able to get the new drain tile in any way till spring. Let's see if engineered, you know, how it helps, how it doesn't help. And then, if we got problems, do the engineering to figure out what's the best solution, and then, work toward that. I just feel very, I feel to do anything else other than, maybe do what would be fairly inexpensive, and we can do now, we can't do it. And, I'm not sure that the berm right now is the best solution. Let's see what happens in the spring. And, if there's major problems, what's the engineered best solution? Maybe a berms part of it, maybe not, maybe something else. I don't know, whatever the engineers come up with. That's, that's my thinking.

- Alder Gerlach.

- Is it possible to, I believe we were told \$5,000 would buy us a good engineering analysis. Is that correct Director Ditscheit?

- What it'll tell you is, how it's different from how it originally was. I guess, the existing conditions, they'd be able to do a model of the existing conditions prior to construction to see how much water drained off of the site. And then, they would do another second model to determine what the new improvements, how much it changed that drainage pattern. But, what it won't be able to tell you is whether or not that's adequate to the expectations to the city council and the adjacent homeowners, because, really that's just, time will tell.

- Okay, my second question and this is a very naive question, is it possible yet to put into next year's budget funding to do a good engineering study? No matter what we find out over the winter, if we don't have another great big storm to test out these drain tiles, can we budget for that and just commit to doing it?

- Well, I think that, yes, you can. You can do that. It would probably have to be part of our bond request, or, we could add it to the budget as a one-time budget expense. The one thing that I would just caution here is, what is the intent of the engineering study? If the intent is that, we know that there's something wrong, then, we would hire an engineer to design something different. I guess my only issue and concern is, we don't yet know whether or not this is an adequate solution. So, I'd be hesitant to just hire an engineering firm to just tell us what's changed because, we know it's changed and we know it's going to function better than it did because, there was nothing in place prior to this. I would only recommend that you move forward with an engineering study if there's an expectation that we're going to re-engineer it and do something different. Otherwise, in my mind, I don't know if it's worth, the expense, because, I don't know what you'd do with that information once you have it.

- Okay, That's great. That helps me. Thank you. So, Alder Scannell I'm with you that, I think we need to wait until spring to find out. But I just feel that we must somehow show that we are committed to coming back to this and taking a good look at it and making sure that it works.

- Well, would you like to make a motion to table this until sometime in the spring, early summer?

- If you promise me it'll come back.

- Well, if you table it, it comes back, yes.

- Okay, what's a good time to table it to?

- First meeting, what would you suggest Dan? First meeting in June, 2nd meeting in May?

- Either of those options would work. By then, spring we'll be finished and we'll have a good understanding at that point, how the first spring went in relation to the drainage. I don't think I'd do it any earlier than that, because, you know, in April you have a lot of freeze/thaws cycles. You have some rain events thrown in there on top of that. I don't know if it'd be worth discussing it in April, but I'll leave that up to you.

- So, how about we, I would move to table this until June of 2022. Period.

- Yeah. Our first meeting. Our first meeting in June.

- Sure. There's a motion. Is there a second?

- I'll second it but if I could comment.

- Right, certainly. Yup. Seconded by Alder Brunette. Yeah, I'm conflicted. I'm frustrated as well, because, I was really hoping for an action item. I just don't know what the action item is and that's why I'm frustrated. And so, I don't like a receive and place on file, I appreciate Alder Gerlach's motion in that, it doesn't like kill it so that it goes away or kind of, doesn't make us acknowledge the issue. June seems a bit far out, you know, it would

have been nice to maybe, you know, April, May. I agree with what Director Ditscheit said but I guess, the fear for me would be that, if there is significant flooding come spring, I liked it at that time to see if the city can do some short term fix, whether it be getting a pump or sandbag or something. So, I'll go ahead with the motion because, I don't know what the alternative is quite frankly. And, that it's hard for me to admit because, usually I like to solve problems, I just don't know what the solution is given the discussion today. So, thank you. Alder Wery, then yourself. Yeah. I think if we do get some issues before the first meeting in June, I think that it, and, I think Alder Wery would be well aware of that, his constituents will be well aware that, they'll be on him. And he could certainly put it into communication and they don't have to table that and come back if there's an emergency situation. So, go ahead Alder Wery.

