

CAPITAL IMPROVEMENTS AND STREET MAINTENANCE COMMITTEE

Date of Meeting: June 9, 2022, at 5:15 p.m. in the Council Chambers of City Hall.

Members Present: Lou Larson, Doug Diny, Gary Gisselman, Chad Henke, Lisa Rasmussen

Also Present: Eric Lindman, Allen Wesolowski, TJ Niksich, Tara Alfonso, Dustin Kraege, Andrew Lynch
By WebEx: Cord Buckner, Norman Barrientos – Barrientos Design, John Dempsey – Toole Design

In compliance with Chapter 19, Wisconsin Statutes, notice of this meeting was posted and received by the *Wausau Daily Herald* in the proper manner.

Noting the presence of a quorum, at approximately 5:15 p.m. Chair Larson called the meeting to order.

Approval of minutes of the May 12, 2022 meeting

Diny moved to approve the minutes of the May 12th meeting. Henke seconded and the motion carried unanimously 5-0.

Public Hearing: Vacating and discontinuing the public walkway abutting 3317 Polzer Drive, 3311 Polzer Drive, 3312 Wildwood Lane, and 3318 Wildwood Lane

Jim Dommissie, 3317 Polzer Drive, is not in favor of the vacation as it will move the lot line within 5' of the corner of his house and would give the neighbor leeway to encroach. It has been a public access area and has not hurt anything. He does not see the need for a change. He would hardly be able to walk on that side of his house without being on someone else's property. When the time comes to sell his house, he would be concerned a buyer would not want the property with a lot line next to the corner of the house.

Gene Storch, 3311 Polzer Drive, explained this came about when they had a survey done last year. They wanted to put a fence up. They thought the walkway should have been absolved 30 years ago as all the other walkways in the area have been. He does not know where Dommissie's lot line would be. Storch would not like a lot line 5' from his house either. This is the only walkway in this area that has not been vacated.

There were no further comments, and the public hearing was closed.

Discussion and possible action on vacating and discontinuing the public walkway abutting 3317 Polzer Drive, 3311 Polzer Drive, 3312 Wildwood Lane, and 3318 Wildwood Lane

Rasmussen asked if half of the walkway would go to each property owner or if the entire piece would go to 3311 Polzer. Wesolowski spoke with the City Surveyor and it was all part of the same plat. He believes 5' would go to each side. Regarding Dommissie's concern, he would actually gain 5' of property and his property line would move 5' further from his house.

Wesolowski explained that as it exists today, there is 10' of right-of-way between the properties to build a walking path between Polzer and Wildwood. There are no plans to develop that walking path. The petitioner asked if it could be vacated so he could put up a fence 5' further away from his house. Diny asked if there was a setback for a fence. Wesolowski does not know where the lot lines lay; the property would have to be surveyed.

Rasmussen said there is right-of-way on the map, but when you go out there it just looks like two yards that come together. There has never been any construction of a walkway. If each party gains 5', both yards get bigger.

Dommissie originally signed the petition but didn't realize until it was surveyed how close it was going to be. Storch's fence could be 6' away from his house and he would rather not have that. The way the neighborhood was laid out is messed up. There is another house 3 houses down that has a lot line that runs within 2' from his house. After it was surveyed, both neighbors had to move their sheds. Sooner or later he will have to sell the

house and he is concerned about being able to sell his property. The open space hasn't bothered anyone for 50 years.

If the area is not vacated, Gisselman asked if 10' was the closest the neighbor's fence could be. Lindman indicated that fencing can go up to the property line per zoning. Discussion followed.

Rasmussen asked if the goal of this was to gain a larger lot. Storch said they wanted to know where they could put a fence as they have a lot of pine trees. If they cannot put the fence out further, they would have to take a lot of pines down.

Barb Storch, 3311 Polzer Drive, explained they had their lot surveyed and put up a fence on the east side and back side of the property. As they are saving money, they want to put a fence on the west side. They knew there was a public walkway there as her parents built the house in 74 and bought the land before that. They just want to know if it can be vacated so they can put the fence up.

Henke said if the vacation is denied, they could still put a fence up at the property line. The City could eventually come back through and put a sidewalk in that would be 1' away from his property.

