

Item 23-1128: Resolution #10-2-22, Alternate Lawe Street Truck Route

Municipal Services Committee

Mon, Sep 25, 2023 4:30PM

Aldersperson Katie Van Zeeland (District 5) 01:31

We have no public hearings or appearances this evening. We'll start with action item 23-1128 Resolution 10 2 22 Alternate law street truck route. Do we have a motion?

Aldersperson Chad Doran (District 15) 01:45

Motion to deny.

Aldersperson Katie Van Zeeland (District 5) 01:51

I heard motion to deny first. Do we have a second?

Aldersperson Kristin Alfheim (District 11) 01:54

Second.

Aldersperson Katie Van Zeeland (District 5) 01:56

All right. With that, I think some important information on this item. Just direct everyone's attention to the wording of the resolution itself. This is kind of an interesting situation. It doesn't happen very often that we have taken care of something in a resolution prior to approval of a resolution. So, I just want to note that if we take a look at the wording—just bear with me a second. Go ahead and read the res—the part of the resolution that is actionable.

Aldersperson Katie Van Zeeland (District 5) 02:42

See. There it is. Okay. So, the action on this resolution is therefore be it resolved that when the road is redesign comes up prior to Lawe Street's reconstruction, staff will explore removing the truck route designation from lawe street between College Avenue and Hancock Street and finding an alternate route for truck traffic to travel north and south. So, I just want to clarify that this is not asking for a vote to remove the designation of lawe street being a truck route. This was, again, a strange situation because we are exploring and finding, not actually removing. I don't know if that makes a difference to the folks who made the motions. I'll just double check. No?

Aldersperson William Siebers (District 1) 03:36

I voted to...

Aldersperson Katie Van Zeeland (District 5) 03:37

Okay, excellent. So, with that, we'll get started. I see that we have several people here to speak this evening. Let's see, how should we handle this? Well, if you're here to speak, can you just raise your hand? Just want to see how many people we have. Okay, excellent. If you'd like to approach one by one to the podium, and whoever would like to volunteer first, just when you get up there, please state your name and address for the record. And I'll also just note that Alder Meltzer has made me aware that they're working on a response to Appvion's proposal for a compromise before we get started in case that changes how many of you would like to speak to this item. So, would someone like to approach?

Andrew Dane (City Plan Commissioner) 04:31

Good afternoon, I'm Andrew Dane at [XXXXX]. And thank you for the opportunity to share some comments relative to the agenda today. I'm still not exactly sure. The way the resolution is written and the procedures—I'm not a lawyer. I could probably argue it either way. But they—

Aldersperson Katie Van Zeeland (District 5) 04:54

We have a lawyer if we need one.

Andrew Dane (City Plan Commissioner) 04:55

We have a lawyer. Okay. So, it might be I would like a lawyer's opinion—no. Um, I—my understanding is it'll be clear for my testimony, I'm a guest speaking in favor of continuing to explore the alternative truck route designation. So—and are these are typically—is it limited to three minutes, two minutes? Common courtesy don't talk forever.

Aldersperson Katie Van Zeeland (District 5) 05:24

We typically allow five minutes, but we can be more lenient—

Andrew Dane (City Plan Commissioner) 05:27

If I go over five minutes just somebody just give me the hook. I'll stop them, I promise. So, I'm just gonna

Aldersperson Katie Van Zeeland (District 5) 05:34

This would probably be a good time to remind everyone to keep their comments concise.

Andrew Dane (City Plan Commissioner) 05:38

There you go. There you go. So, it's 4:35. I will try to keep them. So, I'm just going to start by saying should we, as a community, willingly mix bicycles, kids, and semi-trucks in order to save a valued multinational corporation \$200 a day? I think the answer may be "No." And therefore, I'm asking the MSC to, I think, oppose the resolution, send it back to staff for a more thorough cost benefit analysis before making—bringing this forward to Council.

Andrew Dane (City Plan Commissioner) 06:15

I do want to say I would not be here today, if there were not a clear, viable, and attractive alternate route for the trucks. I am a big proponent of economic development. I have a business on Lawe Street. We own the building that Moonwater Cafe is in. I've spent a lot of time and energy fixing up a couple of properties on Lawe Street. Had a statement here from Luke Jacobs as well opposing the truck routes. So, I'm certainly not a "not in my backyard" type of guy. I do believe economic development is important. I think Appvion is a huge asset to the community. I have friends who not only live in the neighborhood, but who also work there.

Andrew Dane (City Plan Commissioner) 06:59

But I think because we have an alternate route, and one that makes a lot more sense, I think it's worth our attention and time to just take a breather and look at the true costs and benefits of this, of the options before us. So, there's a bunch of non-economic reasons why the alternate route which I would define as Wisconsin Avenue to Ballard to Northland to 441—one of the logical north/south alternate routes for Appvion in particular, that stands to bear a majority of the impact of a change in truck routes designation. But I'm going to focus more just on the economic side of things here.

Andrew Dane (City Plan Commissioner) 07:44

So, I came up with this figure of \$75,000 a year is what Appvion is saving, by having the existing truck route in place and what it would stand to lose if that truck route segment was removed from our overall truck route designation. And I just use the numbers that they provided me in the memo 11,681 way trips a year, 33,792 additional miles, 751 additional hours driving time. I then assumed a \$50 an hour truck driver salary—maybe too low, maybe too high. I assumed a 6.5 miles per gallon average semi fuel economy based on two websites that I researched, \$3.50 per gallon diesel costs based on a variable diesel gallon average. And then I factored in another 65 cents per mile for wear and tear. And I just calculated out those numbers, simple multiplication and addition, and came up with that figure of \$75,000, which reflects the fuel costs, the wear and the tear, and the additional labor costs or the time. And then we divide that by 365, and you get \$205.

Andrew Dane (City Plan Commissioner) 08:59

And then for me at least when you start boiling it down to those kinds of numbers, then you start thinking about well, what is the—what in fact are the benefits of removing the truck route? We know what the cost might be—\$75,000 to, you know, a very valuable corporate member of our community. But I think it's time to start looking at the additional wear and tear on the truck, trucks that have on the highway. We know from a bunch of studies out there that 18-wheel semis are only 20 times the weight of a car, but they have a geometrical impact in terms of their impact on the roadway surface of they say that one semi is equivalent to five to 10,000 cars in terms of the impact it has as it drives—drives over a segment of pavement. Those are just data I've gotten off government websites.

Andrew Dane (City Plan Commissioner) 09:54

So, I think if we looked at the cost-side of this in terms of this status quo from the city standpoint, you know, we could look at some of those issues associated with wear and tear on the vehicles. I think we could also look quite easily at lower depreciation of all of the taxpayer buildings, the property taxes, the property values of all the homes and businesses that are along that segment, those property values are all being depressed, which is depressing tax value, taxable collections by the city. And then we'd have to start putting some numbers on just the fact that, you know, parents and moms won't let their kids walk to school. Parents and moms will let their kids walk to city park. And then try to quantify somehow what this means when we allow semis to drive through this this historic neighborhood, between—by near, pass two elementary schools, churches, Lawrence University, in—through this historic neighborhood. And if we try to kind of quantify all those things, I think those things ultimately would end up costing more than \$200 a day. And so that's why we do cost benefit analysis.

Andrew Dane (City Plan Commissioner) 11:11

And I'm just going to leave it with that. I think there's some other people here that have some other things to share. But I do appreciate you guys taking the time to do this. And I thank staff for putting together the listening session we had in August. I thought that was very well done and nicely summarized, and a good opportunity for the public to come out. I'd just like us to take a little bit of a collective break here and really give this a thorough evaluation before taking further decisions. So, thank you.

Alderperson Katie Van Zeeland (District 5) 11:41

Thank you. And we do have your email here. All of the members of the committee should have received a stack of emails—everything prior to 9/25 at 2pm. So, if you've sent an email, we should have that email here for you if that helps make your case. Yes, come forward. Please state your name and address for the record.

