# MINUTES OF THE COMMON COUNCIL

## TUESDAY, MAY 15, 2018, 7:00 PM
## COUNCIL CHAMBERS
## ROOM 203, CITY HALL

### A. ROLL CALL.

Craig Stevens, Kathy Lefebvre, Veronica Corpus-Dax, Jesse Brunette, Mark Steuer, Brian Johnson, Andy Nicholson, John VanderLeest, Bill Galvin, Randy Scannell, Barbara Dorff, Chris Wery, Excused: None

### B. PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE.

### C. INVOCATION.

### D. APPROVAL OF MINUTES.

Moved by Alderperson Andy Nicholson, seconded by Alderperson Randy Scannell to approve. Motion carried.

1. Approval of minutes of the May 1, 2018 meeting.

### E. APPROVAL OF THE AGENDA.

Moved by Alderperson Randy Scannell, seconded by Alderperson Kathy Lefebvre to approve. Motion carried.

### F. REPORT BY THE MAYOR.

The Mayor stated that Alderperson Mark Steuer and Alderperson Bill Galvin have reached out to the Council about leadership training for both Council members and some staff people through Initiative One. Please follow up with them.

CVMIC, the City's insurance carrier, will conduct harassment training during the first fifteen minutes of the next three Council meetings to update on policies and procedures.

The Mayor congratulated all of the new college graduates.

## G. ANNOUNCEMENTS.

## H. RECOGNITIONS AND AWARDS

1. Employee of the Year, Mike Hronek, GIS Coordinator/IT Administrator

The Mayor presented Mike Hronek with a plaque for being employee of the year.

## I. APPOINTMENTS.

1. **NEW APPOINTMENTS:**

***Brown County Planning Commission***
Austin Miloszewicz, 734 S. Jackson St., Green Bay, WI 54301
Term to expire: May 1, 2021

**RE-APPOINTMENTS:**

***City of Green Bay/Town of Scott Joint Plan Commission***
Timothy Gilbert, 1439 Springdale Ln., Green Bay, WI 54304
Term to expire: June 1, 2021

***Economic Development Authority***
Mahamed Rage, 844 Linden Dr. #9, Green Bay, WI 54311
Term to expire: June 1, 2021

Moved by Nicholson, seconded by Scannell to approve new appointment. Motion carried.
Yes- Andy Nicholson, Barbara Dorff, Bill Galvin, Brian Johnson, Chris Wery, Craig Stevens, Jesse Brunette, John VanderLeest, Mark Steuer, Randy Scannell, Veronica Corpus-Dax, Kathy Lefebvre, No- None, Abstain- None.

Moved by Nicholson, seconded by Scannell to approve re-appointment. Motion carried.
Yes- Andy Nicholson, Barbara Dorff, Bill Galvin, Brian Johnson, Chris Wery, Craig Stevens, Jesse Brunette, John VanderLeest, Mark Steuer, Randy Scannell, Veronica Corpus-Dax, Kathy Lefebvre, No- None, Abstain- None.

## J. PUBLIC HEARINGS.

Motion by Alderperson Randy Scannell, seconded by Alderperson Mark Steuer to suspend rules for the purpose of adopting third reading ordinances 3 & 4 with one roll call vote. Motion carried.

Move by Alderperson Bard Dorff, seconded by Alderperson Randy Scannell to adopt third reading ordinances 3 & 4. Motion carried.

Yes- Andy Nicholson, Barbara Dorff, Bill Galvin, Brian Johnson, Chris Wery, Craig Stevens, Jesse Brunette, John VanderLeest, Mark Steuer, Randy Scannell, Veronica Corpus-Dax, Kathy Lefebvre, No- None, Abstain- None.

1. Zoning Ordinance No. 7-18
An ordinance amending Zoning Ordinance No. 20-07, a PUD overlay district for modified signage on the HSHS St. Mary's Hospital Medical Center Campus. (ZP 18-10)

2. Planning Ordinance No. 2-18
An ordinance amending the official map of the City of Green Bay by closing the unimproved portion of Rothe Street to public traffic.

## K. REPORT OF THE REDEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY

Moved by Alderperson Randy Scannell, seconded by Alderperson Bill Galvin to approve with the exception of item #1. Motion carried.

1. To approve a Request for Proposals for the purchase and redevelopment of the Adams Street lot located on the 200 block of North Adams Street.

Motion by Alderperson Randy Scannell, seconded by Alderperson Kathy Lefebvre to amend the RFP to replace all parking spaces that would be removed. Motion carried.

