



MINUTES OF THE PARKS COMMITTEE

WEDNESDAY, NOVEMBER 30, 2022, 5:00 PM

In person at City Hall, Room 207.

Virtual attendance also available via Zoom.

AMENDED

A. ZOOM MEETING INFORMATION.

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

B. ROLL CALL.

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

Others Present: Director Dan Ditscheit, Deputy Director James Andersen, Lindsay Mather-Attorney, Holly Baseman - Baird Creek Preservation Foundation, Eric Johnson-Engineer Consultant

C. APPROVAL OF THE AGENDA.

Moved by Ald. Melinda Eck, seconded by Ald. Steven Campbell to approve. Motion carried.

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

D. APPROVAL OF MINUTES.

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

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

E. REGULAR BUSINESS.

I. Consideration with possible action on the approval of a fundraising campaign by the Baird Creek Preservation Foundation on behalf of the City of Green Bay, to go towards the purchase of snow making equipment at Triangle Hill.

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

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

Moved by Ald. Steven Campbell, seconded by Ald. Melinda Eck to approve a fundraising campaign by the Baird Creek Preservation Foundation on behalf of the City of Green Bay, to go towards the purchase of snow making equipment at Triangle Hill. Motion carried.

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

2. Consideration with possible action on accepting \$8,585 in grant funding from The Western Great Lakes Bird and Bat Observatory to plant rain gardens, plant pollinator habitat and install a Motus Wildlife Tracking Receiver at the Wildlife Sanctuary.

Moved by Ald. Melinda Eck, seconded by Ald. Steven Campbell to approve accepting \$8,585 in grant funding from The Western Great Lakes Bird and Bat Observatory to plant rain gardens, plant pollinator habitat and install a Motus Wildlife Tracking Receiver at the Wildlife Sanctuary. Motion carried.

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

3. Consideration with possible action on the removal of the Porlier Pier and review options for possible replacement.

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

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

Moved by Ald. Mark Steuer, seconded by Ald. Melinda Eck to approve the removal of the Porlier Pier and direct staff to seek additional public input and potential funding sources to replace the pier and bring it back to the Park Committee for further discussion. Motion carried.

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

4. Consideration with possible action on hiring Berner Schoeber for \$48,500 to complete the engineering bid documents for the Bay Beach Pavilion renovations.

Moved by Ald. Mark Steuer, seconded by Ald. Melinda Eck to approve hiring Berner Schoeber for \$48,500 to complete the engineering bid documents for the Bay Beach Pavilion renovations . Motion carried.

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

5. Consideration with possible action on purchasing 15 bumper cars for Bay Beach Amusement Park from Majestic Mfg. Inc. for a total cost of \$115,275 plus freight.

Moved by Ald. Melinda Eck, seconded by Ald. Steven Campbell to approve the purchase of 15 bumper cars for Bay Beach Amusement Park from Majestic Mfg. Inc. for a total cost of \$115,275 plus freight. Motion carried.

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

6. Consideration with possible action on the purchase of (4) 52 seat bleachers for Colburn Park from JW Industries for a total cost of \$31,920.

Moved by Ald. Chris Wery, seconded by Ald. Steven Campbell to approve the purchase of (4) 52 seat bleachers for Colburn Park from JW Industries for a total cost of \$31,920. Motion carried.

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

F. INFORMATIONAL.

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

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

Yes- None, No- None, Abstain- None

2. The next Parks Committee meeting is scheduled for December 14, 2022.

G. ADJOURNMENT.

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

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

VERBATIM MINUTES

- [Computer] Progress.

- Hmm?

- What?

- Hm.

- Did it say progress?

- All right. The November 30th Park Committee will come to order, and we'll note all members are present, Alder Campbell, Alder Eck, Alder Steuer, and Alder Wery. Can I have an approval of the agenda.

- Motion to approve.

- Second.

- Motion by Alder Eck, second by Alder Campbell to approve. Any changes? Those in favor?

- [Alders] Aye.

- Opposed? Motion carried. Approval of the minutes.

- So moved.

- Second.
- Motion by Alder Steuer, second by Alder Eck, to approve the minutes. Any changes there? Those in favor?
- [Alders] Aye.
- Opposed? Motion carried. Oop?
- Aye.
- Oh, okay.
- Okay. I wasn't sure.
- You learn something every day I guess. Regular Business, number one. Consideration with possible action on the approval of a fundraising campaign by the Baird Creek Preservation Foundation, on behalf of the City of Green Bay, to go towards the purchase of snow making equipment at Triangle Hill.
- Sounds good for the hill.
- Yeah.
- So recently, as you recall, City Council approved \$500,000 in ARPA funding to go towards the purchase of snow making equipment at Triangle Hill. And at the time, we did state in our application that it was a \$600,000 project, but we were only requesting \$500,000 in ARPA funds. The remaining \$100,000 we were planning on bonding for, as part of the 2023 bond request. So the cost for the snow making equipment is about \$450,000, for the cannons, a chiller, to kind of cool down the water before you shoot it through the cannons. That's about \$450,000. The remaining \$150,000 is to buy a piece of equipment, a used tractor, which is a snow groomer. If we can't find a used one for around \$150,000, which is what we think we'll be able to find it for, then that price to buy a new one would go considerably higher, and we would need additional funds than even the \$100,000. So we've talked about this project with the Baird Creek Preservation Foundation in the past. They're very excited about this project. It fits the mission and the theme of their goals and what they're trying to accomplish. And they would be very interested in kicking off a fundraising campaign to help us find the remaining funding for the snow making equipment. And so, you'll see in the agenda packet that they put together kind of a fundraising campaign brochure, which gives five different levels of potential donations and then what donors would get for their potential donation. And so when you see those levels, they range from a \$1,000 donation to \$50,000 donations. We would not be proposing to sell naming rights for the hill as any of this campaign. So we would be hopeful that they'd be able to fundraise for this without selling naming rights. So we would recognize their donations, either through websites, through social media, through press conferences, and more importantly, we'll put a permanent sign on the site in a prominent location listing everyone that donated to it. For the top candidate, if anyone donates \$50,000, they would also be able to put their logo on the tractor showing that they donated towards this project. So, in general the city staff and parks department is very supportive of this fundraising effort. The reason that it's coming in front of the committee is so that the committee and the council can voice their support of the fundraising effort. It just goes a long way when they're reaching out to potential donors to say, "The city is backing this up. We would support this. And we appreciate the effort for fundraising." That's really the reason that we're bringing this forward right now. We do have Holly Baseman, the Executive Director of the Baird Creek Preservation Foundation, if you'd like to open up the floor and ask her questions or give her a chance to speak, I'll leave that up to you.
- All right, thanks. Who'd like to-
- Motion to open the floor.