- Thanks Mr. Chairman. I appreciate the committee really taking the time to try and find a solution. It's not an easy one. We have a lot of different restraints, you know, the financial, the contract and the time of year, and not knowing what's going to happen. I had really hoped that the engineering study that we could have done would have given us more information. I was really kind of pinning my hopes on that, but it sounds like they're just going to put it in a little data program and tell us, "Yeah, it'll be better. No, it's gonna be worse.". I don't know, for five grand, I don't know if that's gonna be worth it. You know, that doesn't tell us a whole lot. You know, is it gonna be a lot better? A lot worse? About the same? I really was hoping for more from that. So, that leaves us with guessing right now and trying to do something, or waiting and address it right away, depending on what happens. I'm reluctantly fine with that. Although, I will, Dan, ask if you can, between now and council, if at all possible, could you find out how much it would cost to put in the new drain tile behind Bruce and Janet's house replacing it so that there be room for the berm, and then how much berm would be there.

- I can look into that and, I will try to get you that answer by council.

- And then if you could, just let me know or us know if that would fall within that 15%, obviously, if it falls within, we have an option, right? It's an option on the table. If it's above, well then it's out of our hands.

- And we'll also look at, as part of that, we'll also look at our budget to see what we could afford to do and not do.

- That's just the one, something that we can try.

- Yeah. And I don't think that needs to be part of the motion.

- No.

- We'll just look into that prior to council.

- I appreciate it.

- Alder Gerlach.

- What is the 15%, I'm sorry, I missed that.

- Per state statute, when you bid out a construction project, you can only have 15% over the base bid price in change orders.

- Okay.

- Anything above that and you should be rebidding the project as a separate project.

- Well, we've got a motion and a second.

- And if I could, Mr. Chairman.

- Yeah, sure!

- I know it's been addressed a couple of times, and we'll be coming back about how residents near a park project will be notified. You know, we had discussed that a couple of years ago. We thought we had a good solution. It turns out it had some loopholes that weren't so good, and so that will be coming back right Dan, in the next couple of weeks?

- Yeah. I was hoping to have it on this committee agenda, but, truthfully I didn't have time to prepare my suggested changes. So, I will be bringing the Park Public Notification Policy back to Parks Committee, either at more than likely, at the next Parks Committee meeting.

- Thank you. So yeah, I think this is the way to go right now, unless I hear differently from Dan with his numbers. If there's something we can do or something else turns up before council, well, we can swing for the fences and find something.

- You hit a home run, Dan.

- I know. I had to get the baseball in there.

- All in favor? Opposed? Okay, that passes unanimously. Liked to thank the public for your comments. It was very helpful. Hopefully, we'll keep our fingers crossed, hopefully what we did will be at least beneficial to some degree somehow. So, are we for item three, Dan?

- Yes,

- Consideration with possible action on accepting the donation of outdoor furniture currently located on CityDeck by Downtown Green Bay, Inc. Staff?

- So on April 28th, the Parks Committee approved letting Downtown Green Bay, Inc. purchase and install some outdoor furniture on CityDeck. In the agenda packet you'll see photos of the furniture that has been installed, so they purchased it for a price of \$12,300. Now, they're interested in officially donating the furniture to the Parks Department to permanently keep at CityDeck. So, when we brought this original proposal forward, they weren't sure yet if they wanted to donate it, but now they do. So, the furniture has worked well over the last few months. It has gotten, you know, some use out there and we would be supportive of accepting this donation. And, I do want to thank Downtown Green Bay, Inc. for all their hard work to see this project through and their ongoing commitment to keep CityDeck and downtown vibrant and active. So.

- Move to approve.

- Second.

- By Alder Brunette, do we know, does any of the chairs, are they ejector seats to flip people into the Fox? Anything like that? No? Oh, wow.

