

CITY OF NEENAH
SPECIAL PUBLIC SERVICES AND SAFETY COMMITTEE MEETING MINUTES
Tuesday, April 14, 2026

Present: Chairman Lendrum, Alderman Borchardt, Linski, Pollnow, and Weber

Excused:

Also Present: City Attorney Rashid, Public Works Director Kaiser, Community Development and Assessment Deputy Director Schmidt, City Clerk Nagel, Humane Officer Bedora, Office Manager Mroczkowski, Nancy Wagner, Melvin Timm, Norma Mammadov, Josh Spatz, Megan Spatz, Anthony Wagner, Jessica Ventura, Ann Ventura, Dick Clark, Eileen Clark, Pamela Less, Lynsey Gonzalez, Sheila Wentzel, Tyler Buchanan, Tom Feren, Alexis DunsMoor, Stephanie Schreiber, Megan Gunderson, Cody Walinski, Lance Steidl, Heather Jelinski, Scott Becher, Kurt Burton, Leanne Burton, Dave Pohlman, Kris Pohlman, Luke Schnieder, Amber Schnieder, Dana Doke Prahl, Dave Schraven, Courtnee Schraven, Chris Amundson, Pam Yang, John Yang, Hue Xiong, MayLee Xiong, Chouyee Chang, Ze Xiong, Nhia Xiong, Chee Xiong, Pachia Vang, Ye Xiong, Steve Vandenhagen, Laura Schoonover, Cory Schoonover, Julie Myhre, Allison Fannin, Paige Parks, Frank Cuthbert, Alderman Bruno, Maia Pedrick, Wynonna Potter, and Nick Leick

Chairman Lendrum called the meeting to order at 5:00 PM

Approval of Minutes of the Regular Meeting of March 24, 2026

Motion by Pollnow, Seconded by Borchardt to approve the minutes of the Regular Meeting of March 24, 2026.

Call for vote by Chairman Lendrum

Motion Carried. All voting Aye. 5/0

Dangerous Animal Designation Appeal for Wynonna Potter for pet dog Oakley

City Attorney Rashid provided a procedural overview of the appeal process.

Clerk Nagel swore in Humane Officer Bedora.

City Attorney Rashid asked Humane Officer Bedora to share with the Committee what is meant by her job title. Ms. Bedora stated that the designated person investigates animal cruelty, neglect and abuse cases. She stated that she also oversees the dangerous animal program for the Neenah Police Department.

City Attorney Rashid asked Ms. Bedora if the appeal case filed was submitted because of the prohibited dangerous animal was made by her. MS. Bedora stated yes.

City Attorney Rashid asked Ms. Bedora to tell the Committee about the events of February 16, 2026.

Ms. Bedora stated that a City of Neenah Community Service Aide was called to Ms. Potter's address because of a report that a dog had attacked a cat in the common area of the apartment building and the attack had resulted in the death of the cat.

City Attorney Rashid asked Ms. Bedora if the dog was owned by Ms. Potter. Ms. Bedora stated yes. City Attorney Rashid stated that the cat died as a result of this encounter with Ms. Potter's dog belonged to another resident of the apartment building.

City Attorney Rashid asked Ms. Bedora to confirm that the cat was owned by Ms. Pary. Ms. Bedora stated that the cat was owned by Ms. Pary and her boyfriend. She stated that her boyfriend is the resident of the apartment building.

City Attorney Rashid asked Ms. Bedora to continue to tell the Committee what happened in this incident that led to the death of Ms. Pary's cat. Ms. Bedora stated that, based off the police report, the cat had slipped out of the Ms. Pary's apartment into the common area of the apartment building. She stated that Ms. Potter had let her dog out of her apartment unrestrained into the common area hallway to the front door, to go to the bathroom. Ms. Bedora stated that at this time Ms. Potter's dog, Oakley, saw the cat in the hallway and began to attack it. Ms. Bedora stated that at the conclusion of that attack, the cat was brought to the veterinary clinic but upon arriving at the veterinary clinic, the cat was already deceased. Ms. Bedora stated that the veterinarian examined the cat and confirmed the death of the cat was due to internal decapitation.