- I'll second.
- Motion by Alder Eck, second by Alder Steuer, to open the floor. Those in favor?
- [Alders] Aye.
- Opposed? Motion carried. Come up and give us your name and address.
- [Holly] Holly Baseman, 1270 Main Street, Green Bay, Wisconsin.
- Questions?
- How many people or members are there on the Baird Creek Association, is that what it's called?
- Preservation Foundation.
- Foundation.
- So for the foundation we have about 300 members that are actively supportive of the foundation and involved in it. And then of course we have a large amount of volunteers that come out and help too. And that number's always revolving depending on the year and what we're doing.
- About how long, I'm just gonna ask a few more questions.
- Yeah.
- How long has it been...
- Around?
- Put together, yeah.
- The foundation has been around for 25 years actually.
- Wow. So is this part to do with the trail system in there too?
- Yeah, so the mission of the foundation is actually educational, recreational, and environmental. So our main focus is obviously environmental, but we also do a lot of educational things out there, like summer camps and those kinds of things, all to drive awareness of Baird Creek and the great space that we have out there. But also trail maintenance is something that we're highly active in too.
- I live right next to it, so I use the trail a lot.
- A lot, yeah.
- And my kids all worked at the ski hill.
- Yeah.
- So that's cool. It's nice to see something, that place coming around. I'd hate to see some big shacks built on top of there, when it's-

- Yeah, right.
- And I learned how to get hurt on that hill.
- Yeah. Yeah. Unfortunately that happened. It'll probably still happen again, but kids are kids.
- If you can get them to go out to the street again, like they used to, when it was really fast.
- Oh gee.
- Next thing you know-
- Oh that was when it was dangerous.
- [Holly] That was when it was fast.
- There goes our rescue squad.
- Anyway.
- Alder Steuer, do you have any questions?
- Yes, thanks for coming in.
- Yeah.
- And I'm just looking at the five different categories. Is there a certain threshold that, are we looking at \$100,000, and once we hit that, that would be it, if we got to that?
- [Holly] We're looking to hit \$150,000 technically, just because we want to cover the sign that would go on the hill listing the sponsors. Also, like Dan mentioned, hopefully we can get something used, but we'd rather have, we'd rather try to raise over what we think we would need than under. That way we can cover whatever that piece of equipment would come in at, or if there's any unexpected costs, 'cause we figured that out with projects that that happens a lot.
- So is there a timeframe on this at all, date?
- [Holly] We were aiming to have it by June, but is that?
- Okay, well, just trying to, 'cause I was just looking at the \$1,000, down there you might have 15, 20 people that give there.
- Right.
- So I'm just saying, if you hit \$150,000 would that be enough?
- [Holly] Yeah.
- I'm being positive here.
- Yeah, great.

- And our goal would be to have the snow making equipment all in place and ready to go for next year's snow season.
- Okay. That's it for me.
- I'm just wondering how you're getting the word out, as far as the sponsorship levels?
- [Holly] Yeah, well as soon as we have approval to go ahead with it, we'll start reaching out to area companies. That's what we did when we did the mountain biking skills park, is we just basically, word of mouth, started calling people and telling them, "Hey, we're working on this project and are you interested in sponsoring it?" So that'll be our main thing, but we'll also put it out on social media, web, all the normal ways of putting it out there and then hopefully it'll just kinda spread and get the word out.
- Thank you for doing this. This is great.
- Yeah, very much.
- [Holly] Well, we think it's a great community addition.
- All right, thanks-
- As I said in my campaign, how many people can say they have a zoo, an amusement park, and a ski hill in their district?
- [Holly] Right. Well, and when we lost Navarino, that was a hit to our area. The fact that people now have to drive further to ski is kind of a big deal.
- Yeah.
- I appreciate it. Good job, much nicer.
- When I was 16 at the gas station right below the hill now, that isn't there no more.
- Yeah.
- I always told them that the, some nights I just wanted to tell them that the air pump was broke to pump up their tires, 'cause there was hundreds and hundreds and hundreds of people that would.
- You're giving away all your secrets.
- You need it. You need to put an air pump up there.
- [Holly] At the top.
- No, now you still gotta put one...
- All right. Well, appreciate it. Thank you. It looks good. Good luck.
- One more thing.
- Go for it.

- So I know somebody in town that, I know they've done work for, and I know they have, I think they still have a snow making machine. If they could donate that.
- If you give me their contact information, I'd be happy to reach out to them to see if that's a possibility and whether or not it would work for our facility.
- Okay.
- [Holly] And there's lots of hills out there, so the more the better.
- Well I don't know if he has time to even use it anymore. Just kind of did it like-
- [Holly] My kids will take it for the back yard.
- Well, if you can check into that, Dan. Let's wrap up on that, and thank you, Holly.
- All right, well, thanks.
- Motion to close the floor.
- Motion by Alder Steuer to close the floor.
- Second.
- Second by Alder Eck. Those in favor?
- [Alders] Aye.
- Opposed? Motion carried. What are your wishes?
- Well, since the gentleman has all the, everything in his district... Do you want to do...?
- It is.
- It wasn't-
- Do you have a motion for us, Alder Steuer?
- It's not in my district.
- No, that's Alder Stevens.
- Right at the bottom of the hill it is, yes.
- I would just recommend approving the fundraising campaign.
- Yeah. This is not gonna really cost, it's something that we're not getting everything out of. We might as well try to improve it, since it was already established all of our lives. Hopefully continue on with that, 'cause we won't have anything like that around town.
- So do we hear a motion to approve?
- I would make a motion to approve.

- I thought I heard-
- Second.
- Motion by Alder Eck, second by-
- Or I would've.
- I know you were. Discussion on that? Those in favor?
- [Alders] Aye.
- Opposed? Motion carried. Everything in tonight's meeting goes to council next week for final discussion or approval.
- December 6th.
- December 6th.
- Tuesday.
- Thank you.
- Next Tuesday.
- Thank you.
- Number two, consideration with possible action on accepting \$8,585 in grant funding from the Western Great Lakes Bird and Bat Observatory to plant rain gardens, plant pollinator habitat, and install a Motus Wildlife Tracking Receiver, oop, I after E, except after C, at the Wildlife Sanctuary. Sorry, I had to-
- You had to call that out, didn't you?
- I had to.
- So yeah, the Western Great Lakes Bird and Bat Observatory applied for and received grant funding from the National Fish and Wildlife Foundation. It's through their Sustain Our Great Lakes Program. The grant total that they received was an amount of \$231,000 in grant funding, with matching funds using in-kind and monetary donations that the group is going to secure. So the group, the observatory, will work with 19 different partners to plant native plants, over 4,000 trees, improve habitat for pollinators and birds, and save over 650,000 gallons to avoid runoff. So in addition, they'll install Motus Wildlife Tracking Systems at 15 different locations throughout the region. This system allows scientists to track migratory animals with radio transmitters, and then all of the data is received through these towers, and then they compile the data and distribute it to different scientists for research purposes. And they will work with, as I mentioned, 19 different community partners to achieve the goal and the purpose of the grant that they applied for. For the City of Green Bay, we're one of the 19 partners that they want to partner with to do some work in the city. And so they're proposing to dedicate \$8,585 to go towards planting up to 17,000 square feet of rain gardens and pollinator plantings at the Wildlife Sanctuary. And in this situation, the Green Bay Conservation Corps would provide the labor to install the plants, doing the work, and we would track our hours, and they would use that as their in-kind match to the grant. So the labor we put towards the installation will account for their in-kind donation. So in addition, UW Green Bay has one of these Motus towers already in hand, and they would like to donate that tower to the City of Green Bay and install it at the Wildlife Sanctuary. And then as part of this