Motion by Alderperson Randy Scannell, seconded by Alderperson Kathy Lefebvre to adopt as amended. Motion carried.
Yes- Andy Nicholson, Barbara Dorff, Bill Galvin, Brian Johnson, Chris Wery, Craig Stevens, Jesse Brunette, John VanderLeest, Mark Steuer, Randy Scannell, Veronica Corpus-Dax, Kathy Lefebvre, No- None, Abstain- None

## L. REPORT OF THE PLAN COMMISSION.

Moved by Alderperson Randy Scannell, seconded by Alderperson Andy Nicholson to approve with the exception of item #2. Motion carried.

1. To amend the City of Green Bay Smart Growth 2022 Comprehensive Plan from Commercial and General Industrial to Medium and High Density Housing for property located at 1060 Gray Court.

2. To authorize a Conditional Use Permit (CUP) to allow a car wash in a Community Center Commercial (C3) District located at 1053 Velp Avenue, subject to:

A. Compliance with all of the regulations of the Green Bay Municipal Code not covered under the Conditional Use Permit, including standard site plan review and approval.
B. Hours of operation for the car wash shall start no earlier than 7:00 a.m. and end no later than 10:00 p.m. per the daytime hours as part of Chapter 27.203 Regulation of Noise, Public Peace and Good Order.
C. All lighting shall be of the sharp cut-off variety and shall comply with the requirements of the Zoning Code.
D. Retention of the existing west elevation façade transparency.

Moved by Alderperson Chris Wery, seconded by Alderperson Randy Scannell to approve. Motion carried.
Yes- Andy Nicholson, Barbara Dorff, Bill Galvin, Brian Johnson, Chris Wery, Craig Stevens, Jesse Brunette, John VanderLeest, Mark Steuer, Randy Scannell, Veronica Corpus-Dax, Kathy Lefebvre, No- None, Abstain- None.

3. To create a Planned Unit Development (PUD) at 215 N. Webster Avenue, subject to the draft PUD.

4. To amend multiple Sections of the Zoning Ordinance affected by 2017 Wisconsin Act 67, as proposed subject to the draft ordinance.

5. To declare City property surplus at 1029, 1035 and 1039 Velp Avenue subject to the following conditions:

A. The surplus declaration must follow Staff's exhibit noting right-of-way retention in blue, surplus declaration in purple, surplus declaration with sale to the Redevelopment Authority in green, and an access easement as shown in yellow.
B. A Storm Sewer Easement shall be retained over the area outlined in purple.
C. Proof that Cross Easements are in place between parcels 18-800-1 and 18-806, 18-809-4 and 18-809-8.

D. Sale must be at or above Fair Market Value.
E. Funds from sale must be returned to Department of Public Works - Real Estate Account.
F. All costs to survey and describe Surplus Property to be Petitioners expense.

## M. REPORT OF THE FINANCE COMMITTEE.

Moved by Alderperson Randy Scannell, seconded by Alderperson Barbara Dorff to approve. Motion carried.

1. To approve the purchase of one new ambulance for $243,053 and one demo ambulance for $221,500 for a combined cost of $464,553.

2. To receive and place on file the designation of the Official Newspaper for the City of Green Bay to the Green Bay Press Gazette for the estimated annual amount of $55,000.

## N. REPORT OF THE IMPROVEMENT & SERVICES COMMITTEE.

Moved by Alderperson Randy Scannell, seconded by Alderperson Jesse Brunette to approve with the exception of items # 2, 8, 9, and 11. Motion carried.

1. To approve the request by Ald. Wery on recycle/garbage bin storage requirements/enforcement and have Department of Public Works staff work with Inspection staff to develop a process of shared inspection duties regarding recycle/garbage bin storage inspections.

2. To approve the request by Ald. Wery to allow City Council members to be provided with printed agendas.

Moved by Alderperson Randy Scannell, seconded by Alderperson Kathy Lefebvre to approve.

Moved by Alderperson Barb Dorff, seconded by Alderperson Bill Galvin to amend item #2 to refer to the Personnel Committee. Motion carried.

3. To hold the request by Ald. Wery to allow City Council members a second parking permit until the May 30, 2018 Improvement and Services Committee meeting.

4. To hold the request by Ald. Dorff to craft a proposal to implement the Municipal Vehicle Registration Fee Program (Wheel Tax) until the May 30, 2018 Improvement and Services Committee meeting.

5. To receive and place on file the request to look at what other Wisconsin communities do with respect to overnight parking bans, with the potential to eliminate the overnight parking ban in the City of Green Bay.

6. To approve the Memorandum of Understanding: Bike Sharing Services between the City of Green Bay and LimeBike, including the same maintenance services on the weekends as on week days.

7. To approve the report of the Purchasing Manager:

A. To purchase a Striping Machine Body from EZ Liner for $267,514.

B. To purchase a truck chassis from Quality Truck Care for $101,000.

C. To award a contract for Televised Sewer Basin Inspection for an amount not to exceed the 2018 budgeted amount of $600,000.