Ronna S. (Resident) 12:17

[Ronna S. at XXXXX]. I'm married to **[Ron W.]**. When Ron and Susan bought that house in 1980 it was the first house in the neighborhood to be restored. And it really helped the city park area with the whole restoration

process. Now all these years later, I'm involved because that's been our home for a long time, and I can tell you that most of you are too young to remember when US 10—Bill [Siebers, District 1 alderperson], you probably do. Sorry. We go way back—when US 10 went from Memorial Drive to the hospital down Seymour Street. At that time, US 10 had a truck route sign in my front yard over there where the backyard was Riverview, and there were kids crossing to go to the schools. There were five schools in the neighborhood.

Ronna S. (Resident) 13:08

I went to the city. I was very well received. I said "What can we do to get the truck route and 10 off of here?" Because we had over 7000 vehicles a day and many hundreds of trucks. The city was very receptive and said "We can run an OD study" and I said "An overdose study?" and they said "No, an origin destination study." We worked with East Central Regional Planning. We worked with the city. We worked with the city, the city traffic department and Appleton police department. We trained people in the neighborhood, and from 6 in the morning till 12 in the eve—oh well till 6 at night we had over 3000 vehicles, more than almost half that stopped. It was a very fascinating day.

Ronna S. (Resident) 13:50

The recommendations were to get the truck route off. It was off several years earlier than it was planned, and it helped get 441 So the city at that time was placing priority on families, safety, getting kids to school, getting kids out to the other side of town so they could walk to the library and so on. And it worked.

Ronna S. (Resident) 14:13

This time I'm concerned that a company that we don't even know if it's going to be around 5, 10, 15, 20 years from now—I wonder what their long-range planning is like. The city is doing a good job on that. I wonder what their predictions are, and how long they're going to need this route with trucks getting electrified and so on. That I'm concerned.

Ronna S. (Resident) 14:33

It's not just kids I'm concerned about now. I'm obviously a senior, and getting across that street sometimes, or trying to get out of our driveways, is miserable. I understand about the trucks. I understand about the trees. The ash trees do have to come down. But I am aware from watching many projects going back to when Calumet Street opened of watching trees that were right adjacent to where the whole street was dug up how half of the root system was basically destroyed by doing the road bed deep enough. And I'm concerned because it's a pretty drive to go down that street right now.

Ronna S. (Resident) 15:10

Trees give us oxygen. Trucks give us exhaust, dirt in our houses, pollution in our air. And I really am not in favor of having that truck route there. It is so bad that it has actually turned lights on in our house, the kind where you can touch. You get up in the morning and the lights are on, and I realized that an improved road bed is going to help that. Thank you for listening.

Ronna S. (Resident) 15:34

I don't

Aldersperson Katie Van Zeeland (District 5) 15:40

Could somebody give...?

Ronna S. (Resident) 15:42

Oh [Ronna S. at XXXXX]

Aldersperson Katie Van Zeeland (District 5) 15:48

Thank you, Alder Del Toro.

Ann M. (Resident) 15:58

Oh, my thing. So, can you hear me?

Aldersperson Katie Van Zeeland (District 5) 16:00

I can. Yes. Could you please state your name and address for the record?

Ann M. (Resident) 16:03

Yes. My name is [Ann M.] and I live at [XXXXXX], right on the campus. I have a new proposal, and I think it's a win-win for everyone. I don't want this to become a war between two different sides. I would like us all to wind up winning. So, I actually brought a visual. I will give it to Israel. And I'm hoping that you'll look at it because I think when you see something, you see a picture of it, instead of just listening to me going "blah, blah, blah, blah, blah," it helps. It helps to understand why this is important that we keep trucks in commercial areas and out of residential areas. So okay.

Ann M. (Resident) 17:13

I would love to be able to see the faces of the Appvion people when I when I propose this, but they're behind me. Okay. Give Appvion the opportunity to build a new warehouse to not only meet current needs, but to improve their facility for future use for decades to come. The new warehouse would be in the industrial park at Ballard and Northland, and that would mean the truck route would move from here to here.

Ann M. (Resident) 18:01

And I just have nine succinct points. And then I will sit down. I will give this to you. Number one, it's better land use. Number two, it's better safety for pedestrians and trucks. Three, better residential quality of life. Four, easier access to Appvion warehouse. Easier access to both 441 and 41 for Appvion trucks. Seven, avoid truck route through school zones and a dangerous roundabout for student pedestrians to and from their schools. Avoid truck route through an historic neighborhood. And finally, avoid truck route past busy neighborhood parks and municipal pool and a university campus. I appreciate the opportunity to give my comments. Thank you.

Aldersperson Katie Van Zeeland (District 5) 19:08

Thank you. And just a reminder to everyone that the action that's in front of the Council right now is not to make any specific recommendations as to ending the truck route. You know, at this point, I think it's safe to say that we are talking about if you would like to hear us extend this conversation. So, if that helps, you can go ahead and approach. Thank you, and state your name and address for the record please.

Allison Fleshman (Resident) 19:42

Yes, my name is Allison Fleshman. I live at [XXXXXX] last Street. I'm also co-owner of McFleshman's brewing company and associate professor of chemistry at Lawrence. So, my understanding is that what we're asking is that the—to go back and do a better assessment on whether or not the truck route should stay. So, getting more data, getting more understanding of the effect of the truck route currently through the neighborhood.

Allison Fleshman (Resident) 20:10

So, I would like to—so I appreciate that the truck route has been a part of our community for about 30 years; however, many of the homes in the historic district or had been around for 100 plus years or so. So, there's a list of scientific publications on this type of inquiry. How much does a truck route affect the houses and the homes

in the neighborhood in terms of environmental health impact for humans as well as the environment around it? Just to give an example, the—here's a title "Influence of Truck Induced"—or sorry "Influence of Traffic Induced Vibrations on Human and Residential Building", a case study in the International Journal of Environmental Research and Public Health. This was published in 2022 by Bevin et al. Another one is "Impact of Traffic Induced Vibration on Residential Buildings and Their Occupants in Metropolitan Cities." This is published in Promet, Traffic and Transportation in 2019. There are further titles that I could give you. In particular, I have found several out of China as well as Canada who have, in some cases, much older buildings than we have in good old 1857-founded Wisconsin. That is—lost my place. "Measurement and prediction of traffic induced vibrations in a heritage building" published in Sound Vibration in 2001.

Allison Fleshman (Resident) 21:30

So, what I'm asking is for a more thorough assessment made on the—using additional scientific and data back references and information from these case studies that are specifically peer reviewed in scientific journals, as well as those that focus on historical buildings with 100 plus yours. In particular, there are some out of, again, out of China that look at the kind of wood that's used in these homes, and the degradation that they've seen over hundreds, 200, 300 years. The kicker is that if Appleton is as accessible as it is—115 years is pretty impressive. And as a fellow business owner, if my business McFleshman's is there 100 years from now, that's fantastic. However, I'm curious what sort of damage that these trucks will do 200 years from now. I have a four-year-old behind me who I'm hoping to inherit my home. The Edwin J. Falk home is on the national registry, and we put a lot of work into ensuring that this house stays. And I'm assuming that the trucks probably won't hurt in the next 15 to 20. But I'd like us to have some data in the assessment that goes back 200, 300 years or so to see how those buildings fare.

Allison Fleshman (Resident) 22:37

So that's my request. When this—hopefully this, I guess request to assess the truck route inquiry, if it goes back to get further data about what damage the trucks could cause in the very long term. Thank you.

Alderman Katie Van Zeeland (District 5) 22:53

Thank you. Go ahead.

