



MINUTES OF THE PARKS COMMITTEE

**WEDNESDAY, SEPTEMBER 28, 2022, 5:00 PM
CITY HALL, ROOM 207**

A. ROLL CALL.

Present: Ald. Steven Campbell - Parks Committee Vice-Chair, Ald. Mark Steuer, Ald. Melinda Eck, Ald. Chris Wery-excused

Others Present: Director Dan Ditscheit, Deputy Director James Andersen

B. APPROVAL OF THE AGENDA.

Moved by Ald. Mark Steuer, seconded by Ald. Melinda Eck to approve. Motion carried.

Yes- Steven Campbell, Melinda Eck, Mark Steuer, No- None, Abstain- None

C. APPROVAL OF MINUTES.

Moved by Ald. Mark Steuer, seconded by Ald. Melinda Eck to approve. Motion carried.

Yes- Steven Campbell, Melinda Eck, Mark Steuer, No- None, Abstain- None

D. REGULAR BUSINESS.

1. Consideration with possible action on removing the Porlier Pier, located on the east bank of the Fox River, due to structural integrity concerns.

Moved by Ald. Mark Steuer, seconded by Ald. Melinda Eck to open the floor for discussion. Motion carried.

Yes- Steven Campbell, Melinda Eck, Mark Steuer, No- None, Abstain- None

Moved by Ald. Mark Steuer, seconded by Ald. Melinda Eck to close the floor for discussion. Motion carried.

Yes- Steven Campbell, Melinda Eck, Mark Steuer, No- None, Abstain- None

Moved by Ald. Mark Steuer, seconded by Ald. Melinda Eck to approve removing the Porlier Pier, located on the east bank of the Fox River, due to structural integrity concerns. Motion carried.

Yes- Steven Campbell, Melinda Eck, Mark Steuer, No- None, Abstain- None

2. Consideration with possible action on the request by Wisconsin Public Service for a utility

easement in Seymour Park to accommodate a gas line relocation.

Moved by Ald. Melinda Eck, seconded by Ald. Mark Steuer to grant staff the authority to approve the request by Wisconsin Public Service for a utility easement in Seymour Park to accommodate a gas line relocation after the final easement location has been selected and approved by City staff. Motion carried.

Yes- Steven Campbell, Melinda Eck, Mark Steuer, No- None, Abstain- None

3. Consideration with possible action on the purchase of Cab & Chassis Single Axle 33,000 GVWR to Packer City International Trucks for the sum of \$88,600.

Moved by Ald. Mark Steuer, seconded by Ald. Melinda Eck to approve the purchase of Cab & Chassis Single Axle 33,000 GVWR to Packer City International Trucks for the sum of \$88,600. Motion carried.

Yes- Steven Campbell, Melinda Eck, Mark Steuer, No- None, Abstain- None

E. INFORMATIONAL.

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

Moved by Ald. Melinda Eck, seconded by Ald. Mark Steuer to receive and place on file the Director's Report. Motion carried.

Yes- Steven Campbell, Melinda Eck, Mark Steuer, No- None, Abstain- None

2. The next Park Committee meeting is scheduled for October 12, 2022.

F. ADJOURNMENT.

Moved by Ald. Mark Steuer, seconded by Ald. Melinda Eck to adjourn. Motion carried.

Yes- Steven Campbell, Melinda Eck, Mark Steuer, No- None, Abstain- None

VERBATIM MINUTES

- First is for park, first item.
- Okay, go ahead.
- We are recording, so you can start the meeting whenever.
- We're here on the Wednesday the 28th of September for the Parks Committee. Start with roll call. Alder Steuer.
- I am here.
- Alder Eck.
- I'm here.
- And Alder Wery is missing, that leaves me in charge. And Alder Campbell, so approval of the agenda.

- So moved.
- Second.
- Second. All in favor?
- All in favor?
- Aye.
- Aye.
- Aye. Approval of the minutes.
- So move.
- Second.
- Any.
- Any discussion?
- Any discussion?
- All in favor?
- All in favor say aye.
- [Committee] Aye.
- Aye, we move on to regular business. Number one, consideration with possible action on removing the Porlier Pier located on the east bank of the Fox River due to structural integrity concerns, staff.

- Yeah, so I'll kinda talk about the project as a whole, give you some background information. There are individuals from the public who do wanna speak on this. So after I give a brief presentation, I'd recommend you open the floor for discussion. So the Porlier Pier was originally built in the early 1900s and served as a railroad bridge that crossed the Fox River. So there was a section of pier along the west bank of the river, a section of the pier on the east bank of the river, and then there was a swing bridge in the middle that rotated as boats came by. So in 2014, the city received approval from the DNR to convert the east bank portion of the bridge, or the pier, into a fishing pier. And we received grant funding through the natural resource's damages settlement with the Georgia Pacific. So that was part of the Fox River cleanup money. So we received money to actually convert that from a railroad bridge to a fishing pier. Shortly thereafter, after we received the funding and the approvals were in place, there was some arson done to the two piers on both sides of the river. And the fire caused some extensive damage to both structures. So shortly after that, the DNR did move ahead and removed the swinging portion in the center, and they completely removed the pier on the west bank of the Fox River. So then in 2015, because we had the approvals and the funding to put in a fishing pier, we hired a structural engineer to complete an analysis of this east bank structure to determine if we could still convert that structure to a fishing pier, even though it had some fire damage to it. So per the structural analysis, it did indicate that due to the arson, we did after remove a section of the pier. So the part that was furthest out into the river had to be removed entirely. But we were able to retrofit the rest of the fishing pier into what you see there now today. So in 2006, we hired a contractor and completed the work. So that's when it officially opened up to the public as a fishing pier. So around the 4th of July this year, our staff completed a visual inspection of the pier, and we noticed that the deck boards were in very poor condition.