D. To award a contract for Televised Standard Sewer Inspection for an amount not to exceed the 2018 budgeted amount of $165,000.

8. To approve the request by Department of Public Works to award the contract SUPERIOR ROAD STORM WATER POND at a staff level subject to the following conditions:

A. Project is included in the 2018 Capital Improvement Program.

B. Delay in bringing forward a recommendation to award at the next regularly scheduled Committee meeting would result in an unacceptable delay in starting construction.

C. The project so awarded would be reported out at the next regularly scheduled meeting of the Improvement and Services Committee.

Moved by Alderperson Randy Scannell, seconded by Alderperson Barbara Dorff to approve.

Moved by Alderperson Andy Nicholson, seconded by Alderperson John VanderLeest to amend. Alderperson Andy Nicholson stated with council moving to one meeting per month during the summer, the ability for the Department of Public Works to take up routine business could be hampered. To allow DPW to continue to handle business in a timely manner and provide service to our constituents, he proposes the following amendment: "and grant staff authority to award other construction contracts to the low responsive bidder provided that the project being bid was part of an approved capital program, funding is available to complete the contract, and that a delay in awarding the contract would adversely impact the ability to complete the construction." Prior to staff awarding the contract, the Director will notify the Mayor, President of the Common Council, Vice-President of the Common Council, and the Chair of the Improvement & Services Committee. Any contracts awarded will be reported out at the next regularly scheduled meeting of the Improvement & Services Committee. Motion carried.
Yes- Andy Nicholson, Barbara Dorff, Bill Galvin, Brian Johnson, Chris Wery, Craig Stevens, Jesse Brunette, John VanderLeest, Mark Steuer, Randy Scannell, Veronica Corpus-Dax, Kathy Lefebvre,
No- None, Abstain- None

9. To approve Agreement for Purchase and Sale of Real Estate at 1012 N. Webster Avenue for the N. Webster Avenue reconstruction project and authorize payments.

Moved by Alderperson Randy Scannell, seconded by Alderperson Barbara Dorff to approve.

Moved by Alderperson Andy Nicholson, seconded by Alderperson John VanderLeest to amend. Alderperson Andy Nicholson stated the ability of DPW to execute routine agreements and acquire real estate for road projects will be impacted by the move to monthly meetings. He proposes the following amendment: "and grant staff authority to execute and amend agreements with the State of Wisconsin, such as the Bridge Operation Agreement or the agreement for design and construction services with WisDOT for Webster Avenue, and to authorize staff to take all actions necessary for real estate acquisition for the Webster Avenue Project." As was the case of item #8, prior to taking action, the Director will notify the Mayor, President of the Common Council, Vice-President of the Common Council, and the Chair of the Improvement & Services Committee, and report out any action taken at the next regularly-scheduled meeting of the Improvement & Services Committee. Motioned carried.

Yes- Andy Nicholson, Barbara Dorff, Bill Galvin, Brian Johnson, Chris Wery, Craig Stevens, Jesse Brunette, John VanderLeest, Mark Steuer, Randy Scannell, Veronica Corpus-Dax, Kathy Lefebvre,
No- None, Abstain- None

10. To approve Relocation Claims for the Webster Avenue project and authorize payments.

same

11. To approve the applications for Concrete Sidewalk Builder's Licenses by the following:

A. Brian's Quality Concrete Inc.
C. Evraets Concrete Const. LLC
D. Precision Flatwork
E. Ray Jaeger Const. Inc.

To contingently approve application for Concrete Sidewalk Builder's License pending successful reference reviews:

B. Carter Trucking & Excavating Inc.

Moved by Alderperson Randy Scannell, seconded by Alderperson Mark Steuer to approve.

Moved by Alderperson Andy Nicholson, seconded by Alderperson Randy Scannell to amend. Alderperson Andy Nicholson stated in order to provide timely response to contractors seeking routine licenses through the City, he proposes the following amendment to item #11: "and grant staff authority to issue Tree and Brush Trimmer, Concrete Sidewalk Builder, and Underground Sprinkler System Licenses, and report out the award of any license granted at the next regularly-scheduled meeting of the Improvement & Services Committee." Motion carried.
Yes- Andy Nicholson, Barbara Dorff, Bill Galvin, Brian Johnson, Chris Wery, Craig Stevens, Jesse Brunette, John VanderLeest, Mark Steuer, Randy Scannell, Veronica Corpus-Dax, Kathy Lefebvre,
No- None, Abstain- None

12. To approve the application for Tree & Brush Trimmer License by Urban Tree Service.

## O. REPORT OF THE PERSONNEL COMMITTEE.

Moved by Alderperson Randy Scannell, seconded by Alderperson Kathy Lefebvre to approve. Motion carried.