- Just yours.

- Yeah.

- Okay. I'd also like thank, as Chair. They work hard and they do a great job with CityDeck. So, all in favor?

- Aye.

- Aye.

- Aye. Opposed? Okay, that passes unanimously. Onto four.

- We're ready.

- Consideration with possible action, Oh, shoot. My screen changed on me. On request by Alder Steuer on behalf of the, no, hang on, there we go.

- We want a picture, not a...

- Yeah, yeah. Consideration with possible action on the staff recommended, City of Green Bay, Emerald Ash borer 2021 to 2023 tree removal plan. Staff.

- So, first of all, I want to apologize for not getting this plan to you a little bit earlier. I know I sent it out last minute and did it as part of an amended agenda, but I hope you all had time to review that. If not, it is attached to the agenda packet that is online. So, we did discuss this issue at the July 28th Parks Committee. So, the concern that was brought forward was that the ash trees are starting to die off due to Emerald Ash Borer at a rate faster than our forestry crews were removing them. So, I'm sure that all of you have received numerous concerns and complaints in regards to that. So, at that meeting, we verbally told the committee what our strategy was going to be moving forward, but we didn't have a plan actually written down. So, the Parks Committee requested that we develop a formal written plan and bring it back to the Parks Committee for discussion. So, in the agenda packet, you'll see two documents. The first document is a one page summary of the Emerald Ash Borer timeline, along with what our staff recommendations are over the next few years. And, this is a great one page document that can easily be handed out to the public. And, our intent is actually to put that one page document on our city website once, if this is approved by the city council. So, there's also a more detailed, four page written report that's attached that has a lot of support documentation and really a lot of detailed analysis of how we arrived to that one page summary. But, in essence, what you'll see is basically the same recommendation that we presented last July, but there's just a lot more information attached to it. So, I saw Alderman Brunette was raising his hand. I don't know if he has a question initially, otherwise I'll just continue.

- Alder Brunette?

- You can continue Director. That's fine.

- Okay.

- I just wanted, not comments, but I just wanted to say, you don't need to apologize. I reviewed the report and I think you and Mr. Pelot have out done yourself. I think it's a fantastic summary. It's everything I was expecting and more, so no need.

- Thank you.

- I'd rather you spend a little more time preparing it and being thorough the way that you are than the alternative. So, good work.

- Thank you. I appreciate it. So, I'll just kind of give you a brief summary of what's contained in that report. So, over the past year, we've inventoried all of our street trees, and we determined that there's a total of 2,000 street Ash trees that would need to be scheduled to be removed because, they're either dead or dying. So, our goal in this plan would be to remove these trees in the next three years. So, the initial 900 trees would be removed in 2021. The remaining 1,100 trees would be removed in 2022 to 2023. And then, to put this in