Patrick H. (Resident) 23:03

Good evening. [Patrick H.] from [XXXXX]. And I'd like the committee to take a look at safety again, I think the proposed route, one on 441—it just seems like much more of a truck route, one that are built for trucks. And it seems like Lawe Street is more of a maybe a shortcut, one not built for trucks. Maybe that was acceptable 30-40 whatever amount of years ago, and I think safety has come a long way. I do believe we should take a look at it again and make sure that we are safe going through a community like that. Thank you.

Alderman Katie Van Zeeland (District 5) 23:41

Thank you. Sir.

David N. (Resident) 23:48

Hello, my name is [David N.]. I live at [XXXXX] and own several other houses in the neighborhood. And I should say that I'm a big believer in historic preservation. And at the same time, I should say that I'm a big believer in engineering studies. And I think this one has—is really that we're basing a lot of decisions on is deeply flawed, because it doesn't seem to have considered the cost of the trucks, their impact on the neighborhood. And they aren't just [indecipherable]. They're not just oh, well, trucks aren't pretty, or well they're kind of noisy. But all the impacts a trucks makes actually have a quantifiable cost, as several speakers have already pointed out.

David N. (Resident) 24:27

Another cost that is quantifiable, though we hate to talk about it, is how much is one kid's life worth? So, we don't know for sure that one of those trucks will ever kill a kid, that's true. But we do know that we can actually find statistics on the possibility of it happening. And then we can actually form an economic calculation about what that life is worth. Frankly, I'd rather we don't find out. It just seems so unnecessary. And I know this isn't a question about whether there should be a truck route or shouldn't. That's not today's meeting. And I hope that there will be a meeting that discusses that based on an engineering study that really takes more of these costs into account—costs that are the negatives of the truck route into account.

David N. (Resident) 25:17

And when that time comes, even if the city Council can't bring itself to recommend, I have a modest proposal. Let's pay Appvion not to do it. \$75 grand a year? Hey, what's that compared to a kid's life? What's it compared to the damage on our houses? What's it compared to the quality of life of people in the neighborhood? The city of Appleton spends huge sums—corporate welfare to developers. I don't want to open a can of worms. But I'm up for \$75 grand a year to make sure we don't have trucks barreling through a historic neighborhood, a block from a school, and past several churches. It would be a bargain. Thank you.

Aldersperson Katie Van Zeeland (District 5) 25:56

Thank you, who else would like to speak?

Kyle Jensen (Appvion) 25:58

Good afternoon, Kyle Jensen. I'm representing Appvion. I'm the Vice President of supply chain. So, I'm accountable to the trucks coming up and down that particular street. So, understand and hear all the justification. What I want to go through, just a couple of points, data points that, you know, we presented in a letter everyone can read. I won't go through that, but I'll give some context.

Kyle Jensen (Appvion) 26:33

So, in the in the notes, we said 279 trucks go down this route a day. We account for 16 of those. So, we're 5% of the problem. We're not the problem. So, I also want to say those 16—let's say they're round trips, that's 32. Let's say that half mile stretch takes five minutes, which we probably can all agree is a bit of a stretch in terms of how long it takes. 11% of the day that we're occupying that street with trucks.

Kyle Jensen (Appvion) 26:59

Here's the other data point that our—so we contract our shuttle service out to Midwest who's in Kaukauna. It is far more dangerous in terms of safety to make mergers and exits on a highway, especially with the short amount of time that these truck drivers have to maneuver on 441, from College to Northland. They can't get up to speed. We're essentially transferring a safety concern, because we've been navigating this for 30 years without incident. I've gone through as much records as I can find. We can't find it. We've occupied this particular building for 115. So, we've been getting to this facility in some way shape or form for 115 years. Incident—incidents from some a safety standpoint, I can't find.

Kyle Jensen (Appvion) 27:41

I'd argue the four wheelers that go down that street are far more dangerous than the semis. Half a mile stretch, you're not going to be able to get up to speed with a full load, a 45,000-pound payload. It's not gonna happen. You're gonna maybe get up 20 miles an hour tops. So, there's a safety concern that gets thrown around that I think is a little bit misguided in terms of especially when you want to transfer that safety, a real safety concern, to the highway, to the rest of the community. And that is a true danger. And I know that right now—it's not till 2026—go look at 441 right now and tell me how those trucks are gonna be able to maneuver on that particular

highway and that stretch at the moment. Again, it's a time in point, but that—those construction timeframes will happen in the future as well.

Kyle Jensen (Appvion) 28:23

So, all that is part of why we are looking to find a compromise. So, I do want to end with that. Appvion is interested in finding a compromise with the residents on the street. There's no reason that we can't coexist. We've coexisted for 30 years. I agree with one of the other speakers. We don't want to get this into be a war or a fight or anything like that.

Kyle Jensen (Appvion) 28:43

We employ 350 people. We support 350 families in this community. We spend \$10 million locally. We also have wages of upwards of \$30 million that in some way, shape, or form come back to this community. And by no means does that trump the residents from being able to peaceably exist with on that route. But our desire is to find a peaceful agreement. We did propose not running the trucks at night to allow for the noise. I know that came out in the in the meeting previously. And we'd be open to other suggestions. We do have to be able to operate. But we are open to discussions and options.

Alderman Katie Van Zeeland (District 5) 29:25

Appreciate that. Thank you. Who else would like to speak?

Christopher K. (Resident) 29:32

My name is [Christopher K.]. I live at [XXXXXX] so a block from Lawe Street. So, I moved here from Salt Lake City two years ago principally for the quality of the environment. And I've got to say that this doesn't—having that truck route in perpetuity doesn't improve the quality of my residential environment. You know, we're taking a neighborhood that's close to the heart of the city and running trucks through it.

Christopher K. (Resident) 30:06

I'm intrigued by that alternate solution about possibly locating a warehouse in a spot that is maybe more amenable to warehouses that just kind of obviates the requirement that we're running trucks through this historic neighborhood. Also, as a as a committed cyclist of long standing, it's a curious choice to mix the bicycle lanes with the truck route. And it feels as if we're asking bicyclists be some kind of human traffic calming device, which makes me a little uncomfortable.

Christopher K. (Resident) 30:47

All in all, I got to say I love what the city has been doing to make the downtown environment more bicycle navigable, I think it's great. And I think we can do a little bit better when it comes to Lawe Street in terms of having this function as a city within our great community. Thanks.

Alderman Katie Van Zeeland (District 5) 31:13

Thank you. Would anyone else wish to speak?

Corinna A. (Resident) 31:24

Good afternoon, my name is [Corinna A.]. I'm a resident at [XXXXXX]. And without any hard data or dollars and cents to put in front of you, I would just like to speak my own experience of living a block from a truck route and being a mother, being a public school teacher, being conscientious of the way that our family—our family and our community are knit together, particularly because we have amazing neighborhoods in Appleton that are pedestrian friendly, that we have neighborhoods where neighbors know each other and meet in the street and on the sidewalk. And the particular social fabric that comes from the nature of those neighborhoods, I think is

inestimable. So, I don't have dollar sign or you know a way to give you data points that that measures that. But I, as a property owner, and as a parent, value those things beyond what I can say in words to you.

Corinna A. (Resident) 32:29

And just to add to that, I'd say, you know, we live—there's a block between us and Jacobs Meat Market. And I have two kids who are 11 and 7. They have friends from school, friends from the neighborhood on both sides of Lawe Street. Kids at these ages are developing within every social circle that they exist in, and my kids socialize with kids who live on my side of Lawe street and have lost friendships with kids that live on the other side, because it's not a safe spot for them to run across the street on their own. That breaks my heart as a mom. But I can also see that if we continue to explore the possibility of eliminating the truck route on Lawe Street that this offers untold possibility for continued growth in our neighborhoods and then the continued growth, of our tax base, of our kids safety, and our seniors safety, of our patronization of our local businesses that we go to on foot and are so grateful that they are there. And so, I thank you for your time. And thank you for considering continue to explore the possibility of continuing this conversation because I know it would make a tremendous difference in the life of my family in this neighborhood here in Appleton.