1. To approve request to fill the following replacement positions and all subsequent vacancies resulting from internal transfers.

1. Support Assistant - Fire
2. Mechanic - Public Works

2. To receive and place on file request for out of state travel for Capt. Warych to attend the National Conference on Race and Ethnicity in American Higher Education in New Orleans, Louisiana, May 30-31, 2018, estimated cost for meals $50.

3. To approve out of state travel for Interim Park Director Andersen to attend the Great Lakes Parks Institute Board of Regents conference planning and board meeting in Angola, Indiana, June 4-5, 2018 at no cost to the City for room, board or transportation.

4. To approve out of state travel for Interim Park Director Andersen and Recreation Supervisor Moeller to attend the National Recreation and Parks Association Conference in Indianapolis, Indiana, September 25-27, 2018. All costs for registration, room, board and travel will be covered by the Parks Rx grant.

5. To approve out of state travel for Public Works Superintendent Fietzer to attend the APWA Western Snow and Ice Conference in Loveland, Colorado, September 24 - 28, 2018. All costs for room, board and transportation will be covered by APWA-WI Chapter.

6. *INFORMATIONAL ONLY* - The Removal From Specialty Team or Assignment grievance is denied and the findings of fact and conclusions of law will be made available at the next Personnel Committee meeting.

## P. REPORT OF THE PROTECTION & WELFARE COMMITTEE.

Moved by Alderperson Randy Scannell, seconded by Alderperson Craig Stevens to approve with the exception of item #1. Alderperson Andy Nicholson abstained from the full report except for item #1. Motion carried.

1. To amend GB Municipal Code 8.06 to require leashes to be 6 feet or less. To also refer a communication to the Parks Committee to add signage within parks property the leash law requirement and report to P&W Committee as to where they are adding additional dog parks.

Moved by Alderperson Randy Scannell, seconded by Alderperson Mark Steuer to approve.

Moved by Alderperson Mark Steuer, seconded by Alderperson Barb Dorff to refer back to the Protection & Welfare Committee.

Moved by Alderperson Brian Johnson, seconded by Alderperson Jesse Brunette to suspend the rules to allow interested parties to speak. Motion carried.

Moved by Alderperson Brian Johnson, seconded by Alderperson Randy Scannell to return to the regular order of business. Motion carried.

Motion to refer: Yes- Barbara Dorff, Mark Steuer, Randy Scannell, Kathy Lefebvre, No- Andy Nicholson, Bill Galvin, Brian Johnson, Chris Wery, Craig Stevens, Jesse Brunette, John VanderLeest, Veronica Corpus-Dax - Motion Failed.

Motion to amend to leashes to be 6 feet or less: Yes- Andy Nicholson, Craig Stevens, Mark Steuer, Randy Scannell, No- Barbara Dorff, Bill Galvin, Brian Johnson, Chris Wery, Jesse Brunette, John VanderLeest, Veronica Corpus-Dax, Kathy Lefebvre - Motion Failed.

2. To approve the change of agent for Van Zeeland Oil Co., Inc. at 601 N. Military Ave.

3. To approve the change of agent for Sam's East, Inc. at 2470 W. Mason St.

4. To approve the change of agent for the Automobile Gallery, Inc. at 400 S. Adams St.

5. To approve the change of agent for Green Bay Lodging II (The Meadows Center) at 850 Kepler Dr. with an effective date of July 1, 2018.

6. To approve a request by Richard Craniums to hold an outdoor event on May 12, 2018 from noon to 6 p.m., subject to complaint.

7. To approve an appeal by Lyssa Root to the denial of her Operator License application.

8. To grant "Class A" Liquor License by Van Zeeland Oil Co., Inc. at 601 N Military Ave. for the 2018-2019 year, with the approval of the proper authorities. (Currently has a Class "A" Beverage License)

9. To approve the renewal applications for liquor and/or beer licenses for the 2018-2019 license year, with the approval of the proper authorities.

10. To approve the renewal applications for liquor and/or beer licenses for the 2018-2019 license year, pending the approval of change of agent at the May 15, 2018 City Council Meeting and with the approval of the proper authorities.

11. To approve the renewal applications with the change of descriptions with the exception to Haystack Bar & Grill at 1911 University Ave. to include only the "Basement, Bar, and Storage" as part of their licensed premises and with the approval of the proper authorities.

12. To receive and place on file a request by former Alderperson Moore regarding domestic violence as it pertains to bail/bond, sentencing and victim resources and request Chief Smith to meet with Brown County counterparts and report back to the committee on the viability of creating a task force for domestic violence weapon surrenders.

13. To hold for 30 days the request by Ald. Wery on an endorsement of Police Chief Smith's proposal for school safety, regarding retired policemen in all Green Bay Public Schools as the Police Department reaches out to the School Board.