perspective, forestry crews typically remove 750 trees annually when you include all of the street tree removals, plus all of the other removals that we do. And so, between 2021 and 2023, our forestry crews will have to remove about 1,400 trees per year versus the 750. So, we're roughly doubling the amount of trees that we're removing on any given year. And, as you can imagine, bumping up the tree removal rate will have an impact on our other operations. So, but we feel that the removal rate that we're proposing is necessary so that these dead trees in the street right-of-way, don't become hazardous to the public. You know, over time, if they continue to stand for a long duration of time, you know, you might have some rotting that occurs, which, might make them unsafe. And so, currently the forestry crews only have 12 crew members. So, in order to create this task, what we'll do is create two crews of four or five foresters. One crew would be working on tree removals on the east side, the other crew would be working on tree removals on the west side. And so, and then there'll be a few crews, a few staff members left over to do the miscellaneous stuff that is going to pop up over time. And so in order to accomplish this task of really bumping up our removal rates, obviously, we'll have to eliminate other services that the forestry department offers during that timeline. So over that three year period, we're going to eliminate all stump grinding altogether. In addition, we'll have to put the majority of our pruning efforts on hold. We'll still prune in emergency situations because, there's always needs to prune on occasion, but the majority of the preventative pruning would be put on hold. And so, this would then, have an impact on our citywide pruning cycle. So, currently, we prune all of our street trees on about an eight to nine year cycle. Because, we won't be doing that preventative pruning over the next two or three years, that'll push the next pruning cycle to 11 to 12 years. Once we get through that cycle, then it'll be back on our rotation of eight to nine years. It's just that initial one would be pushed back. We do feel that continuing to plant some street trees though, is important because, so many larger Ash trees have died out, we do need to start restoring that urban canopy. So, what we're proposing in this plan is to do 500 Ash tree replacements per year. And obviously we'll replace them with alternate species. So, that's less than our normal year, but it's still a decent amount of planting that's going to occur in the city. So, on a positive note though, in the long run, this issue should help create a stronger urban forest. So, prior to EIB, there simply was too many Ash trees in our tree system. So, all research indicates that in order to create a healthy, diverse, urban forestry, urban forest, you need a lot of species diversity so that if this happens again, it's not as traumatic to our tree inventory. So, that is one positive thing. The other thing I also want to mention is that, you know, by postponing the stump removals and tree pruning we'll be causing issues down the road. But, we do feel that the benefits of this plan do greatly outweigh the concerns. So, over the next few years, though, we will be proactive in trying to secure alternate funding sources for additional labor to get back on track with some of these delayed tasks. So, we're currently in the process of planning for the implementation of a Green Bay Conservation Corps program, and if this initiative does move forward, then there's a potential for additional city staff that might be available to help with some of these other services that we're postponing for the next two to three years. In addition, we'll also keep looking for alternative funding sources so that maybe we can contract some of that work out. But, right now, we're limited to our budget and the staff we have, but we'll try to get creative as we move forward. So, and then just one other thing that I wanna mention before we open it up for questions, this plan does only address the dead and dying street Ash trees. So, it really doesn't take into account the Ash trees within the parks and Greenways. So, those trees will have to be prioritized on a case-by-case basis, but, the street trees will take the primary focus in this three-year plan. So, that's a real brief summary of everything that's in the plan. Opened a have questions, open answer questions. And, I do want you to know that our city Forester is on the line if you have specific questions for him.

- Alder Brunette.

- Yes, Thank you. I noticed Mr. Pelot was on the call for the last two hours a little disappointed. He could have cut down a couple trees while he was waiting while we were talking about Colbourn. No, all joking aside, thank you for that report, Dan. I'm a little concerned about the tree grinding and the lack of pruning, but as you stated that the Conservation Corps position that we approved, hopefully, can divert some resources, not paid resources, but other types of resources towards some of those initiatives, because, as we cut down trees, it would be nice to replenish them. Trees are important for a lot of reasons. But, on a more specific note, I guess what I want to make sure that we talk about and that you assure the committee, in regards to city work, aside from public safety like, police, fire paramedic public works, I can't imagine a much more dangerous job

within the City of Green Bay, than cutting down trees. And I know we're increasing quite a bit, the annual tree cutting with pretty much the same staff. So, can you assure us that, you know, safety is obviously considered, you know, highly important because, you know, when you increase that number of trees, the crews are going to get tired and worn and sort of, work day in day out, it's got to take a toll on a person. So, has that been considered, you know, you'll, assure us that it will be done in a safe manner while still keeping the speed?

- Yeah. I will assure you that our city foresters are well-trained on safety aspects. This is a dangerous profession as you're aware, but, we do take a very serious and we do have regular safety training sessions with all of our staff and forestry staff in particular. You know, I don't know if our city forester has some specific examples that he can share with you, but, like I said, we do take it extremely seriously.

- And I know you do. So, Brian, do you have anything to add to that?

- Just, you know, thank you for understanding how dangerous his job can be. We do take safety very seriously. We have one of the finest safety records, you know, in any division across the city. And we do rotate our staff on a two-week basis so that, we're not burning out particular people. You know, of our 12 person staff, we have seven forestry workers too, that are doing the felling and operating bucket trucks. So, we can rotate everybody through on a good schedule to keep them fresh and keep everybody safe.

