

MINUTES
GREEN BAY HOUSING AUTHORITY
Thursday, May 21, 2015, 10:30 a.m.
100 N. Jefferson Street, 6th Floor, Room 604
Green Bay, WI 54301

MEMBERS: William VandeCastle - Chair, Sandra Popp - Vice Chair, Brad Hansen, Brenda Goodlet, and Chiquitta Cotton

OTHERS PRESENT: Robyn Hallet, Kim Flom, Stephanie Schmutzer, Nikki Gerhard, Ka Vang, Sadie DiNatale, and Reed Lewis

APPROVAL OF MINUTES:

1. Approval of the April 23, 2015, minutes of the Green Bay Housing Authority.

A motion was made by S. Popp and seconded by C. Cotton to approve the meeting minutes of April 23, 2015, as presented. Motion carried.

COMMUNICATIONS:

None

OLD BUSINESS:

None

NEW BUSINESS:

2. Discussion and approval of changes to Chapter 3 (Eligibility) of Admissions and Continued Occupancy Plan

R. Hallet explained that revisions to this chapter were approved at the April GBHA meeting, but shortly after, staff learned that PHA's are required to re-verify the need for a resident's live-in aide on an annual basis. Thus, the revision to Chapter 3 reinstates the language requiring continued approval for live-in aides. An individual or family must submit verification for their need of a live-in aide at each annual reexamination.

C. Cotton made a motion to approve the changes made to Chapter 3 (Eligibility) of Admissions and Continued Occupancy Plan. W. VandeCastle seconded the motion. Motion carried.

3. Approval to award Mason Manor Smoke Detector purchases to the lowest responsive and responsible bidder, Graybar Electric, for \$8,144.64.

R. Hallet explained an identified need to replace Mason Manor's smoke detectors. Ten different vendors have submitted bids, with Graybar Electric coming out on top at \$84.84 per unit for a total service price of \$8,144.64. The quote was for a quantity of 96 smoke detectors, but there will be a need to replace all of the smoke detectors at Mason Manor eventually. Therefore, a total of 312 smoke detectors will ultimately be needed.

C. Cotton asked if any of the businesses that submitted a bid recognize or work with Section 3. R. Hallet replied that this requirement was requested in the RFP.

S. Popp asked what Section 3 was to which R. Hallet replied that Section 3 is a requirement that, to the greatest extent feasible, contractors should promote opportunities for economic development for low-income individuals or businesses that hire low-income individuals.

S. Popp made a motion to approve the award to Graybar Electric which was seconded by B. Goodlet. Motion carried.

4. Award of Scattered Site Siding and Roofing Replacement project to lowest responsive and responsible bidder, not to exceed \$35,000.

R. Hallet explained that the Scattered Site Siding and Roofing Replacement project went out for RFP and two vendors' submitted bids—both of which were significantly higher than anticipated. Therefore, staff began looking into different funding scenarios for this project.

R. Hallet explained that the first option is to solely rehab one property. The property at 967 Holzer was identified with the greatest need and would thus be the property chosen if going with this first scenario. The second option would be to replace the roof on Crooks Street and replace the siding and roof on Holzer which would bring the total to just under \$35,000.

S. Schmutzer stated that another option would be to utilize CFP money from 2012, 2014, and 2015. This would allow the GBHA to complete all four properties.

B. Hansen asked how much money was in the 2014 reserves for this type of work. S. Schmutzer replied \$25,000.

S. Popp inquired about the high costs for this project and asked about the size of the properties. R. Hallet replied that the properties on Crooks, Christiana, and Maple Street were all fairly large. She further explained that staff determined the estimated cost prior to selecting the type of siding to use. The siding chosen is not necessarily top of the line but it was chosen for its durability, quality and low maintenance. The bids therefore came in higher than the cost originally estimated.

K. Flom asked if the vendors provided a breakdown of costs for materials versus cost for service. R. Hallet replied that this was not originally requested but when the bids came in higher than expected, we asked the vendors for a breakdown of costs for siding versus roofing.