And so what we did is we decided to close the pier at that point to the public. So we put up a barricade and some signage saying stay off of the pier, and we decided to go ahead with hiring a structural engineer to take a look at the entire structure and not just the decking. We were fairly confident at that point that all of the deck needed to be replaced, and so we hired an engineering firm to do this investigation. And in the agenda packet, I included the text portion of that study, so it's about 14 pages of text, which gives their analysis and their recommendations moving forward. There were about 75 pages of photos in that structural report. And I was not able to include the photos because it was such a large file, I couldn't get it attached to the program. So I have the full report here if you wanna look at the photographs of the condition that the pier is in. For the structural analysis recommendations, the consultant recommended in essence of complete total replacement of the structure. So per the report, 68% of the piles and braces are failing to the point making it unsafe. And there's very little that can be salvaged from a structural aspect of that pier. In addition, they recommended that all of the decking and all of the railings need to be replaced. So it's deteriorated to the point where it's more cost effective to build something new than to try to retrofit the existing structure and build something on top of that because we have so much structural damage and decaying underneath that. So the report also recommended that we close the pier to the public until we do one of two things, complete significant repairs or replacements, or remove the pier entirely, so that was their recommendation. So since that point, the pier is still closed to the public and still have the barricades and the signs are off. So we did reach out to public works and asked if they had an estimated cost to remove the pier. And their estimated cost came out to anywhere in the range of \$250,000 to \$400,000 to just remove the pier. Now it's still undetermined what the method of removal is going to be. So we reached out to the DNR and asked them, what condition do you want us to leave the pier in if we do consider removing it here? And because there's several different things. One is you can leave the piers in place so that they're all visually there, but then you might have issues with navigation, and they might be, somebody could potentially run into them with a boat in the future, especially if they rot off to the point where they're just below the surface and not easily physically seen. The other option is to pull the pier out entirely, completely out of the ground. And the third option is to hire a contractor to, in essence, cut it off at the floor of the river so where the silt meets the water. So those are the three options. So the cost estimate you see in front of you is based on public works previous experiences on other projects of cutting it off at the silt bottom of the floor of the river. So it's not pulling them out entirely, but it's cutting 'em flush with the floor of the river. And most of that work, nearly all of that work would have to be done by a barge, that's why it's fairly expensive right now. So I guess from there, I would recommend that you open up the floor for discussion, and then we can talk about other options beyond removing it after everyone has a chance to speak.

- Okay, thank you. I'll motion to open the floor.

- Second.

- Anyone here to speak? Step up to the podium and state your name and address.

- My name is Jim Sanderson. My address is 417 Cambridge Street in Green Bay. I was over there in 2005 watching the new deck be built on the shore and then they lifted it by crane onto the existing structure of the old bridge. And I have a very good memory of what the pilings and the understructure of that bridge looked like back then. And I was just over there this afternoon, and it looks almost the same as from what I remember back then. And that bridge, most of it probably dates back to the 1870s. This railroad bridge to the north of the downtown, that was put up in 1895. But of the nine rows of supports with seven posts in each of 'em, I've seen three rotting posts total close to the shore and two of the posts gone on the furthest west row. And like I said, I think that was in that condition, uh, you know, fine when they were refurbishing it. And that fire that was done to by the truant kids, that wood is so thick on it that the fire department got there fairly quickly, and it basically just squashed the thick crease silt that was on it. The woods suffered very little actual damage from the fire eating into it. And I just think that based on the fact that that structure is the second oldest of anything in that area manmade other than hazelwood, I think a lot of efforts should be made to continue preserving it. And I think a lot of people in the city liked the fact that that wasn't completely removed, and it was made into a fishing pier because people were going on the old bridge probably illegally to

fish. And apparently it still gets plenty of use now. So I just think the \$400,000 that would take to remove that, probably not that much could be spent to refurbish it for where it's safe. It's only holding up the weight of people. It was built for a lot, obviously the weight of trains passing over it. So obviously I'm in favor of all efforts to retain as much as what's there originally as possible. Thank you.

- Thank you. Anyone have any questions for him?

- Actually, Jim, I have a question. I've known Jim for a while, he's very much in the history of our community and we appreciate a lot of your efforts for that on that. And I know you're looking at ways to preserve the bridge and at one time we actually had thought of using that bridge as a connecting route between trails on the east side and west side. And of course the damage that was done by the arson was sad, to say the least. So one of the problems we have to face is that looking at the cost to take it down, that's gonna be quite a bit. But I'm just wondering where your thoughts came in that you don't think there's that as much damage to that because of the fire. I know there's engineers and other folks that have looked at it more extensively and I know that you have a very strong interest, but where do you get your thoughts on that and as far as your research and the validity of that?