Aldersperson Katie Van Zeeland (District 5) 33:54

Thank you. Is there anyone else who wishes to speak?

Philip B. (Resident) 33:56

Hello, I'm [Philip B.], and I live at [XXXXX]. And I've lived in the neighborhood for over 30 years, not always in this residence but on Union Street. And over the years—we bought a house in 2000. And at that time, the neighborhood was kind of definitely in a state of decline. But in the time that we've lived in the neighborhood, we've seen many families move in with great pride of ownership and desiring to upgrade their homes and, you know, build community.

Philip B. (Resident) 33:56

What I've what I've seen, of course, I don't—I agree with that I don't want to create a, you know, a range war between industry and the local environment, the local populace. But, you know, you see how things tend to change and develop over the years. The Appvion Corporation has existed for, as it's been said, 115 years. At the time they've been there, through the time through the years they've been there, you know, Appleton has expanded. It's both grown in that direction, and it's also coming to a place of a recession.

Philip B. (Resident) 35:42

I think we're coming to a place where growth is, is beginning to develop, the seedlings of growth are beginning to develop in the private sector again. And what I would like to see is at least some degree of segregation between the industrial areas and the residential areas. And I don't think—you know, this has been, like I said, the case for 30 year—for 30 years of traveling through. But the neighborhood has changed in the time. And the neighborhood has become more family friendly. Families are growing up. It's becoming more urban centric. And it would be very, very nice if we could have something that would just blossom into a beautiful residential area, where people would, of course, be able to get to know each other, to have block parties, to cross streets safely, to traverse between homes and schools. I mean that's all wonderful things. And I hope that we do look at this proposal with—in more depth, because I think there are, there are some important aspects that are being overlooked. Thank you.

Aldersperson Katie Van Zeeland (District 5) 36:58

Thank you. Anyone else? Check one more time. Would anyone else like to speak? All right. Before I bring it back to committee, I just want to remind everyone what our action would be today. We've essentially satisfied the

resolution as written. What I heard from Appvion, and the residents was that there's interest in continuing the conversation, and from Appvion's side, looking for a compromise, which we would be unable to do with the denial. So just a reminder of that. I don't know if that changes anyone's minds. But we'll go ahead then and—oh, yes. Alder Alfheim?

Aldersperson Kristin Alfheim (District 11) 37:49

I can tell you're excited for me to say something.

Aldersperson Katie Van Zeeland (District 5) 37:51

I am.

Aldersperson Kristin Alfheim (District 11) 37:53

I will, I will happily take back my second because it actually wasn't—I didn't actually realize what he said. So, I'll have the discussion. I think that we—it's fair. And obviously there's enough people here in the community that want to talk about it. Let's have the conversation. So, I will take back my second on the denial so that we can have that conversation fully.

Aldersperson Katie Van Zeeland (District 5) 38:16

Alder Siebers, does that change your mind as we move forward?

Aldersperson William Siebers (District 1) 38:20

I wanted to approve.

Aldersperson Katie Van Zeeland (District 5) 38:23

I'm sorry. I heard deny.

Aldersperson William Siebers (District 1) 38:25

Alderman Doran just voted no.

Aldersperson Katie Van Zeeland (District 5) 38:28

Okay. Well, I think the best way to do this would be to just remove the motion if so agreeable. Go ahead. Director one.

Aldersperson Chad Doran (District 15) 38:43

I guess I'd just asked staff, the—because I, I guess my read of this is that there with the wording of this resolution, there's no real action here for Council necessarily to take, that staff could continue to have conversation with Appvion. If Appvion is willing to offer some other changes or concessions, staff can have those conversations with them without needing any direction from the Council or this committee, I guess. Is that correct?

Director Danielle Block (Department Of Public Works) 39:21

We certainly could.

Aldersperson Katie Van Zeeland (District 5) 39:26

Alder Alfheim.

Aldersperson Kristin Alfheim (District 11) 39:27

I think my concern on this is if the way that we can close the conversation is to say what the resolution says we've already done, my opinion is there's just going to be another version of the resolution that's going to show up asking for specific action. So, I would rather have the discussion, make it clear what we can and cannot do as a city, and then put that to bed one way or the other. I think the idea of making it go away quickly because there wasn't clear, clear statement in the resolution, it's not going to work. So rather than putting it off and then having another endless conversation, let's have the conversation out in the open and go from there.

Aldersperson Katie Van Zeeland (District 5) 40:06

Let's deal with the motion that is currently on the table. So, the second has been withdrawn. Should I just ask if anyone else would like to second? Hearing none, then that motion would fail. Is that correct, Attorney Behrens? Okay. Alder Siebers.

Aldersperson William Siebers (District 1) 40:28

I am making a motion to approve.

Aldersperson Kristin Alfheim (District 11) 40:31

I would like to second that.

Aldersperson Katie Van Zeeland (District 5) 40:32

We have a motion and a second to approve. Thank you all for hanging in here. And let's see who would like—oh, yes. Alder Meltzer.

Aldersperson Vered Meltzer (District 2) 40:43

Thank you. I guess one of one of the things that I would like us to see happen tonight, and it's my understanding the way that the resolution came forward and the way it exists in front of us now—I feel that for Council to take some kind of action some sort of amendment would be needed, either an amendment to accept the staff recommendation at this time, or maybe if we do allow these explorations to continue, a different recommendation might be arrived at. So, I would—I would like to see us be able to keep this resolution here so that we can have further discussions about potential compromise with Appvion.

Aldersperson Vered Meltzer (District 2) 41:27

I definitely—you know, I appreciate—I really appreciate how willing Appvion is to come to the table. And I do think that for the future of Lawe Street, it's important to recognize that both the residents and the businesses need to find a way to coexist there. I do think that so far, the proposed compromise, as far as the input I've received, does not address enough of the community concerns. So, the way I see it, we have begun an exploration. But I feel that there's still a lot more work to do, and also going to some of the other comments about different sorts of data that we don't have in front of us that I think would be important to have so that we have the proper context for those conversations going forward.

Aldersperson Katie Van Zeeland (District 5) 42:16

Alder Hartzheim.

Aldersperson Sheri Hartzheim (District 13) 42:19

Thank you, Chair. Might I—might I address some staff, please?

Aldersperson Katie Van Zeeland (District 5) 42:22

Sure.

Aldersperson Sheri Hartzheim (District 13) 42:24

City traffic engineer Lom, would you be able to tell us very briefly—because I know you could go on for days—what, what—and that is not, that is not a degrading comment. You just have that much knowledge. What is different about a truck route, as opposed to another city street?

Aldersperson Katie Van Zeeland (District 5) 42:47

Are you director—oh, I'm sorry, there we go.

Eric Lom (City Traffic Engineer) 42:54

Well, a number of things. When we look at a truck route, first of all, one of the things we're looking at is the pavement design, make sure that we are designing it in a way that it would last for the duration of that we would want it to. When we look at just sort of the horizontal design, you know, like with—at intersections where the trucks are turning, we need to make sure that the trucks can safely make the turns. I think you know, generally speaking that covers most of it. I mean, obviously we're thinking about interactions with pedestrians and bicyclists and things like that, and you you'd like to have those be separate, but that isn't always practical in terms of how the transportation system lays out.

Aldersperson Sheri Hartzheim (District 13) 43:44

Thank you. Chair, may I continue?

Aldersperson Katie Van Zeeland (District 5) 43:45

Sure.

Aldersperson Sheri Hartzheim (District 13) 43:47

I'm not sure who can answer this. But how would other businesses in Downtown Appleton receive goods and services that are brought by trucks if this truck route did not exist on Lawe street?

Aldersperson Katie Van Zeeland (District 5) 44:00

Who'd like to take that? Go ahead.