- Thank you. No other questions for me, Chairman.

- Anyone else? Alder Gerlach.

- I don't have a question I just would like to thank you so much for putting this in aldermanic districts so that we can all see the statistics for our district, and talk to our constituents intelligently about it. Thank you.

- Until we've withdrawn.

- Yeah, I was going to say, I want to change when the districts change in a month.

- I forgot, I haven't been through that yet.

- Alder Steuer.

- Thank you, Chair. Yes, I want to give kudos as well to Director Ditscheit and Mr. Pelot on this report. And it does help with the aldermanic districts. This is pretty much just for street trees I presume, right?

- This plan specifically addresses street trees. But, as far as stump grinding goes, that would be, I mean, we are eliminating all stump grinding. So, that includes within the parks, and same with pruning. So, we wouldn't be doing proactive pruning in the parks either at this point.

- Okay. But you foresee, of course, you foresee a time where that will come back, but you just are not sure when.

- Yeah. So, after this three, after the 2,000 trees are removed, we will kind of get back into our routine. But, I would anticipate getting a lot of complaints, especially as it relates to the stump grinding because, although, people don't like to look at a dead trees, they also don't like to look at stumps in their front yard either, and that will be a recurring issue and we just can't do it all with the staff we have so we're prioritizing where the most important needs are right now.

- Okay. All right, thank you.

- Alder Wery.

- Thank you Mr. Chairman. Thanks, Dan. I know you're limited with what you have available, but, with budget time coming, have these discussions occurred with the mayor yet, and maybe, hiring out some extra help to do stump grinding or, some of the breaking down of trees?

- Yeah, this plan has been reviewed with the mayor, but as it relates to our funding requests for the 2022 budget, we are budgeting at similar staffing levels.

- Okay. Could you have some numbers? You know, and I can ask you offline too, but, I think everybody here would like to know what would it cost to throw in some hiring people to do stump grinding? I can tell you three years, people can barely wait six months, right?

- Yeah. I'll have to have some discussions with our city Forester and the mayor on that. And also, I'll have to bring Steve Grenier into that discussion. because, as you know, like I previously mentioned, forestry is 88% under the stormwater budget. So, obviously, that would have an impact on the stormwater rates.

- Yep. if this stands right now and budget time comes up, I'll gladly make some suggestions to put some additional money, or find somebody because, three years is not going to cut it. I don't care how we explain it to people. It will not cut it. I don't, believe me, it just won't cut it. Especially no new trees really being planted where their stumps were. Man its gonna look like a disaster, I know your hands are tied. There's gotta be a way to do better than that. And so, if we can think about that, as budget comes, get some numbers together of what we would need to get us back to normal or halfway back to normal, I would appreciate it, I'll certainly try, and I think most of us will. So, you got my support.

- And for me, I really don't, I mean, stump grinding is really, for me, I have no problem with that. Waiting. I mean, looks are something I can put up with for years and complaints on looks I can put up with for years, But, my most concern is with the trimming. I mean, that's where, with the power lines, with visuals for our traffic is signs and signals to me, that's where I really like to see a focus of whether we cannot get too far behind on that and keep up on that. You mentioned a couple, I was very happy to hear, you mentioned a couple of possibilities of how we might be able to get some more help to address that. And, I would certainly support being able to maintain the trimming as much as possible. I feel that's a hazard. That's a safety issue. Stumps are, you know, let's have a contest and people can decorate stumps. Whatever, you know? Have some fun with it, whatever, but the trimming I think is a hazard that I'm really concerned about. So, Alder Brunette.

- Yeah, Mr. Pelot, when you cut down a tree, how far from the surface of the ground are you able to get?

- With the stump grinding?

- No, no, like prior to stump grinding.

- Like how big is...

- Oh the height of the stump?

- Yeah, we get them six inches. It all depends kind of on the site, but we do cut them as low as possible because that does save on the stump grinding time.

- Yeah.