grant, they will fund the installation of the tower and then the annual maintenance of the tower. So there will be no cost to the city to install these towers long term. And we will be placing, if this is approved, we will be placing the tower in a secure area where the public doesn't have access and can't see it. So it's not going to be an eyesore for anyone. And it'll be in a fenced-off area where the public is not allowed. So it'll be in a safe location. And then long term we'll work with UW Green Bay to figure out how to gather that data and how we can put some sort of a display on site to provide that data to the public so that they can see the benefit of this tower and migratory patterns in the area. So it's kind of a fun little thing that we can do to engage the public in on it at a later date. So really we're not accepting the grant itself, we're just agreeing to be a partner with the group that received the grant. So I would recommend approval to accept the amount of the grant money. But if you have any questions, I'd be happy to answer them.

- Alder Steuer.

- Thank you, Chair. Dan, I was just wondering, in the past, have we tracked some of this activity in the past that you know of?

- Not the migratory patterns, that I'm aware of. There may have been different programs and initiatives by other groups, like the DNR or the US Fish and Wildlife. But we, as a city, we have never, that I'm aware of, ever helped track that. Now the only thing that I'm aware of is throughout the years we do do a crane count once a year. I don't know if we're still doing it, but we did it for 20 plus years, where we go out and do crane counts and bird counts, the people in the community to kind of count the number of birds they see on a particular day. So we've done stuff like that, but never anything to this magnitude.

- Okay, so it's really a new, a fairly new project then, and something that could really be beneficial in the long run.

- Yeah.

- Okay. Thanks.

- Questions? Alder Campbell.

- Thanks. Did they try planting something in that whole area along the highway there, like a bunch of wildlife flowers and all that? I know it's went under construction since they planted, or that was part of it, but I don't think it went over very good. It didn't grow or something, did it?

- I'm not real familiar with that. That was prior to me being director. But I know that they cleared a lot of, the power company cleared a lot of vegetation underneath the power lines because they wanted, they were concerned about trees and limbs falling on the power lines. I think that they did some minor restoration as part of that, but it wasn't much. They didn't do a full-fledged habitat restoration project at the sanctuary. Now we've done little things with our own staff here and there, just small little habitat projects here and there. In the next few years you're gonna be hearing about another fairly significantly large habitat project that we're working with the DNR on, on the entire site. So we'll be discussing that at some point in the near future. I think we might have even brought it to Park Committee once or twice in the past before you were an alder and discussed that project. So that one's coming up in the next year. So we'll have a fairly large habitat project coming up there.

- You mean on the other side? By the leaf dump or whatever you call it.

- This would be in the entire site. We'll do different areas.

- Is that what's considered the entire site though?

- Yeah, from all of the, yeah, the whole.

- All the way to GB.

- 500 plus acres.

- That covers it. Yeah.

- Alder Eck.

- Maybe strange question. Is there anything that, negative about this at all? It seems really like a great project, and I just don't know if there's something missing, but I thought I'd ask.

- There's nothing negative that I can think of. In essence we're, the money is gonna be used to purchase plants that we're gonna plant at the Wildlife Sanctuary for habitat improvement. And then our staff, with the Conservation Corps group, that's their mission to maintain these plants over time. So the only negative thing that could happen is if that Conservation Corps group ends at some point, we probably wouldn't have the staff to adequately maintain those areas. But hopefully it can maintain itself at that point. Most of the work with habitat areas is done in the first three to five years. The Conservation Corps program is budgeted for three years. So we'd be hopeful that it would all be fairly well established, even if we don't continue on with another grant cycle for that program. That's the only negative that I can think of. But there still wouldn't be any negative aspects to it if we would just stop maintaining it if that were to happen. The plants would still remain.

- Okay, thank you.

- Does this work on people? My mother-in-law, Kathy's, getting up there in age and we can track her with a thing like this.

- Wait, what did you just say?

- I miss pickin' on her. I'm just kidding.

- In case she's listening.

- Any other questions?

- Alder Campbell has a comment.

- I just have one more question. That whole 500 acres is, just a little history on it. Is that committed to, say, like for 100 years or something like that under some preservation, DNR, something that controls it?

- I would have to research the deeds that came along with it. A lot of that is dictated by how we acquired the property and whether or not there's deed restrictions in there.

- Just wondering.

- I can't answer that right now.

- 'Cause that, if I'm not, before I lived there I think it was a landfill, correct? And it's still under-

- Portions of it, yes.

- Certain, right, well one big area there, and it's a big hill. And all the rest is pretty much low land. Just wondering, just history on it all. Trying to learn more about it.

- I make a motion to approve.

- All right, a motion by Alder Eck to approve.

- I'll second.

- Second.

- By Alder Eck and Alder Campbell. And discussion on that? Those in favor?

- [Alders] Aye.

- Opposed? Motion carried. And I can't track Kathy. That's fine. Number three, consideration with possible action on the removal of the Porlier Pier and review options for possible replacement. Director.

- Yes, so this item, if you recall, was discussed at the Park Committee on September 28th. The committee recommended removal of the pier. We did have a lot of discussion with that, with this topic at the city council. And the motion that came out of the city council was refer to staff to do additional research on it and then also explore options to salvage or replace the pier. So as part of that motion, we were also asked to compare the new structural analysis to the structural analysis that was done in 2005 when we initially renovated that railroad trestle into a fishing pier. So I did hand out a graphic, which is also included in the agenda packet for anyone who wants to refer to it digitally. But you'll see in that graphic, this was something our consultant put together, and you'll see that at the top there's a graphic showing all of the structural piles for the entire structure. You'll see that there's 11 bents, which are kind of the, all the structural components that are all in a row. Each of those bents has seven large piles that go into the water to support the bent. In 2005, you'll see that there were 19 unsound piles and 58 sound piles. So you'll see a different color-coded graphic on the upper right-hand corner that shows what is structurally sound now, what was deficient or not structurally sound in 2005, and then you'll see another color-coded key showing what is not structurally sound anymore. So as I mentioned, in 2005, there were 19 unsound piles and 58 sound piles. And at the time, each structural bent of seven piles had at least three sound piles where we could attach additional steel structure membrane to it and attach to the good piles that were there. You'll see in the engineering study that was done in 2022, you'll see that steel member that was added in 2006 when we renovated it. So in the study that we did earlier this year, we found that it went from 19 unsound piles to 53 unsound piles, with only 24 sound piles that still remain. So that's an additional 34 piles that have rotted away since 2005 when the initial study was done. And now when you look at it, five of the 11 bents don't even have a minimum of two sound piles to attach a steel member or additional structures to, to support it. So we were asked to compare the two structural analyses. That's a pretty clear indication of what's happened in the last 15 to 20 years, with that aging of the structure. We did reach out to our consultant that did the 2022 structural analysis of the pier and did ask them to put together a few options for either repair or replacement of the pier. Those options are also in the agenda packet. I do have our consultant here in the audience, and what I would recommend is we open up the floor to our consultant and let him give a brief synopsis of kind of maybe the structural analysis, just if he has anything to add to what I already told you, but more importantly to talk about what the options are that they would recommend as options for replacement. And I will say, and I don't want to speak for him, he can answer this, too, himself, but when we spoke to him initially, he didn't feel that repairing it was a viable option from a cost perspective. And so all of the proposals are building new. So you tear out what's there and you build something new. So if you have additional questions, as far as why the recommendation was to not repair it, now's the time to ask those questions. So I would recommend opening the floor.