- Well I went over there to look at it 'cause I thought I had heard that there had been plans to make the east end of it into a pier at that time. I think the idea of that being a connecting link between the two sides river for a trail got kind of put to a stop because of the length of time that the mechanical workings of the rotating opening had been left without any maintenance done to it. And it was also considered a kind of inconvenience passing for ships 'cause of the design of it. But I was over there talking at the construction people that were building the deck and everyone was saying that if that bridge hadn't been, had the thickness of the construction was made out of that fire, it would probably have quickly destroyed it. But it's like in the old growth forest when those trees survive fires because the fire only burns the outer edge thickness of the bark on those large trees. The same thing was true with that bridge. I mean, it was scorched when it got approval to continue to be deemed worthy of putting the new deck on top of it. And I don't think that in the few years, as far as how long that thing's been standing in the few years since that was retrofitted with the new deck, I don't think there has been any real significant deterioration on it. I noticed when they finished putting the deck on it, I thought there should have been more cross beams connected to the post underneath, but they did add a few of 'em, but they apparently figured what was there was structurally worthy enough for the little bit of weight that would be put on it by the deck, so.

- Those are good points. I just wanted to . . .

- Yeah, I mean I trusted the construction 'cause I've talked to construction people who have told me when they're working on something, they say, well, for my project, I wouldn't do it. It's not worth saving. But the guys would say, yeah, it's still amazingly in good condition considering it had the outer thickness of it scorched by fire, so.

- Do you know how thick those beams are in offhand? I mean we can kind of, I can look at it.

- Yeah, I don't. They look like oversized railroad ties. I mean as far as, I mean, all the bridges, all the wooden structures, they took down a structure over by Monroe in University Avenue. They had the same kind of construction on it, but . . .

- Okay, well, I can ask that of staff too.

- Yeah.

- That's fine.

- In my opinion, I think could stand there like it is for a very long time. I understand the concerns about the deteriorated deck, which I don't think the replacement of the boards on there would come anywhere close to what the demo on it would be, so.

- Right, well, Jim, thank you very much.

- Jim.

- Halt, Jim.

- Linda.

- Yeah, thank you. I'm wondering if you saw the report that we're looking at.

- Well, I was listening to what he was telling you about that.

- Okay, well, just 'cause, and we're looking, I just wondered if you saw.

- I was over there looking at it from both underneath the bridge and I just don't see anything, what I would notice as noticeably worse condition of it than it was in '05, so. Considering that thing's 150 years old, I mean, I think there's been pieces of it that were reinforced and changed out by the railroad over the years, but I think most of it's from that time period.

- Okay, thank you.

- Yeah, I'm reading right here.

- It was the 13th page report on it.

- 14-inch timber pines.

- 14-inch, okay.

- 14-inch timber pines. And the underlying part that, I mean, ice is a pretty powerful thing. There's significant risk of structure failure in the event of a powerful storm of ice shelves, and you know what ice can do on a river.

- Yeah.

- I mean, it doesn't stop for too much.

- Get somebody else.

- Is there anybody else that would like to speak?

- Hello, my name is Melissa Schmitz. I live at 815 South Adams Street in Green Bay. I live almost directly across from the pier. And I have one question and I have a couple of comments. So was there a structural engineering report conducted in 2005 to compare what the integrity was then versus today?

- Yes, we did an engineering study in 2005, and they deemed that a portion of the bridge had to be removed because of the fire damage, and the rest of it could be salvaged and renovated as you see today.

- Okay, so the 68% that is in poor and failing condition today, did we have any kind of percentage of, was it a similar sort of report that graded the structure itself by good, fair, poor, similar to what's in this report?

- I don't know that offhand. I did not review that report prior to today's meeting.

- Okay, so in general, my comments, I definitely want the pier to be as safe as possible. It is widely used in the community, not just from the neighborhood, but from people all over the community. I've lived at that address for almost eight years. So my kids spent a fair amount of time, and myself, fishing from the pier. And I just want this committee to understand that it is an asset, and if it needs to be removed, so be it. But I do think there should be a plan in place to replace it with another similar style of amenity for fishing or recreation. So beyond the fishing aspects of it that are used, there's a ton of families that gather there from outside of the Astor neighborhood, the area along Adams Street that we're talking, there's plenty of parking. So it's very accessible for people just to drive up, bring out their fishing stuff, their picnic, whatever they're doing there. There's also a kayak and canoe launch adjacent to where the pier is. So people frequent it there and the Fox River Trail is there as well. So tying all of that together, it's a draw for the community and probably people outside of the community as well. People have had their weddings there; people take their senior photos there. And the other thing is from a public access point. Most of that stretch from Poirier Street, down to the water utility area on Adams Street is owned by a private entity, it's not public. People aren't supposed to fish there. So the pier area is public access. And that's very important I think from an access standpoint, for people that don't live on the water or are looking for somewhere to fish close to shore. But still as an angler, it's always that if you don't have a boat, you wanna try to get a little further out so that you have some casting opportunities. And the pier is awfully high, it was built as a railroad bridge. So as you consider what to do for next steps, my recommendation would be to put some dollars and have, there's probably a ton of grant opportunities as well as an opportunity for the city to put some dollars towards a good replacement for that bridge or for that pier. And it's 88% accessible right now. So I mean, I can't tell you how many families, such a diversity of families that utilize that area, so that's what I wanted to say.

- Go ahead, thank you, thanks Melissa, for coming in. And I know you've been out there for a while, and I know it's been closed for a bit. So when's the last time you and your family was on that bridge?

- It would've been in the beginning of this season, this summer. I don't know exactly the date that it closed, but I remember I kinda have this whole walking path with my dogs. Now my kids are a little bit older, I got dogs. So we walk along the path and go down on the pier and do all this stuff, and I noticed when there was the gaping hole in the decking.