City Attorney Rashid asked Ms. Bedora to tell the Committee what Ms. Potter's statement was to her.

Ms. Bedora stated that in the initial statement to the Community Service Aide Ms. Potter stated that she had let the dog out and the cat was in the hallway. Ms. Potter said there was no stopping the attack when the dog saw the cat. Ms. Potter noted to both Ms. Bedora and the Community Service Aide that she had known that her dog did not get along with cats in the past. Ms. Potter stated that there weren't any prior significant incidents, but she was aware that her dog did not like cats.

Ms. Bedora stated that in her follow-up interview with her, Ms. Potter, she stated that she thought the incident could have been considered provoked because she thought the cat had swatted at the dog. Ms. Bedora stated that was not something Ms. Potter had said in her initial statement. Ms. Potter also stated that she presumed that the cat could have gotten its injuries during the attack when the cat and dog fell down the stairs of the apartment building. Ms. Bedora stated that this statement by Ms. Potter of the cat and dog going down the stairs together was not mentioned in her initial statement.

City Attorney Rashid asked Ms. Bedora if she interviewed Ms. Pary, the owner of the cat. Ms. Bedora stated that she did interview Ms. Pary. City Attorney Rashid asked Ms. Bedora to tell the Committee the details of the interview.

Ms. Bedora stated that Ms. Pary had stated that to her that she had not witnessed the incident. Ms. Pary stated that the cat had slipped out of the apartment into the common area of the hallway before the attack. She stated that Ms. Potter came to her to let her know what had happened. Ms. Potter stated that she tried to administer care to the cat for its injuries and that the cat was bleeding from its' eye. Ms. Pary stated that because of the incident she now had anxiety with the dog still living in the apartment building because she has other cats and small children.

City Attorney Rashid asked Ms. Bedora if Ms. Pary had noted during the interview that she had concerns about Oakley prior to this incident. Ms. Bedora stated that Ms. Pary stated that she had previously been told by Ms. Potter that Oakley did not like cats, which is consistent with Ms. Potter's statement.

City Attorney Rashid confirmed with Ms. Bedora that Ms. Potter is not denying that her dog killed Ms. Pary's cat. Ms. Bedora stated that it was correct.

Ms. Bedora stated that when she reinterviewed both parties, some details were altered a bit from what was in the initial statement. She stated that the cat was somewhere it was allowed by Municipal Ordinance and was not considered "at large". Ms. Bedora stated that Oakley was technically not "at large" and both animals were in a common area that might have been against apartment rules but was in no violation of City Municipal Codes. She stated that the attack resulted in the death of a cat.

City Attorney Rashid stated that in our ordinance there are three different designations for dangerousness of animals. He stated that in this case, a dog can be potentially dangerous, dangerous, or in this case, prohibited dangerous.

City Attorney Rashid asked Ms. Bedora, why in this case, is it prohibited dangerous under our ordinance. Ms. Bedora stated that the definition as outlined in our ordinance, states that a dog can be declared prohibited dangerous if it meets one of the following conditions- without provocation, has killed a pet animal or human being.

City Attorney Rashid asked Ms. Bedora if that was condition upon which she made her designation in this case. Ms. Bedora stated yes.

City Attorney Rashid asked Ms. Bedora if there was any reliable indication that this Pit Bull- Terrier was provoked by the cat. Ms. Bedora stated that the city's municipal code has a very specific definition of provocation. City Attorney Rashid stated that the cat would have to have been teasing, tormenting, abusing or assaulting the animal.

Ms. Bedora stated that Ms. Potter did not mention anything about her dog Oakley being provoked in her initial statement. She stated that it wasn't until the later interviews that she mentioned the cat swiping the dog's nose. She stated that action does not meet the criteria for provocation per our ordinance.

City Attorney Rashid asked Ms. Bedora if the outcome of this appeal is to uphold the prohibited dangerous dog designation, what are the consequences and the next step for

the owner. Ms. Bedora stated that the owner has five days to either relocate the dog outside of the City of Neenah boundaries or humanely euthanize the animal.

City Attorney Rashid entered into record as Exhibit 1, the two-page letter to Ms. Potter, dated March 4, 2026, of the prohibited dangerous animal designation.