W. VandeCastle asked if the RFP had a timeline as far as when the project was expected to begin and close. R. Hallet replied that a start time was not indicated in the RFP but once the award is made, construction would likely commence within the next couple of weeks.

W. VandeCastle commented that usually contractors expect about a six month turn around period once a contract is awarded. N. Gerhard stated that only the expected completion date, September 30, 2015, was indicated in the RFP.

B. Hansen asked if there were any projects already targeted to receive the 2014 CFP money. N. Gerhard stated that there are some lower priority projects but the highest priority projects are the ones being targeted currently (on Holzer, Crooks, Christiana, and Maple Street). The property on Holzer Street is the GBHA's first and highest priority.

S. Popp asked the Authority if they should go forward and approve all four properties for siding and roofing rehabilitation or just the two properties with the highest priority.

R. Hallet explained that if all properties are not completed at this time and we take them out for bid again, there is a chance that the new bids could come back higher because vendors could see the prices bid this time.

K. Flom asked about rehab needed on other properties to which N. Gerhard explained that the remaining properties needing rehab would still be completed in 2016. The reason that these four properties are being pushed for completion in 2015 is because they are such high priorities. S. Schmutzer further commented that the funds for these purposes do not have to be spent until 2019.

B. Hansen opined that the Authority should move forward with all four projects at this time. S. Popp and W. VandeCastle stated their agreement.

W. VandeCastle made a motion to approve the four Scattered Site siding and roofing replacements to the lowest responsive and responsible bidder(s). S. Popp seconded the motion. Motion carried.

5. Approval to award Mason Manor Tuck-pointing Exterior Brick to the lowest responsive and responsible bidder, not to exceed \$25,000.

R. Hallet explained that item five, six, seven, and eight are all similar in that these are all projects being pursued through the Purchasing Department but have not yet been bid out. By bringing all these projects to the Authority now, the process can be streamlined and awards made immediately after bids are received without waiting to be presented at the next Authority meeting.

A motion was made by S. Popp to award Mason Manor Tuck-pointing Exterior Brick to the lowest responsive and responsible bidder, not to exceed \$25,000. W. VandeCastle seconded the motion. Motion carried.

6. Approval to award Mason Manor Removal/Installation of Ceiling Tiles to the lowest responsive and responsible bidder, not to exceed \$7,000.

N. Gerhard stated that this project would just be for common areas for the floors with ceiling tiles. Not all floors at Mason Manor have ceiling tiles.

B. Hansen made a motion to award Mason Manor Removal/Installation of Ceiling Tiles to the lowest responsive and responsible bidder, not to exceed \$7,000. B. Goodlet seconded the motion. Motion carried.

7. Approval to award Mason Manor Ramp Wall Coating Multi-year Contract to the lowest responsive and responsible bidder, not to exceed \$25,000 for first year, \$5,000 each year thereafter.

W. VandeCastle asked how many years "each year thereafter" means. R. Hallet replied that it would be a maximum of five years: the contract would be a baseline of three years with two extensions of one year each.

S. Popp made a motion to award Mason Manor Ramp Wall Coating Multi-year Contract to the lowest responsive and responsible bidder, not to exceed \$25,000 for first year with an additional award of \$5,000 for each year thereafter. B. Hansen seconded the motion. Motion carried.

8. Approval to award Mason Manor Apartment Painting Multi-year contract to the lowest responsive and responsible bidder, not to exceed \$7,000.

R. Hallet explained that this project would also be a five year contract with a base of three years followed by two extensions of one year each. Currently, the GBHA does not have a contract for painting. With the increasing need to paint units due to increased turn over the need for bidding this out is becoming apparent.

W. VandeCastle made a motion to award Mason Manor Apartment Painting Multi-year contract to the lowest responsive and responsible bidder, not to exceed \$7,000 per year for five years. C. Cotton seconded the motion. Motion carried.

B. Hansen inquired how the not-to-exceed limit would work since yearly prices are contingent on how many apartments are being painted in that year. R. Hallet explained that the budget amount per year was determined through consideration of previous years' prices so \$7,000 would be the maximum amount the Authority would paint in a year's time, based off of past experiences.