- Yeah.

- And I thought, should I call parks, or should I call public works about this?

- Yeah.

- I wasn't sure exactly.

- So it was a safety.

- It was definitely a safety concern, and there's kids that hang out there, there's adults, there's every age group imaginable.

- Right.

- So it was definitely, go ahead . . .

- In your estimation, do you think with what's there now, it just doesn't seem viable to keep what's there?

- Well, the decking for sure.

- The decking.

- The decking for sure should be replaced. I read the report, I saw that they did borings and sound testing on the pilings themselves, so I trust that engineering report. However, at the same time, it's like, okay, we're not talking like cars are driving on it. So that comparison of what is left and what is viable from a safety perspective, not the decking part, that definitely needs to be replaced. But I would put my trust in the engineering report, and I think there's a lot of community resources besides, in addition to whatever funding the city deems necessary to be able to garner community support for that, because it's beyond the neighborhood as far as who utilizes that.

- So something with depending on what our committee does, if we decide to set it back, it would be nice to have some access, or some thought as far as what some of these sources are. And I suppose staff could fill us in on that as far as funding sources or potential grants, so.

- Okay, I'm good.

- Linda.

- Okay, yeah. So I was gonna say your first name, Steuer was indicating. I kinda look at you as maybe the grant guru 'cause you've got a lot of grants. Well, am I right? I mean.

- Well, so yes.

- So maybe that would be.

- That's a compliment.

- It was a compliment, yeah. He had to clarify that maybe you have some ideas for where to get the grants, just maybe.

- So this is like a citizen refer to staff thing.

- Yeah.

- So what I'm saying, well, I will say that this is parks and I'm in public works, but just as an individual and a personal interest in this, yes, I know that there are grants that we could explore, and I have some fantastic coworkers in various departments that I think would all have interest in potentially doing this. But I will refrain from being at work right now.

- Right.

- Okay, well, thank you.

- Okay.

- Okay, so what kind of fish did you catch off?

- Well, I'll tell you that it's come a long way, it's changing. The fish species diversity, so there's always catfish, there's always carp, but there are perch and there's a lot more perch now and there are smallmouth bass.

- Cool.

- Okay, thanks for the enlightening. Any other questions, anyone else on to speak?

- Hi, committee, Director, Tony Tyson, 931 South Barrett Street, Green Bay. So my eight-year-old grandson fishes a couple miles south at his other grandfather's dock in Allouez. Last summer he caught a gar, and people in the neighborhood said they've never seen a gar, but when you're off the great lakes, you never know what you're gonna catch. But yes, he's catching perch, he's catching smallmouth bass, he sees the muskies spawning. So he hopes to catch a big muskie someday. So I know a lot about this pier, I grew up in that neighborhood. I and my brothers and friends, 60 and more years ago, we would hang out underneath there. I guess we probably smoked a couple cigarettes under there, whatever boys do when they're . . .

- The secret safe.

- When they're hiding.

- It's on camp.

- So I've been on that in the last 10. Well, first of all, director was saying 2015 and Jim was saying '05. I was on the city council up until April 2012, and I thought it was prior to 2012.

- Yeah, I misspoke. We built it in 2006. So we received the funding in 2004. So if I said 15, that was . . .

- Okay, so you have the report. I saw what was online. I look at the local WBAY.com, Fox11.com, et cetera. And just has a little bit of what you read. One thing I do recall reading is the concern seemed to be more if there's powerful storms or ice shelves. Now the Fox River doesn't have ice shelves, so you don't have to worry about that, okay? I grew up in that area. It might be the geometrics of it. You could ask a meteorologist. In fact, just to double check, I called our grandson's other father-in-law who lives on the river in Allouez. He says Fox River doesn't have ice shelves, it melts out in the river, middle starts melting in the river. I know what the ice shelves look like. On Lake Winnebago and where they have 'em, Fox River doesn't get those. So as far as a powerful storm, a tornado did go through that area when I was a kid in 1959. And yes, I'd be concerned about a tornado, but nobody's gonna be on that thing during a tornado. So the way I read it is, and it's my bias reading, if you don't have powerful storms and you don't have ice shelves, you're in pretty good shape, I think. That's just my reading of it. The other thing is I wish you had the engineering report from whenever that was, 15 years ago, whenever that was. Did they say what percent of those pilings were bad then like they're saying 68% now? What percent was it? 'Cause I don't remember anything that discouraged us from putting that decking on, and safely opening it to the public. And I have a hard time believing it's changed much with that treated wood between then and now. Before I forget, I would suggest, okay, it's barricaded off. There's nobody going out there. I wouldn't make a quick decision, I would suggest, I know you folks haven't been out there because the barricade is there, unless Director took you out there. So I would like you folks to walk that thing before you make a decision. It doesn't hurt to let it sit for a while. That pier is on my bicycle route. I'm probably out on that pier 10 times every biking season. I come down the trail, I park my bike, I walk out there. A lot of times there's nobody out there. Depending on whether, if somebody's fishing, I see what if they're catching anything? Melissa sees groups of large people 'cause she lives close. I've never seen a group of large people, but I'm sure there are. What I would question is from the engineering point of view that pier, that bridge was built to carry trains. You're talking about locomotives, maybe more than one locomotive carrying a train that's full of stuff, so I believe the number of uprights is for train usage, and if Jim says he counted 60 some of 'em.