Eric Lom (City Traffic Engineer) 44:03

When you look at the existing truck route network that we have, it is fairly sparse in some areas to begin with. So really depends on which direction the truck is coming from, and what their sequence of deliveries is that they're trying to make. So, in some instances, the—for instance, getting deliveries into the downtown might not be affected at all. If they're coming from the south on 41 or 441, they can take Oneida street into the downtown, they can take West College into the downtown. Other—but what happens in in reality many times is that the trucks are maybe not in Appvion's instance, but are—they have a series of deliveries. You can think of them like the Amazon truck to some extent. And so, they're trying to string those deliveries together in a certain way. So sometimes they might find themselves making the delivery to the city operations building out on the east side of town, and they need to get to downtown. Well, how do you do that? Well, right now, you would most likely take Lawe Street down to College Avenue. In the absence of that, you would have to go all the way down to Richmond Street, make a left turn at Richmond, go down, make another left turn at college, and come into the downtown that way.

Aldersperson Sheri Hartzheim (District 13) 45:25

Thank you. May I continue?

Aldersonperson Katie Van Zeeland (District 5) 45:26

Sure.

Aldersonperson Sheri Hartzheim (District 13) 45:28

If a alternate route were available and was suggested, something to the effect of Ballard Road, 441, etc. Are those roads in our city capable and engineered as well as a engineered truck route is?

Eric Lom (City Traffic Engineer) 45:49

So, for the short answer would be yes, based on the alternate routes that I've heard suggested, such as Wisconsin Avenue, it's a state trunk highway is designed for large trucks. Ballard Road, partly a county trunk highway, partly used to be a county trunk highway, again engineered for large trucks. Richmond Street, the same situation. So those streets are—wouldn't have any concerns either with the ability to make the turns or the additional traffic.

Eric Lom (City Traffic Engineer) 46:22

One thing that—I guess one street that hasn't been specifically talked about that I think would end up with extra truck traffic is College Avenue itself through the downtown. That, as many of us know, is plenty of trucks use it. It's not an ideal situation. And from a capacity standpoint, we do not have any capacity to spare. So that one would be a bit more challenging than the others.

Aldersonperson Sheri Hartzheim (District 13) 46:51

Thank you. And if I could just conclude, please.

Aldersonperson Katie Van Zeeland (District 5) 46:52

Sure.

Aldersonperson Sheri Hartzheim (District 13) 46:53

I think it's important for us to remember that Appvion is a very tiny piece of this particular puzzle, and there are continued uses or other uses of this route for many other truck deliveries to many other downtown businesses, including if there were to be a future grocery store on College Avenue or something to that to that effect. So, I think it's important to remember that we have to kind of balance all these pieces to what's best for the community. And I don't know what that is yet, but I think we shouldn't—I think it's a mistake to put a \$75,000 price tag on a child's life or some of those sorts of arguments, because there's far more involved in this than that particular piece of the argument. Thank you.

Aldersonperson Katie Van Zeeland (District 5) 47:42

Thank you. I think that I'm going to make a suggestion that might help us with the resolution we have in front of us. So, the questions that Alder Hartzheim has are valid. I think they're questions that need to be answered at a time when we're looking at an action. So, I am going to make a suggestion that we amend the resolution to include—I think a specific action would be helpful. And I think in this case, I would like the—after "the truck traffic to travel north and south", "to direct staff to engage in conversations with Appvion and other businesses for a compromise." One second. Do we have a second for the amendment? Again, reminding everyone that this—everything in this resolution we have in front of us has already been accomplished.

Aldersonperson Vered Meltzer (District 2) 48:52

I am interested in this amendment, but I don't want to second it yet because I feel that the other co-author of this resolution hasn't spoken yet, and I just want to make sure I get a sense of my bearings before we decide what's the sort of best way to take the next step.

Aldersperson Katie Van Zeeland (District 5) 49:14

Okay, so without a second the amendment would fail. And then Alder Del Toro, would you like to speak. You are District Four? **[He starts talking off microphone.]** All right. Are you just four, correct? You're four, no?

Aldersperson Sheri Hartzheim (District 13) 49:32

No, your mic is not on.

Aldersperson Kristin Alfheim (District 11) 49:34

You have one of the directors.

Aldersperson Israel Del Toro (District 4) 49:35

Thank you. All right. The more **[unclear]** of part of me wants to say change the action item on this to deny the truck route and to just say flat out "no trucks here," but that's not a constructive way forward. So, I'm gonna hold that horse back. That recommendation or that amendment would be stemming from the obvious community input that has been heard here today. I do want to keep this discussion going. I think it is a fruitful discussion as Alder Alfheim has mentioned. It's important to have this discussion out in the open and not behind closed doors or between a private individual business and directors or mayors or individual Council persons, but out in the open and fully disclosed.

Aldersperson Israel Del Toro (District 4) 50:27

So in regards to the suggestion that the amendment that was just proposed, I would only hesitate to encourage you all to vote for something like that, because it signals out a single entity in our community, and I want to make it clear that this resolution is not a personalized attack at Appvion in any way, shape, or form. They are, as mentioned 16 trucks of the 200 plus trucks on this road every day and will directly impact how distribution flows around the city. Absolutely. Shout out to Alder Hartzheim and what she what she brings to the table. I think all of those things are important to take into consideration.

Aldersperson Israel Del Toro (District 4) 51:05

Having said that, I think explore—exploring, continuing to explore as the resolution states should stand to have more fruitful conversations, bring better data to the table. I believe I've shared some data in my email communications to each of you, and I'd like that to also be added to a formal part of the record because in it are issues that address things like safety. For example, a concern right now is that this is a safer alternative for a route; however, this current route makes seven left turns, as opposed to an alternative route that only makes two left turns. Left turns account for over 50% of traffic accidents as detailed by the federal transportation administration. So that's not a statement that unnecessarily stands. We need to take a very, very detailed close look at the infrastruct—and because we're in the municipal services committee, we need to look at the infrastructural costs to the city, the development of a route and that is truck appropriate which offers the city potential cost saving benefits that would likely total greater than the 70k mark that was aforementioned, as well as infinite environmental and pedestrian safety concerns could be addressed by properly developing. These are conversations we haven't had yet, and it's essential that we continue to have those conversations. So, for that reason, I encourage you all to vote in support of this resolution. The action of exploration is a valid action.

Aldersperson Katie Van Zeeland (District 5) 52:39

Thank you. And I apologize if it didn't come across this way. I thought I had said "Appvion and other businesses." So, it's a very valid point. This was not singling out—the amendment was not to single out Appvion. It was to deal with all businesses involved. Alder Alfheim.

Alderson Kristin Alfheim (District 11) 52:58

This is a big, big conversation. I also live in a national historic home with 74 original windows that shake from time to time on a city bus goes by. I do have a little crack every now and then. I do understand this conversation. I would also be irritated if that route were used for business trucks on a regular basis. I get that. I also understand the safety issue.

Alderson Kristin Alfheim (District 11) 53:22

And I think the challenge that I have in this entire conversation is at some point in time, we can't just stop all the trains and all the trucks from being around. And I—and my concern in this entire conversation is let's say, we figured out a way to compromise or say "Yes," all those trucks still have to get here somehow. And there's—it's still going to be there. We just push it out of the backdoor that we're complaining about. And that doesn't nullify the serious nature of kids and pedestrians and bikes and all that. But you see the problem. We're just trying to push it out to the next neighborhood to deal with. And as a city, I think that what are we going to do? If we if we say yes, every time, then you can see that we're going to have a never-ending issue.

Alderson Kristin Alfheim (District 11) 54:13

Now there is an issue. There is a reality to is there. You know, semis have not been around for 100 years. My house has. Your house has. So, I think there's validity in the conversation. However, I don't think we're there yet. I don't think we have—we don't have a solution. And I think we have to acknowledge that out loud. We have 5% of the vehicles that are using that road are coming from the one business that has been mentioned in every comment. That's not right. That means that 95% of the traffic on that road has nothing to do with that one business. So, there's a bigger issue in terms of how are we going to be as a city?