- I make a motion-

- Motion to open the-

- Okay.
- Motion by Alder Eck, second by Alder Campbell, to open the floor. Those in favor?
- [Alders] Aye.
- Opposed? Motion carried. Come up and give us your name and address please.
- Erik Johnson. My address is W5557, Number 14 Road, Wallace, Michigan.
- All right. Thank you, Mr. Johnson. Welcome.
- Thank you.
- Tell us about the pier.
- Yeah, as Dan said, it's in bad shape. The 2005 report and the repairs that happened then were good repairs, and they relied on having a few timber piles per bent that were in good condition. And since then, it's progressed to there not being a minimum of two piles per bent to support that. So a bent, you've got a drawing there that probably shows what that is. A bent is one of these lines of timber piles. This is a cross section through one of the bents.
- Vents.
- So a bent is a group of piles together. Like Dan said, it's got seven piles per bent. And for that steel system to really work, it needs at least two legs that are good. And as you can see from the piles that were sound in 2005, that that did work out just fine. But what we found out just a couple months ago was that things have progressed significantly. One of the graphics on the drawing here shows that typical unsound piles, that detail number four. And what we found on the majority of these piles is that you drill through that first one and a half to three inches and then the drill just goes through mush. It's pretty much hollow on the inside. So unfortunately there is still some structure there, and it's obviously holding the pier up, and it can probably hold a lot of people up. But what it can't do is sustain any type of wind, strong wind forces, or if there was some type of ice movement or any other outside force that could happen, it could easily cause a failure, and there's no way to say how much load it can hold because it's so bad. So any questions on that existing condition report before I go into the new?
- Sure, Alder Steuer.
- Erik, thanks for coming in. So it's called a vent, each one of those?
- [Erik] Bent. B-E-N-T.
- B-E-N-T. Okay. I'm looking at them and I'm looking at the legend here and it says unsound timber pile, the red dots, and I see quite a few of them. Then I see the ones that says unsound at time of 2005 survey with a blue ring around them. Can you just explain briefly the difference there? Maybe I'm missing something.
- It's a change. Oh, I'm sorry.
- [Erik] So the ones that have the blue dot, I reviewed the report from 2005. They had an inspection, and then they did the repairs in 2005. That report indicated which piles were bad at that time and that they couldn't rely on those for structural integrity. So the ones circled in blue, that blue outline around it, are the ones from that report that said they were bad. The ones that do not have that blue, but still have the red on the inside, are the ones that I found are bad at this time as well.

- Above and beyond?

- Yeah.

- Keep in mind that the ones with the blue dot, no repairs were done to them since 2005. So they were noted as faulty in 2005 and they're still faulty.

- They're still probably deteriorating even more.

- And some of them had the steel reinforcement to them?

- [Erik] Yep. One other thing that we didn't talk about, a major structural issue, is the bracing. There's cross bracing that goes between each bent and along each bent, and the majority of that has also failed, it's falling into the river. And they wouldn't have left it like that in 2005. So that's another sign that a lot has happened in 20 years.

- So real quickly, was there, it sounds like, Dan said that you're saying it too, that repairing is not really a viable option. That if we, I know there's groundswell of support to maybe see another pier, either nearby or in the same location roughly. Have you looked into what that might cost or is that that's a whole 'nother animal? Or did I miss something?

- Yep.

- All right.

- It's in there as an attachment.

- All right.

- But you can-

- I apologize, I just wanted, for the record.

- [Erik] Yeah, so you're asking about adding on additional piles to support the existing pier?

- No, I would think, you're talking as if the repair would be, there's no-

- Yeah, so, I believe what I stated in the report, and Dan was getting at, is that so many of these elements are in bad condition that really all you'd be working to do is saving those main girder beams that run through the middle. The complexity of trying to do that is pretty intense. First of all, you'd want to get rid of all that bad stuff under there at the same time. So in my opinion, the cost of trying to do that would be higher than replacing with a new one, or similar. If it was a similar cost, you have to think about, is it worth saving something that could itself be bad in another 10 years?

- I can't read that.

- I think the attachment for some reason-

- It's very-

- It's not working.

- It's kind of hieroglyphics. For some reason it doesn't...
- It's working fine on my end.
- If I'm squinting a little bit, I can read it, but I looked at it prior to today, so that has helped me figure it out, but-
- [Erik] Which attachment are you referring to?
- Are you able to see this page?
- Oh the estimates for the removal and then different ideas.
- Here it's really jumbled.
- It's just very, like he said, hieroglyphics.
- [Erik] Dan has one copy of it.
- It's just-
- It's almost a different language.
- I can get each of you, I'll make sure that it looks right in the council packet.
- Yes, I appreciate that.
- And for some, when I opened it from my own laptop at home, I was able to read it, but now I'm not.
- You can't?
- Yeah, I read it at home too.
- It's hard to read.
- So I'm not totally out of it.
- Yeah.
- Yeah.
- So we'll kind of go over the different options since you can't read it on there. We'll kind go over the options that we're proposing.
- Can I just say something?
- Go ahead.
- So as Director Ditscheit said, it did come to the committee, and we did vote unanimously to remove it. We appreciate you coming in and explaining that, but I believe we all agreed that it should come down. Now it's what we're doing, to like moving forward, how we're gonna handle it. So anyway, that's part of the options here I guess.

- Yeah, we did come up with a few cost estimates, as far as what the different options are to replace it. And so option one is obviously just tear it out and don't replace it with anything. From input we've received we know that that's not a very popular option. So what we did is we worked with our consultant to come up with three different options and give us a cost estimate for each one, and he can talk in a little bit more detail with it. So option one is take the existing structure out and just build a pier that's about the same length, about the same height, and using similar materials so it looks kind of the same. Option two is maybe shorten it slightly, lower it to the water a little bit closer, because it is hard to fish off of that real tall pier, and maybe you select alternate materials to save a little bit more money, but get a pier out there, but not necessarily a pier that looks identical.

- Can you say the prices of the different ones?

- Yeah, he'll go over that.

- Okay.

- And then the third option is to do just a little overlook from the shoreline, where it just gets you out over the water but not very far. So I guess from there you can kinda go over the details.