Per Rasmussen, if this public land was not reserved and it didn't exist, a fence could go up on the western lot line. When looking at the aerial photo, she believes trees would have to come down either way. Whether the trees between them leave or a fence goes up, she feels there will be an impact between the neighbors. All of the neighbors, except one now, have signed the petition. It is up to the committee to decide what is best. Larson believes they also have to look at what value it is to the City if kept. The petition is signed and we should act in the best interest of the citizens. Rasmussen added that if 3 of the 4 property owners want it vacated and we deny it, we are not serving those neighbors either.

Diny asked if there was a foreseeable value to keep the right-of-way. Lindman replied no and noted there are no plans for the area. Gisselman said in developments it has been a policy to get some land in return or payment in lieu of that.

Rasmussen noted a similar area by Wausau West. There are long blocks and without going all the way to the end and around, there is no good way to get through. In some of these long blocks, they put in little walkways to go across without having to go 3 blocks out of your way. That might have been the thought in this case. If it is not going to be built or serve anyone, it would not behoove the City to hold onto it.

Henke moved to approve the vacation. Seconded by Rasmussen. Motion carried 4-1 with Diny the dissenting vote.

Discussion and possible action on request from Town of Wausau regarding 25th Street from McIntosh Street to Townline Road

This item was taken out of agenda order.

Wesolowski stated he and the Mayor met with the Town of Wausau regarding the condition of 25th Street. The City limits border 25th Street. There is a large apartment complex that exits onto 25th Street. 25th Street is owned and maintained by the Town. It is a crushed red granite gravel road. In the springtime it gets in rough shape. For about a month this spring, the Town closed the road from McIntosh Street to the apartment complex entrance. This required the residents leaving the complex to go south towards Townline. The Town's contention is that the traffic from the apartment complex caused the road to become impassable. The Town is requesting the City work with them or support them in a grant application. Wesolowski drove the road yesterday and it is starting to heal up. The road is open again. It is not in great condition but is better than it was in spring. He feels it will be fine for the rest of summer and winter. It really is in spring when it breaks up.

Larson asked if the apartment buildings are in the City or Town. Wesolowski replied they are in the City; the Town owns the road. The Town gets the road mileage, and they are the responsible maintaining authority.

Rasmussen indicated this was a problem back when Jim Riehle was the Town Chairman. The apartment building did bring the brunt of the traffic, but it is right where the City meets the Town. The requests in their letter are valid. She can understand their concern about paying for a road and having it annexed later. Since the City is unable to apply for bipartisan infrastructure aid on a Township road, it would be appropriate for the City to encourage the Town to apply. She feels the City should offer a letter of support for their application. If the State or County are making the decisions on disbursing funds, it may help showing we are collaborating. If they do not get the grant, maybe we can work on a compromise and find a workable solution.

Lindman said we are absolutely supportive of it, but they need to take the lead as they are the responsible party for the road. If they apply for grant money, we can write a letter of support. If they do receive grant money, they could come back with another ask for a cost share. Rasmussen agrees as this has been a concern for them ever since the apartment building went up. Larson also agrees and noted that it is not our road, but since we use it we could offer support and go from there.

The committee agreed by consensus to have staff provide a letter of support. Wesolowski will contact the Town and let them know our support and provide a letter if needed.

Wesolowski added that there is a gate on the other side of the apartment complex that goes out to Buteo Cove. The Town requested that to be opened up to alleviate traffic onto 25th Street. The owners of the complex did open the gate when 25th Street was closed. He did not hear any complaints from residents on Buteo Cove or 21st Street. The gate is again closed now that the road is back open. He feels we can work with the apartment owner to open the gate if it does become an issue again.

Presentation on Fleet Maintenance Shop – Barrientos Design

Lindman noted the process of planning for a new fleet maintenance shop began in 2018. Norman Barrientos was hired to assist with that planning. Staff worked with them for about 1½ years and came up with some concepts. The City moved in another direction by having a fleet study done to provide a broader view on motorpool needs for fleet and staffing. That came back in 2021. With those recommendations, staff again worked with Barrientos on planning. Options were presented to Finance. Feedback was received to look City-wide for different properties.

The entire presentation can be viewed at <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=oMaCT4sosRU>.

