

Item 23-1405: Resolution #12-R-23 Closure of the Whitman Yard Waste Site

Municipal Services Committee

Mon, Jan 08, 2024 4:30PM

Aldersperson Katie Van Zeeland (District 5) 01:01

We have no public hearings or appearances this evening. We'll start with action item 23-1405 the resolution 12-R-23 for the closure of the Whitman yard waste site. I can start with a motion.

Aldersperson Chad Doran (District 15) 01:19

Move to approve.

Aldersperson Katie Van Zeeland (District 5) 01:20

We have a motion to approve. Do we have a second? Okay, well, that motion would fail. Why don't we just start with some discussion? I want to thank everyone for—oh, nope. This isn't the parking study. This is Whitman. Never mind. So, staff spent some time putting together a lot of information on this item. So, thank you. If we could start with the author of the resolution, if you'd like to talk, Alder Doran.

Aldersperson Chad Doran (District 15) 01:54

I'll just defer to staff, I guess, at this point, let them sort of explain the compromise that they are bringing forward here.

Aldersperson Katie Van Zeeland (District 5) 02:02

Okay, Director Block.

Director Danielle Block (Department Of Public Works) 02:05

Director 2. Thank you, Chair. Just to summarize, last time this came before committee, we basically fielded the committee and asked for questions, right? And so, the first section of the memo lays out what exists today in terms of curbside collection and what is offered at each one of the yard waste sites followed up with the series of questions that we heard from the committee and then staff responses below. So, questions in bold; staff responses are below.

Director Danielle Block (Department Of Public Works) 02:34

Following that are different exhibits related to portions of the memo. Operations of the resource center, so if there's questions on that, we'll refer there. The MOU with Grand Chute was included. And then there was kind of a front and back site layout of each one of the sites. And then the community comparison was another attachment. So, depending on where our questions take us, we'll try to refer to, you know, each exhibit.

Director Danielle Block (Department Of Public Works) 03:05

And you are correct. I think it was mentioned at the end of the memo. Staff had summarized a compromise, if you will, or an alternation of days of service. So as staff looked at this layout, we would recommend this change. This actually really serves DPW well, and it provides consistent service to the residents and is cost neutral. So, if there's something to highlight within the memo, I think it's that last answer on the bullet point. But of course, questions we can we can help field. Deputy Director Loper did a great amount of work on this and is truly the expert in this area and helped guide me through this. So, he's here tonight as well to help.

Alderman Katie Van Zeeland (District 5) 03:58

Well, I'll just start by saying that my biggest concern here is while the closure of the site is said to save \$50,000, the town public works director from Grand Chute feels that they'll anticipate the need to revisit the MOU which—Director Block could you give us the exact number that we are earning through that contract? The MOU here says \$55,000 in 2019 with a 3% increase thereafter. I believe that's 3% increase per year. Is that correct?

Director Danielle Block (Department Of Public Works) 04:39

Correct. I'm calculating it as \$63,760 for 2023.

Alderman Katie Van Zeeland (District 5) 04:46

Okay, so if they were to withdraw from this agreement, I guess I don't see any savings, and I don't know how it makes sense to make any changes to the services. I also did run past the alternating locations with some of my, my constituents who take the best care of their yards we'll say, and none of them were very excited about having to get across town to Whitman versus Glendale on our side of town. Anybody else have questions or information to add? Alder Alfheim?

Alderman Kristin Alfheim (District 11) 05:28

Just a question on that same vein. In the summary, it was referred to as a "cost neutral" to make the change, and the purpose of this conversation I believe, from the author was to be a tax saving. Can you just validate based on Alderman van Zeeland, that the cost neutral did or did not include the potential loss of revenue from Grand Chute?

Director Danielle Block (Department Of Public Works) 05:54

Did not.

Alderman Kristin Alfheim (District 11) 05:55

It did not.

Director Danielle Block (Department Of Public Works) 05:56

We assume since there's still two sites available, that things would remain status quo with the MOU with the town.

Alderman Kristin Alfheim (District 11) 06:05

If I may follow?