- [Erik] So in terms of pricing, I'll mention, first the price, the estimate that we put together to remove the structure is \$145,000. I gave you that price 'cause I didn't include that in any of the other costs. So just removing the existing structure is estimated at \$145,000. And it seems like high number, but it is very high because it's all gonna be on a barge or a very large crane.

- Didn't it go down, though? From the original or was-

- The original estimate was an estimate that Public Works put together. So this is a consultant's estimate.

- Okay.

- We don't really know what the price is gonna come until you put the documents together and you put it out to bid, and the price comes in, what it comes in at.

- Okay.

- Public Works estimated anywhere from \$250- to \$400,000.

- Hm.

- Okay.

- [Erik] Just the pricing estimates that I used utilizes nationwide cost data that is localized to Green Bay. So we didn't put together any bids or more formal plans to get accurate estimates. This is considered a budgetary planning estimate. Okay. So the options. Dan mentioned the first one is the biggest and the best. It's replacing the existing pier with a pier that pretty much looks the same but will last much longer than the current one will. And that is estimated to be \$1.6 million. And again, that does not include the demolition of the existing structure. So that option would be to replace the new fishing pier, same size, which is 138 feet long by 16 feet wide. It would use the heavy timber piles and wood members, so it still has that trellis, timber railroad bridge look to it. Obviously the new wood treatment methods they use work much better than the ones from 120 years ago. So you wouldn't have quite the rotting and deterioration issues that you have going on right now. Any questions on that first option? Okay. Second option is a smaller version of that. It would be lower to the ground, about half as long. It would utilize more modern materials to take advantage of the technology and the economical advantage of that. And my estimate for that was \$631,000. So less than half the cost.

- So what's the height on that? I was looking at-

- [Erik] It would be closer to the water.

- Well you, it was mentioned that I've never fished off the pier. You've fished, though, I saw. But I'm just saying, how high up? If you go too high, fishing's not all that great. So I could see something like this being a little more amenable, it's closer to the water.

- [Erik] Yeah, it could be. I don't think the water level changes very much on the Fox River, so it can be pretty close to the water.

- Okay.

- [Erik] The last option was just a small fishing platform at the shoreline. This would just be more of a viewing platform or mounted to the shore, not using anything in the water at all. This would just be a small dock. I estimated a 40 foot by eight-foot fishing platform, mounted from the shoreline, so no barge work involved, and that was estimated to be \$94,000.

- Just one quick question. You were saying that some of these options, that does not include demolition?

- [Erik] Right.

- So the demolition would have to, that'd be added onto whatever the replacement would be. And I know that would go out to bid, but is that something your company does? Do you do demolition and-

- [Erik] No, I'm a structural engineer. We can design it. The contractors would take care of that.

- All right, that's fine.

- Do you want to?

- Does he want to? Would you like to?

- Okay. Any other questions from the committee?

- Is there, in mind, recommendations for companies that would do this?

- [Erik] For the contract work? I don't have any right now that I would recommend, but I'm sure this-

- It usually goes out to bid.

- [Erik] Dan has worked with quite a few.

- In this situation we would go through our standard public bidding process. There are several companies in the area that do this type of work, but we would not call them in advance. We would advertise it, just like every other Public Works bid project and if people see it and bid on it, they see it and bid on it.

- Alder Eck.

- So is a big part of the cost the barge work?

- [Erik] That's one of the large items, yes.

- Okay. And then I'm trying to remember the group that you'd have to work with as far as anything that's on the water. I can't think of the name of it right now.
- Is that EGLE?
- Army Corps Engineers.
- Army Corps of Engineers. That's it.
- And the DNR.
- What?
- And the DNR has a lot to say on that.
- So would there be a difference in that, in any of these options? Like would D still include all of those people, or would it change, being that it's like right near the shore?
- [Erik] It would be easier to go with D, but you'd still have to deal with the DNR, 'cause it's the shoreline.
- Sure.
- And the Army Corps of Engineers?
- [Erik] That might be a question for Dan.
- Yeah, I think if we went with anything out over the water, we'd have to reach out to both and get a permit. If we just do the shoreline one, maybe the Army Corps of Engineers wouldn't be involved, but definitely the DNR what be. Either way there's gonna be permitting involved, state permitting involved.
- Any other questions from the committee?
- Not for Mr. Johnson.
- Anything else you wanted to add? Mr. Johnson, appreciate your work.
- Yeah, thank you.
- You've been very detailed.
- [Erik] Yeah, no, I don't have anything else.
- Appreciate it. Thank you.
- Thank you.
- Thank you.
- [Erik] Thank you.
- Motion to-

- Is anybody else here for this item?
- Oh. That's right.
- [Melissa] I have a couple of questions.
- If we can just get your name and address, please.
- [Melissa] I'm sorry. That's right. Melissa Schmitz, 815 South Adams Street, Green Bay. So of these, of the item this evening, is this committee voting-
- Hold on, one second.
- [Lindsay] If I could just clarify, Melissa, are you speaking as staff?
- I'm speaking as a citizen.
- [Lindsay] Can you just state that for the record?
- [Melissa] Oh, I'm so sorry. Resident of Green Bay, speaking as resident of Green Bay.
- [Lindsay] Thank you.
- [Melissa] So my question pertains to the options that are here in the agenda. Are you voting on which option to go with this evening? Is that what the item is pertaining to?
- Recommend it.
- I think the item in general is on the, right now we can hold it, we can decide to take down the existing structure and wait on what to do, based on public feedback. It's basically all on the agenda.
- Yeah. And after we close the floor I'll talk; we went to an Astor Neighborhood Association meeting and got their input. So after we close the floor we'll talk about that and kind of the input from the neighborhood.
- [Melissa] Sure, sure. That was part of what I wanted to talk about is, I agree with the engineering analysis. It's pretty obvious that it's, a boat could hit it, and something could happen to the pier. So that's not the question at this point anymore. As far as the options, getting neighborhood input, community input, community in general, not just the neighborhood, because there's a lot of community members that use the bridge, and I think there'd be opportunity for fundraising efforts to potentially help in the cost of some of this. As an outdoors person, I would not advocate for the option C. There is fluctuating water levels, and sometimes the water can be, we can have it, right now we have a beach area. Two years ago there was no beach area. So the further we can get out into the water, there's gonna be more opportunity for recreational opportunity, and the lower the, if we bring it down too low, it's good for fishing, but at the same time, as far as bird watching and other wildlife opportunities and just viewing boats on the river, having one that's too low is probably, in my opinion, it would change the use of what people are currently enjoying with that asset. So hopefully we can take a broader look at some of the options as this goes forward.
- Question, go ahead.
- I have a question. I just want to make sure, 'cause you said C, and then there's D. I just want to make sure that you're talking about the same one as I was talking about.
- [Melissa] Yeah, so I would say I'm not advocating for D.