Kraege feels all the studies that have been done show a desperate need for this facility. They have grossly outgrown the current space. We are looking for direction on how to move forward and input on what would be in the best interest of the City. From his department's perspective, there are three things important to them when looking at a site. One is to try and stick as close as possible to the optimal site plan. Sticking to that increases efficiencies and makes everything they do that much easier and that much more work can get done. Another consideration would be room to expand. We have outgrown the current site. When you build on a site, one should plan to be there for at least 50 years. He assumes in that amount of time we will have more streets and more equipment. There is a need to plan for the future. The final thing to consider is continuity of service. It would be a huge benefit in having a site to build and move in when ready with no interruption in service.

Larson urged new committee members to tour the current facility to view the dire need. Larson does not like site 1 as it would move people out of their homes. He does not like the idea of Cleveland Avenue being mentioned because it is a contaminated site. He feels it would be beneficial to get the heavy truck traffic from DPW off the neighborhood streets. Larson likes the West Street location as there is room to grow. When growth would occur there, it would get rid of one of the most blighted areas in the City. This site is also centrally located. The site on Westwood Drive would cost more per vehicle to get equipment where it needs to be. He noted that the County has already been at the West Street location so the street is already strong enough to handle the traffic.

Diny asked if all three options are considered viable for DPW. Kraege stated the current site is viable but not optimal. We are there now so we can make it work, but there would be severe restrictions on how we get things

done. If Kraege had to pick, he would choose the 3rd option as it has a larger area. There would be drawbacks with being further from the center of the City, but it gives room to grow.

Diny does feel the 3rd option looks like the nicest option but questioned if costs between the options has been determined. His inclination would be to try to find the most economical route. Barrientos stated the Westwood site would be the easiest to develop but may have a high cost to purchase the land. He believes the West Street site would have a lot of demolition and probably has some contamination. He does not know how much the County would ask for the property. With the Myron site we would have to deal with flood water and stormwater issues. The building costs are about the same; probably a little less on West Street as we would try to use some of the existing buildings.

Rasmussen stated that this project has ballooned to \$31 million. It didn't start out at \$31 million until we started to talk about picking up the entire facility and moving it somewhere else. The original plan started with leaving the office, the salt shed and other things where they are today and remodeling them. Then building a fleet facility on a secondary site as those two things could operate separately. She believes the project started out with a cost between \$8 and \$10 million, not \$31 million. As a City we are hypersensitive to debt; we cannot afford to borrow \$31 million on a 20-year bond to build a facility. So often we ask ourselves, what would you build if the money didn't matter, and then you back into what you can afford. We need to do that here. The property on Westwood Drive was never meant to be a public facility that pays zero in property tax. That area is prime commercial development. Even though the Westwood site would be easy to build on, from an economic development and urban planning standpoint it is a terrible idea. She feels the only way to get away from a \$31 million price tag, is to split the site as was first talked about. A combination of West Street for the fleet facility with other aspects staying at Myron may be what needs to happen. We have been stringing them along for 3 years trying to find the perfect plan. There is frustration on part of the crew who has to work in the existing facility knowing that any decision made is probably two years away due to planning, design, and phased construction. She feels that Westwood Drive needs to come off the table. Originally when 1300 Cleveland was looked at, it was assuming the site would have DNR closure and the facility would be built to current standards for things like oil and gas spills. However, Council decided to remove 1300 Cleveland from the discussion. We need to have a discussion about another site for the fleet part so we can get the price tag back down to a reasonable level. We should not assume that the price tag has to be \$31 million.

Larson asked for clarification regarding the West Street site as it was listed as City-owned in the packet. Lindman said it is County owned. The challenge with West Street is that the County may not be ready to move from the site for a couple of years. We do not have City-owned property that is large enough to build a fleet facility. Anywhere that we go, we will have to purchase property. The direction Lindman is getting from the committee is to look for a site for the fleet maintenance facility alone with a potential of renovating the exiting location. Staff can work towards that but the challenge is finding the property and the timeline.

Gisselman said Marathon County is looking at a new plan for Marathon Park. The West Street site houses the Park Department and the Highway Department. This area south of Marathon Park may be part of a larger plan for the County. He asked how many acres would be needed for a fleet facility. Barrientos replied 7 acres. Thinking of City-owned properties, Gisselman noted the land on Wausau Avenue at 3rd Street. He agrees we need to save money.