Alderman Katie Van Zeeland (District 5) 06:05

Yes.

Alderman Kristin Alfheim (District 11) 06:07

But somewhere in there, didn't it also say they would want to review that? So, is there any way that we could confirm that before making the decision?

Director Danielle Block (Department Of Public Works) 06:18

I could certainly work with their public works director. I think if there was closure of the site—of a site is what she had indicated as wanting to renegotiate. I think the MOU just calls out "access to each site". It doesn't get specific on days or times. But of course, we would want to have a follow up conversation with the town following this committee meeting.

Alderson Kristin Alfheim (District 11) 06:45

And—

Alderson Katie Van Zeeland (District 5) 06:46

Go ahead.

Alderson Kristin Alfheim (District 11) 06:46

And just to be clear, so under the under that bullet point in the winter hours, Thanksgiving through March, Whitman, for all intent and purposes, is closed. So, my concern is—and I love what you've done here to try and make this work. But my concern is we are removing one of these sites for an entire season, and will that cause Grand Chute...?

Alderson Katie Van Zeeland (District 5) 07:09

And I would just add that—

Alderson Kristin Alfheim (District 11) 07:10

It already was? I'm sorry. Go ahead.

Director Danielle Block (Department Of Public Works) 07:12

Correct. It's already closed in the winter.

Alderson Kristin Alfheim (District 11) 07:14

Okay, that's good to know.

Director Danielle Block (Department Of Public Works) 07:15

Page one—I'm sorry about that—highlights the existing hours for Glendale and Whitman right on that first page. Already closed in the winter.

Alderson Kristin Alfheim (District 11) 07:23

Okay.

Alderson Katie Van Zeeland (District 5) 07:24

My concern also, just to add to that, would be that if we start telling Grand Chute to haul their items to Glendale, why wouldn't they just continue a couple blocks down the road to the landfill itself? You know, this is allowing us to—the phrase being used here is "duplication of services". And yes, it's a duplication of services. It's a duplication of services that our constituents are used to using. I still think that maybe there's an option, because Glendale is our largest site, to look into consolidating some options, but I just don't see how closing it benefits anyone. Alder Hartzheim.

Alderson Sheri Hartzheim (District 13) 08:13

Thank you, chair. I don't know where I got this bit of information. But I believe that there were some advantages to the city closing this site as well, including some storage space that we'd be able to use etc. So, when this thing comes across our desks and says it's cost neutral, are those things taken into account as well? And I'm concerned that we're not taking all the pieces of the puzzle—and this is not an offense to staff at all. I just am concerned that we're not taking all the pieces of the puzzle into effect when we're looking at the balance of this.

Alderman Katie Van Zeeland (District 5) 08:46

Yes. I actually asked Director Block to go through this with me also. Because I said it appears here as if you know you're hoping to use this area for equipment storage, etc.—and Director Block, I'll have you follow up—but from what I understood, that site is being used for dropping snow and things, and really the ability to use that location—that was not the first—that was not staff's recommendation, their first recommendation, that they would want to store equipment there, but in instead it was an answer to "What if this gets closed and we want to look at selling that parcel of land?" Director Block, could you maybe clarify

[Director Block responded, but her words were off microphone.]

Deputy Director of Operations Nathan Loper (Public Works) 09:59

Sure. So, you know, in the winter, if we're in a pinch, we might store some snow there now. During leaf collection currently, if we're in a pinch, we might drop a couple of loads of leaves there from our trucks. But typically, we stay out of there because we need the space for our customers to be able to bring in materials. If we do use it for hauling leaves or snow, we try to get those materials out of there as soon as possible. If the site was closed, then we would use that for material storage. We probably wouldn't store equipment there, but it would be a material storage location. We could let snow sit there, melt in the spring, summer, and we'd haul, likely haul some leaves there, until we get a mulched up in the fall.

Deputy Director of Operations Nathan Loper (Public Works) 10:48

And just to point out, so the recommendation for the summer winter hours. The summer hours, the days of the week, nothing would change. Glendale is currently open Friday, Saturday, Sunday, Monday, so we left that alone. Whitman's currently open four days a week. We've kept it open four days a week, but we do hear at times that folks would like to bring in stuff on Tuesday, Wednesday, and Thursday, and they can't do that anywhere now. So that's just where that came from.