9. Discussion and approval to use and request contractors to use low volatile Organic Compounds or avoid other harmful chemicals in building material and chemicals where feasible and affordable.

R. Hallet explained that this topic was brought up at last month's meeting. Since April's meeting staff has spoken with the Purchasing Department and B. Hansen has provided some language that can be included in future RFQs as it relates to the selection of materials.

R. Hallet stated that a staff member from the Purchasing Department recently reached out to certain vendors and reported back that using Low VOC products is becoming industry standard for materials.

R. Hallet explained that VOC is measured by grams per liter; 64 grams per liter or more is considered high. In consideration of the materials being utilized for Mason Manor, the adhesive for the carpet installation is 3.0 grams per liter and the adhesive for the tile installation is 1.7 grams per liter—quite low VOC levels.

R. Hallet went on to report that the Purchasing Department stated that there is not a big need to request two quotes when accepting bids from vendors as there is an expected industry standard regarding this concern.

S. Popp then asked if there is a way to still ensure that contractors are using low VOC. R. Hallet replied that the drafted language would be added to all RFQs in the future.

W. VandeCastle stated that this could also be something the Authority promotes.

R. Hallett lastly commented that N. Gerhard had a discussion with R. Lewis who conveyed that all of the everyday cleaning products used by maintenance staff are also meeting Low VOC standards.

S. Popp made a motion to approve the request for Contractors to use low Volatile Organic Compounds or avoid other harmful chemicals in building material and chemicals where feasible and affordable. B. Goodlet seconded the motion. Motion carried.

10. Discussion and approval to revise passbook savings rate to 0.00%.

R. Hallett stated that when clients have assets, staff must look at how much interest is earned on individual asset to count it toward their income. However if the total value of all of their assets is \$5,000 or greater, staff must apply the passbook savings rate instead of using the individual assets' rates.

R. Hallett continued to explain that HUD has recently made a change to regulations regarding the passbooks savings rate. The regulation now requires a PHA to determine a passbook rate within 0.75 percentage points of the national savings rate, which is currently 0.06. PHA's may not go lower than zero percent, thus the range we could set our passbook saving rate is zero percent to 0.81 percent. Staff has determined that zero percent would be best as in general the public is not earning much in interest.

C. Cotton made a motion to approve the revised passbooks savings rate to 0.00 percent. B. Hansen seconded the motion. Motion carried.

12. Discussion and possible action regarding Wi-Fi at Mason Manor.

R. Hallett began the discussion stating that when staff originally looked at the notion of getting Wi-Fi at Mason Manor, it was thought to be a great idea. When staff started to look at actual costs the idea of Wi-Fi at Mason Manor was realized to be less than attainable.

N. Gerhard stated that if Mason Manor was to get Wi-Fi it would only be available in common areas, perhaps reaching to apartments that were near the access points but not with any guarantees.

S. Schmutzer stated that the quotes that came in were extremely higher than anticipated. The lowest bid, from Time Warner, was quoted at \$71,360.00 for a five year commitment. S. Schmutzer explained that this cannot be easily supported with the Authority's Operating Budget.

S. Schmutzer further explained that the GBHA received quotes on two different versions through Cineviz (at approximately \$133,000 for each separate version), an \$87,090 quote from Camera Corner, and lastly a quote through a partnership with the City at \$104,409.45. Further, all of these quotes do not include the cost for wiring.

The Authority discussed that Wi-Fi for Mason Manor is too expensive at this time to which staff agreed that current funding would not support this project.

R. Hallett commented that staff additionally reached out to the DePere Housing Authority who has recently installed Wi-Fi. Staff received some information back from them but will continue to seek out what kind of costs they have accrued.

N. Gerhard stated that one of the reasons Wi-Fi would be so expensive is because of the size of Mason Manor; essentially three pucks would have to be used to allow Wi-Fi to reach throughout the building. S. Schmutzer added that Mason Manor would need 48 access points—and that would still only ensure and guarantee that common areas are covered.