Alderson Kristin Alfheim (District 11) 54:53

I'm a farm girl. I was raised at, you know, at seven years old driving tractors because that's what you did. And in today's age we want, we want more safety. We want less [indecipherable] business. We want less monsters around our kids. But sometimes we can't make that all go away that fast. So, I like the effort that has gone through in this conversation. I like the passionate conversation saying, "Hey, I want to protect my house of my kids." I love that. But we're not going to have an Appleton Downtown that has no business. Or if we shut down all the roads that take us to the businesses, those businesses won't be there, and it won't be nearly as much fun to be there.

Alderson Kristin Alfheim (District 11) 55:32

So, again, this isn't an answer. What I do know is that I am not prepared to say "Let's shut down that truck route," because we do not have a better solution right now. So again, what I don't like is the idea of "okay, staff, sharpen those pencils again," because they've already done a lot of work. I think that, as we progress in our conversations as a city, it's going to be decades and decades that we continue to work towards solutions of safety, but it doesn't really go away. So again, I apologize. That maybe didn't mean anything to anybody, but we are listening. But I do not believe we can solve and give you what you want right now. I really don't. And I don't think it's fair to be bringing Appvion up in the conversation as often it is because it's industry and business and commerce period versus residential living. That's the—we just have to deal with it. Sorry.

Alderson Katie Van Zeeland (District 5) 56:32

Thank you. Alder Meltzer.

Alderson Vered Meltzer (District 2) 56:35

Thank you. I do want to point out that kicking this problem into another neighborhood is something we've been very sensitive to avoid from the beginning. So that's one of the reasons why it's only alternate routes that are

already capable and, you know, built for holding trucks that have been considered as alternate routes. When people first started talking to me about this issue is made very clear to me that, you know, nobody wants to turn Lawe Street's problem into Mead street's problem. Nobody wants to turn, "keep it out of our residential neighborhood" into the same problem somewhere else. So, I think that it's—an important thing to keep in mind is that we are very carefully keeping ourselves circumscribed in that regard.

Alderman Vered Meltzer (District 2) 57:29

I do think that, while we—staff has been doing really great work, and I definitely commend them for all their work, I do think that there is more work that staff can do. I do think that we can have a deeper cost benefits analysis. I do think that what's been brought to us so far in our packet is incomplete. At this point, I would like to make a motion to refer this to staff so that we can come back with a deeper cost benefit analysis to form the foundation for another round of conversations that can help put things into better context so that we can continue to explore moving forward. And you know, if we—upon a deeper analysis of the cost benefit situation, if the staffs recommendation remains the same in spite of that research, I think that that'll be very helpful for the neighborhood to have a deeper understanding of why exactly it is that the truck route is better in the place where it is. If that is the case, we need to be able to demonstrate that. Thank you.

Alderman Katie Van Zeeland (District 5) 58:36

I think my only concern is that, again, if we vote to approve this, technically, staff has already done what's listed here. Therefore, you know, I think it would be better to clarify something along the lines of wanting a cost benefit analysis. Staff needs to know what they—what is needed of them. At this time, let's maybe ask staff, is there anything in particular—if this were to come back to you, is there anything outstanding that you would be looking into?

Director Danielle Block (Department Of Public Works) 59:12

Thank you, Chair. I've been jotting down a few notes here. When we talk about the alternatives discussion, I believe what I heard was "It must be an alternative that's already designated as a truck route." Am I hearing that correct? So, when we look at the truck route network designation map that the city has, we would be limited to the routes that are already designated for trucks. Correct?

Alderman Katie Van Zeeland (District 5) 59:41

I guess that's the problem is there is no direction here.

Alderman Vered Meltzer (District 2) 59:47

Yeah, I think that that is a good summary. I think that that's definitely been the premise that we're operating on. We have absolutely no desire or intention to create a new truck route where there has not been one. And I think that if that needs to be clarified by language then then by all means we should make that amendment today.

Alderman Katie Van Zeeland (District 5) 1:00:09

Director Block, if I'm not mistaken, there is nothing east of Lawe Street, and the closest area would be Oneida. Is that correct? Could somebody...?

Alderman William Siebers (District 1) 1:00:23

West.

Director Danielle Block (Department Of Public Works) 1:00:23

West of Lawe Street. Yep. Closest is Richmond to the west. That goes all the way north south. Is that what you're asking?

Alderson Katie Van Zeeland (District 5) 1:00:35

Yes. Thank you. Without having a map, it was very difficult to explain. Yes. Alder Schultz did have some remarks. I don't have your microphone number. 15.

Alderson Alex Schultz (District 9) 1:00:51

Thank you, Chair. Are we speaking to an amendment currently?

Alderson Katie Van Zeeland (District 5) 1:00:54

We didn't have a second for that amendment. Would anyone like to second the amendment? So, we don't have a second for the amendment. So that would fail.

Alderson Alex Schultz (District 9) 1:01:07

Thank you. I just—a lot has been said. I don't want to rehash a number of the comments from the community or the business that has been, I think, as I would agree with a number of my colleagues unfairly singled out in this conversation. A safety isn't an issue, but when you think about that volume of traffic produced by large trucks, it's relatively insignificant. I think there's other types of traffic down that street that probably pose more danger to individuals crossing for either getting back and forth to school or just, you know, basically the quality of life and living in that neighborhood. So, I just want to recognize, as many already have that Appvion should not be singled out in this conversation. But the conversation does have to do with trucks that of a large volume. 15,000 you know, gross vehicle weight is pretty significant vehicle and—

Alderson Katie Van Zeeland (District 5) 1:02:07

Actually, the discussion is, should we keep talking about this? Not about the vehicle weights, etc.

Alderson Alex Schultz (District 9) 1:02:15

Okay, I think that we should continue talking about this, because there are a number of things that I think we have not quite vetted yet. And one of those would be the significance of these large vehicles that may or may not be fully loaded, versus the notion that there are smaller vehicles that can facilitate transportation of goods throughout our city that may not fall under that or exceed that gross vehicle weight. So, I think that's a false argument.

Alderson Alex Schultz (District 9) 1:02:42

There are convers—I think issues when we have reconstruction in the system, and we look at our streets, and we want to preserve the existing terrace and the trees, and that requires a shrinkage of the road to maintain the trees that are in the terraces, not just maintaining the existing street width. You actually have to shrink it to allow for some space between the reconstruction and the roots that are going to be affected by that. So, this proposal is to maintain the street width which means we're going to lose some trees. And the proposed number is 47—

Alderson Katie Van Zeeland (District 5) 1:03:20

Interrupt again. The—there is no proposal for the construction on—you know, there is written information is 30% into the design phase. So just again, if we could keep our comments about the resolution at hand.

Alderson Alex Schultz (District 9) 1:03:36

Okay, I'm just speaking to what was provided as information to the resolution. So, I'm looking at the numbers referenced here, and that's a 40% number of trees that might be influenced by what might or might not be the final design. So, I would, I would share a concern about any street design that would eat into existing trees that

aren't ash that need to come down, but those other trees that are either influenced by power lines or the street width itself. So, I want to share that concern. And I'm sorry, I'm babbling a little bit, but also the effect of these large vehicles on the homes on that street, if there's something that can be done with the street design itself, I think there's conversations that can be had a little bit more in depth about what that street design is or what that concrete design is to alleviate some of that, you know, stress on homes and stress on other structures.

Alderson Alex Schultz (District 9) 1:04:34

I would support sending this back and having a deeper conversation because I feel like there are some unanswered questions and maybe a little bit more information that can be garnered, some research that research that can be done to see if there's other means of working on this route that can alleviate some of these concerns.