- Each row originally has seven poles going to the ground.

- Okay so if you got 60 some of 'em, if you only needed the number to hold, those are there because that's the number you needed to hold a train. The number you would need to hold pedestrians has to be much less than

that, I know something about physics. If you look at the load of a full train with locomotives, what is the load per square inch compared to 20 people walking out there, it's gotta be a big difference. So an engineer could tell you if that was needed, if those posts were needed strictly to hold people, maybe you only need a third of 'em. An engineer can tell you how many of those would hold up that deck and people. So these are things that . . .

- It's a good point.

- I'm hoping you folks would look into, get some answers to these, there's no rush to fix it or take it down. So I was out there a couple times when I saw that hole in the deck, and what if that hole wasn't there? We wouldn't even be talking about this. You wouldn't have had the, or you could ask the director, was there gonna be, was there a planned, an engineering inspection coming up anyway, or was it only done because that hole was in the deck? By the way, if it was me, I would've put a picnic table over that hole in the deck and left it open, that's just me. I look for the commonsense solution. So I was out there before they barricaded off. I was out there from something in the neighborhood. And to me, it looked like now you've heard comments that that deck needs to be replaced. Those are two by sixes, and they are worn. But except for where that hole is, maybe I'd have to take another look at it. Walking out there and back, probably half dozen times before I saw the hole this year, I never saw any decking that looked exceptionally all that worn. I mean a two by six can be very worn-looking and still be strong. So I'm guessing those are treated two by fours. I don't remember if we had put plastic, not two by fours, they're two by sixes. If we had put plastic in there, would've been more expensive, but we wouldn't be talking about it, would've lasted forever. So I just have a lot of questions. And if I was you, guys, I would wanna go out there and take a look at it. Really the question to me is, from an engineer's point of view, if there's 62, 63 of these pilings, how many good ones are needed spread out? How many good ones are needed to hold people as opposed to a train?

- Chair, I may have a question.

- Go ahead, straight.

- Thanks, Tony, for coming in, and the history, et cetera. I guess we're looking at the fact that there was damage done. There was a fire, and some people think, well, it wasn't that bad or maybe it was. The decking itself, it sounds to me like you're looking, you're thinking that the pilings are strong enough that all you need is some repair or something to the decking and then it would be fine. Is that it?

- I'd have to take a second look at it. Did I miss something?

- And that's like I said, we're looking at the engineering report and kinda rely on the experts on that. But we're asked to have action on this tonight, but depending on with the committee, we start talking, I think we can talk about it well enough. But I just wanted your take on that as far as the safety issue. You thought that it was safe enough? I guess our concern, or my concern is looking at the pilings, the ones that have burned. I mean, they took out that swing area and they took out the west side of the bridge. So I mean, the fire, was it worse in the west side than the east side? I mean, there's all sorts of speculation, a fire can do different things in different areas.

- So it was inspected after the fire. The engineers then said the fire did not cause any structural damage. It's safe to put the decking on and open it, so. And I look at it, those are huge timbers I believe, and they're like Jim said, I guess they're so good cressel or whatever. I recall that they were charred on the outside. I know somebody that reclaimed wood from a house fire, this house had the old two by fours when they were actually two by fours. And I guess the fire was put out quickly, but just because they were scorched all the way around, the lumber was still good, that's just an example. Engineers are very cautious. The engineers, we had engineers and you could, you still have that report from the fire? So you should read that report, back then, the park director's recommendation was it's safe, based on the engineer's report. So my recollection is the fire out there was cosmetic to the surface of the wood and didn't affect the strength of the wood.

- Okay. That's all I have.
- Right, thank you, Tony.
- Thank you.
- Any other questions? Anybody else would?
- Yeah, and something to what Tony was saying. It's easy to . . .
- Step up to podium thanks.
- There's a kayak launch on the shore there that's got easy access to it. If you go into the kayak launch area and you walk along the shore, you can see perfectly well underneath the understructure of that bridge and the newer under framing of the deck that was put there, well, 15 years ago, that's intact. It's just, as Tony was saying, just deck planks on top that are deteriorating out in some spots, so thanks.
- Thank you.
- Do we have anybody else that wants to speak?
- Motion to close?
- Motion to close floor?
- Second.
- All in favor?
- Aye, aye.
- Aye.
- Aye.
- We don't happen to have the inspector here, do we? I know we have his report.
- No, it was a consultant. I did not ask the consultant to come to the meeting. But let me just kinda state a few comments here moving forward. I guess one thing I just wanna point out is the fire that happened in 2005 was a significant fire. And if you recall when I talked about that fire, I mentioned that per the engineer's report back then, a portion of the pier had to be removed 'cause it was structurally unsound due to the fire. So it started out on the end, it prepped its way inward, and at some point, the consultant said, okay, from this point over to the shoreline, it's safe if we beef it up and add additional structural numbers to it. Where you can see in the photographs in the report, you can see those new cross members that were added. But then a portion of the pier had to be redrawn because it was structurally unsound. And then I do wanna just point out, I do wanna point out the page five, the recommendation of how they inspected the piers and what their analysis was. So I'm just gonna read this to you real quickly here. So on page five of the report, it says every pile was visually inspected and checked with a sounding hammer. Some of the questionable piles were also checked with an auger drill bit to verify accuracy of soundings. The inspection revealed approximately 70% of the wood piles are no longer structurally sound with estimated capacity of less than 50% remaining due to interior decay. So what they're saying is, the wood has been there so long that it's now starting to decay on the inside. And you can't necessarily see that from the exterior. And unless you kinda do some of the other additional soundings