C. Cotton made a motion to table the discussion due to extreme cost. W. VandeCastle seconded the motion. Motion carried.

11. Discussion and possible action regarding redesign of Mason Manor dumpster area.

R. Lewis explained a project involving two potential redesign scenarios to improve Mason Manor's dumpster area. This site, which includes the dumpster area and maintenance garage, is in need of extensive upgrading to alleviate larger surface issues in the future but also to mitigate safety concerns in the present.

When the site was originally built in 1980 it was a good use at the time. Changes have occurred over time, which have now impacted this area. Since its implementation additional surface parking and a road has been introduced at Mason Manor making the site extensively higher than grade, posing risks. In addition, because of the location of the site and the fact that little was done to the surface since 1980, heavy garbage trucks have been slowly destroying and sinking the surface area in and around the site. To fix this, two design options have been proposed.

The first design rendering has been estimated at \$18,000; the second rendering at \$25,000. R. Lewis explained that the first scenario will require bringing the entire area up to a level height, filling it in with heavy gravel to withstand the weight of heavy trucks. A section of this area would require the implementation of a concrete pad—approximately 20'x20' and eight inches thick to handle heavy trucks going back and forth which would eliminate a washboard effect occurring in the future.

R. Lewis explained that the second rendering, although a little more costly, involves putting up a small retaining wall around the garage so that the rest of the site can be brought down closer to grade. There would be a slight gradual decline which would be more user-friendly and would mitigate safety concerns. This scenario would be a long term fix to the issue of safety with the current slope.

S. Popp asked if both scenarios were long term or is one was more of a "Band-Aid" fix. R. Lewis replied that both scenarios are long term fixes. The only difference is that one of the solutions, depicted in the second rendering, would change the grade significantly and would add a retaining wall which would have the additional advantage of being more aesthetically pleasing.

R. Hallet asked if the retaining wall in the second option would interfere with parking spaces or maneuverability of equipment around the garage. R. Lewis replied that it would not.

K. Flom asked what kind of retaining wall would be installed. R. Lewis replied that it would most likely be a typical concrete block wall, not more than a few feet tall. The wall would also require a handrail of some sort as an additional safety amenity.

S. Popp asked how the estimates of each rendering were acquired. R. Lewis replied that Dave Johnson from Architect Groups Limited quoted the prices for the GBHA.

B. Hansen asked if the entire site was asphalt and concrete. R. Lewis replied that currently it was all asphalt except for the concrete curb line.

B. Hansen asked about storm water issues. R. Lewis explained that because they are not expanding the site, there shouldn't be any issue with storm water but this issue could certainly be brought to DPW for consideration which would occur anyway during the permitting process.

S. Popp inquired about budgeting and timelines, asking S. Schmutzer if we are in a financial position to approve this project. S. Schmutzer stated that there are funds set aside in the 2012 CFP money. These funds need to be spent before March of 2016 so this project would have to occur this summer, as far as a timeline goes.

R. Hallet asked what the dollar amount for said funding was to which S. Schmutzer replied that it was \$14,090. S. Schmutzer went to state that there was \$910 for 2013 funding sources as well. S. Schmutzer explained that originally when this project was first being considered, staff estimated approximately \$15,000 total for the project. Even though numbers came in a little higher than expected, the GBHA does have the money that can be reallocated to this project.

Commissioners discussed their general approval of the project but wanted a more definitive quote as opposed to solely estimates.

K. Flom suggested that one option to utilize is a design-build approach, where the two renderings could be brought right to the Contractor without utilizing a professional architectural service. Then the Contractor could provide a bid and would save some time. B. Hansen commented that the price might be slightly higher this way due to the extra work the contractor would have to do on their end.

W. VandeCastle made a motion to allow staff to proceed with getting bids on both redesign options, to be brought back to the Authority for approval at a future meeting. C. Cotton seconded the motion. Motion carried.

13. Discussion and approval of Operating Budget and Resolution No. 15-03 Approving the Operating Budget for the 12-Month Period Ending June 30, 2016.