14. To receive and place on file the Liquor Violation Reports from the Police Department for May 7, 2018.

15. INFORMATIONAL- To approve a request by Catch-22 at 1699 E. Mason St. to change their liquor license to include an outdoor patio seating area with the stipulation that the speakers point away from the residential area. *(The City Council granted final authority to the Protection & Welfare Committee regarding this request.)*

## Q. REPORT OF THE PROTECTION & WELFARE COMMITTEE GRANTING OPERATOR LICENSES.

Moved by Alderperson Randy Scannell, seconded by Alderperson Bill Galvin to approve. Motion carried.

2. Report of the Protection & Welfare Committee granting Operator Licenses, valid until June 30, 2020.

1. Report of the Protection & Welfare Committee granting Operator Licenses, valid until June 30, 2019.

## R. REFERRAL OF PETITIONS & COMMUNICATIONS.

Moved by Alderperson Randy Scannell, seconded by Alderperson Andy Nicholson to approve. Motion carried.

1. Refer to the Protection & Welfare Committee -Application for a "Class B" Combination License by Wally Spot Supper Club LLC at 1979 Main St. (Currently an Individual Ownership by Thomas Adamany)

2. Referral to Protection & Welfare Committee - A request by Tenet LLC at 2475 W. Mason St. to file an extension to issuing their liquor license application due to a pending remodel/addition.

3. Refer to the Protection & Welfare Committee - Appeal by Krisi VanRemortel on the denial of her Operator License application.

4. Refer to the Protection & Welfare Committee - Renewal applications for liquor and/or beer licenses for the 2018-2019 license year.

5. Refer to the Protection & Welfare Committee -Notice of change of agent for The Cannery Market, LLC at 320 N. Broadway.

6. Refer to the Improvement & Services Committee an application for Concrete Sidewalk Builder's License by Blaser Construction, LLC.

7. Refer to the Protection & Welfare Committee- An application for an available "Class B" Combination license for Francisco Soto at 1807 N. Irwin Ave.

8. Refer to the Improvement & Services Committee an application for Underground Sprinkler System License by Lizer Lawn Care.

9. Refer to the Protection & Welfare Committee - Appeal by Nicole Leigh Mommaerts on the denial of her Operator License application.

10. Refer to the Personnel Committee a request by Alderperson Barb Dorff to approve a salary increase for the position of mayor effective following the 2019 Mayoral election the Mayor's salary will be increased annually based on any general increase provided to general municipal employees on the date the increase is provided. Increase by $11,000 on May 1, 2019 for an annual salary of

$93,535. Increase by $11,000 on May 1, 2020 for an annual salary of $104,535. Increase by $11,000 on May 1, 2021 for an annual salary of $115,535. Increase by $11,000 on May 1, 2022 for an annual salary of $126,535.

11. Refer to the Parks Committee a request by Alderperson Chris Wery to have staff compile, or contract out, a list of all City of Green Bay Council Presidents and dates served as such. A plaque bearing this information shall be displayed in the 2nd floor main hallway of City Hall.

12. Refer to the Park Committee a request by Alderperson Kathy Lefebvre for best practices for mulching trees, shrubs, etc., and mowing.

13. Refer to the Traffic, Bicycle, and Pedestrian Commission a request by Alderperson Kathy Lefebvre to clarify who is allowed in No Parking Zones.

14. Refer to the Protection & Welfare Committee a request by Alderperson Randy Scannell that the Protection and Welfare Committee include not only fire, police, safety, health, licenses, and permits, but also redistricting, administrative procedures, policies, or any other item that does not fit into the agenda of any other standing committee. That if this change is made to the Protection and Welfare Committee it will be renamed the Protection and Policy Committee.

15. Refer to the Protection & Welfare Committee a request by Delaware North, Green Bay Sportservice, Inc., 1265 Lombardi Avenue, To amend their liquor license for an additional plaza area in front of the Johnsonville Tailgate Village.

16. Refer to the Improvement & Services Committee - Application for Concrete Sidewalk Builder's License by Paul Conard Construction Co. Inc.

17. Refer to the Improvement & Services Committee - Application for Tree & Brush Trimmer License by WB Tree Service.

## S. RECEIVE & PLACE ON FILE.

Moved by Alderperson Chris Wery, seconded by Alderperson Andy Nicholson to approve. Motion carried.

1. Municipal Court Report for April, 2018.

## T. RESOLUTIONS.

Moved by Alderperson Randy Scannell, seconded by Alderperson Bill Galvin to suspend the rules for the purpose of adopting resolutions 1 thru 4 with one roll call vote. Motion carried.