Deputy Director of Operations Nathan Loper (Public Works) 11:15

And then in the winter, we'd done some studies. We get 10 to 15 customers in at Glendale on the weekends in the winter, hardly pays to keep that site open in our opinion. We'd rather have that employee be plowing snow or something. So, if we could close that on the weekend and be open during the week, seems to be what most communities are doing, and it feels to us like it'd be a better use of our resources, plowing snow doing things like that then seeing one customer an hour coming through. And that was prior to the change that was approved by you guys to eliminate garbage. We don't expect much traffic coming through in the winter at all to drop off yard waste. Christmas trees maybe, but not a lot of folks doing yard work in the winter.

Alderman Katie Van Zeeland (District 5) 12:09

Alder Meltzer.

Alderman Vered Meltzer (District 2) 12:11

Thank you. I definitely appreciate that this compromise schedule here does open up Tuesday, Wednesday drop off options. I think that that's an improvement over the services we're currently offering. I guess my biggest concern about all this, though, is would—how this would affect the Grand Chute contract. And I really wouldn't feel comfortable taking a vote on this tonight without having more information on that.

Alderman Katie Van Zeeland (District 5) 12:49

Alder Alfheim?

Alderson Kristin Alfheim (District 11) 12:51

I would love to hear from the author a little bit, because if I understand correctly, the point of this was to be a cost savings change. And I don't see that that's happening. Even though there are some pluses that I think came out of the recommendation that we see, making the changes keeping it open, is cost neutral. I guess I really would like to hear from what the author says, because this is not a cost savings thing—the way that we've got it proposed.

Alderson Katie Van Zeeland (District 5) 13:27

Alder Doran, would you like to address?

Alderson Chad Doran (District 15) 13:29

Sure.

Alderson Katie Van Zeeland (District 5) 13:30

Alder Alfheim?

Alderson Chad Doran (District 15) 13:30

I think when we—when I first had discussions with staff, we sort of—and Director Block can correct me if I'm wrong—but I think the \$50,000 number was sort of the baseline that we sort of anticipated savings by closing the Whitman site. Part of the discussion also surrounded the fact that had if the site was closed to our constituents and was available just for use for DPW, there could be additional cost savings of trucks not having to drive all the way over to Glendale. So, there could be some fuel savings, some time savings, lots of other additional kind of ways that we could recoup some additional savings through this change. Also being able to then potentially use that site in the future for storage of equipment, which is more of a long-range plan. But I think as we, most of us know, the current site isn't big enough to store all of our equipment inside, and having the option of using that site to potentially—that the city already owns—to potentially build some sort of storage for equipment if we ever felt the need, would be another advantage to having that site not being open to the public.

Alderson Chad Doran (District 15) 14:11

At the time when we, I think, first discussed this, we didn't necessarily know what Grand Chute would want to do with the contract. But also, then just I guess a question since you have had some conversation with them. You've said that they might want to renegotiate if we close the Whitman site to Grand Chute residents. Did you get a sense if that means that they would want to renegotiate for a lower fee to be able to use the Glendale site? Or would they just not use our facilities at all and not reimburse the city anything? Or do you not have that answer at this point?

Alderson Katie Van Zeeland (District 5) 15:15

Just to clarify, what I read here says "the town public works director has indicated in writing that a closure of the Whitman yard waste site would have an impact to their operations and community, and they would anticipate the need to revisit the MOU should the resolution move forward." And then the follow up question would be was there any other discussion as far as renegotiating the contract? And any details like that? Director Block.

Director Danielle Block (Department Of Public Works) 15:44

Thank you, Chair. It was a brief discussion.

Alderson Katie Van Zeeland (District 5) 15:48

Hold on, are you three or two? Two sorry about that?