Ms. Bedora stated that it's important to note that this incident does meet the definition of a prohibited dangerous animal because it has killed a pet cat. She stated that we do can make exceptions if the animal that was attacked was violating other city ordinances such as an animal being at large on someone else's property. Ms. Bedora stated that in this case, that was not the circumstance. She stated that she did have concerns that the dog was in common areas of the apartment building unleashed, especially in areas that could have other animals and children.

City Attorney Rashid asked the Committee if they had any questions for Humane Officer Bedora. There were none.

City Attorney Rashid stated that Ms. Potter will now have the opportunity to ask Ms. Bedora questions.

Ms. Potter stated that she does not feel this was an unprovoked attack. She stated that when she opened her apartment door the cat was right there.

Ms. Bedora stated that this does not meet the criteria provoked.

Ms. Potter stated that both animals batted each other at the same time.

Ms. Bedora stated that information was not part of the original statement that was taken by the Community Service Aide.

City Attorney Rashid asked Ms. Potter if she had any further questions for Humane Officer Bedora. Ms. Potter stated no.

City Attorney Rashid asked Ms. Potter if she would like to make a statement before the committee. Ms. Potter stated yes.

City Clerk Nagel swore in Ms. Potter. She stated that her name Wynonna Potter, 610 Maple Street, Apartment 2, Neenah Wisconsin.

Ms. Potter stated that the attack happened in a shared hallway. She stated that the police report states that the cat could have escaped the night before which means the cat was in the hallway all night. She stated that she feels that's wrong. Ms. Potter stated that she agrees that the dog should have leashed. She stated that the veterinarian only had an assumption of how the cat had died. She stated that the cat could have died when the animals tumbled down the stairs during the attack. Ms. Potter stated that there is false information in the police report regarding her boyfriend giving live cats to the dog to chew on and that did not happen. She stated that the veterinarian report stated that there were no lacerations or no obvious bleeding tracts.

City Attorney Rashid asked Ms. Potter how old Oakley is. Ms. Potter stated that she is three.

City Attorney Rashid asked Ms. Potter how long she had lived at 610 Maple Street. Ms. Potter stated three years.

City Attorney Rashid asked Ms. Potter if she or the cat owner lived there first. Ms. Potter stated that she moved in first. She stated that she did have letters of reference from neighbors that have cats in the building.

City Attorney Rashid asked Ms. Potter what the distance is between her apartment and where the attack took place. Ms. Potter stated 15 stairs.

City Attorney Rashid asked Ms. Potter if she doesn't deny that Oakley went after the cat and attacked it. She stated that she believes that both animals did damage to each other.

City Attorney Rashid asked Ms. Potter what the cat had done to her dog. Ms. Potter stated that when she opened her door the cat was right there and both of the animals freaked out and started pawing and scratching each other. She stated that within seconds they both got into a fight and tumbled down the stairs.

City Attorney Rashid asked Ms. Potter why she did not include that in the first statement that she gave to investigators. She stated that she did not remember that until later. She stated that she felt that she did not have enough time to explain everything because she was upset.

City Attorney Rashid asked Ms. Potter if she agrees that she told the investigator that her dog did not like cats. Ms. Potter stated that she did make that statement. She stated that the police report stated that there have been signs of aggression by the dog towards cats and that is not true.

City Attorney Rashid entered the American Animal Hospital report into record as Exhibit 2. He asked Ms. Potter if she had received a copy of the report. Ms. Potter stated yes.

City Attorney Rashid asked Ms. Potter if she is claiming that the cat was teasing, tormenting, abusing or assaulting her dog. Ms. Potter stated that she is claiming that the cat batted her dog and that is what she feels started the fight.

City Attorney Rashid asked Ms. Potter if her dog received any medical treatment. Ms. Potter stated no but she did clean blood off of Oakley's face.

City Attorney Rashid stated that he had no further questions for Ms. Potter. He asked the Committee if they had questions for Ms. Potter.

Alderman Linski asked Ms. Potter why the dog was not leashed coming out of her apartment. Ms. Potter stated that she was walking Oakley down to where her leash was. She stated that she has been letting her out the same way for the last three years.