- Then we don't have much debris to clean up. No, you know, six inches is still a trip hazard. So, I appreciate Alder Scannell saying, you know, it's unsafe. We're garrulous the way you look at. It's unsafe to have dying trees in our city, it's unsafe to not prune, you know, street signs and power lines and whatnot, it's also unsafe to have six inches of a stump protruding from the ground. You know, at night kids playing, running. No, they don't always see sorts safe too. So, I agree with Alder Wery. I've made this point a couple months ago when

this first came up, city budget, hopefully resources are allocated that, that we can try to address, though, I do agree with you Alder Scannell, tree stumps, on an aesthetic level, I could care less about personally. That doesn't mean that my constituents feel the same way. I am concerned about safety. Kids playing, running, walking dogs, especially late at night, it's a trip hazard and I want to be mindful of that as well.

- Alder Wery.

- Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Director Ditscheit, how difficult would it be to get some budgetary numbers for this to maintain our three services?

- I mean, I can have that prepared for the budget meeting. I guess, I'd need a little bit more information as far as what you're looking for.

- Well, if we were to maintain our full forestry services next year, knowing the work we have to do, what would it take? What would it get to, you know, what would it take to get to that point?

- I'll work with the city Forester to see if we can generate that for you.

- I'll make a motion to refer this back to staff for budgetary numbers to maintain full forestry services, just so we have some numbers to work with. You know, I just, I would have no idea what to do with the budget. Don't have any numbers.

- Okay.

- Yeah.

- Is there a second?

- Mr. Chairman,

- No, but if there's not a second, I'd like to-

- I'll second it.

- Yeah.

- Okay, Motion by Alder Wery, seconded by Alder Gerlach. Go ahead Alder Brunette.

- I like the motion, but when you say to maintain current level of forestry, what we're looking to do is maintain but also add the ability that cut down some of these trees.

- Well, Yeah.

- 'Cause, like, I get the point though. I think the motion gets us there, I just want to make sure that's known.

- You are correct.

- Maintain current as-is, but also add additional resources that clear some of these Ash trees.

- To maintain the current tree stump grinding and tree trimming.

- Right.

- And planting. Yeah.

- Yeah, and planting. It just gives us and the public an idea, here's what we need, are we willing to sacrifice for it or not? It gives us a clear picture.

- Can you recall the motion for all of us? I'd like to just hear.

- It was just to refer the report back to staff to include budgetary numbers in order to maintain our full forestry service, in addition to the extra work that is needed on the Ash trees.

- Okay. As long as that's understood. I think, Yeah, that's fine. It's really just information for all of us to work with, so we know how big of an issue this is.

- Alder Gerlach.

- Just a question. I seconded the motion, but I just want to make sure I am in favor of it. If we ask this information to come back to us in two weeks, is that going to hold anything up for the forestry staff if for the next two weeks?

- I don't know if I'll have that information ready for you in the next two weeks. It's one of those where I can have it to you as part of the budget. I'll have to get back to you on when I can have this prepared by. But, as far as the direction the Forestry Department or Division would go. We likely will, I'll let Brian speak to that, but you know, that's a short duration of, you know, a few weeks or a month here. So, we probably will be proactive starting to remove some of these trees at this point. And, if we changed directions based on where the budget goes, we can kind of go back to where we were. But, Brian, can you speak a little bit more as to where our staff is currently at as far as their function or what they're working on currently?

- Sure. So, staff just finished up our removal list that we started last fall, winter. Which, a big amount of that was Ash trees. And, we have one stump grinding crew, they are bought 150 street tree stumps away from getting through that list as well. So, we're kind of using the next weeks here, going into October as a transition phase that we're trying to get some pruning done because, we are getting a lot of requests for pruning and clearance, things like that, school buses. And then, so yeah, the next two weeks, if we're not going to be doing a lot of removals, we're going to try to do some essential pruning, get ready for tree planting in the fall. I anticipate the bulk of the Ash removal starting sometime in November, depending on planting season and how our fall weather is.