Director Danielle Block (Department Of Public Works) 15:51

That's okay. Thanks, chair. It was a brief discussion. But the way I would interpret it is if there was a reduction in the level of service or services that we originally agreed to within the MOU, I would assume they would be negotiating for some type of reduction in in payment. And that is just my take on the conversation. But correct, in writing, it just said, renegotiate.

Alderson Chad Doran (District 15) 16:16

So, reduction doesn't necessarily mean we're going to lose all of the revenue. It may mean that we may still collect some of the use of Glendale site. So, I guess, if a big part of the reason that we had this initial discussion in closing this was to find some cost savings. If we don't have an answer from Grand Chute yet and my colleagues feel that we need to hear from them to find out what that might be, I'm fine if we want to give staff time to try and address that further and see what that what that might be.

Alderson Katie Van Zeeland (District 5) 16:49

I just don't think that the Town of Grand Chute is going to renegotiate when we already have a contract with them. I don't see the advantage of them doing so. It feels to me like this is already a very strong response. You know, municipalities don't speak this way in writing to one another very often, so I don't see how, say, holding this—I don't see how that would change the answer that we have. I don't know if maybe—Attorney Behrens, are you involved in those kinds of discussions?

Attorney Christopher Behrens 17:36

I can be if it's necessary. I guess if the chair would indulge me, I might suggest a path forward for you.

Alderson Katie Van Zeeland (District 5) 17:45

Yes, please.

Attorney Christopher Behrens 17:46

At this point, and there's a couple different approaches they can take. I'm making an assumption based on the motion that was made and there was no second earlier that this body may be inclined to recommend denial of the resolution. And you could take that path with the understanding that the director get back in touch with Grand Chute regarding the proposed changes to the policy to make sure Grand Chute would be comfortable with those and that wouldn't affect the existing agreement. And if that's the case, then bring that back as a separate action item to amend the policy with those recommended changes. The alternative would be to approve those changes tonight by substitution, but the risk of that is this uncertainty of where Grand Chute is for sure with it so that may not be the best approach. Just some suggestions for the—

Alderson Katie Van Zeeland (District 5) 17:51

I think that we're all as a committee trying to take this extremely seriously in going through all of this information. But I think without having without having anything specific from Grand Chute I—it just behooves me not to move forward. Alder Hartzheim, I saw your hand.

Alderson Sheri Hartzheim (District 13) 19:04

Thank you, chair. What makes me uncomfortable is not having all the information to make an informed decision. I think that's unwise of us. I would like to know what we would be able to negotiate with Grand Chute so that we have a dollars for dollars knowledge of what's going to happen, and not just dollars, but also feelings of the constituents who are affected.

Alderman Sheri Hartzheim (District 13) 19:28

It concerns me—I'm glad that Appleton is willing to work with neighboring municipalities. It concerns me, though, that we're deferring to Grand Chute to make a decision that's important to Appleton, and I would like us to have all the information before we are able to say, "Nope, let's not do it," or "Yes, let's do it." So, I would be very interested in knowing more rather than outright denying this at this point. I don't know that we need to know book loads more, but it would certainly behoove us to ask that that Director of Public Works at Grand Chute, "If we close Whitman, what would you offer? Or what could we—what could we arrange?" That should be a simple answer that will help us to make a more cogent decision. Thank you.

Alderman Katie Van Zeeland (District 5) 20:13

And if I heard Alder—or I'm sorry, Attorney Behrens correctly, one of the options would be that if we did deny this this evening, that we could amend the policy at a later date. That was what I heard. Attorney Behrens, is that correct?

Attorney Christopher Behrens 20:19

That's what I said.

Alderman Katie Van Zeeland (District 5) 20:29

Okay. Thank you. Anyone? Alder Doran first.

Alderman Chad Doran (District 15) 20:34

I'll just remind my colleagues that the resolution calls for this change to take effect next year, following the budget process, and if I recall correctly, the contract that we have with Grand Chute is renewed at the beginning of each year. Correct, Director Block?

Alderman Katie Van Zeeland (District 5) 20:50

Director Block on here it just says "prior to budget adoption".

Director Danielle Block (Department Of Public Works) 20:56

That it may be terminated. Otherwise, the assumption is it's intact.