that they did in this report, you can't visually tell what that is. So based on the recommendations in this report, my recommendation as staff is to remove the pier. In my opinion, based on how I'm interpreting this report, it is unsound and unsafe to the public to leave it in place for very much longer. And if we were to consider rebuilding something in its place, which is obvious that it's a nice amenity for the city. I'm not necessarily saying we shouldn't have something there, but if the rotting of these vertical posts are starting to happen now, it's just gonna continue to get worse as the years go on. And so what I'd hate to do is build something new around those structures, and then they decay to the point where you have to remove 'em, but it's almost impossible to remove 'em after the fact. So my recommendation to the committee here is to remove the pier now fairly quickly based on the report that you see in front of you. And then if we wanna build something in the future, we have that discussion. What do we wanna build? How long do we want the pier to be? How tall do we want the pier to be? Do we even want a pier in that location, or do we want just an overlook from the shoreline? And we can have those discussions at a later date. And the city doesn't currently have funding to build anything of that magnitude right now. So we would have to look at alternate funding sources, which could be grants. There are grants that would fund this. If you recall initially, I told you that the renovations to this pier was originally funded by a grant. So there are grants that we could use, and the other option is bond bank. So I did not include a new pier in our five-year capital improvement plan, which was just submitted to the finance committee, because this was an unknown when I submitted that plan. But it's something that we can discuss and talk about any given year, at what point you wanna fund something. But in my mind, it wouldn't make a lot of sense to keep this in place if we wanna build something new and keep it there for a long time moving forward. Now to give you some idea of what the potential cost would be to build a new pier of a similar length, we did not ask the consultant for a cost estimate, but we can compare this to the bid that we just received for the pier out at Bay Beach Amusement Park. So if you recall, we recently bid out a pier that was a little over 400 feet long, maybe about 425 feet long. And that bid came in at roughly \$3.4 million. This pier is about 140 feet long. So if you kinda do the math and estimate it, again, that would cost maybe in the range of \$1.5 million to install a new pier about the same length. Now that of course, is variable depending on the materials that you use and the size of the pier, the length, the height. I'm just comparing it to what was designed out at Bay Beach, which was steel piers with a concrete deck and a steel rail. I'm sure if we go with wood, it would be somewhat more inexpensive than the one that we designed out at Bay Beach. But keep in mind, wood is not cheap right now either. Wood used to be a fairly economical option for an alternate construction method, but the cost of wood is very high right now. So part of this is when you bid it out right now, construction costs are high. If you wait a couple of years, those costs might come down or not, we don't know yet. But I'm pretty confident that if you're building any pier structure with additional footings and piers, if it's a new structure, it's gonna be well over a million dollars in my estimation now.

- Yes.

- Dan, I was just gonna ask you on this report here, I presume this is the entire width of the river right here. The study that was done with all the pilings.

- That's the entire width of the pilings and the pier structure, I guess.

- Not across.

- Not the entire river, just what we look at.

- 2005.

- Right, the 2005 report. So I'm looking at this and there's about 73 pilings. Well, it looks like it's more, more than 60. And then over 50 of 'em are listed as unsound timber piles. So that could either be that the rotting wood or the fire did some damage. I mean, it could be either or, right?

- Combination of both.

- A combination of both. So that is this 68% that we were talking about, two thirds is damaged. And we got a picture right here of the report that was done in 2005.
- That's the report from now, not the 2005.
- Okay, well it talks about the details of the project in 2005.
- Yeah, they just.
- So is that 2005?
- No, well, the report where it talked about the piers, they used that graphic from that initial report just to number-
- It just appears to have, okay.
- And just to provide a graphic so that they could complete their analysis. But the analysis is from this year.
- I guess the question I had is that you're talking about \$250,000 to \$400,000 to remove. You're talking about one point some million, \$3.4 million and threw out a couple of numbers.
- \$1.5, I think is \$3.4 for Bay Beach.
- For Bay Beach.
- \$1.5 because this is not as big.
- Same here, that's not in our five-year plan, I presume.
- I mean, it's currently not in there. So I guess the question is where would we get the funding too, either we move up here now at \$250,000 to \$400,000? So last year, I know some of you weren't on the council at that point, but last year in our bond process, we reallocated \$750,000 from Bay Beach, and we put it towards other park projects. So we do have projects that were assigned to that, but because of this one, it's a fairly time sensitive one with a safety concern. This would take, probably take priority for that funding, and so I would recommend using that funding or a portion of that funding to remove the pier now. And so what I'm saying is, there is funding available currently to at least pay for the removals. We do not have nearly enough to build anything new of this magnitude. So that's why if we're gonna talk about building something safe that the public can use, that can be a future discussion.
- So the decking would be taken off.
- Everything would be taken out, so it would be the decking, the railings . . .
- I just wanna clarify what you just said, something that caught my ear. I thought Bay Beach through the last three years had a \$2.5 million deficit, so how did you take money from there?
- It was part of the refinancing package that the city council approved for the shoreline improvement. So the City, Bay Beach bonded \$5 million to do that project, which is gonna fund that pier, the beach, and several other improvements along the shoreline.
- Which was estimated at \$2 million.