- Okay. That's what I kind of figured based on your description.
- [Melissa] And from a width standpoint, as far as having multiple groups utilizing the pier for fishing, you don't want to have it so narrow that as one person is casting, it's just from a practical standpoint.
- So you're for option C?
- D had 40 by eight.
- [Melissa] Yeah, no I would be more in favor of the first option.
- The B, the \$1.6 million.
- [Melissa] With bringing it down a little bit lower.
- That'd be B?
- That'd be C?
- [Melissa] Well, it'd be a kind of combination of B and C.
- Well B is the \$1.6 million, and that's similar to the current one, and then C is a little bit lower to the water.
- Shorten and drop.
- [Melissa] Yeah.
- Just so we-
- Not the best option.
- [Melissa] Yeah, so I'm not saying I'm on board with any one of these options 100%. But I just wanted to get my input into the conversation.
- I have a question. And thanks for all your input on this. I'm just gonna add to a little bit, have you ever fished off any other piers?
- [Melissa] Yes.
- Like for instance?
- For instance?
- Kewaunee, Algoma?
- Not in Kewaunee, no. Algoma, yes. From-
- Breakwater.
- But the marina and the breakwater area, that's up fairly high, but there's also not a railing.
- So how high is this? I haven't been there, I apologize.

- Off of the water. Well it depends on the water level. I would say 15, 20 feet.
- It's pretty high up.
- Yeah, that'd be about right.
- I know when I boated the river, it went up two or three feet.
- It's fairly high.
- Daily.
- Depending on the type of fish you're reeling in. If you're reeling in a carp, that's a pretty heavy fish to bring up. So a lot of people actually let their line out, go to shore, walk around, and then bring it in. Or they have a friend go down and net it and then they kind of do like a tag team.
- So is your idea half the height?
- I don't know if half the height is right. I think that's why we need to have a little bit more community input into this to see what the appropriate height would be.
- It sounds like you've done some research on it, so that's why I'm asking.
- Yeah.
- Try to get us there a little bit.
- Yeah, the height is because it was a railroad bridge.
- Right. Right.
- It wasn't because it was designed for fishing at the time.
- Something you see at Newport Beach or something like that.
- Yeah.
- But that's what I'm asking. I'm looking at it. I used to boat under it a bit when it was a bridge. And I know it went up two or three feet daily, sometimes four, five times a day. So it goes up and down because of the dams. And I don't know if the dams are still used like they were. But anyway. Maybe the length, other than the channel, how deep would you say that varies, from beginning to the end, being 138 feet long?
- Well, I-
- Four or five feet?
- I can wade in for quite a while before it reaches like my waist.
- Okay.
- But not to the end, for sure.
- Just wondering. It sounds like you know a lot about it. So that's why I'm asking.

- I live right near there, so I'm able to observe different situations.
- So I'm thinking the length of-
- I think the length of the pier is-
- More options for fishing types?
- Correct.
- There, is what I'm getting to.
- Yeah.
- All right. Thanks.
- Mm hm. That's all I have.
- Anyone else?
- No.
- Thank you.
- Thank you.
- Thank you.
- Thank you very much.
- Anyone else here for this item? Anybody else? Alder Eck?
- Motion to close the floor.
- Second.
- Motion by Alder Steuer to close the floor, second by Alder Eck. Those in favor?
- [Alders] Aye.
- Opposed? Motion carried. Now we go to Director here and...
- So as I mentioned, when we were in open session here, on Monday, November 21st, park staff did meet with the Astor Neighborhood Association, presented the results of the finding of the structural analysis, and then we also presented the different options for replacing the pier with them. I wasn't able to be at that meeting. James was at that meeting. I guess I'll have him kind of recap the comments that were made.
- [James] Yeah, overall, it was a very, I think it was a very, for a neighbor association meeting, very well attended, probably had 15 or so individuals there, and went over the study and went over some of the options, kind of in general, that were suggested that you guys saw for replacement. Overwhelmingly everybody at the meeting kind of agreed or saw the study, and the conclusion was that it definitely needs to be removed. Everybody pretty much came to the same consensus on that, based on that engineering study. And then when

we talked about kind of replacing it or what they would like to see, overwhelmingly everybody wanted something that was over the water and engaged people in that experience of going over the water. Depending on the, based on the different criteria, some preferred kind of more that middle of the road option, 'cause the budget was at least a little more palatable to them, and hopefully they thought maybe it would get done a little quicker than waiting on the, ultimately they would love the first solution I think, as getting something similar in length and out engaging in the water and that experience. But with the budget, they also didn't want to necessarily see something that sat empty for 10, 15 years because we don't have the budget for it. So they were trying to find that middle of the road compromise between kind of getting over the water, but also conscious of the budget. But overwhelmingly everybody wanted something that was over the water.

- Questions for Mr. Anderson?

- Well, and maybe it's for both of you, but at this time, due to, well, first of all, I know we were talking, when we first voted on it, we were looking towards getting it done before winter as far as the removal. And so I'm wondering is it still that possibility? And then talk about and work through the options for spring, to give more time, like Melissa said, for possible fundraising, have more options open, instead of trying to make that decision now. The decision would be, yes, it's needing to come down, let's go move forward with that and then talk about the options later.

- Yeah, my recommendation moving forward would be, in essence just what you just stated. Based on the engineering study. I feel very comfortable saying that the pier needs to be removed. It's not safe, it's not in good condition, we just need to remove it. And if the recommendation is not to repair it, then we can make these decisions of removing it independent from the decision of what are we gonna put in its place? It's gonna take some time, if we want to go through a public input process, to do that. And then once we go through that public input process, it'll take some time to figure out where the funding's gonna come from. Do we bond for it? Do we use ARPA dollars? Do we apply for grants? Some grants are only on a one-year cycle. So for example, like the DNR Stewardship Grant, they only accept applications May 1st, one time a year. So it's gonna take some time to figure out a funding source for doing anything. But because of the condition of the pier, I really don't feel comfortable, from a staff perspective, proposing that we leave that pier in place until we make the decision of what we're gonna put in its place and find money to build something different. So my recommendation here would be to approve removing the pier as quickly as possible. Now I think realistically I don't think that can happen anymore this fall, obviously. It's gonna freeze over pretty soon. But we do have to do some bid documents and bid the project out, which takes some time. So more realistically that'll be something earlier next year after everything thaws out. And that'll give us time to do some prep work and the planning for what we can put into place. And however you want to direct us to do that, you can just direct staff to find funding sources and do some community input and bring back a recommendation. You can also recommend that we discuss it at the Finance Committee, where we're doing our 2023 bond request. We won't have time to do any more public input prior to the bond request going forward for 2023. But we can at least discuss the project itself and see if there's any interest in dedicating any money in 2023.

- If I remember correctly, there, correct me if I'm wrong, but when you were first proposing it and thinking it was gonna be like an average of \$350,000, you had budgeted for that and taken it out of the money for Bay Beach?

- Correct.

- So that is taken care of as far as the removal?

- Correct. The Parks Department does currently have enough money in an account to remove what's there, even if it comes up to the \$400,000.

- Okay.

- But we don't have enough money to build something new. So that will take some time to figure out where we go from there.

- All right. Thank you, Melinda.

- Thank you.

