



CITY OF WAUWATOSA
7725 WEST NORTH AVENUE
WAUWATOSA, WI 53213
Telephone: (414) 479-8917
Fax: (414) 479-8989

**COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT COMMITTEE MEETING
Tuesday, February 13, 2007**

PRESENT: Alds. Birschel, Didier, Donegan, Herzog, Meaux (8:16 p.m.), Minear, Treis -8

EXCUSED: Ald. Krill

ALSO N. Welch, Community Development Dir.; A. Kesner, City Atty.; Chief D. Redman, Fire Dept.;
PRESENT J. Archambo, City Admin.

Ald. Treis as Chair called the meeting to order at 8:05 p.m. -6

Fire Department Facility Study: Proposed RFP

Ms. Welch reported that the committee has received two RFP drafts, one requesting proposals from consultants to prepare more detailed studies on design options and costs for the Blanchard Street and Underwood Avenue sites, and one requesting proposals from developers on purchasing and developing those sites. She called attention to an important phrase in the developer RFP: "Proposals may incorporate additional private land into the proposal if necessary to enhance the overall project design; however, the City will not participate in any acquisition of private land for development purposes."

Citing comments by Chief Redman in a January 25th Wauwatosa News Times article, Ald. Didier raised a question of the need to relocate fire station #2, 4187 N. Mayfair Road, in view of anticipated future development in the Burleigh Street area. If there is a need to move that station within five years, she felt that the committee should investigate the possibility of locating administrative and maintenance facilities at a relocated station #2, thereby downsizing station #, before getting into an RFP. It would not change the need to replace station #1, but there are not as many options with land within the Village as there may be for station #2. Although station #2 doesn't have the immediate needs of station #1, the committee should consider moving up the replacement timeline, potentially building it much sooner and temporarily relocating administrative and maintenance functions in the interim.

Ms. Welch noted that the facility study includes recommendations on updates at station #2 to accommodate future equipment. Given that cost and recognition that its location is farther north than would be preferable, she agreed that further investigation would be warranted. One developer interested in the Burleigh corridor, in fact, suggested locating a fire station on a portion of land there in return for certain TIF support. Whether station #1 could have a smaller footprint merits discussion and might be an offshoot to a consultant's work.

Ald. Birschel noted the presence of representatives of St. Matthew's Church, whose parking lot on Underwood Avenue has been discussed in connection with land that might be needed for station #1. The Chair ruled it inappropriate to comment on acquisition or use of eminent domain at this time.

Chief Redman explained that a station #2 option wasn't introduced with the original considerations because there is not a structural and mechanical demand other than the single bay door height. When relocation of administrative

functions to station #2 has been raised, he has cautioned against it because he didn't see the station serving for a long period of time at its present location. Although the 1993 Almont study on fire service stated that the station would be better located near Burleigh and Mayfair Road, relocation wouldn't be justified financially just to improve response times. Detailed analysis indicates that a better location would improve response time for about 1,700 responses from station #2 and lengthen response time for about 700. Projecting growth in the number of responses based on development moving forward right now indicates improved response time for about 13% of vehicle responses, which Chief Redman termed a marginal improvement. A \$15-16 million investment would be needed to replace both stations #1 and #2 instead of the \$10-11 million needed for just station #1, which would then become a \$4-5 million project on a smaller footprint.

The Chief said he would not envision saying in the future that it is imperative to relocate station #2. Structurally, the station serves the city's needs but is slightly improperly located. Relocation might be a viable option if the desire is to both improve service and offset some of the impacts of a new station #1. He noted that the News Times article was in response to the question of whether the department could handle the demands of expected development in the Burleigh area, the simple answer to which is yes. Asked if his evaluation would change with maximum development in the Burleigh area, he said that the question of better service might arise depending on the density of the development. If demand grows, the cost of relocating the station might be justified. Likewise, when the station is 75-80 years old or structurally and mechanically inefficient, building a new station at a better location would probably be recommended. The 1950s-era building was acquired from the volunteer department when that area was incorporated into the city in about 1955. An addition was built in the 1980s.

Ald. Donegan advocated a quick evaluation of building the maintenance and administration facilities at a new station #2. He felt the city could acquire land in the Burleigh area for a lot less than in the Village and would be creating more revenue opportunities in the Village space opened by such a move. Ald. Herzog disagreed with the assumption that the Burleigh area would be less costly and advocated proceeding with the RFP process while investigating the questions raised. Until the Burleigh triangle is developed, we may not really know definitively whether station #2 needs to be relocated, he said, but we can't wait that long to act on station #1. The proposed bay improvements are relatively cheap and would provide another 15 years of life. Ald. Meaux agreed with moving forward with the RFPs, perhaps adding a request for responses that exclude the administrative and maintenance functions. Ald. Didier commented on the need to be forward thinking and explore possible economies of scale.

Chief Redman said that adding a new bay on the north side of station #2 would cost around \$600,000, a fraction of the cost of relocating. He said that the real pressure to do something with station #2 because of its location is probably farther out than five years, more likely in the 10-15 year range. He provided a copy of his response to questions from the News Times reporter. He identified location parameters as within three blocks of Mayfair and Burleigh and no farther west than 112th Street. They do not need prime street frontage but need to be reasonably located to travel in all directions. He confirmed that station #1's footprint would become smaller with the removal of one response bay, a maintenance bay, and reduced parking, but he cautioned that a single floor with little change in the footprint might be seen by consultants as a better design.

Becky Rudella, 1531 Underwood Avenue, reminded the committee of earlier strong comments by fire department staff about keeping administration and maintenance at station #1.