- That pier route kit was estimated at \$3.5, \$3.4 million. Or no, it was estimated at \$2.4 million, and it came in at \$3.4 million. But as part of the refinancing package, the City Council authorized taking some of that bond money, and instead diverted to objects because that would make our bond payment burden less on Bay Beach Amusement Park.

- Okay.

- And so that's where the funding came from, it's still available. We do have other projects slated to use the remaining funding of that. But in my mind, it's either we add to our bond request, which is already over what the Finance Committee and City Council probably would like to move forward with, or we use this funding money for their removals.

- Thanks for that clarification. Yeah, Linda?

- Okay, so that's right. So it was \$250,000 to \$400,000 for removal. \$1.5 million if we wanna rebuild. Is it feasible to fix what's there? I know you said something about it costing more, it wasn't cost effective. Do you have an amount if say, the things that needed to be replaced or repaired?

- Well, in the report what it says is it's not cost effective to try to replace the piers that are damaged. It's just hard to get rid of the bad piers and put a new one in its place. What the report recommends is either remove the entire structure or what you could do is put new piers along the sides of the addition of the structure that's there, and just leave all that wood underneath it. And that in essence, build something over the top of it. So that's what the report actually states, but my recommendation is if we are going to in essence build a new pier around it, that doesn't make a lot of sense to me. I would much prefer to get rid of the old pier structure altogether, so that as those timber structures continue to fail, which they will, 'cause it's a wood structure, they do rot out over time. I mean, this one lasted over a hundred years, but when you have wood in contact to water, eventually it's going to fail. And I'd hate to build a brand-new structure that's gonna last decades or maybe another a hundred years, and then have all this old stuff underneath it that's impossible to remove once we built something around it. So in either scenario, I would recommend removing what's there.

- I mean I was reading the report, but I didn't see a number for say for fixing, that's all. I just wondered if that was, when we're comparing everything, just trying to get all the numbers together. I personally, I feel like there's an emotional attachment to it, which makes sense, because it's been there a long time and it's a great feature. My concern is if it's not safe, I certainly think that we have engineers and the inspector. We have people in place for that reason so that the public is safe. And just to clarify, Melissa mentioned, is this a public works or parks, and is this considered a park?

- Yes.

- I mean, I know it's in our Parks Committee here, but.

- Yes, this is considered a park facility, okay, because it's along the Fox River Trail, which is managed by the parks.

- So the base of the entrance to it was owned by the city, bought from the railroad, or was it owned?

- The railroad was originally owned by the railroad company. When that was abandoned, the DNR took over ownership of the entire corridor that runs through the river. And so in 2005, when we got approvals to do this, we actually received an easement from the DNR, which allowed us to convert the railroad bridge into a fishing pier. So we have an easement with the DNR, allowing for it to be a fishing pier. But the property on the land side, that it's sitting on, and I believe that that's actually sitting on right away if my memory serves me right.

- Well, did you wanna make a motion or do you wanna?

- I just make comment. I know my kids used to go out to the end of the river and fish there off of the whatever by the city there. And I have friends that go off the, not city deck, but cross by the lights dock. I was wondering what that cost, that the wooden structure, I'm pretty sure. But I really do like the idea of it being centrally located in the city. Yes, the east side, west side. But how many kids can ride their bike to Bay Beach? How many kids can come from north, east and west to come to this? I think it's a great spot. We're a waterway, we're gonna clean up the coal piles, and we have unused resources that as far as I've lived in Green Bay, may have never ever been used to their potential. And I mean, the parks are definitely part of that. I like to see something put in place for this. If not someday, I mean, it would be great. I mean, kids are gonna grow up, and maybe the next generation they'll have to enjoy it. But when the water is cleaning up, I mean, everything's looking forward. It's a great waterway for history. It's one of the only, one thing I remember, it's the only river that flows north other than the Nile River. It's kinda one of them, things that you grow up with, it's pretty rare. So, and it's a great system. So I'd like to see something put in place too. And it's a tough one.

- I think, I mean, at this time, this is consideration possible action, we have to state to what it is. So I'm looking, I'm mimicking with all Alder Eck too about the safety. I mean, there's an emotional attachment to this, and I'm very much into history in this community as well, I really would like to see something preserved. However, if you take down this building, this setup I should say, that is removed. If you build a new one, well, it's just the convenience. it's a new structure. My concern is the safety issue, just pure and simple. And again, this will go to city council, this is a recommendation, and the council will have a chance. I'm sure it'll be spoken of at council. So if I could make a motion.

- Would you like to make a motion of this, go ahead.

- So I'm gonna follow what the Director said and say consideration of possible action and removing the corroded pier would make that motion.

- We have a second.

- I will sit again to.

- All those in favor say aye.

- Aye.

- Aye.

- Aye.

- Gonna get till it goes to city council this Tuesday.

- And it does go to City Council next Tuesday, which I think we can maybe get every fishing partner in there and voice your opinion and maybe give us a chance to go look at it ourselves too. Sounds like a place that.

- And I'll do that, I will go look.

- Sounds good. And you get to get outta here and board a train.

- Field trip.

- And a guide.

- Do we vote, all in favor?

- Just a comment.

- [Tony] You won't be able to look at it unless the Director opens up the gate for you.

- Right, we know his number.

- [Tony] Okay.

- Okay, onto the next item, item two. Consideration with possible action on the request by Wisconsin Public Service for the utility easement in Seymour Park to accommodate the gas line relocation, staff.