- Thanks, Director. Yeah, I think it's obvious, like you agreed before and probably will agree again, it's unsafe, it needs to come down. I think most of the public wouldn't be that sad, but it's a wood structure underwater, so it is what it is. I think as far as moving forward, it would be best to get more community input. I'm sure there's some people out there who might want to form a Friends of Porlier Pier and then start fundraising and help give input. So I don't think we need to make any decisions on that today.

- Yeah.

- He's-

- There might be someone who might be nodding his head and might want to head a group.

- He's pointing that way.

- Why are you going like this?

- One more thing to do.

- So I think it's wise that we break it into two and move ahead with the tearing it down as quick as possible 'cause it's an accident waiting to happen. And then get as much community support as possible before we move forward. 'Cause it's a great site, it's a great asset, and I'm sure there's some combination of the extreme one and the middle one that we can build that's gonna meet everybody's needs. And I'm sure there'll be some community support, so not worried about that part.

- So the motion again?

- It'd be two motions, one to, I guess-

- Well, I would, to approve the removal of the Porlier Pier and direct staff to seek public input and potential funding sources to replace it and bring it back to committee for further discussion.

- So moved, or do you want to do that?

- Oh, I was gonna say what he said.

- Yeah.

- So motion by Alder Steuer, second by Alder Eck.

- Second.

- Any discussion on that? All right, so this will go to council next Tuesday. I'm sure we'll be seeing more of this in the future.

- All those in favor?

- Those in favor?
- [Alders] Aye.
- Opposed? Motion carried. Thanks, Dan.
- Maybe think two will work?
- Thanks, Erik, appreciate it. If you're free, I don't know, also might have questions, might not.
- 'Cause we already did this.
- It's up to you.
- [Erik] Yeah, we'll-
- Okay, thanks.
- Yeah, we'll talk.
- Okay.
- Do we have to take the second part of it?
- What's that?
- Do we got to make a motion on the second part?
- No, we did combine them.
- Oh.
- Yeah.
- We did it as one.
- Yeah. We just did it as one. Four, consideration with possible action on hiring Berners Schober for \$48,500 to complete the engineering bid documents for the Bay Beach Pavilion renovations.
- So recently the city council also approved \$2.25 million in ARPA funding to go towards Bay Beach Amusement Park; \$800,000 of that funding went towards purchasing a new ride, which has already been done and will be installed next year. And then the bulk of the remaining funding, roughly \$1.4, \$1.5 million, is to be used to renovate the historic pavilion at Bay Beach. So the work will consist of replacing the roof with new asphalt shingles, and then installing new HVAC throughout the entire building. It's currently a seasonal facility. We don't have a furnace to heat the whole facility. We have no air conditioning in there, other than just in the offices. This will pay for heating and air conditioning in the entire building, central area, and the two wings. So the first step in the process is to hire an architectural firm to design the HVAC system and also the roof replacement details. Because it's always been a seasonal facility, there might be code issues if we turn it into a year-round facility and we add heating and ventilation to it. So we might have to do other things along with it other than just adding a furnace and duct work. So the architect that we hire will have to figure that out as part of their scope of work. In addition, there's a potential that some of the, there might have to be some roof penetrations with the HVAC system. So that's why the consultant is doing all of the engineering for the HVAC and the roof replacement. And then if there's any money left over, they'll then work on doing kind of cosmetic

improvements to the dance hall. But the first step in the process is phase one, which is the roof and the HVAC. So we did send out requests for proposals to six architectural firms and only one company submitted a bid or a quote for the work, and that was Berners Schober and Associates, for a total cost of \$48,500. That fee is right in line with what staff thought the fee was gonna come in at. We have worked many times with this architectural firm and they're a competent firm. They're very reliable. In fact, just for your knowledge, they are actually the same company that did the original design for that building when it built over 100 years ago. And then they also did the architectural plans for the recent bathroom renovation. So they're very familiar with that building and the ins and outs of it. And so we feel very comfortable going with BSA and hiring them to do this work. The ARPA funds that were dedicated towards this project would be used to pay for this. So I would recommend approval.

- Actually you answered my question, and I was gonna ask about Berners Schober, they've been in town for quite some time, and they've done work and I just wanted to know if they did work on this before, and it sounds like they have, so I think that is an advantage.

- So is this something where it'll come to be approved at each step?

- So what will happen here is we're just hiring a consultant to do the engineering bid documents, and then we will put the project out to bid for the roof and the HVAC work, and that will end up going through Public Works' bidding process, and the award of that contract will go through the Improvement and Services Committee. So it would not come to Parks.

- Which is us, so. Either way, okay.

- And then if there's money left over, we'll do a phase two project, which is doing cosmetic improvements to the dance hall.

- Any other questions? Otherwise I'll take a motion.

- I've got a question. So this \$48,500, is this just, does this cover the improvements, or is this just?

- This is just to hire the architect to design the bid document so that we can hire a contractor to do the work.

- Okay.

- Motion to approve-

- Second.

- By Alder Steuer, second by Alder Eck. Discussion? Those in favor?

- [Alders] Aye.

- Opposed? That carries. Number five, consideration with possible action on purchasing 15 bumper cars for Bay Beach Amusement Park from Majestic Manufacturing, Inc., for a total cost of \$115,275, plus freight.

- So the existing bumper cars at Bay Beach Amusement Park are the original ones that were purchased when we built that new bumper car facility in 1992. So we originally purchased 18 cars. Throughout the years they've been breaking down and we can't find parts to fix them.

- Some of them are a little old.

- Those are just old. And we're currently down to nine bumper cars and that's it. And so we can operate up to 15 cars comfortably within the space. And so each car generates about \$10,000 in revenue per year by people riding the ride. And so we're kind of putting \$60,000 on the table right now of potential revenue sources by only operating nine cars instead of 15 cars. In addition, our mechanics are assuming that more cars are gonna break down in the near future. These are old, we can't buy replacement parts, and it's just time to buy new cars. So we reached out to our purchasing agent to talk this through with them, with our city staff, and we'd like to purchase 15 new bumper cars in time for season next year, the 2023 season. Our staff did do some research with amusement park vendors, and we were only able to find three companies that sell bumper cars that will work with the system we have without having to do renovations to our building. Of those three, two out of the three companies are located in Italy. And so we would've had to purchase them from Italy, they'd have to be shipped over. We have worked with companies in the past from out of the states, and we have a lot of problems with companies not in the US, with getting technical support and parts. So if something were to break down and we'd have to order a part from Italy, we'd lose the whole season of that car being used, just waiting for a part to arrive. So when at all possible we try to purchase in the United States. So that being said, we only found one company that sells bumper cars that'll work for our building in the United States. Now, in this situation, they also purchase their cars from Italy, so they do have to be shipped from Italy. But the advantage to going with this company is that they have the tech support that we can rely on locally or within the United States. In addition, they sell replacement parts in the United States, so we don't have to rely on ordering all of our parts from Italy.

- Where are they located?

- I don't recall. It might be in the packet, and I'm thinking Ohio, but I-

- It says Waterford, Ohio.

- Ohio, yeah.

- I didn't know if you were asking the Italy one or?