Rasmussen asked why the International Drive site scored 22. While Business Campus land is also prime development, it may be easier to find 10 acres out there than to purchase 10 acres from a private owner. Lindman explained it was more location as that property is so far west. There would be a lot of additional miles driven from that location versus center of the City. Lindman has had conversations with the Park Department. They too want to stay in the City to be more centrally located. Polley has been interested in partnering and she was interested in the West Street site. She has provided that information to whoever is developing their West Side Masterplan. Lindman hopes that draft is done soon. Having shared costs with Parks would be a benefit. The Highway Department wants to move out to the Village of Maine. Being located outside of the City would not work for DPW.

Rasmussen said we are years away from anything happening on West Street. If we had 8 acres in the Business Campus that was awkwardly shaped or not necessarily useful for other commercial purposes, we could build there anytime and still cut the price tag. She feels that is something we should be talking about.

If we do not have some relative understanding of what the cost would be between the 11 sites, Diny is reluctant to sign onto any. It seems to him a small parcel in the Business Campus would be a lot easier to make happen quickly and not as expensive. Larson noted the added costs of traveling back and forth and wear and tear on equipment. Rasmussen said they travel to certain points of the City no matter what. Regardless of where the garage is, you will always have some expense for fuel and wear and tear. Rasmussen feels that expense compounded over time would not exceed a \$31 million price tag. Larson still feels a site closer is needed to keep operation costs down.

Gisselman feels the facilities have to be separate and we have to be more diligent in finding a spot. Larson believes the West Street site would be very appropriate but who knows if it would be cost effective. He does not know how the Iron Works building gets by existing without the City enforcing inspection laws. That block is a mess; if we can clean it up by putting a facility there it would be a plus for the City. If we could keep part of the facility on Myron Street, it would allow for room for expansion should the Utility need it. If it will be a couple of years before the County moved from West Street, Larson indicated we could start at the Iron Works building and work west. Rasmussen thought that was a good idea and added that at one point the National Guard Armory wanted to move from 17th and Sherman to Highway K. That did not get off the ground. Maybe we need to look a little deeper in that area. Discussion followed on focusing on the West Street area.

Staff will narrow their focus on the planning side, get some concepts together, and may reach out to some of the property owners along West Street.

Presentation on downtown redevelopment street concepts – Toole Design

The entire presentation can be viewed at <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=oMaCT4sosRU>.

Diny questioned the design of flush streets. Dempsey stated that Toole has designed several flush streets. In these illustrations they did a valley gutter treatment with everything pitched to the center. This is still mountable with wheeled devices where people can easily traverse across yet deep enough that it will carry water safely across the surfaces.

Gisselman worries about bicycles being in the travel lanes and questioned why there would not be a bike path separate from the travel lane. In Dempsey's experience, when designed correctly the flush street design drastically reduces motor vehicle speeds. Less than 20 MPH is the design preference. With that design speed, it is really comfortable for most bike users to share the road. Gisselman noted the bicyclers tend to use the sidewalks rather than dealing with traffic. This is an issue, especially on 3rd Street.

Per Rasmussen, when we initially started to look at this flush street design, we talked about the conflict between vehicles, pedestrians and bikes. She believes part of that resolved when we set the right-of-way at 78', which is much wider than other downtown streets. Bikes and cars are supposed to share the roadway on other downtown streets. The blocks are short enough that there is not enough distance to get a head of steam, there are traffic calming measures, and parking on both sides. The thought is with the low speed they could coexist, much like they coexist on 3rd Street and 4th Street. There are bicyclists that take the sidewalk; however we have ordinances against bikes and skateboards on the sidewalks.

Henke also noted the ordinances and stated there are bike lanes downtown. He loves the overall design and can already see different organizations wanting to shut down the streets for a weekend event. Without having a curb, it makes the whole area more walkable and usable for events.

Larson also believes there should be an area for bicyclists. If nothing else, have lines painted. He noted that Thomas Street is only 25 MPH and yet there is a bicycle lane. With the downtown as popular as it is, he thinks there should be some space for bicyclists, whether they use it or not.

Wesolowski stated this was discussed with the previous committee and it was decided not to put bike lanes. It was agreed that this is a slow-moving street and it was felt that bikes would mingle in with the slow moving traffic. Also, 3rd Street and Washington Street will not have bike lanes.