Moved by Ald. Didier, seconded by Ald. Meaux to hold this matter for one month, requesting the Community Development Director to look at the various elements discussed tonight –

Discussion of direction to be given to staff ensued. Ald. Herzog felt the committee needs to be specific on the questions to be answered. Ms. Welch indicated that she would be able to come up with projections for growth and can look at available land and its assessed value, but issues related to fire station design might be difficult to address. She will use the Zimmerman study's square footage and approximate size as guidelines.

Ald. Donegan indicated that he would like information on the potential cost of building two fire stations and projections of development opportunities for both areas. Potential sites would not necessarily need to be identified unless something jumps out as a realistic possibility. Staff should not be asked to do what was requested of Zimmerman Design. Chief Redman could look at the 1993 study to determine if anything has changed since then and perhaps be a little more definitive in projecting when response time will become a significant issue and under what conditions and when relocation would be cost justified. He would also like an evaluation of the physical condition of station #2, including how long it will last absent significant renovation. With construction costs likely being very comparable, everything else comes to land values of a Village site versus Burleigh area, especially if there is a good location not on Mayfair Road. Can we identify a parcel that may be more available or more accessible than what we are working with in the Village?

Vote on the motion, Ayes: 6; Noes: 1 (Treis)

Ald. Donegan commented on the committee's process thus far and asked the City Administrator to become more involved and assertive in guiding deliberations.

(The committee recessed at 9:20 p.m. and reconvened at 9:28 p.m.)

Removal of Village Fountain

Referred by the Board of Public Works, Mr. Kappel reported on a request by the Village Business Improvement District (BID) to remove the Root Commons fountain from the area immediately west of Drew's at Wauwatosa and Harwood Avenues. In connection with a preliminary 2004 plan for renovating the Root Commons area, it was agreed that city crews would demolish the fountain pending Common Council approval of an overall plan. The plan that was underway at that time was never approved, but the Village BID is in the process of developing a new plan that they plan to present in a month or two. City crews could be assigned to do the work only until about the end of March; after that, the BID would be responsible for demolition.

Mr. Kappel reported that the BID's original request was for removal of both the fountain and the cement wall in the area. Due to an 1897 water main beneath the wall, they have been told that the wall has to remain and they will need to design around it. The fountain is somewhat in disrepair and should be removed. In the interim, the area would probably be sodded or seeded so that it would at least be grassy for the summer. Ald. Meaux asked about removal of defective brick pavers as part of this demolition. Mr. Kappel noted that the brick pavers eventually will all be removed but said he will look into their immediate condition from a safety standpoint.

Rich Conley, 18650 Corporate Drive, Brookfield, chair of the BID's Root Commons committee, said they will be looking at a final preliminary plan this week and also plan to meet with Mr. Kappel. Contingent upon comments, there may be another revision that would be taken to the BID board in March and then move on to the public process.

Moved by Ald. Herzog, seconded by Ald. Birschel to recommend to Council approval of demolition of the Root Commons fountain by city crews. Ayes: 7

Public Works Site – Proposed Purchase and Sale Agreement with Cobalt Partners

Mr. Kesner reported on a proposed purchase and sale agreement that results from the Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) that the city entered into with Cobalt Partners for the public works site south of Walnut Road. The agreement provides for the sale of the parcel under certain conditions including significant contingencies that would be in place prior to completion of the purchase. Appraisals would be submitted by each party and, if acceptable, would be averaged; otherwise, a third-party appraisal would be done. A requirement for earnest money is included, and a letter of interest from the potential end user is required. Cobalt's development plans would need to be finalized through a development agreement approved by the Common Council; it would be determined at that time if the project is feasible. Cobalt would be required to finalize development plans within 270 days of the effective date of this agreement.

In response to questions, Mr. Kesner clarified certain language in the agreement. He explained that the anticipated taxable increment will actually come from the county's Watertown Plank Road property, which will be covered by the development agreement. The city's obligation to sell the public works site would terminate if Cobalt doesn't perform as outlined or deliver a development agreement that is acceptable to the Common Council.

Richard Bachman, 2229 N. 115th Street, commented on past closed sessions and the need for the public to have more information. He said that questions about both the city's public works site and the county site have not been answered. He had specific concerns about just what county operations would move, what type of structures would be built, and what access would be allowed.

Mr. Kesner responded that information was released following entering into the MOU indicating that the proposal involves moving in some form the county public works operations currently located at Watertown Plank Road to the city's site. Cobalt would have to discuss with the county exactly what they want to relocate to the new facility that would be built. Some degree of cooperation with city operations that are of a similar nature might provide efficiencies to both the county and city. Cobalt is in the process of working with the county on those issues and also with WEDC (Wauwatosa Economic Development Corp.) to determine what the private development on the Watertown Plank site would be. The agreement limits access to the public works site to 113th Street. Details would be included in the development agreement, which would have to be reached before the sale is finalized.

Ald. Donegan added that the key point is that the city is agreeing to enter in a process. No land gets sold until a development plan is approved, and no development plan could be approved without a public hearing. The Chair added that the agreement is a public record and offered a copy to Mr. Bachman, which he declined.

In answer to further questions from the committee, Mr. Kesner said that the development agreement will be between the city and the buyer. "Reasonable time" in which to reach the proposed incremental value will be defined in that agreement and would have to be a term acceptable to the Common Council.

Moved by Ald. Donegan, seconded by Ald. Herzog to recommend to Council approval of the proposed agreement. Ayes: 7

The meeting adjourned at 9:52 p.m.

Carla A. Ledesma, City Clerk
Wauwatosa, Wisconsin

es