- Okay, we have a motion and a second, is there any other discussion? Alder Brunette.

- Yeah, thank you, Chairman. I just don't want my opinion, I don't want Director Ditscheit or Mr. Pelot to think we don't appreciate the report that was done. Very thorough. They're only working with the resources that the council will allow them. And, you know, this is an extraordinary situation with the Emerald Ash Borer that we need to rectify lest we have even more significant damage to our tree stock throughout the city. So, thank you, both gentlemen for doing this and, hopefully we can work out a solution and provide the adequate funding to do everything we need to do in Forestry. Thank you. Just needed to say that.

- And I think, we don't really need this information back at committee. This is just so we've got it for budget, correct Alder Wery?

- Yeah. And I should clarify that, yeah, really the reason for that would be for budget time. That is when it would be needed. And, it is an excellent report, it clearly shows, you know, where it's needed and it spells out the situation. It's excellent. But, I do, would like some data and ammo and information on how to keep our services where they are if at all possible. So, thanks.

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

- Aye.

- Aye. Opposed? Okay, that passes unanimously. Are we ready for the next item?

- Yes.

- Okay. Consideration with possible action and donating 1229 Street Clair? Saint Clair Street!

- Saint Clair Street.

- St. Clair St. I should know that too. Okay. Parcel 14 dash 68 to the Green Bay Redevelopment Authority. Staff?

- So, originally this parcel consisted of a single family residential unit. The parcel was purchased in 2005 by the Parks Department for future trail expansion efforts. So, at the time when we acquired this property, the desire was to build the east river trail expansion along the south side of the river, between Baird and Roosevelt instead of on the north side, which, is where it's being proposed now. So, in this proposal, portions of the trail would have been built in the backyards where there's deep residential lots and on other parcels where the lots are shallow and we couldn't fit a house in a trail, the entire parcel would be purchased and the house would be removed to make room for the trail. So, as you're all aware, within the last 10 years, we had a lot of public input sessions, and the decision was made to route the trail to the north side of the river instead of the south side. And, this was the first and the only lot that was purchased for future trail purposes. So, after we acquired it, the city removed the house and it's currently being maintained as a grass area. And, in fact, we do have a lease with the adjacent property owner which allows him to park vehicles on the property in exchange for mowing the turf. So, that was approved a number of years ago. So, since this parcel isn't really needed for trail or park purposes anymore, there's a desire by staff to redevelop this parcel for residential again. You know, it doesn't make sense for parks to continue to main that property, when there is no need to build a city park there it's too small of a site, and the trail isn't going to be located there anymore. So, we're recommending that the city donate the parcel to the redevelopment authority and for them to initiate the redevelopment process. And, I would recommend that we donate this instead of selling it to the redevelopment authority. So, there are a lot of situations where the RDA purchases property and donates it to the city for park development. So, that's actually a pretty common occurrence throughout the years. So, we would just kind of, be extending the offer in the other direction.

- Any comments from anyone?

- Motion to approve.

- Motion to approve by Alder Wery.

- Second.

- Seconded by Alder Gerlach. All in favor?

- Aye.

- Aye. Opposed? Okay. That passes unanimously. We ready for six?

- Yes, we are. Consideration with possible action on the approval of the purchase of a demo 16 foot Groundsmaster 5,900 riding mower for the sum of \$94,899.27 from Reinders.

- Just sounds really weird

- Yes, Alder Brunette?

- Staff?

- I think Alder Brunette is raising his hand. I don't know if he has a question.

- I just want to know if it can cut tree stumps.

- We can try, you never know. Might be a lot of replacement blades though. So, in 2021-

- It doesn't cut too low does it?