Moved by Alderperson Randy Scannell, seconded by Alderperson Kathy Lefebvre to adopt the resolutions. Motion carried.
Yes- Andy Nicholson, Barbara Dorff, Bill Galvin, Brian Johnson, Chris Wery, Craig Stevens, Jesse Brunette, John VanderLeest, Mark Steuer, Randy Scannell, Veronica Corpus-Dax, Kathy Lefebvre,
No- None, Abstain- None

1. Resolution for Purchase and Sale of Real Estate at 1012 N. Webster Avenue.

2. Resolution accepting Relocation Claims for North Webster Avenue.

3. Resolution authorizing conditional-use approval at 1053 Velp Avenue (ZP 18-11).

4. Resolution declaring City property surplus at 1029, 1035 and 1039 Velp Avenue (SP18-02)

## U. ORDINANCES - FIRST READING.

Moved by Alderperson Barbara Dorff, seconded by Alderperson Bill Galvin to suspend the rules for

the purpose of advancing the ordinances to the third reading. Motion carried.

Moved by Alderperson Randy Scannell, seconded by Alderperson Mark Steuer to advance the ordinance to the third reading. Motion carried.

1. General Ordinance No. 8-18
An ordinance creating section 8.16, relating to the practice of massage or bodywork therapy requiring state licensing.

2. General Ordinance 10-18
An ordinance amending Green Bay Municipal Code Section 13-205(d)(1), to repeal regulation related to conditional use protest; Section 13-205(g), to amend regulation related to conditional use expiration; Section 13-404(b), to amend the provision requiring nonconforming lots be combined; and Sections 13-602, 13-702,13-802 and 13-902, to amend conditional uses within various zoning districts (TA 18-02).

3. Zoning Ordinance 8-18
An ordinance creating a Planned Unit Development (PUD) Overlay District for 215 North Webster Avenue for the redevelopment of Whitney School and proposed townhomes (ZP 18-14).

4. Miscellaneous Ordinance 1-18
An ordinance adopting an amendment to the Smart Growth 2022 Comprehensive Plan of the City of Green Bay to amend the Future Land Use of property located at 1060 Gray Court from Commercial and General Industrial to Medium and High Density Housing (CPA 18-01).

## V. ORDINANCES - THIRD READING.

Moved by Alderperson Randy Scannell, seconded by Alderperson Barbara Dorff to suspend the rules for the purpose of adopting ordinances 1 & 2 with one roll call vote. Motion carried.

Moved by Alderperson Randy Scannell, seconded by Alderperson Jesse Brunette to adopt ordinances 1 & 2. Motion carried.
Yes- Andy Nicholson, Barbara Dorff, Bill Galvin, Brian Johnson, Chris Wery, Craig Stevens, Jesse Brunette, John VanderLeest, Mark Steuer, Randy Scannell, Veronica Corpus-Dax, Kathy Lefebvre,
No- None, Abstain- None

1. To amend Section 2.01(1), Green Bay Municipal Code, relating to regular meetings of the Common Council.

2. General Ordinance No. 6-18
An ordinance amending Section 29.208, Green Bay Municipal Code, related to Parking Regulations.

3. Zoning Ordinance No. 7-18
An ordinance amending Zoning Ordinance No. 20-07, a PUD overlay district for modified signage on the HSHS St. Mary's Hospital Medical Center Campus. (ZP 18-10)

4. Planning Ordinance No. 2-18
An ordinance amending the official map of the City of Green Bay by closing the unimproved portion of Rothe Street to public traffic.

## W. COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE.

1. Consideration with possible action on the request by Wisconsin Public Service for a utility easement in Eisenhower Park for the new Eisenhower School addition.

Moved by Alderperson Andy Nicholson, seconded by Alderperson Bill Galvin to approve. Motion carried.
Yes- Andy Nicholson, Barbara Dorff, Bill Galvin, Brian Johnson, Chris Wery, Craig Stevens, Jesse Brunette, John VanderLeest, Mark Steuer, Randy Scannell, Veronica Corpus-Dax, Kathy Lefebvre, No- None, Abstain- None.

2. Update with possible action on status of litigation in the Saldana, Ignacio v. COGB, et al matter.

The Council may convene in closed session pursuant to Section 19.85(1) (g), Wis. Stats., for the purpose of conferring with legal counsel for the governmental body who is rendering oral or written advice concerning strategy to be adopted by the body with respect to litigation in which it is or is likely to become involved. The Council may thereafter reconvene in open session pursuant to Section 19.85(2), Wis. Stats., to report the results of the closed session and consider the balance of

the agenda.

