

City of Racine, Wisconsin Common Council

1 2

AGENDA BRIEFING MEMORADUM		
COMMI	TTEE: Finance and Personnel	LEGISLATION ITEM #: 0490-18
AGENDA 1	DATE: May 21, 2018	
DEPARTM	IENT: City Attorney's Office	
Prepar	ed By: Nhu Tran	
Review	ved By:	
SUBJECT	Claim of Yamille Mederos, City Attorn	ney File No. 2018-0072
EXECUTI	VE SUMMARY:	
result of her negligent in	running over a pothole on the road on F	fing \$134.50 worth of damages to her vehicle as a February 20, 2018. The city denies that it was , even if the city was negligent, it is immune from as pursuant to Wis. Stat. § 893.83.
For this reas	son, it is the recommendation of the City	Attorney's Office that this claim be denied.
BACKGRO	OUND & ANALYSIS:	
reads now, conditions, 2012, the le reduce the r	the city is immune from liability for damincluding defects such as potholes. In cagislature did so with the interest of protenumber of lawsuits brought against town as' legal costs, damage awards and insurance.	or highway defects when it was amended in 2012. As it mages resulting from highway defects under most arving out this exception to governmental liability in acting the public purse, noting that the goal was to s, villages, cities and counties and thereby reducing ance premiums. <i>See</i> 2011 S.B. 125 Fiscal Estimate
maintain or	repair such road defects. The Departmen	ne city further denies that it was negligent in failing to nt of Public Works routinely maintains these portions lucted December 4 and December 18, 2017, as well as

31 32 33 34 35	January 9, January 25, January 31, February 19, February 23, and March 8, 2018. When potholes were discovered or a complaint was made, those holes were subsequently be filled shortly thereafter. In this case, there were no specific complaints received by DPW regarding this particular pothole or area prior to February 20, 2018 and therefore the city had no notice of such defect. As a result, the city did not fail to fulfil any ministerial duties.
36	Since the city was not negligent here and because it is immune from liability, the claim should be denied.
37	
38	BUDGETARY IMPACT:
39	None
40	
41	OPTIONS/ALTERNATIVES:
42	Pay the claim.
43	
44	RECOMMENDED ACTION:
45	Deny the claim.
46	
47	ATTACHMENT(S):