- In 2021 the city bonded \$113,000 to replace a 16 foot mower with a cab. The original unit that we're replacing was purchased in 2010, and it's a need of replacement. It gets a lot of use. We're using it constantly, and there's a lot hours on it. So, we recently came across a Toro 16-foot mower for sale that was being used as a demo model by Reinders. So, the purchasing department did get a formal quote from them for the demo unit versus a comparable new unit. So, I've included that quote in the agenda packet. So for the new unit, the comparable quote was \$123,307. And, for the demo unit, the quote came in at \$94,899. The city does frequently purchase items from Reinders. They are a big company. So, we purchased a lot from them and haven't had any issues in the past. We do have a lot of experience with various brands of mowers. In this situation, our preference is to only purchase a Toro mower to replace the Toro Mower that we're currently using. We're gonna be using this mower to mow the steep hillsides at Triangle Hill. And from our previous experience, we found that Toro mowers are the safest mowers on slopes as steep as that. So, we've tried other mowers in the past on these hillsides and they just haven't worked out very well. So, we've already tested this demo mower onsite, and it will do an adequate job of mowing. Our crews are pretty happy with how it mows on that hillside, and our mechanics have also inspected the mower and have no concerns with purchasing this demo unit. There's currently approximately 300 hours on the unit. So, it's still not a lot of use on it to date. So, our recommendation is to purchase the demo mower for the sum of \$94,899.27 from Reinders.

- Move to approve.

- Motion to Alder Brunette.

- Second.

- Seconded by Alder Gerlach. I hear this mower is a cut above the rest. All in favor?

- Aye.

- Aye.

- Aye. Opposed? That passes unanimously.

- We're ready for the next item.

- Informational Director's report. Updates and recent activities of the Parks, Recreation & Forestry Department.

- So, I just have a couple of brief things to mention to you. One is, that, Bay Beach has now closed for the season, and we had a pretty good year. So, our revenues were very similar to 2019. So, I know that there was

a lot of concerns with how, you know, COVID this year, would be in comparison to last year. And, what we're finding is, people just wanted to go out and enjoy the park and spend some time outside at the amusement park. So, we're pretty happy with those revenues, and I'm sure we'll share more once the season is finalized, and we have exact numbers to share with you. And, then the other thing I wanted to mention, which, we already briefly touched on is the notification policy. So, as I previously... the notification policy about public notification. Sorry. I didn't quite have that ready to bring to this committee. So, I'll be bringing it to a future committee agenda. So, I just wanted you to be aware of the timeline and let you know I didn't forget about proposing changes to that policy, I just haven't had a chance to fine tune it yet.

- Motion to receive and place on file.

- Motion to receive and place on file by Alder Brunette.

- Second.

- Seconded by Alder Gerlach. Alder Wery.

- Thank you, Mr. Chairman. This just flashed through my mind for some reason, I been meaning to ask you about this, Dan. Somebody had kind of, clued me in on Facebook that there was a train and track for sale in Luxembourg, Wisconsin. The same one we have. I don't know if you've seen that. Do we need extra train parts or track?

- Yeah, I'll look into that.

- Just, before I forget. I wasn't aware of that one. It's possible that our superintendent out there or, that Jason is aware of it, so I'll ask him if he knows about it and see if we have a need for that track.

- Yeah, if you can. they tagged me in on it, and I meant to get it to you, but I just remembered it, so thank you.

- Glad you didn't lose track of that.

- Oh, No. I make a motion that we've had enough of Randy's puns.

- Yes, second!

- Second.

- I second. I'm not on the committee, but I second.

- There was a motion to receive in place on file, and seconded. All in favor?

- Aye.

- Aye.

- Aye. We have received and placed that on file. Our next meeting is that Uber 13th of this year. Make a motion to adjourn?

- Move to adjourn!

- Second.

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

- Aye.
- Aye.
- Aye. Opposed? We're adjourned. Thanks staff.
- All right.
- Excellent job everyone, thank you.
- Thank you.
- Bye.
- Good work.
- Have a good evening.
- Talk to you later.
- Bye.
- Chris, the boys are 101 to nothing'.
- Ah! Yay!
- It was-
- How bad did they lose yesterday? I never did-
- 6 to 2.
- 6 to 2.
- Just beat them once. Just beat them once. All right.
- With a stick.
- All right.
- Later, Dan.
- See you guys.
- Bye