Alderman Chad Doran (District 15) 21:01

So, we could we could hold the resolution, just the same, allow for discussion with Grand Chute, as long as we would take it up before budget adoption, and still get information that we're perhaps seeking from Grand Chute if they would engage in discussion looking forward to next year, not—we're not looking to change the policy this year. We're not looking to close Whitman during this 2024 budget. We're looking at this change for 2025. So that would give us time. And I guess, I'd make the motion if you wanted to specify how much time you think that would need.

Alderman Katie Van Zeeland (District 5) 21:38

Can I just clarify what the question was Alder Doran? What was the question specifically to Director Block. Time for holding the item?

Alderman Chad Doran (District 15) 21:49

Just time for having discussion with Grand Chute.

Director Danielle Block (Department Of Public Works) 21:50

The way I see it with approaching Grand Chute, there's almost two options—right?—to propose to them. One would be the closure, which was specified in the resolution. And one would be kind of that compromise situation, if they—how they would view that, let's put it that way. Two sites still remain open. If anything, there's an increase in allowing Whitman users the Tuesday, Wednesday, Thursday option which is a good thing. So, I would anticipate with the latter option that there wouldn't be a change to the MOU. If anything, we're providing ample opportunity at both sites, which is what it says in the MOU. It just says "two sites". So really, it's the question of closure. And I could from that pass their director. And it's really dependent on how far—you know, how much they want to give me in terms of discussion. A month or two? To work with their administrator, I'm sure, and gather some feedback.

Aldersperson Katie Van Zeeland (District 5) 22:59

Does that answer your question, Alder Doran?

Aldersperson Chad Doran (District 15) 23:02

Alright, I'll make a motion just to hold for a month then just to see where it come—where it where it's at. We could bring it back, and you could fill us in, I guess, on how the discussions have gone at that point.

Aldersperson Katie Van Zeeland (District 5) 23:15

We have a motion to hold. Is there a second?

Aldersperson Kristin Alfheim (District 11) 23:18

I'll second.

Aldersperson Katie Van Zeeland (District 5) 23:23

My feeling about this is this resolution is in regard to the closure of the site. And when I look at what the alternative option would be, that is not closure. That is providing two sites just at different times. My concern is that, again, with the location of the Whitman site is really what Grant Chute would have an issue with being that they are bordering that. But again, it's hard to know. And that's why I just think that we could do away with this resolution, and we could—we could, going forward, take a look at this policy closer. I think it's a good thing to do. I think we should be looking to see if we can—if in fact staff prefers this alternate schedule, that we make sure that it is an option with Grand Chute and we could have that come back as a policy. I'm sorry, I didn't see who was first but I'm gonna start with Alder Alfheim.

Aldersperson Kristin Alfheim (District 11) 24:27

Thank you, Chair. I understand your point. I guess that my recommendation for hold is we shouldn't have to guess about anything. We don't have to guess. We're not in a rush. If we can get some a couple of simple answers back. We do have two options on the table. One close one alter. And if Director feels she can get answers on that, then I would rather us have a conversation without any guesswork. We know the answer. The bottom line is the resolution was an attempt to reduce costs at what would have been a loss to the community in terms of service. And so far, what we're seeing from staff is that that may not be the best option.

Aldersperson Kristin Alfheim (District 11) 25:12

The—to your point that the resolution is about closing it or not, I wish that we would do this more often. I wish that we would come back with an option that says "Here, we know what you're trying to do, but here might be a better version of it." I like that we're doing this. So just because it's not listed in the resolution as such, this is the way we should be finding that compromise, and if we can actually add value as opposed to take away. We may or may not be able to save money. Let's find out for sure, by talking to Grand Chute. Once we have that answer,

then if we can augment the system not cause any more cost, but actually improve service, I think that's a win/win. And it came from this resolution, which therefore gives it some merit. So, I would hope that we would hold it and finish the conversation with an outcome of save or not save and keep with an alternate or not. I think that's civilized conversation to have. And it sounds like it'd be beneficial for the community. Thank you.