Alderson Katie Van Zeeland (District 5) 1:04:53

Alder Doran.

Alderson Chad Doran (District 15) 1:04:55

Thank you. I think what I—my initial read of this resolution and the discussion we've had here just sort of reaffirms the reason that I recommended we denied the resolution. Because the work that was asked for has already been completed in the resolution. It's all done. All that was asked for has been completed.

Alderson Chad Doran (District 15) 1:05:17

The language at the end of the resolution asks for staff to continue exploring taking away the truck route, but that work's already been done. And the staff has recommended in the memo they gave us that they suggest we do not remove the Lawe street truck route. So, referring this back or voting yes on this resolution, accomplishes the same thing, sending it back to staff to have them say to us, "We've done that work. We provided you our recommendations."

Alderson Chad Doran (District 15) 1:05:52

If there's a desire, I guess for staff to do further work on this as the design of the street continues over the next couple of years, the budget process is coming up here. Part of my issue with this with the whereas clause or the therefore be it resolved clause is that it's open ended. I think what we've heard from at least one of the authors and the residents that have spoken is a desire for the truck route to go somewhere else. But the staff is not making that recommendation, and I'm not sure that further study, if there is further study to be done, would change the staff's recommendation from that standpoint. So—plus, there's no discussion here about how much more we want the staff to invest in doing any further study. We don't know how much the staff has spent already on this on the study that it's done. I can't imagine it was a lot, because if it was, I'm sure staff would have brought that forward for, you know, at least some discussion before they move forward.

Alderson Chad Doran (District 15) 1:06:50

But what I hear is a desire for staff to go much further in depth on a number of different issues surrounding this, some of which might already be accomplished in the normal process of the street design work that they do anyway. So, I just don't see a reason to continue with the resolution, or refer it back because what's been asked in the resolution has been accomplished. So, to me, what makes sense is voting no on the resolution, so that we don't have to send it back to staff again, for the same answer to come back. And if there is further work that can be done, perhaps the authors might want to reach out to staff to see if there is a need for a future resolution on this.

Alderson Katie Van Zeeland (District 5) 1:07:32

I think at this point, we have talked over and over and over about the things that we don't know, but we don't have anything to give the staff as far as direction is where we go from here. Therefore, I think, in all honesty, we haven't had anybody add anything specific. If the authors of these resolutions do not want to add something specific, then I would go ahead and entertain a vote. Would the alders representing the neighborhood like to suggest specifics that they would like to hear from staff?

Alderson Vered Meltzer (District 2) 1:08:07

I would as well or I—

Alderson Katie Van Zeeland (District 5) 1:08:11

Hold on. Alder Del Toro was first. Go ahead. What—I'm sorry, what microphone? Director one?

Alderson Israel Del Toro (District 4) 1:08:16

Director one, one, please. Okay, so the issue here is the language is not specific enough. So, in the continued exploration, I would consider amend—I would hope that you would entertain an amendment that details tree management, cost benefit analysis of construction, destination origin analysis, traffic volume analysis, sperser—ugh specific traffic speed reduction efforts, and environmental impact as specific tasks for staff to address within a six-month period of March 2023 deadline of March 2023. So now we're covering the deadline as well. So that we can continue on time towards the development of this Lawe of this Lawe Street section.

Alderson Katie Van Zeeland (District 5) 1:09:03

Thank you. Can you repeat what your second item was?

Alderson Israel Del Toro (District 4) 1:09:06

Sure. Tree measure—or sorry, trees tree measurements, cost benefit of construction, origin destination, as was pointed out by one of our constituents, traffic volume, specific traffic with speed reduction efforts, and environmental impact.

Alderson Katie Van Zeeland (District 5) 1:09:22

Thank you. Alder Meltzer, did you want to add any items?

Alderson Vered Meltzer (District 2) 1:09:26

I just wanted to say that this resolution was written with the help of staff so that it would be timely and accessible to make this discussion possible. The resolution was open ended, so to speak, because at the time the resolution was submitted, there was no way for staff or anyone else to have any idea what staff's recommendation was going to be. So, I just—I do feel like it's important to point that out that this isn't some kind of vague, nebulous resolution where we asked staff to think about something, and they did so now they're done. This resolution was written so that we would have an opportunity to open up a really big issue during one of these kinds of once every 10 year windows that is the only opportunity for this issue really to come up. So, this resolution was very thoughtfully worded, and very intentionally crafted in order to give us the opportunity at the timely appropriate time to have a necessary conversation.

Alderson Vered Meltzer (District 2) 1:10:36

I really appreciate all the work that staff has been doing to make this possible. I think that, certainly given the last time these conversations were attempted, just to see how well everything is going and how everyone is coming to the table together with a sense of shared community, it—this is a really good place for us to be in as a community. And I really want to commend everyone who has gotten us here. Thank you,

Aldersperson Katie Van Zeeland (District 5) 1:10:59

I don't think anybody is making suggestions that there's anything wrong with the resolution. I think what I was trying to do is trying to move this along, per the remarks of the people who are present and the people who have emailed, and I just want to make sure that you know that we are moving forward from this resolution as stated.

Aldersperson Katie Van Zeeland (District 5) 1:11:34

I'm going to ask to hear from Alder Alfheim.

Aldersperson Kristin Alfheim (District 11) 1:11:36

If I may ask the staff a couple of direct questions. Hearing we just heard in the last couple of statements, the—this was done with the help of staff, and I'm not looking at just public works, but also CEDC back there. In these conversations working together, do you feel that the recommendation by the city at this point in time coming out of this really good conversation is clear? Do you feel the recommendation at this point from public service? And then I love Director Kara to comment as well.

Director Danielle Block (Department Of Public Works) 1:12:09

So, recommendation on the further study? Correct?

Aldersperson Kristin Alfheim (District 11) 1:12:13

The recommendation on as where you stand right now, if after this much maintaining the truck route or not?

Director Danielle Block (Department Of Public Works) 1:12:22

How do I feel about that right now?

Aldersperson Kristin Alfheim (District 11) 1:12:24

Based on everything coming in so far. I think that's really what we're trying to get at, right?

Director Danielle Block (Department Of Public Works) 1:12:28

I would—I feel comfortable with what staff has written up even after the discussion tonight. Yes.

Aldersperson Kristin Alfheim (District 11) 1:12:34

Which is pretty clear. All right. And from Community And Economic Development, you've been involved in this as well?

Director Kara Homan (Community And Economic Development) 1:12:46

Yes, we have been.

Aldersperson Kristin Alfheim (District 11) 1:12:48

And your thoughts, please.

Director Kara Homan (Community And Economic Development) 1:12:50

I support the recommendation from Director Block as it's written in the memo.

Aldersperson Kristin Alfheim (District 11) 1:12:56

So, I bring—thank you. So, I bring that up because I think that if our goal is to get a different answer, I think that's—we're going to keep on spinning our wheels. I think if the goal of the amendment is to make them come

up with a different answer, we're going to spin our wheels, and I don't support that. I do hear the community, and I think that in our comprehensive planning, we must be aware that the world is changing. I think that is valid from Community And Economic Development and Public Works. But today with this resolution, as well as with an amendment that was just brought up, the answer is still clear from our staff as to what the recommendation is, which is to maintain that truck route, if I understand that correctly.

Aldersperson Katie Van Zeeland (District 5) 1:13:42

Any other members of committee? All right. With that being said, I think that we have gone over and over this. I'm just going to suggest if there is no objection from our committee members that we go ahead and we take a vote on the resolution as is and then if the Alders who represent these areas would like to, you know, put something different together to come back then I think that that would be probably our best plan of action at this point. Alder Meltzer?