Moved by Alderperson Randy Scannell, seconded by Alderperson Barbara Dorff to go into closed session at 8:11 P.M. Motion carried. Alderperson Randy Scannell read the closed session language. Yes- Barbara Dorff, Bill Galvin, Brian Johnson, Chris Wery, Craig Stevens, Jesse Brunette, John VanderLeest, Mark Steuer, Randy Scannell, Veronica Corpus-Dax, Kathy Lefebvre, No- Andy Nicholson, Abstain- None

Moved by Alderperson Randy Scannell, seconded by Alderperson Bill Galvin to reconvene in open session at 8:21 P.M. Motion carried.

Moved by Alderperson Bill Galvin, seconded by Alderperson Barb Dorff to proceed as counsel directed. Motion carried.
Yes- Andy Nicholson, Barbara Dorff, Bill Galvin, Brian Johnson, Chris Wery, Craig Stevens, Jesse Brunette, John VanderLeest, Mark Steuer, Randy Scannell, Veronica Corpus-Dax, Kathy Lefebvre, No- None, Abstain- None

## X. ADJOURNMENT.

Moved by Alderperson Randy Scannell, seconded by Alderperson Andy Nicholson to adjourn at 8:22 P.M. Motion carried.

Kris Teske
Green Bay City Clerk

Verbatim Minutes

- [Woman] Okay.

- [Man] Okay, I hit record. I don't wanna send that, I wanna send this live.

- [Woman] There we go.

- So that's it, that's on right now?

- [Woman] Yep.

- Is everybody on? Chris, are you, is everybody on? Is everybody on?

- [Woman] Brian Johnson.

- Brian?

- [Woman] Chris. And Mark Steuer.

- [Mayor] Oh, Mark Steuer, just log in. Alright.

- Yep, you're good.

- We're good?

- [Woman] Still Brian and Chris.

- [Mayor] Am I in, I'm in, right?

- [Woman] You're not.

- Part of it? You voted off the island?

- [Woman] That's 'cause you're the main vote. Still waiting

- Okay.

- [Woman] Can Mike help them, okay.

- Mike, can you help these guys? We wanna get going.

- [Woman] Brian's in now. Thank you. Okay, I'm still not showing them.

- What's that?

- [Woman] I'm still not showing them as in.

- No, I know.

- Oh, you know.

- Alright, we're good. Alright, good evening and welcome to City Hall, I wanna call to order the meeting of the Common Council for Tuesday, June 19th, six p.m. Everyone has logged in, we just, for the audience, we have a new software system that we're working on, this is our fourth meeting, Civic Clerk, it is very transparent, it's a good system, but we're all kinda learning together on this. And Chris, is everyone logged in?

- [Clerk] We have 12 here, your honor.

- Alright, so we're all here, we have a form, we'll proceed. If you now please rise for the Pledge of Allegiance and remain standing for the invocation.

- [All] I pledge allegiance to the flag of the United States of America and to the republic for which it stands, one nation, under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all.

- Heavenly Father, we, as the City of Green Bay, are grateful for the many gifts and talents you've bestowed upon our community. It's through a belief in You and helping our neighbors that we can build a community of hope and prosperity. As we enter the summer months, we ask that you watch over the many children in our community who use this as a playful and learning times in their young lives. While they learn to swim and ride a bike let us all be a community that teaches the values of respect, kindness, and faith. It's through these teachings and a belief in You that we can be examples to our children and to each other and truly lift the lives of those who call Green Bay home. As we approach the Fourth of July holiday, we thank you, as we do every City Council meeting, for our dedicated military, especially those who serve on the USS Green Bay. Bless them and their families as we pray for their safety and wellbeing. We ask this in Your name, amen. Alright, with that I'll entertain a motion to approve the minutes of the May 15th meetings. And there was a motion by Alderman Nicholson, and that was seconded by Alderman Scannell. The discussion here on the minutes of the May 15th meeting. Sea now it's all in favor of that motion please signify by saying aye.

- [Aldermen] Aye.

- And those opposed, nays, the ayes have it, and the minutes have been approved. We're now on to approval of the agenda. There's a motion by Alderman Scannell and seconded by Alderperson Cathy Lefebvre. Alderman Steuer, a proper recommendation would be to move Report L up to after G, the announcements. And that will get packaging on there. So, we have a motion by Alderman Steuer and seconded by Alderman Scannell to move Item L up to follow G, which is the announcements. All in favor of that please signify by saying aye.

- [Aldermen] Aye.

- And those opposed nays, the ayes have it. Alderperson Dorff.

- I'd like to move up Z to right after whatever you think is best, but--

- [Mayor] Right after the appointments, it'd be right before J.

- Okay. We'll take Item Z, because I know you wanna, so--

- Thank you.

- [Mayor] Alderperson Dorff has made that motion. And it's seconded by Alderman Scannell. All in favor of that motion, please signify by saying aye.

- [Aldermen] Aye. And those opposed, nay, anything else? Entertain a motion to adopt as a mandate.