Alderman Linski stated that his second concern is there was a second incident where Oakley was again running loose in the hallway and knocked over a child near the stairs. He asked Ms. Potter if the dog has nipped at the mother of the child. Ms. Potter stated that her mom was there during that incident and saw the whole thing. She stated that dog did not nip or bite the mother of the child.

Alderman Linski stated that there are now two incidents where the dog was not leashed. Ms. Potter stated that she was able to retrieve the dog right away in the second incident.

Alderman Pollnow stated that he is aware of how traumatic this is for her. He stated that he is a dog owner and knows that he needs to be responsible and not place the dogs in situations that he knows could present a potential issue with other animals. He stated that Ms. Potter should have been more cognizant of having that leash on him when taking him outside of her apartment. He stated that as a council and committee, members need to weigh in that there may be neighbors that have felt uncomfortable around the dog and have not said anything.

Alderman Lendrum asked Ms. Potter if she had taken her dog to the veterinarian to be checked out due to the scratches the dog had received from the cat. Ms. Potter stated no.

City Attorney Rashid asked Ms. Potter if she had any other witnesses. She stated no.

City Attorney Rashid made a suggested motion to uphold the prohibited dangerous animal designation made by Humane Officer Bedora. He stated that after the motion is made, the Committee needs to present Findings of Fact.

Motion by Pollnow, seconded by Weber to Uphold the Prohibited Dangerous Dog Designation by Humane Officer Bedora, for Oakley, owner Wynonna Potter, 610 Maple Street Apt 2, Neenah Wisconsin.

FINDINGS OF FACT

Alderman Lendrum stated she will vote to uphold motion for the reason that Ms. Potter did not seek medical attention for her dog and does not understand why an unspayed dog was not leashed in common areas.

Alderman Linski stated that he will vote to uphold motion for the reason that after the first incident, Ms. Potter continued to have the dog run free. He stated that she needs to keep the dog secure for safety.

Alderman Weber stated that he will vote to uphold the motion for reason that Alderman Lendrum and Alderman Linski have stated. He stated that owners of dogs need to be accountable for the dog and the safety of people and pets around that dog or any other animal.

Alderman Pollnow stated that will vote to uphold motion for the reason that dog owners need to be aware of their dogs 'tendencies and not place them in situations that may lead to unfortunate circumstances.

Alderman Borchardt stated that he will vote to uphold motion for the reason that it was negligent to not have the dog leashed and it was unprovoked attack on an animal.

Chairperson Lendrum called for vote.

Vote on Motion. 5/0

Road Conditions-Freedom Acres and Homes at Freedom Meadows

Chairperson Lendrum welcomed everyone to the meeting. She stated that Director Kaiser will present his information first and then residents will have 3 minutes to speak.

Director Kaiser reviewed his memo of April 9, 2026. He provided background regarding the Freedom Acres and Homes at Freedom Meadows subdivision developments. He stated that each phase, the developer is responsible to install for temporary surface road per the development agreement.

Director Kaiser addressed the road conditions, specifically the mud on the roads. He stated that there are two main causes for the mud, top-soil and sod stockpiles on the reclaimed asphalt roads and the removal of the erosion control around the lots prior to the establishment of a lawn.

Director Kaiser reviewed short-term solutions to the address the road condition issues-

1. He stated the city will take over road maintenance using the escrow paid to the City by the developer through the development agreements
2. Silt fence has been installed on lots within the 3rd Addition to the Homes at Freedom Meadows and the 1st Addition to Freedom Acres
3. A contractor has been hired by the developer to clean the inlet protection to ensure that water can properly drain
4. Reclaimed asphalt will be placed on four streets, Sovereign Way, Freeman Drive north of Liberty Avenue, Freeman Drive south of Liberty Avenue, and Liberty Ave as soon as material becomes available per the development agreement.
5. "No Dumping Topsoil on Street" signs will be posted on the streets with reclaimed asphalt and gravel.
6. Erosion control inspections by City staff and follow-up inspections will be more stringent and occur regularly.

Director Kaiser reviewed long-term plans and timing for the final road installation, project costs, special assessment costs, and length of time residents would have to pay the special assessment.