Aldersperson Katie Van Zeeland (District 5) 26:13

Alder Hartzheim.

Aldersperson Sheri Hartzheim (District 13) 26:16

Thank you, Chair. I don't believe I could have said that any better than Alder Alfheim, except to remind folks what happens when we make assumptions. Thanks.

Aldersperson Katie Van Zeeland (District 5) 26:29

There were a couple things that Alder Alfheim referred to in the resolution, you know about saving money. And just to clarify, if nothing happened with the Grand Chute contract at all, and we went to it—so it stays the same, it stays intact, and we made the change that's listed on the last page with the alternate days. That is a cost—that's cost neutral, not taking into account the Grand Chute contract. Correct?

Director Danielle Block (Department Of Public Works) 27:02

Correct, because that assumption—but a discussion is needed. But that assumption is, sorry, two sites remain open. And that is what the MOU says. And if anything, the case could be made that you're giving more opportunity or on different days for Grand Chute residents to use both sites. They're really open to both of the residents.

Aldersperson Katie Van Zeeland (District 5) 27:24

And I think that's where I have the concern is that we have a resolution in front of us that we aren't really considering the closure, because we're not going to be threatening Grand Chute. We're not telling them, "Hey, this is hanging out over here. What do you want to do?" But if we, if we look at cost savings, which is the key as Alder Doran said, we're not saving anything by going to the alternate schedule anyway. Just check over here quick. Okay. Alder Hartzheim.

Aldersperson Sheri Hartzheim (District 13) 27:57

Thank you, Chair, I understand what you're trying to say I believe, but I don't think it's threatening to Grand Chute to ask them a legitimate question. "If we were to close this site, what would it do?" That is an answer that we should get? I think that that is a fair answer. And that still follows the spirit of the resolution. We may not have to use that piece of information, but we still need to find that piece of information out. Thank you.

Aldersperson Katie Van Zeeland (District 5) 28:21

I just worry about having a negotiation on a contract that's already settled. You know, we have a settled contract with them. Asking them what they want to do, well, that gives them the opportunity to make, you know, to maybe put forth some research that they haven't in the past where we might now be at a position where we could lose that funding, even with the changes that we would make. Did I see a hand over here? Alder Siebers.

Aldersperson William Siebers (District 1) 28:55

Thank you. I'm gonna change the topic a little bit. I don't want to hear Grand Chute anymore.

Aldersperson Katie Van Zeeland (District 5) 29:03

No offense to Grand Chute.

Aldersperson Katie Van Zeeland (District 5) 29:04

Yeah, I agree. If my if my residents were more open to using the Whitman site, as opposed to the Glendale site, I think I could see a path forward. But the reaction has been very strong for my constituents that they want to have access to the Glendale site and that they don't want to have to drive to Whitman from our side of town through the downtown. Any other...? Alder Meltzer.

Aldersperson William Siebers (District 1) 29:04

I asked the question of staff, and I asked why did we have the Whitman site to begin with? And the reason why I asked the question is because a philosopher by the name of Chesterton said "Do not remove a fence until you know why it was put up in the first place." And I think a core component of making good sound decisions is understanding the rationale behind previous decisions. Going way back when, I don't know where Grand Chute was or where it was situated, but I think the main reason we had the Whitman site was to service our residents, to service Appleton. And I keep hearing Grand Chute Grand Chute. And so, we want to close the site to save money at the expense of our citizens. I have a hard time voting for something like that. Thank you.

Aldersperson Vered Meltzer (District 2) 30:31

So, I actually haven't had a chance to field this alternative days of service to any of my constituents. I've just gotten feedback that they are not in favor of us closing a site, and they're concerned about how an increase in people all—everybody going to Glendale, instead of dividing between the two sites, might cause congestion and might, you know, interfere with their ability to use the site in a timely fashion. So, at this point, as far as the alternate days of service, I can, I would feel much more comfortable actually having a chance to reach out to the community. So, in that regard, I am in favor of holding this because it does give me a chance to get that word out.