- So, what we're proposing is a sole source for this and just buy from the company that's local. That company is called Majestic Manufacturing, Inc., and the quote that they provided was for \$109,125 to purchase 15 bumper cars. I did include in there a photograph in the agenda packet showing that we're gonna, we'd like to purchase the Vette Model, which is kind of, it's kind of the same era that we're trying to shoot for aesthetically. With the park we always try to go with the retro look instead of a modern look.

- They're pretty snazzy.

- A very nostalgic look. We'd also be interested in purchasing the two add-ons that they quoted, which was to include a galvanized chassis and polyurethane wheels. So for those two add-ons, that would add \$6,150 to the price, the \$109,000. And then if you read over the quote you'll see that we'd also be responsible for freight from Italy. Right now the freight runs \$625 per car, which is between nine and \$10,000 in freight. They're not specifically locked into that. How they wrote the quote is, we'll pay whatever the freight costs at the time that they ship it. So that's why what I'd like the motion to say, if you approve this, is to approve purchasing the bumper cars from Majestic Manufacturing, Inc., for a total cost of \$115,275 plus freight. Because we can't lock into a freight cost with them.

- Okay.

- Questions? Alder Eck.

- Well, when you say we're looking at the possibility of losing \$60,000, that's, you're speaking our language of trying to get that income, right? So in my opinion, it seems like a no brainer to get this done. And I didn't,

when I first read it, I didn't realize we were gonna pay the \$625 in addition, to pay from Italy to here, but now I understand that.

- Yeah, and just to be clear, like I said, each bumper car generates about \$10,000 in revenue. The total cost for this will be about \$125,000. So these bumper cars should pay for themselves in one year.

- I guess I was talking about the loss of the \$60,000. Yeah.

- And just speaking from a customer service standpoint, and somebody who's waiting in line, there's nothing more frustrating than getting in line and there's six cars running or eight and you want to ride with four of your friends and there's only eight cars running. So this, they look beautiful, from what's shown here. It's really, it would look nice.

- Now the funding source would be from excess revenues at Bay Beach, so it's our development account that would fund this.

- I think if anything, you're gonna see the ridership go up. People will do this, and hopefully they'll go a little faster.

- That was gonna be my next question, it's budgeted for, right?

- Yes.

- What if, would it be feasible to order, say two more, just for parts to have on hand?

- Well, our staff feels pretty comfortable that 15 is what we need right now.

- Yeah.

- They can use the parts of the ones they already have.

- We can always order a couple more down the road too if we feel we need to.

- Done with our questions?

- Alder Eck.

- Motion to approve.

- Motion to approve by Alder Eck.

- Second.

- Second by Alder Campbell. Discussion on that? Those in favor?

- [Alders] Aye.

- Opposed? That carries. Number six, consideration with possible action on the purchase of four 52-seat bleachers for Colburn Park from JW Industries for a total cost of \$31,920.

- So we worked with the purchasing department to quote out new bleachers for the ball fields at Colburn that were just renovated, so we need four bleachers. The funding for this will come out of ARPA dollars that were allocated as part of the 2022 budget, not the new one, this is this year's budget. So we still have that money

available, and we do have to spend that by the end of the calendar year. So nine companies did provide a quote for the bleachers. You'll see the quote summary in the agenda packet. We're proposing to purchase the bleachers from JW Industries. They were the third lowest quote at \$7,980 per bleacher. The two lower quotes did not adequately meet the specifications that we put out there. So the lowest quote didn't have the central aisle built into the bleachers. You'll see also in the agenda packet, the ones from JW Industries, the one that did meet our specifications, you'll see there's a central aisle with handrail. That's a nice addition to the bleachers to have that. And then the next lowest quote had a rail in the front, in portions of it, which would block the view of people sitting in the bleachers. And so we didn't feel that that was a very good design. And so that's why we're proposing to go with the next lowest bidder, the only one that met the specifications, or I should say the lowest quote that met the specifications. And so we did review the justifications with our purchasing agent, as he was in agreement that the two lowest quotes did not meet the specifications.

- Questions? The fields will be ready to play this year. Right, they kind of were closed for last year.

- The fields will, yeah.

- That's our game plan. What we'll do is, in the spring, we'll look at the quality of the turf. Worst case scenario is we would do some fertilizer early in the spring, let it grow and then we can use it kind of early summer. But we're thinking they'll get some use this year for sure.

- All right, thanks. And I know it came up in the past, obviously, when we regraded the land, right? I haven't had any complaints or issues of flooding. So I think how it was designed-

- No, I haven't received any.

- Is working. Cross your fingers. So that's good news.

- Well this is obviously your district so...

- I make a motion to approve then.

- Yeah.

- I'll make a motion to approve.

- Second.

- A motion by me, Wery, seconded by Campbell. Those in favor?

- [Alders] Aye.

- Opposed? Motion carried. I made a motion as the chair.

- Passionate.

- Yes, I was gonna say.

- Director's Report.

- I just have a few things to mention. So the docks at the Metro boat launch I believe are gonna be removed tomorrow. And that will be the last day hopefully that we'll be using those old docks. So we did order new ones. We'll put those in storage over the winter and our plan is to install the new docks in the spring once we get back into the fishing season here. Secondly, we just opened up a new welcome counter at the gift shop at

the Wildlife Sanctuary at the Nature Center. So we're planning on opening about three to four days a week in the slow months here, primarily on the weekends. And then in the spring when we have more activity in the park, we'll open up seven days a week. But what's nice about is now we're gonna staff it with somebody at a welcome counter. So when you walk in the door, we'll have a staff member there to answer questions, which I think has always been lacking at the Nature Center. And then finally, I know we handed out a brochure for you, or a handout, in regards to an event at Colburn Park coming up. So for the last few years what we've been doing is we've selected a park where we've done a little holiday light display that's pretty extravagant. The first year we did it at St. James Park. Last year we did it at Seymour Park. This year we selected Colburn Park as the location for this light display. And so what we're doing a little bit differently this year from previous years is we're gonna have a little winter wonderland lighting ceremony on December 15th at 5:30. I highly recommend if you can make it, attend that. That'll be the kickoff to the holiday light display. But what we're also gonna be doing is we're gonna be promoting ice skating pretty heavily at that location, more so than in some of our other facilities. So you'll kind of see a little bit more effort on our end to really promote that park as kind of a winter destination. That's a very good fit for it. And you'll see on that brochure the activities that are going along with that event. So hope that you can make it. But that's all that I have for the Director's Report.

- Questions?
- Motion to receive and place on file.
- Motion by Alder Steuer to receive and place on file.
- Second.
- Second by Alder Campbell. Discussion? Those in favor?
- [Alders] Aye.
- Opposed? Motion carried. Next Parks Committee scheduled for December 14th.
- Motion to adjourn.
- Motion to adjourn.
- Motion to adjourn.
- Second.
- Second.
- A second by Alder Steuer. Those in favor?
- [Alders] Aye.
- Opposed? Motion carried. We are adjourned. Press it.
- I didn't know Colburn had ice skating. Where is that at?
- It was a nice ice, it was a hockey rink, actually, right in the back.