Director Kaiser reviewed temporary alternatives to the final street construction-

1. Paving a temporary two-inch asphalt mat on all streets with reclaimed asphalt or gravel. The estimated project cost to do this is \$432,000. The assessable cost for abutting property owners would be \$1,500 to \$2,000 per lot depending on which special assessment method is used. Installation would take place in 2027.
2. Placing a double oil/chip surface on all streets with reclaimed asphalt or gravel. The estimated project cost is \$200,000. The process would be done in two phases. The City would place an oil/chip treatment similar to that used for paved street maintenance. This method is not a recommended approach because the treatment would only last two to three years and would require annual maintenance.

Director Kaiser stated that his overall recommendation is that the identified short-term measures be carried out and that the final street construction be included in the City's 2028 Capital Improvement Program.

Chairperson Lendrum asked the Committee if any of them had questions.

Alderman Pollnow asked Director Kaiser why the temporary two-inch asphalt mat was used in the earlier phases and the reclaimed asphalt in the later phases. Director Kaiser stated that the entry points into the earlier phases heavy construction traffic was using those roads and staff suggested the two-inch asphalt mat. He stated that for the side streets, staff felt that the reclaimed asphalt would be fine to use. He stated the developer had used reclaimed asphalt in another subdivision and it performed well. Director Kaiser stated that we didn't have mud issues in the other subdivision and the maintenance was just addressing potholes periodically. He stated that given the price point of the reclaimed asphalt versus the two- inch mat and the purpose of the temporary roads, staff felt the reclaimed asphalt would work fine.

Alderman Pollnow asked who determines the type of temporary road surface to use. Director Kaiser stated that it is a negotiation between the city and the developer. He stated that after the two-inch mats went down in the initial phases, the subsequent agreements called for reclaimed asphalt. He stated that given the progress of the subdivision, it made sense to continue with the reclaimed asphalt in later phases.

Alderman Pollnow noted that a conversation he had with Mr. VanSistine, he was told that the final streets would be scheduled in three years. Director Kaiser stated that there may have been a misunderstanding between how he and Mr. Van Sistine were looking at the overall development. Director Kaiser stated that he would have been reluctant to commit to three years given the scale of the development.

The Committee discussed in length erosion control procedures, documentation plan for erosion control inspections, the need to be stricter with landscapers, builders and property owners, and the permitting process.

Alderman Weber asked for an explanation on the availability of the reclaimed asphalt. Director Kaiser stated the reclaimed asphalt comes from millings of streets. He stated we are early in the construction year so there have not been a lot of projects yet that have created millings to be used for reclaimed asphalt.

Alderman Weber stated he would like to have a discussion about the possibility of an alternative access entrance to the subdivision so the final street could be done in phases.

Alderman Pollnow stated that a \$4 million dollar road project is a high cost for the residents to pay for the final road. He stated that he wants to be equitable and feels that the temporary two-inch asphalt mat with a price of only \$432,000 is better option and would like to have discussion about it. Alderman Pollnow stated that he would be in favor of having discussions on a city 50/50 cost share for the two-inch asphalt mat.

Chairperson Lendrum Opened Public Appearances

Melvin Timm, 7665 Wodenshoe Rd., Neenah WI- Mr. Timm stated that he owns three properties in this development adjacent to that retention pond. He stated that the mud has been an issue from the beginning. Mr. Timm stated that according to his code class for his contractor's license, the DNR requires weekly inspections, regardless of rain. He stated that when there is a rain event, you need an inspection within 24 hours of precipitation over a half inch, and then you must have continuous monitoring of the site. He stated that if the contractors are out there, why hasn't the city taken the initiative to go out and talk to them.

Lynsey Gonzalez, 1634 Valor Drive, Neenah WI- Ms. Gonzalez stated that she wanted to thank the City Council for addressing residents' concerns. She stated she appreciates the council members that came out and walked the neighborhood with residents. She stated that her street does have the reclaimed asphalt. Ms. Gonzalez stated that there hasn't been follow-up from the city or the developer. She stated that the road went from clean asphalt roads, to being mud covered. She stated that erosion control barriers were placed, but nothing was done for the roads. Ms. Gonzalez stated that that it's been a failure from the start. Ms. Gonzalez stated that she would like also to address the \$15,000 to \$18,000 price range that was quoted for the final road special assessment. She stated that residents were told \$8,000 to \$10,000. Ms. Gonzalez stated that she was also very disappointed in the way the erosion control permitting, documentation and communication has been from both the city and developer.