S. Schmutzer stated that the GBHA is close to the end of the fiscal year. When thinking about the upcoming fiscal year, a sound preliminary budget has been put together with staff input. This budget is being brought to the Authority for review. The Authority does have an additional month before the budget needs approval; however, the deadline to submit the budget to HUD is by the end of the current fiscal year.

W. VandeCastle asked if there is anything significantly different than the last budget. S. Schmutzer stated that HUD contributions for Mason Manor have yet to be determined and additional funding will be provided through the new Verizon cell tower.

C. Cotton asked what the tenant service recreation line item was for to which S. Schmutzer replied that it was for Christmas expenditures. N. Gerhard elucidated that the GBHA provides Christmas presents to Scattered Site residents.

C. Cotton asked what the miscellaneous line item was for to which S. Schmutzer replied it was for things that don't quite fit in one particular category. The Authority tries not to use this category for that reason which is why there are so few funds in it.

S. Popp asked what other income meant. S. Schmutzer replied that they are from revenue bonds, fees collected for certain services or damage, laundry money, etc.

C. Cotton made a motion to approve the Operating Budget for the next fiscal year. B. Goodlet seconded the motion. Motion carried.

W. VandeCastle made a motion to adopt Resolution 15-03 approving the Operating Budget for the 12-Month Period ending June 30, 2016. B. Hansen seconded the motion. Motion carried.

14. Discussion and approval to use a new bank product, Select Plus.

S. Schmutzer stated that currently the GBHA utilizes a product that holds GBHA money at several different banks in money market accounts. Yet, this product is not transparent. The new product that Nicolet National Bank is offering, and currently being proposed, would allow complete visibility. This will allow GBHA's accounts to be viewed online by staff at any given time while still remaining insured.

S. Popp made a motion to approve the use of the new bank product, Select Plus. W. VandeCastle seconded the motion. Motion carried.

INFORMATIONAL:

None

FINANCIAL REPORT AND BILLS:

S. Schmutzer summarized the financial report. This month a large sum of money was paid to the City for the last few months of staff wages. S. Schmutzer commented that there was nothing else too significant to point out.

B. Hansen made a motion to approve and place the financial report on file. W. VandeCastle seconded the motion. Motion carried.

B. Hansen made a motion to approve the bills which was seconded by B. Goodlet. Motion carried.

STAFF REPORT:

15. Langan Investigations report for the month of April 2015.

R. Hallet verbally reported the information provided on the written Langan Investigation Report for the month of April 2015.

A motion was made by S. Popp to place the April Langan Reports on file. C. Cotton seconded the motion. Motion carried.

16. Occupancy Report for the month of April 2015.

N. Gerhard reported the upcoming vacancies and occupancy rate, which is a slight increase at 94.6 percent.

N. Gerhard additionally showed a PowerPoint presentation of the before and after conditions of some vacant Scattered Site and Mason Manor units.

A motion was made by S. Popp to accept and place on file, seconded by C. Cotton. Motion carried.

17. Quarterly Capital Funds Program report.

S. Schmutzer stated that a review of the quarterly capital funds program report was recently requested by a commissioner. A brief overview of the report's information was given, as documented on the agenda attachment.

C. Cotton asked if any of these funds could go towards providing training to which S. Schmutzer said it could not, as this funding is specifically for capital improvements.

18. Updates from Wisconsin Association of Housing Authority Conferences.

R. Hallet shared the workshops she attended while at the 2015 Wisconsin Association of Housing Authority Conferences. The workshops were for Davis Bacon, Asset Management, utilization of Public Housing, and Robert's Rules of Order.

S. Popp asked what Davis Bacon was, to which R. Hallet replied that it was a requirement to ensure Contractor's are paying prevailing wages for projects over \$2,000.

19. Tour of some Scattered Site properties to follow meeting.

The meeting continued in the field with a tour of some Scattered Site properties.

20. Farewell to Sadie.

R. Hallet stated that this was S. DiNatale's last meeting as she is moving. Everyone thanked S. DiNatale for her work.

The GBHA meeting of May 21, 2015, adjourned after the tour of the Scattered Sites at 1:06 pm with a motion made by B. Hansen which was seconded by S. Popp. Motion carried.

sd: rah