Lynch stated his previous job was working for Marathon County in the Wausau MPO as a Transportation Planner. There he had the opportunity to focus on bicycle and pedestrian planning. He is very familiar with the issues brought up. It comes down to an issue of comfort. On Thomas Street there is a bike lane. By all standards it is adequate, but you'll still get plenty of bicyclists that are on the sidewalk. The downtown streets have relatively slow traffic but some people still choose to go on the sidewalk. With the flush street design slowing down the car traffic, it raises the comfort level enough that it makes it more likely cyclists would feel comfortable in the street. With this design he would take his teenage kids on the downtown streets. It is a matter of experience and comfort and how the area is presented. Toole Design is well known nationally and we have to lean towards their expertise on this.

Larson asked what the anticipated speed zones would be for downtown. Dempsey is not sure what the posted speed limit is today, but with a flush street design speeds could be under 20 MPH. With that and the short blocks, the level of comfort of sharing the road goes up. Rasmussen said we set the speed limit on local streets. When the mall first opened, 3rd Street was set for 15 MPH. No one went 15 MPH and it became 25. In spite of that increase, it does take a bit to get to 25 MPH between blocks. Even with that we still haven't seen a substantial amount of conflict between cars and bicycles on the 3rd Street corridor. These streets will be wider than existing. We don't see a lot of people speeding through there because there are so many opportunities to stop in the short blocks. Larson lives on a short street and yesterday he saw two people speeding down his 25 MPH street.

Henke asked if the slight curves in the road are for speed control. Dempsey replied some are due to site restraints but any kind of curve will slow vehicle traffic. Lindman added that the amount of activity will slow traffic. This will be a little better as with parallel parking people will not be backing out into traffic. With the combination of pedestrians and activity, traffic will move slow. Diny concurs. He likes the design and layout and feels it will slow traffic down. He just spent a couple of weeks in Maryland. The traffic density is a lot higher, but in the downtown area they had mixed bicycle and car traffic. It naturally goes slow. He supports this without additional widths for bicycles.

Gisselman said we do not know what this neighborhood will look like in two years and do not know what kind of traffic there will be. He wondered if it was too early for this type of design. Lindman stated we are trying to run parallel with proposed developments. There is supposed to be mixed use on the first floor for the first block and possibly the second block. We are trying to narrow in on a concept so that we are ready to establish design as we move forward to the final plat and different developments.

When we envisioned mixed use in the initial design plan, Rasmussen said it was small business type mixed use. It was not any high density high volume that would require a volume of surface parking. Our goal is to make it more walkable.

Discussion and possible action on rerouting of STH 52 and Business Hwy 51 in the City of Wausau

Wesolowski indicated that part of this came from the downtown study. The plan adopted recommended changing Forest Street, 1st Street and 5th Street to two-way traffic around the downtown redevelopment of the mall. The only way to do that would be to get STH 52 and Business 51 out of the downtown area. Staff has been working with the DOT. They also have interest in getting STH 52 and Business Hwy 51 out of the downtown.

If you are on the west end of town, STH 52 comes off the highway, down 52 Parkway, down Stewart Ave, to 1st Street and Forest Street around the former mall site, up 6th Street to East Wausau Avenue. STH 52 is cumbersome as it separates on two different one-ways. Business 51 starts on the north end of town by Fleet Farm. It utilizes 3rd Avenue for southbound and 1st Avenue for northbound. It also follows 1st Street and Forest Street, then to Grand Avenue.

If rerouted, STH 52 would go across the WI River on Bridge Street, and utilize 5th Street and 6th Street to get to East Wausau Avenue. Business 51 is proposed to utilize 1st and 3rd Avenues to Thomas Street to Grand Avenue. The first step would be to complete a traffic study. The traffic study would identify if Bridge Street could handle STH 52 traffic and if more people would utilize Bridge Street. Regarding Business 51, the study would look at if 1st and 3rd Avenues and Thomas Street would handle the Business 51 traffic. If that came back favorable, an environmental study would be done to determine if there would be any negative environmental impacts. It is not environmental as in pollution or contamination; its environmental regarding impacts to residents.

There would be economic impacts to this. The City gets higher money for connecting highway road miles. If we have less road miles, the City would get less money. There are also impacts with the bridges. The City now owns Bridge Street Bridge. The current proposal would be for the DOT to take over Bridge Street Bridge. The proposal does not have the connecting highways on the bridges across Stewart Avenue. The current proposal would have the DOT still owning those bridges. Therefore, if those bridges need to get reconstructed, the State would pick up that cost. It would be a big advantage to have the DOT own Bridge Street Bridge. If that ever had to be reconstructed, it could cost \$20 to \$30 million dollars.

When a connecting highway is reconstructed, the DOT pays for it. However, it is tough to get the DOT to reconstruct streets. We can apply for STP Urban funding to reconstruct connecting highways. So it gives us more flexibility to apply for funding. The DOT would like to go ahead and do a traffic study, which they would fund 100%. That is estimated at \$150,000. Staff is looking for the committee to support moving ahead with the study.

Diny moved to move forward with the study. Seconded by Rasmussen.

Rasmussen feels the STH 52 reroute makes complete sense. Regarding Business 51, she noted the amount of debate regarding a two-lane bridge versus a four-lane on Thomas Street. When it is someday rebuilt, it may encourage the DOT to build a four-lane bridge. However, we have now built two-lane infrastructure on the west side. Also, 1st and 3rd Avenues between Thomas and Stewart are residential neighborhoods. We just rebuilt 1st Avenue as one really wide lane to mitigate conflict between large trucks, pedestrians, and bicycles. It has been working, but questioned where that leaves us if we funnel a bunch more traffic there. She does not want to be too quick to buy into this idea. We may have created some pinch points with what we did south of Stewart Avenue.

Larson agrees. He said he was the first one to be critical of 1st Avenue going to one lane, but it works and works well. He is all for going forward with the study to see what it brings.

Gisselman is concerned about Thomas Street and asked why we couldn't send Business 51 up 6th Street to Bridge Street. Wesolowski indicated the traffic study will look at whether the existing roads can handle the traffic. When 52 downtown was rerouted to Scott Street, the traffic study found rerouting made very little difference. He does not feel it will divert a lot of traffic no matter how it is marked. He doesn't believe most people even see the 51 or 52 signs. One of the alternatives was keeping Business 51 on 5th and 6th Streets but then we run into the triangle by the Courthouse. If that is under State control it would be complicated to install a roundabout for two-way traffic on Forest Street. This seemed to be the most straight forward way to get Business 51 completely out of the triangle and downtown area.

Rasmussen said sometimes we have difficulties working with the DOT. Often when we want things that they are not necessarily ready to do, they say we can do it but will have to pay for it. We have always been reluctant to go it alone. She cannot imagine it would be difficult to get them to approve a roundabout, assuming they didn't pay for it. She asked if that was any more difficult than getting them to reroute this entire system throughout the city. Getting Scott Street changed over from McIndoe took a lot of effort and took two years. She's interested to see the impact of the study because the goal with adding turn lanes to Thomas Street was to calm things down. The last thing we want to do is rebuild that, run a bunch of traffic there, and make things worse.

Larson is not anxious to put more traffic on Thomas Street. He does not want to tear people's homes down to widen a street for a highway. As it is now, traffic is backed up for blocks when Kolbe and Kolbe gets out of work. He is willing support to moving ahead with the study.

There being a motion and second to move forward with study, motion carried unanimously 5-0.

Discussion and possible action on State Municipal Agreement for Project ID 6999-18-08/78, North 18th Street, STH 52 to Sell Street

Wesolowski explained that with the Bipartisan Infrastructure Law, there were funds available for what is considered 2022 STP Urban Funding. Staff applied through the MPO and the project was funded at 70%. The estimated project cost is \$702,487. 70% of that is Federal funding with 30% City funding. The funding was limited and is for a mill and overlay project. It could not involve real estate or sidewalks. This serves Wausau East High School and is a good road to get done. It is a very tight time frame to be bid this fall, awarded late fall and constructed in summer of 2023. Even though it is considered a 2022 project, it would be constructed in 2023. This State Municipal Agreement would get us \$484,000 for the project.

Rasmussen moved to approve. Seconded by Henke and the motion carried unanimously 5-0.