Heather Zielinski, 1733 Patriot Way, Neenah WI- Ms. Zielinski thanked the committee for the presentation this evening. She stated that with the public facing duties of the City representatives and the developer's responsibility of developing an entire subdivision, she believes the city and developer should be held accountable to the same standard

as residents. She stated that she is specifically talking about erosion control, road maintenance, and enforcement. She stated that from the resident's perspective, there's no clear documentation showing that this work was completed or that enforcement actions were taken. Ms. Zielinski stated because of that, as far as she is concerned, it didn't happen. She stated that if this work has been done and enforced, there should be clear and accessible records to support it. She stated that is how trust is rebuilt. Ms. Zielinski stated that moving forward, we need accountability, not just statements. She stated the city and developer need to show this through consistent, verifiable documentation and enforcement.

Dave Pohlman, 1721 Freeman Drive, Neenah WI- Mr. Pohlman stated that he wanted to address another reason for the mud on Freeman Drive. He stated that Sovereign Way wasn't nearly as muddy as Freeman Drive until the developer started piling dirt on the far end of Freeman Drive and then running it over to the south end of Freeman Drive. He stated that the dirt was bouncing out of trucks for two days straight for probably 10 hours a day. He stated this is the developer's responsibility to clean up. Mr. Pohlman stated that he thinks we're making good progress towards a better solution than what we were facing.

Dana Doke-Prahl, 1772 Legacy Lane, Neenah WI- Ms. Doke-Prahl stated that she emailed multiple times and replies were very politically correct and felt like brush offs. She stated that she did not feel that her concerns were being taken seriously until residents attended the March 18, 2026, Common Council meeting. Ms. Doke-Prahl stated that she also wanted to address the reclaimed asphalt failure and filling of the potholes. She stated that there were two piles of reclaimed asphalt that were used to fill potholes. She stated five different times potholes were filled and today the same potholes are still there because the reclaimed asphalt is junk. Ms. Doke-Prahl stated that it doesn't work and she is offended that there are certain people sitting here that blame the residents and are acting like we don't know what's been going on.

Julie Myhre, 1712 Patriot Way, Neenah WI- Ms. Myhre stated that she has lived in her home for two years. She stated that she would like to put asphalt down in the front of her driveway because it is washing away and because the water shut off is sticking out and is going to get damaged. She stated that she is tired of the dirt, mud, and rocks. Ms. Myhre stated that the city should have put money away to build these roads or made the builders responsible for the final road installation.

Josh Spatz, 1651 Founders Street, Neenah WI- Mr. Spatz stated that he is glad to hear that the city is going to do better regarding erosion control. He stated that anyone could see there was no erosion control being used just by driving around the subdivision. He stated that the city should look into why the builder is not enforcing the construction equipment dropping clumps of mud from their trucks. Mr. Spatz stated that he would like more information about the per lineal feet special assessment method and per parcel special assessment method.

Pamela Less, 1709, Founders Street, Neenah WI- Ms. Less stated that she does not like the reclaimed asphalt. She stated that it does not hold up especially after all the rain we have received.

Chris Admundson, 1759 Legacy Lane, Neenah WI- Mr. Admundson stated that he agrees with other residents that the reclaimed asphalt is an inferior product. He stated that there is no definite edge and it can't be cleaned.

Stephanie Schreiber, 1710 Sovereign Way, Neenah WI- Ms. Schreiber stated that she is not in favor of the 50/50 cost share for the two-inch asphalt mat. She stated that resident would have to pay for the temporary road to be removed as part of the final road project. Ms. Schreiber stated that she was also told that the cost of the road would be \$8,000 to \$10,000.