Aldersperson Katie Van Zeeland (District 5) 31:20

Yeah, I think that holding seems to be the better option at this point. However, I feel uncomfortable basing the hold on the discussion with Grand Chute since we don't know if they're they intend to engage in any negotiation. So just to clarify, again, Director Block, what was the amount of time that you thought would be helpful to hold this item?

Aldersperson Vered Meltzer (District 2) 31:20

And I think that, you know, this is something that that people do feel very strongly about. But we don't have any of those people here in our chambers at committee, and we didn't when it had gone to Council the last time either. So, I do think that there's a way in which whatever action might be taken, as opposed to taking no action, per se, would be seen as something that came out of the blue and was a surprise to many members of our community. So, I would be comfortable voting this down. I would be comfortable holding it for a continued discussion. But I feel that if we were to vote in favor, even with a substitution for the alternating days of service, I still think it's something that that people would feel that they had not had a chance to participate in the public discussion about.

Director Danielle Block (Department Of Public Works) 32:41

I said one month. I believe that the first committee meeting in February is February 12 just based on the way the committee Council schedule these out. So that's a month in a few days.

Aldersperson Katie Van Zeeland (District 5) 32:54

Any other discussion or questions on the hold? Yes, Alder Alfheim.

Aldersperson Kristin Alfheim (District 11) 33:00

Thank you, Chair. I appreciate the allowing the hold. Again, what I like about this is I think we've actually found a way to free up some man hours of staff to do things with a higher priority, which in a sense, is cost saving, if you look at it, and we found a way to provide more opportunity for our community and the constituents. And it's not costing us any more money. So, whether we look at this as it's a continuing conversation of the same resolution with a potential really good amendment, I—that's the way that I look at it. And I think it's valid to have the full conversation. And again, our goal is to do good. And I think that this conversation is leading to some. So, let's—I hope that we can hold, get some answers. And we're not playing chicken. I mean, we're literally saying, "Here's the deal, things are happening in our communities." I don't think that we're putting ourselves in a negative conversation to say, "Hey, we may be losing this, we want to talk about it." This is just conversation, and we redo a contract every year. So, it's not a super-secret once in a decade opportunity. So, I hope that we can hold this and continue the conversation.

Aldersperson Katie Van Zeeland (District 5) 34:10

Alder Doran.

Aldersperson Chad Doran (District 15) 34:13

I just wanted to make a couple more points just so we're all keeping in perspective here. I know staff had mentioned the contract is \$63,000, right? With Grand Chute? So, as we—if we hold this and give staff time to go discuss, let's not tell the community "Well, the tradeoff is we could we could say \$50,000 but lose \$63,000." We don't know that answer from Grand Chute yet. They—if we just allow them to have discussion, there may there may still be some willingness in the next contract here to utilize the Glendale site for some sort of fee. So, we may still end up with some savings in terms of actual dollars saved, I guess, out of that trade off. But one of the other things that staff and I discussed when we talked about this was that we could potentially by closing this, repurpose those employees who man the site year round for other work, which is another form of savings and other ways that we can accomplish—DPW can accomplish more work that needs to be done that there isn't currently being done by being able to utilize those staff in another way rather than for the minimal amount of visitors that come to the to the Whitman yard waste site. So, there's more to this than just the dollar savings that we're talking about. So just want everyone to be able to keep that in perspective as we move forward.

Aldersperson Katie Van Zeeland (District 5) 35:42

Any other questions, discussion? Do we need to clarify that the motion to hold is for February 12th? I don't recall that being part of the...?

Attorney Christopher Behrens 35:57

The motion was made to hold it for approximately one month. I clarified in the notes that if it passes, it would be until February 12, or the next scheduled meeting thereafter, just in case for some reason the meeting would get canceled.

Aldersperson Katie Van Zeeland (District 5) 36:10

Okay, great. Thank you. So, if I'm hearing none, with that, we will vote on holding this item for a month or so. Most likely the meeting on February 12. All those in favor say aye. Aye. Any opposed?

Aldersperson William Siebers (District 1) 36:25

Nay.

Aldersperson Katie Van Zeeland (District 5) 36:26

That motion passes four one. Thank you.