- Yeah, so I included the proposed easement in the agenda packet for your reference. And so Wisconsin Public Service did request approval to route a gas line right through Seymour Park. The line is needed to replace aging WPS infrastructure. So there's currently a gas line there that's underneath the trail that you can see in that graphic right next to where they're proposing to run the new route. And they in essence, just wanna build it next to it and kinda circle it around a little bit, bow it out from the trail a little bit more. So in order for them to install a new service, they do require a formal utility easement. When that gas line was originally installed, they did not require formal easements in all situations, so there is no easement there. So if you take a look at that, you'll see a conceptual location. So it's not a defined easement that they show in that graphic, it's a conceptual location easement and we did review that location with public works. So in general, we are supportive of providing the easement to WPS 'cause we feel it is a necessary easement, but we're hesitant to approve it as presented tonight. So as you know, public works is currently working on a design of a storm water facility at Seymour Park, roughly in the area where that proposed easement is going. And that design is not completed yet. So they hired, they contracted it out to an engineering firm to design it. And at this point today, we don't know if what's being shown is gonna be adequate or if it needs to be pushed over even further towards the south. And so the problem that we're running into, and the reason we brought to you today for consideration, is because public service would like to install that gas line in mid to late October. And so the only way that we can make that happen for them is if the committee grants staff the approval to award the easement or to grant the easement after the fact. So what I'm requesting is approval to allow staff to approve the easement after we work out all the final details with our consulting engineer, and we're certain that the location meets our requirements for the pond, and we can give WPS an exact location of where that easement would be. So I do have a proposed motion for you so before you actually make a motion, I'd be happy to share that with you. But if you have any questions, we can go through that right now.

- You handle the gray area here. Alder Eck?

- Okay, so you mentioned DPW. So you're working on that and figuring out where they need their stuff for the storm water, basically you'd work it up between the two departments, you're saying?

- Correct, yes. And with our engineering consultant that we hired to design the pier.

- Okay.

- Thank you.

- Post strike.

- Thank you.

- So Dan, I was just looking at this. So I understand you're looking for that easement, is there any, if we can grant this as far as any kind of cost of city, I know there will be a cost of some sort. But you fill in a little bit that potential?

- No, there is no cost to the city to reroute this gas line. Like I said, it's aging infrastructure, so they really want to remove it, plus they have to, due to the storm water pond location. But because it's aging infrastructure, WPS will pay for the bill.

- That's what I wanted to know. Okay, thank you. Motion to approve.

- Specific.

- No, I would have read, well.

- What I would recommend you say is to grant staff the authority to improve the request by Wisconsin Public Service for utility easement and Seymour Park to accommodate a gas line relocation after the final easement location has been selected and approved by similar staff.

- A motion to whatever he said.

- Do I have a motion to?

- (inaudible).

- What staff recommended?

- And I will second with.

- One of the staff here can say aye.

- Aye.

- Aye.

- Aye.

- It was too long to repeat.

- Yeah, solid good.

- You did?

- Well.

- What staff said.

- How he said it, how he recommended.

- So we all voted.

- Yes, yep. So item three, consideration of possible action on the purchase of a cab and chassis, single axle, 33,000 gross vehicle weight recommendation to Packer City International Trucks for the sum of \$88,600.

- So this purchase will replace a 1998 Ford F-750 flatbed dump truck that is primarily used by the forestry department. They use that vehicle to haul large logs and then dump them as needed. So the truck will be purchased in two phases. This approval is just for the purchase of the cab and chassis. So once this cab and chassis is acquired, the rest of the truck will be fabricated and purchased from another vendor using the cab and chassis that we provide to them. So we'll work with the purchasing department at a later date to quote out the second phase of the acquisition or the purchase. So if you look at the quote package, you'll see that six companies did take out a full package, but only two companies submitted formal quotes. We're recommending purchasing this from Packer City International Trucks, and they were the low bid for \$88,600. And we have purchased many vehicles from this vendor in the past, and we feel comfortable with this quote. Funding for this is from our 2022 bond request. So as you know, forestry department is funded 88% through the storm water division and 12% through the General City budget. In 2012, the city did bond \$15,776 towards this purchase, and the storm water division bonded \$114,224 for a total budget cost of \$130,000 for the entire truck, for both phases. We are estimating that the total truck will come within budget after the second part is pulled out. So I would recommend approval.

- Motion to approve?

- Second.

- All in favor say aye.

- Aye.

- Aye.

- Aye.

- Item E, information on Director's report.

- So I included the Director's report in the agenda packet. I really have nothing to add to that as far as updates go. But if you have questions that you have to answer them, otherwise you can. I would recommend making a motion to receive in place on a file.

- Make a motion to-

- Motion to receive in place on file.

- I feel so.

- Alder Eck. Favors or second to. All in favor say aye.

- Aye.

- Aye.

- Aye.

- Okay, the next Park Committee meeting is scheduled for October 12th, 2022.

- See, I didn't see anything about closing Bay Beach. So I was like, I looked at the agenda. I didn't see that on there.

- I just was wheeling some power.

- Yeah.
- For the season, you didn't let me finish.
- But you just still going for the weekends.
- Motion to adjourn.
- Is it still going?
- Yes.
- Oh wow, I misunderstood the news then. It kinda made it sound like it was closing.
- It's still weekends.
- But just weekends.
- Sure, motion to adjourn.
- Second.
- All in favor say aye.
- Aye.
- Aye.
- All right.
- We can leave the meeting.
- Almost done.
- Oh, did he?
- Well.