- [Mayor] Motion to adopt as a mandate.

- Alderman Scannell, seconded by Alderman Steuer. All in favor of that motion, please signify by saying aye.

- [Aldermen] Aye.

- Those opposed, nays, the ayes have it. So the motion, the agenda, the adopted agenda you have before you has been adopted. Okay, clerk?

- [Clerk] Report by the mayor.

- A couple things. One housekeeping item, Joanne Burgert, as you can see, is sitting in Vanessa Chavez, our city attorney's, seat. Vanessa Chavez is, has some personal issues that she's got to deal with, and we gotta keep her in our prayers. And Joann will be here for the foreseeable future. She is our deputy city clerk, or deputy city attorney. Sorry. And she'll be acting as our counselor throughout the evening. A couple reminders on things. One is, well obviously tonight's a big night for us. There's a lot on the agenda, and I'm pretty excited about some of the things that we'll be discussing. And tomorrow we have our bridge lighting. That's something that some of us have been working on for a couple years now, it's at eight p.m. We tested it early this morning at like midnight, and it looks awesome. And it's gonna be a pretty neat feature in Green Bay to really connect the community with some of the activities we have going on with skin cancer, with the Fourth of July holiday, there's just a lot of things that will showcase tomorrow. So that's at eight o'clock, we have a band, I thank Downtown Green Bay Incorporated for picking up the tabs on that. And then, so that's the 20th. And then on the 21st at three o'clock, we do the ribbon cutting for Granger on Monroe, and, you know, we don't have an advertising department, but that just has not gotten the press it deserves. And I think we should all be there, I talked about It at my state of the city. You know, they moved about a $20 million payroll from Ashwaubenon

into downtown Green Bay. It's over 300 jobs. We're very, very excited about that. And they renovated the building, as, you know, there was, they're paying market rate for parking, it's just, they're just a good flagship community, what's that? Three o'clock. And that's on the 21st. And then, as you know, the 25th is kids' day. I put that brochure on your desk, that's a day that is, it's not a day off, but it's your day that we celebrate, everything's free for kids in the city of Green Bay, Bay Beach, transit, we have a lunch with the mayor, where we'll have 1,000 kids come to light park, and if you're there, I'll be sure and introduce you. And there's a lot of activities that kids can take advantage of here in Green Bay on kids' day, that's the 25th. The Fourth of July, which is really being led by Alderman Brian Johnson, the events start, Alderman Scannell, maybe you wanna mention that under announcements at the Liberty Bell, and then we have activities going on all day. So that takes us to the Fourth of July. So that. Those are the activities going on, and then under the welcome wagon, we have to give a warm welcome to Augusta, but we'll call him Augie, Augie Feld, Jo had a baby last week. Right, he's a week old.

- [Augie] Yep.

- That's awesome, congratulations, Jo. Augie, that's a cool name. I love it. So. Alright, and I'll discuss presentations when we get done. Okay, clerk?

- [Clerk] We're onto announcements.

- [Mayor] Help me out, Mike.

- I don't see any--

- What lights do you have on? Any announcements from the City Council? Yeah.

- Now I see where--

- Alright. Alderman Randy Scannell.

- Thank you, your honor. It's summer, so there's a lot going on in the city, and especially in District Seven, we've got, it's gonna be, let me back up a minute and let's get organized here. Summer City Live on Wednesdays from 10 a.m. to 1:30. There'll be bands and food out at the city deck there, oh, this is at the Brown County Library. They're gonna start off with a performance at 10 o'clock and then another one at 1:30, every Wednesday. This first one is gonna be a, features comedy juggling. Imagine, juggling, comedy, that's pretty funny. Funny stuff. Nicolet's Dine on the Deck starts off this Wednesday, 11 a.m. to one p.m. Food and music. The farmer's market on Saturdays has started off. We've got our summer solstice party at the Whitney Park this Thursday, starting at five, going 'til nine, there's Food Truck Fridays at the Brown County Central Library. Well I could go on and on and on. Let me just jump to the Fourth of July Liberty Bell, again, we'll be having the liberty bell ringing ceremony. It'll be about a half an hour long, starting at one o'clock. We're gonna welcome in some new citizens to our community. And we'll have a little music and a little cake, a little water, and start the festivities for the Fourth of July. Thank you.

- [Mayor] Thank you, Alderman. Alderman Mark Steuer, announcements?

- Thank you, your honor. This is a shout-out to one of the folks that worked at City Hall for years, Mickey Brosig. He was in public works for over 40 years, he passed away recently and if anybody knew him, he was amazing how he worked with the public and worked with people and I had the opportunity to work with him for over 20 years. And he'll be sorely missed, thank you.

- [Mayor] Alright, thank you, Alderman. