



MINUTES - SHOREWOOD BOARD OF TRUSTEES
Committee of the Whole Meeting
May 18, 2020

1. Call to Order

Trustee Stokebrand called the Committee of the Whole meeting of the Village Board to order at 6:13 p.m.

2. Statement of Public Notice

Clerk Bruckman stated that the meeting had been posted and noticed according to law.

3. Roll Call

Clerk Bruckman called the roll. Present over the phone: President Rozek (6:15 p.m.) Trustees Davida Amenta, Jessica Carpenter (6:45 p.m.), Arthur Ircink, Kathy Stokebrand, and Wesley Warren. Tr. Bockhorst was excused

Others Present: Village Manager Rebecca Ewald, Public Works Director Leeann Butschlick, Police Chief Peter Nimmer, Finance Director/Treasurer Mark Emanuelson, Planning and Development Director Bart Griepentrog

4. Discuss outline for next steps for the Transportation and Parking Analysis

Mr. Griepentrog explained staff is seeking direction on desired next steps related to high priority items and recommended actions. Staff will bring to a future Village Board meeting selected items with more analysis and options for implementation.

* The majority of the Committee of the Whole meeting did not record. The items listed below were general notes formatted per Village Board member comments.

President Rozek

Wants to see the fiscal impacts of recommendations prior to the budget

Notes that we have 2 months of data on lost citation revenue

Questions the \$75 permit sale amount

Doesn't believe the change will be cost neutral

Wants to know the cost to change Duncan program, believes it is very customized and difficult to change

Noted that WFB only issues \$120,000 in citations annually

Wants the Developer Agreement reviewed for Metro Market to confirm cost sharing of streetscaping

Wants overnight parking permit implemented, but needs to know financial impact

Believes we penalize renters unfairly

Wants overnight parking changed for all, including multi-family - #1 priority

Believes that \$500,000 in citations is harassment

Believes the need for change is time sensitive and wants the policy changed now, but can implement later

Changes in night parking go hand-in-hand with alternate side and winter parking (eliminate date restrictions)

Wants new permitting system to be more accessible and require less customization

Believes permitting is too time sensitive
Wants staff to talk with Milwaukee about joining their system
Requested that parking garages be enforced
Noted we have too many loading zones and is not in favor of recommendation of 1 per block, but they need to be addressed
Does not agree with adding a parking checker, believes downsizing is more possible
Would be in favor of meters in the business district
Noted that we only have 4 months until the budget is done, so we need to prepare now
Believes the BID could run an Ambassador program with volunteers, suggested BID to talk to Milwaukee
Wants better gateway and wayfinding signage, like the “P” for parking – believes we should work with the BID
Agrees with the removal of excessive stop signs
Agrees that an e-scooter policy and ordinance update is needed
Does not believe bike lanes on Capitol are a priority, would stick with Kensington and Murray
Wants infrastructure projects to be added to the Long Range Plan
Reminded Trustees that these issues are not new and that this was not the first conversation
Noted that the study cost \$90,000 and was disappointed that there wasn’t more urgency
Did not believe that further research would require a huge time impact
Needs data and projections for budget discussions
Believed a multi-phase implementation plan would work

Tr. Warren

Desires to push ahead with researching night and alternate side parking.
Does not think that changing things within the COVID environment is best.
Also wants to see the fiscal impact, including proposed cost of signage
Agrees with creating consistent daytime regulations
Wants to simplify the process
Agrees on moving forward with amendments to ADA parking
Wants to know more about Complete Streets
Agrees with crosswalk recommendation at Metro Market
Should move forward with regulating e-scooters
Look into permit parking at high school
Was intrigued by the idea of discussing policy this year and implementing later, but needs the data

Tr. Amenta

Wants to see all of the details of the recommended night parking change laid out
Believes the system is punitive to residents
Agrees with the proposed policy recommendations, but needs more info on all of them
Has questions about the proposed mid-block crosswalk at SIS
Agrees on moving the bus stop at SIS
Does not think we should research more shared parking agreements, unless night parking stays the same
Agrees to researching High School permit parking
Agrees on ADA
Does not understand what Complete Streets involves
Agrees on need to respond to resident requests
Agrees on removing stop signs
Agrees on all Metro Market recommendations
Stated we’ve received conflicting recommendations on crosswalks on Capitol Dr
Not interested in a traffic signal at Oakland and Kensington
Believes Menlo/Morris should be put into the Long Range Plan
Does not believe the Village needs additional parking checkers

Noted that the parking study was the top priority of the Board last year and that we need to keep it moving

Does not believe COVID costs will hurt us

Tr. Stokebrand

Stated that the system is too difficult to navigate and is set up to produce revenue

Wants to make it more simple and comprehensive for everyone: residents, businesses and staff

Needed to better understand the revenue aspect

Noted that WFB has parking meters

Believed consistent signage is important

Stated we should be competitive with neighbors

Wanted to move forward with simple things at Atwater and rectangular rapid flashing beacon at Menlo and Jarvis (Manager Ewald noted State DOT involvement)

Agreed to move forward with Metro Market recommendations

Believes actions should be safety-oriented

Wanted to know how much could be done this year and suggested that choosing priorities was a false option without knowing everything else that was taking place

Agreed that policy could be discussed now but implementation could be pushed of until 2021

Tr. Ircink

Echoed the thoughts of others in needing more information, particularly costs

Noted he has not been fully involved until now, but supports the analysis

Interested in knowing more about Complete Streets

Stated moving forward with ADA was a no-brainer

Noted that now may be a good time to restart things

Is not in favor of parking meters

Wanted to see efforts to slow down traffic on Morris, including north of Capitol

Agreed with Tr. Stokebrand that there is a lot on staff's plate and noted that more time was needed to make decisions

Tr. Carpenter

Wants to update winter parking ordinance acknowledging seasonal changes

Agrees with proceeding with night parking permits

Wants to review fee collections

In favor of limiting loading zones

Believes we should continue discussion on e-scooters

Requests that BublR be removed from the implementation chart

Wants further investigation into the "bump out" at Metro Market

Agrees with removal of crosswalk at Jarvis

Agrees that implementation could take place later, but wanted the policy discussion now – has financial concerns and needs numbers to make choices

Notes that night parking was the #1 issue

Staff Summary of Discussion

The Village Board wants to move forward with policy discussion of night parking, alternate side parking and winter parking this year prior to budget

Staff needs to provide current data on permits and citations and future projections to guide that conversation, including budget impacts of various policy options.

Multi-phase implementation plan, including signage and consistent daytime regulations, is acceptable

Place infrastructure recommendations into Long Range Plan

Future policy discussion on Complete Streets and resident requests after parking issues are resolved

Work with BID on opportunities

“Quick Actions” to be brought forward as time/opportunity permits:

- ADA parking
- Metro Market
- Loading zones
- E-scooters
- Stop sign removal
- Relocate bus stop at SIS
- High School permit parking

5. Tr. Warren moved, seconded by Tr. Amenta to adjourn the meeting at 7:32 p.m. Motion passed 6 - 0.



DRAFT

MINUTES - SHOREWOOD BOARD OF TRUSTEES
Village Board Meeting
May 18, 2020

1. Call to Order

President Rozek called the meeting of the Village Board to order at 7:40 p.m.

2. Roll Call

President Rozek called the roll. Present over the phone: Trustees Davida Amenta, Jessica Carpenter, Arthur Ircink, Kathy Stokebrand, Wesley Warren. Tr. Bockhorst was excused

Others Present: Village Manager Rebecca Ewald, Village Attorney Nathan Bayer, Assistant Village Manager Tyler Burkart, Public Works Director Leeann Butschlick, Finance Director Mark Emanuelson, Police Chief Peter Nimmer

3. Statement of Public Notice

Clerk Bruckman stated that the meeting had been posted and noticed according to law.

4. Special Order of Business

a. 2019 audit report and CAFR presentation - Sikich. (7:42 p.m.)

Dan Berg gave an overview of the audit report and CAFR presentation (attached at the end of the minutes).

Mr. Berg explained the Village did receive the certificate of excellence in financial reporting from the Government Finance Officers Association in 2018 and expect to receive the certificate of excellence again in 2019. In Sikich's opinion, the statements are fairly presented (clean and unmodified) and is the best opinion Sikich can give.

Tr. Amenta asked Mr. Berg for an explanation in the changes to the assumption. Mr. Berg explained the actuarial report received through WRS supplies Sikich with Shorewood's portion of the total OPED Liability that they calculate. The liability will fluctuate annually based on what the assumptions were for the prior year and what the actual results were for the current year. Mr. Berg explained when there is a change in assumptions the impact is deferred impact over a period of time rather than the impact hitting the liability on the balance sheet in the first year. Mr. Berg explained the actual experience and the expected experience will be the change when things did not happen the way the actuary said. Tr. Amenta questioned if the overall debt is down but the Village's debt service percentage of operating expense is up, which seems counter intuitive. Mr. Berg explained that is the amount of payments made, the debt service principal was \$4.9 million in 2019, the year before the debt service principal was \$3.7 million. The reason the debt when down was due to the \$4.9-million-dollar payment; the payment went up substantially compared the to the prior year. Mr. Berg further explained it's a percentage of expenditures not a percentage of outstanding debt. Mr. Emanuelson explained that was due to the refunding of the bonds in early 2019.

Tr. Amenta remarked the debt service stabilization fund in 2018, the Village spent \$254,000 on debt service stabilization to keep the Village at a 5% increase and the Village spent \$300,000 to keep the Village at a 0% increase and the fund balance increased \$300,000 in 2019.

Tr. Warren questioned the report states the Village is working on the segregation of duties; does the Village need more staff to respond to that finding, what does working on it mean. Mr. Emanuelson explained there are a number of cross verification items that staff is doing in the background to help mitigate that the Village does not have enough staff to fully separate some key duties. Mr. Emanuelson explained these are things we continue to work on. Mr. Berg explained Sikich does not have specific recommendations but the Village should continue to monitor its cross check points.

- b. Consider Ordinance #3011 – Amending Section 10, “Smoking Prohibited in Certain Places,” OF Article II, “General Regulations,” of Chapter 319, “Health and Sanitation,” of the Shorewood Municipal Code and associated communications plan. (8:02 p.m.)

Director Christiansen explained on May 4 the Village Board approved implementation of a smoke free policy with the exception of leased premises such as Hubbard Park Lodge and the River Club and asked to return with a proposed ordinance and other administrative actions.

Tr. Amenta questioned what are the rules of smoking outside of businesses. Tr. Amenta explained the rules should be consistent between drinking establishments. Tr. Amenta questioned if people could smoke in the Estabrook Beer Garden. Director Christiansen explained there was a designated smoking area and smoking is prohibited within 100 ft. of the beer garden or park buildings at Estabrook. There was Village Board discussion about what area of Hubbard Park Lodge and the River Club is designated for smoking. There was clarification provided that the smoking is allowed in a certain area but not the whole park. President Rozek questioned if there is a distance requirement for an establishment, why isn't the same being done for Hubbard Park Lodge and the River Club. Attorney Bayer explained Wisconsin Statute 101.123 would apply to the Hubbard Park Lodge and River Club area because it's being used in the same manner as a restaurant or bar. Attorney Bayer explained you would have to be a patron of the leased space, you couldn't just be in the park and say I'm going to smoke in the smoking area.

Tr. Warren requested clarification on what does requesting compliance in the first year mean. Chief Nimmer explained if the police department received a complaint of someone smoking on the beach or in the park, the police officer would educate the person on the new ordinance and try to obtain compliance through education. People will have an expectation the fine should be

enforced but the officers will educate and try to maintain compliance; citations will be issued as a last resort.

Tr. Warren moved and Tr. Ircink seconded to approve Ordinance #3011 – Amending Section 10, “Smoking Prohibited in Certain Places,” OF Article II, “General Regulations,” of Chapter 319, “Health and Sanitation,” of the Shorewood Municipal Code and associated communications plan.

Tr. Carpenter expressed she has full support of moving forward with the ordinance.

Tr. Stokebrand clarified the judicial discretion of the penalty is \$100-\$250 and the Municipal Judge will decide the penalty at court. Attorney Bayer explained that is correct. President Rozek questioned if a range was typical and why. Attorney Bayer explained some have ranges, some have specific amounts and some have fines based off of how many offenses the individual has had. Attorney Bayer explained the range already exists; it’s not amended in the existing ordinance. If the Village Board sees fit to change the citation amount, they would need to change the forfeiture schedule as well. Attorney Bayer suggested the forfeiture amount be the same as a restaurant or bar and should be uniform across the board. Director Christiansen explained the amount came from the Wisconsin State Statute when the smoking ban went into effect in 2009. President Rozek remarked every time an ordinance is changed, the whole ordinance should be reviewed for any changes.

Tr. Stokebrand explained the idea of including the leased premises for the Hubbard Park Lodge and River Club was to leave a competitive disadvantage for weddings and events. President Rozek questioned if the entire leased property is larger than the designated smoking area. Attorney Bayer explained the intent is to change nothing on the leased space and smoking will only be allowed in the designated smoking areas. If the leased spaced isn’t excluded, smoking will be prohibited in the whole park.

Tr. Amenta moved, seconded by President Rozek to amend that staff return with an ordinance that designates the smoking area of Hubbard Park Lodge and River Club. Tr. Amenta withdrew her amendment.

Attorney Bayer explained the Village Board could request the tenant to put in a clause to the existing commercial lease that will forever define the defined area moving forward.

Tr. Amenta moved, seconded by Tr. Carpenter to call to question. Call to question carried 6 - 0.

Motion: to approve Ordinance #3011 – Amending Section 10, “Smoking Prohibited in Certain Places,” OF Article II, “General Regulations,” of Chapter 319, “Health and Sanitation,” of the Shorewood Municipal Code and associated communications plan. Motion carried 4 – 2 by a roll call vote with Tr. Amenta and President Rozek voting nay.

- c. Update on Milwaukee County Public Health Officers Local Health Plan for Milwaukee County: Order #1, Gating Criteria and Phased Re-Opening Plan. (8:38 p.m.)
Director Christiansen explained the Supreme Court ruled on Wisconsin’s Safer at Home, local health officers convened to discuss next steps for the communities and issued “Order 1”, which was a stop gap measure to allow for time between the striking of Safer at Home and what the next steps were going to be in the North Shore. Director Christiansen explained Order 1 is set to expire Thursday, May 21 at 11:59 p.m. The next step is to issue guidelines for safe reopening for establishments that will allow for that phased in approach discussed through the Badger Bounce Back Program. Director Christiansen explained the attorney for the North Shore Health Department legal guidance is not to proceed through an order for the next phase but through guidelines and directives from the North Shore Health Department. The attorney’s

concern about moving forward with a continued order is there is a lack of clarity around the health official's authority to issue orders based on the ruling by the Supreme Court.

President Rozek questioned who has the authority to issue an order. Director Christiansen explained for the local health officials under § 252.03, the Health Department's attorney said an order under that state statute would be difficult to defend in court based on the ruling of the Supreme Court. Attorney Bayer explained the Attorney General issued an advisory opinion that local health officials under chapter 252.03 still have the authority to issue directives and make restrictions but there could not be criminal penalties. Attorney Bayer explained if a local municipality wanted to issue an order they would have the authority under chapter 323 of State Statutes, which gives local municipalities power under an emergency order. Attorney Bayer advised that the order under the Department of Health Services at the state level was valid and the Supreme Court had a different interpretation. Attorney Bayer explained if a local municipality acted differently than the Health Department in the jurisdiction, there would have to be substantial evidence or basis upon which the municipality could defend any further restrictions that would extend beyond those imposed by the Department of Health and Human Services and would need to be based on substantial evidence why the particular restriction in this area may assist in reducing the spread of COVID-19.

President Rozek provided an ICC update. The ICC has been meeting three times a week with the public health officials from Milwaukee County since the outbreak of COVID-19. President Rozek explained the Public Health Officials developed reentry criteria; 11 public health officials recommended to the Milwaukee County Municipalities a reentry plan (criteria included in the packet). President Rozek asked Director Christiansen in her opinion is there a public health emergency. Director Christiansen replied she does think this is a public health emergency. President Rozek explained a public health official is not an elected position and if the health official views we are still in a public health emergency; the elected official can appeal or override the Supreme Court's decision based on the health officials input. Director Christiansen explained the order in place ends May 21, new guidelines will be issued on Friday, May 22 and those guidelines are still based on this criteria and approach that the 11 health officials have been talking about and agree on. The difference the health officers are struggling with legally is if the guidelines are deemed an order which means there's an enforcement component or whether they are guidelines meaning the health department recommends that businesses operate under these parameters. That means there are certain occupancy restrictions the business has in place, use of personal protective equipment, the guidelines will be very detailed about what the health department expects from businesses. The difference is there is no mechanism for police involvement for enforcement or citations. Director Christiansen clarified the health department will issue guidelines and local municipalities will determine what they do with those.

Ms. Ewald provided a May 18 ICC update; the communities agree the order will expire Thursday, May 21 and all 11 health department officials recommended the guidelines. The suburban communities are well informed; the guidelines are available for their use. There is no other community other than the City of Milwaukee implementing an order. President Rozek would like to see the Village Board approve the guidelines as an order.

Tr. Amenta questioned if on May 21 the Village would be going into phase B. Director Christiansen explained the Village will be moving to a modified phase B; the health department will be putting out guidelines for reopening with occupancy limits for restaurants and bars. There is still the recommendation of no mass gatherings of more than 10 people.

Tr. Amenta stated she would like to see the school playgrounds and track open before June 30 and clarified the Village would be in phase B for the beach. Attorney Bayer clarified the Supreme Court exempts the schools from lifting the closure. Tr. Amenta questioned if the number of tests done per day needs to be under 2,000 to get to the next phase. Director Christiansen explained it's number of tests and percent positive, it's an or statement meaning

2,000 or a percent of positive test in the 5-10% range. The North Shore area is well under 10%. Tr. Amenta does not support implementing an order.

Tr. Warren would like to stay consistent with the other North Shore Communities and does not support an order.

Tr. Carpenter explained she is concerned about the ongoing public health crisis. The numbers in Milwaukee County are not trending down. Tr. Carpenter explained Shorewood is in a unique situation because the City of Milwaukee, who is under an order, surrounds two sides of the Village but we are a part of the North Shore communities. Tr. Carpenter asked Director Christiansen in a perfect world what she would like to see being done. Director Christiansen explained it's a challenging question, but alignment with the other suburban communities is important for messaging and communication. There are also counties that are choosing to go in less restrictive ways. Director Christiansen explained Shorewood and the North Shore Health Department does a terrific job on focusing on communication to the public and working with the business community to offer clear guidelines going forward.

Tr. Ircink questioned if the Village would be following the same guidelines as other suburban communities and if the parks were open. Director Christiansen stated yes.

Tr. Warren would prefer to move forward with guidelines

Tr. Stokebrand questioned which motion is the best option. Attorney Bayer explained if the Village Board is okay with the North Shore Health Department's criteria, there is no official action the Village Board would have to take. The suggestion with the resolution is to make a strong statement in support of the health department. Attorney Bayer explained if the Village Board wants the restrictions that expire on Thursday, they would need to schedule an additional Village Board meeting.

President Rozek 100% supports making a local order.

President Rozek moved, second by Tr. Carpenter to defer this item until a Special Village Board meeting is held, direct staff to create a resolution citing the North Shore Health Department guidelines gating criteria as a basis for an order.

There was Village Board discussion on how the order would be enforced.

Motion: defer this item until a Special Village Board meeting is held, direct staff to create a resolution citing the North Shore Health Department guidelines gating criteria as a basis for an order. Motion fails 2 – 4 with President Rozek and Tr. Carpenter voting aye.

5. Consent Agenda Items (9:41 p.m.)
 - a. Accept Presentation of Accounts – May 18, 2020
 - b. Consider Village Board minutes – May 4, 2020
 - c. Consider human resource manual amendment for health insurance opt-out payment
 - d. Consider approval of new online payment vendor

Tr. Amenta moved and Tr. Warren seconded to approve the consent agenda. Motion carried 6 – 0.

6. Items Removed from the Consent Agenda (9:42 p.m.) - None

7. Public Hearing(s) (9:42 p.m.) - None

8. Citizens to be heard – This item is for matters not on the agenda. Discussion may follow comment on non-agenda items or discussion and action may come at future meetings. (9:43 p.m.) –

Esther Berkowitz, 2419 E Marion Street, Shorewood, 53211; explained she has comments on the sidewalk replacement program. Ms. Berkowitz had her sidewalk replaced during the most recent phase and the pavers are extremely crooked which causes water to gather. Ms. Berkowitz expressed she would like to see everything leveled when the sidewalks get replaced. She also expressed it's unclear why residents pay for this; why does the homeowner pay when they are required to shovel?

9. New Business

a. Consider Resolution #2020-16 – Requesting Estabrook Parkway to be added to the Milwaukee County Parks Active Streets Program (9:48 p.m.)

Mr. Burkart explained after reviewing the active streets program by Milwaukee County Parks and the City of Milwaukee jointly worked on, the Pedestrian and Bicycle Safety Committee made a recommendation to add Estabrook Parkway to the program. If the Village Board supports the resolution, a copy will be forwarded to the Milwaukee County Parks Commission. Mr. Burkart explained the Police and Fire Department support blocking off the road.

Tr. Ircink explained the closing would go from Capitol Drive to the Beer Garden allowing access to the beer garden and they are requesting eight barricades from Public Works to close the street. Tr. Amenta questioned why they are using village barricades. Ms. Ewald explained they county has exhausted their barricade resources on similar programs and are requesting use of the village's.

Tr. Carpenter moved, seconded by Tr. Ircink to approve Resolution #2020-16 – Requesting Estabrook Parkway to be added to the Milwaukee County Parks Active Streets Program

Tr. Stokebrand expressed it would be great if both driveways to the beer garden remain open and allowing access from Capitol Drive to the Benjamin Church Museum building because that allows closer access for handicap individuals and people with strollers. Chief Nimmer expressed concern with not blocking the road at Capitol Drive and at Hampton due to the fact if vehicles are allowed to come down Estabrook Parkway, they will get stuck and have to turn back around and it will cause congestion. Chief Nimmer's recommendation would be to close at Capitol down to Hampton and eastbound/northbound turn lane on Capitol. Tr. Carpenter expressed concern moving the closure and would like to keep it as it's listed. Tr. Stokebrand expressed concern about where will people park to access the beer garden. Tr. Amenta clarified the road is being closed at Capitol to the driveway south of the beer garden.

Andy Pendelton, 3529 N. Frederick Avenue, Shorewood, 53211; thanked the Village Board for taking up the issue. Mr. Pendelton suggested the closure be as follows: people can drive through the parking lot of the beer garden and the street be closed further south from Hampton Ave. and suggest the street be completely closed just north to the entrance of the parking lot of the Benjamin Church Museum. He expressed it's important for people to be able to get to the parking lot and then engage in their recreational activity.

Janet Kreilein, 2016 E. Menlo Blvd., Shorewood, 53211; explained Estabrook Park has rental spots available for the public and if the guidelines allow those spaces to be rented in conformity with COVID-19 guideline; a certain number of cars should be allowed to access those rental spots.

Director Butschlick stated that DPW concurs with the Police Department's recommendation to

close at Capitol down to Hampton and eastbound to northbound turn lane on Capitol for traffic control or safety reasons.

Tr. Stokebrand questioned why can't there be access from Capitol to the Benjamin Church Museum parking lot. Chief Nimmer stated from a logistical perspective the beer garden parking lot is substantially larger, there are two entrances so essentially people could go into the parking lot and come out the other end if they needed to turn around. The parking lot on the south end is only one way in and one-way out and there is a concern there will be a lot of traffic coming off of Capitol Drive and there will be a lot of traffic coming into that parking lot and trying to turn around.

Tr. Amenta moved, seconded by Tr. Stokebrand to amend to move the southern boundary just north of the north exit of the parking lot just opposite the soccer field. Amendment carried 4 – 2 with Tr. Carpenter and Tr. Ircink voting nay.

Tr. Ircink stated he would like to see very clear and specific signage.

Harriet Black, 2615 E. Menlo Blvd., Shorewood, 53211; expressed she does not understand why the Village would go towards active streets when people are not to gather in groups. There should not be any streets designated for people to gather together during a time of social distancing.

Christina Tysoe, 2709 E. Menlo Blvd., Shorewood, 53211; expressed Menlo Blvd is not wide enough to keep social distancing and traffic flow. Ms. Tysoe stated there are sufficient parks around and has not personally noticed it's difficult to keep social distancing while walking around Shorewood. She expressed she is concerned about making Menlo Blvd. an active street because there wouldn't be anyone to properly monitor people to keep them social distancing.

Andy Pendleton, 3529 N. Frederick Ave., Shorewood, 53211; expressed the Oakleaf Trail is heavily congested and will be far more congested as the weather improves. The Village should create spaces where people can do so in a socially distance manner.

Michael Maher, 2100 E. Menlo Blvd., Shorewood, 53211; uses Estabrook Park weekly and expressed it is important a resident be able to park in the parking lot.

Rachel Ellerman, 4035 N. Newhall Street, Shorewood, 53211; one of the key components of the active street program is it encourages movement through instead of lingering.

Diana Jacobson, 2304 E. Menlo Blvd., Shorewood, 53211; questioned what is the enforcement to discourage or prohibit congregation. Chief Nimmer explained the enforcement in Estabrook is the Milwaukee County Sheriff's Department.

Amended Motion: to approve Resolution #2020-16 – Requesting Estabrook Parkway to be added to the Milwaukee County Parks Active Streets Program and to move the southern boundary just north of the north exit of the parking lot just opposite the soccer field. Motion carried 6 - 0 by a roll call vote.

- b. Discuss and possible consider adding Menlo Boulevard to the Active Streets Program. (10:29 p.m.)
Mr. Burkart explained the Pedestrian and Bicycle Safety Committee met to discuss options for an Active Streets Program in the Village. The Committee is suggesting adding Menlo Blvd. from Morris Ave. to Lake Dr. Mr. Burkart explained staff is looking for direction on doing direct outreach to the Menlo residents to let them know this will be considered at the June 1 Village Board meeting.

Rachel Ellerman, Pedestrian and Bicycle Safety Chair, explained the committee looked at what streets have been currently designated in Milwaukee and Wauwatosa in the Active Streets Program. They include wide stretches of residential streets. The committee then looked at the Village where people could spread out in open active space. The group considered other corridors in the Village but wanted something further south from Estabrook.

Harriet Black, 2615 E. Menlo Blvd., Shorewood, 53211; explained there is nothing that stops any biker today from utilizing Shorewood Blvd, Beverly Rd, Newton Ave, or Menlo Blvd. To take a quiet residential street and turn it into an active street seems to be an aggressive move and is concern of people who live there.

Tr. Amenta questioned since there would still be cross traffic allowed, are there barriers at each of the cross streets. Ms. Butschlick explained the traffic control plan in the packet indicates where barriers may potentially be placed. There will be a pair of barricades placed at every north/south cross street. Ms. Butschlick explained the barricades would be staggered so any vehicle that wanted to enter that block section would need to do an S maneuver around the barricade. Menlo Blvd. would not be closed and would remain open to local traffic and delivery.

Tr. Carpenter explained she is very much in support of having an active street but expressed concerns for utilizing Menlo Blvd especially the boulevard section. Both sides of the boulevard are very narrow, the purpose of the active street is to get people moving. Tr. Carpenter explained the idea is to create a loop that should be centrally located in the Village.

Tr. Warren expressed he is concerned Menlo Blvd is too narrow for the concept and may have the opposite effect of encouraging social distancing; a loop would better disburse people. Tr. Warren also expressed concern for Menlo Blvd residents.

Tr. Ircink expressed there are mixed feelings on utilizing Menlo Blvd but is in support of the active street concept.

Tr. Amenta suggested that Tr. Carpenter and Tr. Warren come forward with a proposal to discuss at the next Village Board meeting.

Tr. Amenta moved, seconded by Tr. Carpenter to request that Tr. Carpenter and Tr. Warren return to our next meeting with a suggestion for an active streets proposal. Motion carried 5 – 1 with President Rozek voting nay.

c. Review of biennial sidewalk program. (10:54 p.m.)

Ms. Butschlick explained review of this program and policy was a DPW initiative for 2020 and DPW is looking for the Village Board's confirmation on the program's funding policy. Ms. Butschlick explained the four main components of the sidewalk program, frequency/implementation of the program, program schedule, funding mechanism, replacement criteria and treatment methods. Program frequency is on a biennial basis; program schedule will be discussed during the Long Range Financial Plan Meeting. The current funding mechanism is through special assessment. Ms. Butschlick explained 2019 was the first year DPW included grinding in the program. Previously grinding was not thought to be a special assessment charge and the opinion from the Village Attorney is the grinding cost could be levied as a special assessment. The Village Board can provide direction if the Village should pay the grinding cost or if it should be included as a special assessment to the property owner. The fourth component is replacement criteria and treatment methods. The replacement criteria were modified in 2019 and there are not recommendations for

changes at this time. Ms. Butschlick is requesting confirmation from the Village Board to continue the program as it was implemented in 2019; the option to change the program would be to change the funding criteria so all or part of the costs that are issued as special assessments could be covered by tax levy.

Tr. Amenta expressed she did not want to change the sidewalk program for 2020 and requested Ms. Butschlick to address the resident comment about the sidewalk being replaced but still having a water issue. Ms. Butschlick explained the purpose of the sidewalk program is to reduce liability, improve walkability and eliminate trip hazards; it's not to address grading or ponding issues. Typically grading/ponding issues will span larger than the adjacent property; the replacement of one or two stones will typically not address those issues, to address those types of issues correctly, the Village needs to replace large runs of sidewalk. Ms. Butschlick explained it's difficult to address ponding issues on a piecemeal basis. The Village's program is structured to address the stones that are in poor condition not blocks at a time.

President Rozek questioned if there was any benefit of using an assessment. Ms. Butschlick explained not from a constructability standpoint.

Tr. Carpenter expressed there are residents who need stones replaced but could not be replaced because of the capacity of that contract. Tr. Carpenter expressed it's important to maintain a walkable community. Director Butschlick clarified the stones were not replaced because of the contracts capacity but because the Village Board modified the criteria to do more of the area. Ms. Butschlick explained staff is purposing to reallocate some of the contract field hours. In the past most of those hours have been used on post installation inspection and staff will shift the hours to utilize on what work needs to be done prior to replacement. The bids would be based on actual field conditions instead of estimates.

Esther Berkowitz, 2419 E Marion Street, Shorewood, 53211; questioned sidewalk replacement being based of trip hazards and how a trip hazard is any different than a ponding/ice issue. Ms. Butschlick explained from a safety/liability standpoint there is not a significant difference, however, the current criteria are not written to address ponding/grading issues, they are written to address material defects in the concrete.

- d. Consider plan to re-open Saturday compactor at DPW yard. (11:19 p.m.)

Tr. Ircink moved, seconded by Tr. Stokebrand to move that staff be directed to collaborate with Whitefish Bay to implement Saturday compactor temporary operation measures to include suspension of gate fees for June 6th only. Motion carried 6 - 0 by a roll call vote

There was Village Board discussion on the length of Village Board meetings and Village Board members appearing by video.

- e. Consider waiver of lease payment for Hubbard Park Lodge.
This item is deferred until June 1, 2020 Village Board Meeting
- f. Consider agenda management vendor selection.
This item is deferred until June 1, 2020 Village Board Meeting

10. Reports of Village Officials

- a. Village President –
 - i. Proclamation recognizing National Public Works Week
- b. Village Trustees – None
- c. Village Manager – None

11. Items for future consideration - None

12. Adjournment.

Tr. Amenta moved and Tr. Carpenter seconded to adjourn at 11:29 p.m. Motion carried 6 - 0.

Respectfully submitted,

Sara Bruckman, CMC/WCMC
Village Clerk