Aldersperson Vered Meltzer (District 2) 1:14:18

Thank you. Respectfully, I disagree with my colleague Aldersperson Alfheim. I don't think that we're just spinning our wheels and trying to get staff to come back with another answer. But the recommendation as staff has given it is not answering all of the questions. So, if the answer is going to remain the same, but there is more data, you know, that that's the direction that I'm giving from staff. At what point in our conversation, will we have an opportunity? I guess I've been having a lot of trouble following whether we're amending or whether I'm moving to refer back or what's happening, but I am very interested in taking up the amendment suggested by Aldersperson Del Toro to see if the committee would approve that, so that we could refer this back to staff. I think that the community really wants to continue this discussion with an another round that digs even deeper.

Aldersperson Katie Van Zeeland (District 5) 1:15:19

Nobody from committee has moved to make an amendment.

Aldersperson Vered Meltzer (District 2) 1:15:23

Then I was looking for the opportunity. So, at this point, I move to make the amendment that was described by Aldersperson Del Toro.

Aldersperson William Siebers (District 1) 1:15:33

Second.

Aldersperson Katie Van Zeeland (District 5) 1:15:34

Can we have a second? Any discussion on the amendment? Alder Hartzheim

Aldersperson Sheri Hartzheim (District 13) 1:15:41

Thank you, Chair. If the amendment is asking for more in-depth information, I'd like us to keep in mind that we received a four-page memo detailing what came from staff from their inspection on this issue, all alternatives, etc. We also received a 20-page attachment, which granted one of the pages was the resolution under discussion, but 20-page attachment, which included further detail that shows what staff has already done. I would encourage this committee to defeat this amendment.

Aldersperson Sheri Hartzheim (District 13) 1:16:24

I do not believe that the direction that this amendment would take this situation will be beneficial to anyone. I believe that there's further information to be to be garnered. Yes. But I don't believe that we should be directing staff to do anything that is beyond the four and 20 pages of data that they've come up with and reasons that

they've shown that this is—this route is what is intended to be kept. So again, I would encourage this committee to defeat that amendment. Thank you.

Alderson Katie Van Zeeland (District 5) 1:17:02

Alder Del Toro.

Alderson Israel Del Toro (District 4) 1:17:04

Thank you, Chair. Thank you first to all the staff that has put effort into creating the stated recommendation. But as outlined by this amendment, there are gaps here that must be considered before a final recommendation is reached. Today, given what we know, yeah, maybe it stays a truck route. However, if we gather additional information, provide the best data available possible, including, thank you for pointing out the CEDC involvement in in this, that answer may change in the future. It is very, very possible that that answer changes in the future. And so, I encourage us to gather the best available data, consider public input, consider industrial input, and consider alternative—explore continued exploration of valid alternatives to this route.

Alderson Katie Van Zeeland (District 5) 1:18:00

Any other discussion on the amendment? Director Block.

Director Danielle Block (Department Of Public Works) 1:18:04

I would just ask for clarification on a couple of the items within the amendment and a couple of comments related to the items in the amendment. Tree canopy management and discussion. So, the general terms of tree canopy, the survey that was done, and the existing and proposed conditions are really outside of the discussion of the truck route analysis. Whether the truck route is there or not the proposed width of the roadway would remain the same. We have narrow travel lanes and have to accommodate the bike lanes per the state agreement. So, keeping the roadway width proposed at 32 feet—no widening—that's what it's going to be whether or not there's a truck route here. So, I would need more specifics on what we mean by tree management and how it relates to truck route. Environmental impact. That's a big statement. What specifically within environmental impacts do you want staff to look at?

Alderson Katie Van Zeeland (District 5) 1:19:08

Alder Del Toro.

Alderson Israel Del Toro (District 4) 1:19:11

[Indecipherable] to continue these discussions with staff so we can nail down specific analyses. Of particular concern are particulate matter emissions from existing traffic conditions, as well as heavy metal analysis that are being deposited into the roadways. And finally, the deterioration of habitat and tree which includes the tree trees directly adjacent to the roadway, just as spit balling off the top of my head, but I'd love to continue that discussion with staff.

Alderson Katie Van Zeeland (District 5) 1:19:41

And I would just add that if we're talking about tree canopy management in this it's okay to say what you just said. Alder Alfheim.

Alderson Kristin Alfheim (District 11) 1:19:56

I would love there to be conversations about how to perhaps lower the speed of these trucks. I would love conversations too to make sure that we fill in the manholes so they don't create two-inch bounces as they go over them. There's lots of conversations we can have to make this better. I think that we these are valid

conversations. However, we cannot find ways to not allow truck routes, which is what my opinion—my thought just my opinion is—

Aldersperson Katie Van Zeeland (District 5) 1:20:22

Just a reminder, we are talking about the amendment.

Aldersperson Kristin Alfheim (District 11) 1:20:24

I am talking about the amendment because in the request, what we're saying is, there are many reasons—and I believe there's probably studies that say—we shouldn't be using big trucks in cities. We can find that stat, but we can't—or we are not in a situation, in my opinion, to not be using truck routes. **[Someone, possibly a member of the public, said something off microphone.]** Okay. But that's a different conversation.

Aldersperson Katie Van Zeeland (District 5) 1:20:46

Hey, let's direct—

Aldersperson Kristin Alfheim (District 11) 1:20:48

Apology. I apologize. So, my concern is as a city, I don't believe it's in our best interest to be driving a conversation that says we shouldn't use trucks in the city. And that, in my opinion, is where this conversation is leading. And I'm not sure that that serves the city well to be going that route in today's world.

Aldersperson Katie Van Zeeland (District 5) 1:21:07

Based on my notes, I just want to remind everyone the amendment did include discussion of traffic volume and speed reduction. So, I don't see that as making a suggestion either way. That's what I had written in my notes as far as the amendment. Is that correct with your amendment, Alder Meltzer? Okay. Any other discussion on the amendment? All right, we will vote with the amendment. All those in favor say aye. Aye. Any opposed?

Aldersperson Chad Doran (District 15) 1:21:41

Nay.

Aldersperson Katie Van Zeeland (District 5) 1:21:42

That motion passes three - two. Now on the item as amended. Any other discussion? Alder Doran.

Aldersperson Chad Doran (District 15) 1:21:52

I'm still uncomfortable that we're asking staff to do this additional work without any sort of direction as far as how much we're—how much more we're willing to spend to get the same answer that we've already gotten. Staff has been asked and said that they are confident in their recommendation that the truck route will stay. So, I won't support this resolution. But I think it at least deserves to ask the question of staff, and I hate putting staff on the spot. But based on what you've heard in this amendment, do you have any sense of what that cost might be to do that additional work? Just so we have a sense.

Aldersperson Katie Van Zeeland (District 5) 1:22:31

Director Block? I'm sorry? Do you have the same? Okay.

Eric Lom (City Traffic Engineer) 1:22:38

Well, I think before I would venture to come up with a cost, I think we would be looking for more clarification on a couple of the items. For instance, in my notes—I may have not gotten this exactly right—one of the criteria was traffic volume analysis. We have studied the volumes out there. That's in the report. I'm not sure. I guess we'd be looking for some clarification on what that means.

Aldersperson Chad Doran (District 15) 1:23:09

I guess, and that, I mean, sort of follows up on what I was saying before that the work we have—that staff has done has answered the questions that were have been asked here. And I just don't know what we're sending this back to them for just to take up more time. The discussion that's being, I think, requested here is focused on one street, and as Alder Alfheim said, this is a bigger city-wide problem that we can't just look at one street in a vacuum, that perhaps what I think maybe some of our colleagues are looking for is that bigger discussion, but that bigger discussion can't be focused on one street. So, I just I don't I don't support moving forward with this even as amended.

Aldersperson Katie Van Zeeland (District 5) 1:23:50

Thank you. I just see this as we had a resolution that said staff should do some exploring. And now I see a resolution that staff will get some very specific data with the help of the alders to continue this conversation. Any other discussion? All right, on the item as amended. All those in favor say aye. Aye. Those opposed? That motion passes three two.