Anthony Wagner, 1705 Freeman Drive, Neenah WI- Mr. Wagner stated that he would never have built in this subdivision knowing there was going to be an additional cost of \$40,000 for the road and landscaping. He stated that he does not believe that the difference in the estimated cost for the final road is an accident.

Nancy Wagner, 1705 Freeman Drive, Neenah WI- Ms. Wagner stated that she likes the idea of a 50/50 cost share for the new road. She asked how the how that process works for this to be an option for the residents. She asked if the neighborhood would vote, does majority rule, how long would the process take, and does the cost get added to resident's tax bill. Ms. Wagner stated that she lives at the end of the Freeman Road where Freeman Street and Sovereign Way will eventually connect. She stated that she is tired of having heavy equipment, skid steers, delivery trucks, FedEx, Amazon and UPS trucks turning around in their driveway. She stated it has caused ruts and asked who will be fixing them. Ms. Wagner asked the city or developer to put up a sign informing the trucks that it is not a turnaround.

Megan Gunderson, 1654 Founder Street, Neenah WI- She asked for clarification regarding the 50/50 cost share. She asked if it is for the two-inch asphalt mat or the final road and also how long does a two-inch mat hold up for.

Director Kaiser stated the 50/50 cost share is for the two-inch asphalt mat. He stated the life cycle for the road, on average, is eight to 10 years.

Ms. Gunderson asked at the end of the eight years what condition will the road be in. Director Kaiser stated that it would be breaking down by that point on the outside edges and the road would need to be budgeted for replacement.

Ms. Gunderson stated that if the 50/50 cost share is done with the two-inch mat, and then eight years from now, the city puts in a final road at obviously higher cost, she has a hard time paying now, for the two inch asphalt mat and then being assessed more than \$15,000 to \$18,000 because it's eight years. She asked if the 50/50 cost share could be saved and applied to the cost of the final road in 2028. She asked if the

builders that are not following the erosion control can be held accountable financially to help offset the road cost for all of us.

Sheila Wentzel, 1750 Founder Street, Neenah WI- Ms. Wentzel stated that she would like a copy of the minutes from tonight's meeting. She then asked who owns the property between the sidewalk and the road. Director Kaiser stated that from the back edge of the sidewalk to the street is owned by city, it is called the right-of-way.

Ms. Wentzel stated that she left a small strip in that area and expected the city to fill that area with topsoil and seed it. She stated that it would have helped with erosion control. Director Kaiser stated that the city does not make any terraces, similar to in developed areas where there's grass in between the sidewalk and curb, the city doesn't maintain that.

Ms. Less stated that she was under the impression that the discussion was about the final road. She stated that if the temporary road is put in that is kicking the can down the line and it's going to get more expensive and that is a waste of money. She stated that we should want to put in a final road and feels that 2027 is reasonable.

David Schraven, 1799 Legacy Lane, Neenah WI- Mr. Schraven asked if the sidewalk is not his property, why does he have to pay for it. He stated the amount that he will be getting reimbursed from the developer for installation of the sidewalk is only \$2,800. Mr. Schraven stated that contractors have quoted him \$4,500.

Jessica Ventura, 1748 Patriot Way, Neenah WI- Ms. Ventura stated that we don't need another statute downtown or Arrowhead Park, we need roads. She stated that the residents pay a lot in taxes, and she does not see what they are getting in return.

Ann Ventura, 1748 Patriot Way, Neenah WI- Ms. Ventura stated that she wanted to speak for the US Postal Service because they have had a very difficult time delivering mail. She stated that she has seen them stuck in the snow and mud and have had to be towed out.

Norma Mammadov, 1702 Founder Street, Neenah WI- Ms. Mammadov stated that she and her family have been living there for a year. She asked what it will take for the city, builders and the developer to come together and figure out a plan on how to move this forward. She stated that she is a nurse and is worried if there is an emergency that the emergency vehicles won't be able to get through.

Steve VandenOgden 1723 Sovereign Way, Neenah WI- Mr. VandenOgden stated that his daughter lives at 1723 Sovereign Way and he is concerned about the road because the road behind them is six feet above hers and all the water is coming towards her house. He stated that he would like to the city to look at the grade and possibly fix it.