Discussion and possible action on authorizing a public hearing to amend the Official City Map for the 28th Avenue corridor

Wesolowski explained the corridor for 28th Avenue is on the Official City Map. We have been working with the County and there was some additional work done by Becher Hoppe to look at a two-lane alternative which would reduce the need for the amount of land on the Official City Map. When Official City Mapping is changed, a public hearing is required.

Larson asked if this was 28th Avenue by the hospital and going north up the hill. Wesolowski confirmed. Larson asked if this was boarded by County owned land and Wesolowski confirmed. Larson asked if it would be possible to receive any wheel tax money from the County to pay for this project.

Rasmussen explained that originally the County came to the City about someday possibly turning the top of the steep hill into a cul-de-sac so the City would have to figure out a path for 28th Avenue. Originally we had enough land mapped for a four-lane road around the steep hill. This came to light when the Achieve Center came in for a permit but could not get it because of the mapping. We still want to reserve our right to someday do something but not as much of it. This is supposed to narrow the area to two-lanes which then would solve Achieve Center's problem of wanting to expand. Even with the smaller right-of-way, we will still have enough room for a street should we ever need one. She noted that we have asked the County before for wheel tax for County roads within the City. We still have not been able to get collaboration even though we all contribute heartily to the wheel tax.

Wesolowski further explained the reason for the change would be to go from a four-lane corridor to a two-lane.

Gisselman moved to approve moving forward with a public hearing. Seconded by Diny.

Gisselman asked if this was being driven by the County. Lindman explained the County is going to abandon their end of the corridor north of Wausau Avenue and so is the Village of Maine. This would preserve our corridor within the City limits. This may not be built for a number of years. We have had calls from homeowners in the area. The County owns land within the City that they had purchased for this corridor. Some people want to buy the land back, some people want to sell other pieces. We have been referring those inquires back to the County. This public hearing would allow us to get public input and feedback.

There being a motion and a second, motion to approve carried unanimously 5-0.

Construction update for 2022 Projects

Project A, which is the reconstruction of Bugbee Avenue and watermain extension along Campus and Burek, is slated to start on Monday of next week. Project B, which is 4th Avenue from Bridge to Knox is also scheduled to start next week with tree clearing. Excavation and temporary watermain will start the following week. 4th Street

by City Hall is also a part of Project B. That is scheduled to start sometime in August or early September. Project C, which is Torney Avenue from Townline Road to McDonald Street, will be bid later this month with construction anticipated to start in August. The 72nd Avenue Trail is expected to bid later this month or early July with construction starting in August.

6th Street from Horseshoe Spring Road to Evergreen has been completed. Asphalt Overlay projects will be starting the end of June. 6th Street from the Courthouse to Scott Street will be milled and overlaid. The intersection of Kent Street and Grand Avenue will also be overlaid. There is an ongoing Sidewalk Replacement Project that will continue over the next month. The Concrete Repair Project is miscellaneous joints getting repaired on several streets throughout the City, which will begin in late August.

Larson mentioned the condition of City Hall and the front sign. He questioned when we would spruce the building up and asked if it should be placed on a future agenda. Lindman said projects that reach \$25,000 go to the CIP Committee with Council determining which projects get approved. There are quite a few facility projects that are on CIP. Projects that are less than \$25,000 would have to be funded through the operating budget. Facilities do not get approved through CISM.

Based on the timelines and bids, Rasmussen feels we have bitten off a lot of work for late summer. She asked if we are confident work will get done before winter. We always have trouble late season with contractors needing extensions, unforeseen delays and weather. With work starting in August, two-thirds of the summer is gone. Wesolowski said the major projects will be starting next week. We have good contractors and are confident the work will get done.

Gisselman said people will be watching the level of tree removal on 4th Avenue. Tree removal is sensitive to a lot of people in the City. Lindman noted public hearings were held and residents had the ability to ask questions, see the plans, and impacts to their property. Hopefully if they had concerns, they showed up and asked questions. Gisselman added it is not only the residents on the street but others in the City that are concerned with the level of tree destruction. Lindman stated staff is sensitive to this and does not remove trees that we do not have to.

Adjourn

Henke moved to adjourn the meeting. Diny seconded and the motion carried unanimously 5-0. Meeting adjourned at approximately 7:35 p.m.