Ms. Myhre stated that that last two years she has not had water in her back yard. She stated this year the water is coming close to her landscaping. Ms. Myhre stated that she wants to know who is responsible for fixing this problem.

Lance Steidl, 1621 Founders Street, Neenah WI- Mr. Steidl stated that the developers just care about getting in and out of these homes, selling them and moving on putting all these costs on the taxpayer. He stated this is unreasonable. He stated that he would not have bought the house if he knew he was going to have to be responsible for paying \$18,000 for the road. Mr. Steidl stated that he is also concerned with the lack of police presence in the subdivision and the lack of snow plowing from this last winter. He stated that there is mud coming from construction equipment and the 10-ton road limits are still posted.

Chairperson Lendrum asked which road the trucks are going down. Mr. Steidl stated that they are coming off of CTH G and going down Liberty Avenue.

Scott Becher, 1061 Green Acres Lane, Neenah WI- Mr. Becher stated that the residents need answers and a timeline for the road. He stated that possibly a subcommittee needs to be established to discuss a process, so this does not happen again.

Chairperson Lendrum closed Public Appearances.

Chairperson Lendrum thanked the residents for coming out and being civil.

Public Works General Construction and Department Activity Report

- 1) Contract 4-25 (Misc Concrete Pavement/Sidewalk Repair): The contractor has restarted work that was carried over to 2026. This includes installing sidewalk in a couple of gaps in the Homes at Freedom Meadows area.
- 2) Contract 5-25 (Misc Asphalt Pavement Repair): Some work items have been carried over to 2026.
- 3) Contract 10-25 (City Hall Window Replacement): All work is done. A final payment is being processed.
- 4) Contract 12-25 (Courtside Fields Pond): Rock crushing is ongoing. The crushed rock is being used for the utility work taking place on Elm and Reed. Storm sewer tie-ins have been installed. The remaining storm sewer work will be done after the pond's clay liner is installed.
- 5) Contract 1-26 (Elm, Reed, Laudan Utilities/Street):
 - a) Elm St: Water main has been installed from Laudan – Cecil.
 - b) Reed St: Sanitary sewer and storm sewer have been installed from Washington to Division.
- 6) Contract 2-26 (Henry, Sterling, Winneconne): The contractor started on 4/6 with water main replacement on Greenfield Street.
- 7) Contract 3-26 (Tullar Garage Roof Repair – Vehicle Storage Bays): Work is scheduled to start on 4/15 and should take about a month.
- 8) Storms of early April: The Fox Valley area experienced a high volume of rain in early April. As a result of the rain and clearwater inflow to the sanitary sewer, the City bypassed sanitary sewer flow into the storm sewer at the Henry Street/Langley Boulevard

intersection in order to avoid causing basement backups in the area. In responding to the situation, crews also located a downstream line blockage that is being investigated. Our WDNR sanitary sewer program contact was notified of the bypass. These streets are in approved 2026-2030 CIP for utility and street work in 2027.

Director Kaiser stated that staff feels that residents that still have their sump pump connected their sanitary drain could be the cause of the bypasses.

Alderman Pollnow asked how illegal connections are found.

Director Kaiser stated that the Waste Utility checks for them when they are replacing water meters

- 9) Recycling Ordinance: WDNR rules related to recycling programs have changed. Ordinances related to our recycling program are embedded in the Solid Waste chapter of the municipal code. Staff are revising that chapter and will present those at a future committee meeting.
- 10) Church Street Ramp: Building Manager Benson and Director Kaiser met with Wells Concrete to examine areas in the ramp that were identified in the condition report. They will be providing us with a proposal.
- 11) Special Leaf Collection: Crews started a single round of spring leaf collection on 4/6. We experienced equipment issues the first couple of days, so progress was a little slow. Collection in Area 1 was completed on 4/9.

Alderman Borchardt thanked Chairperson Lendrum for serving an alderman and on many committees for the City of Neenah and wishes her well.

Adjournment

Motion by Borchardt, Seconded by Pollnow to adjourn at 7:41 PM.

Call for vote by Chairman Lendrum

Motion Carried. All voting Aye. 5 /0

Respectfully submitted,



Lisa Mroczkowski
Public Works Office Manager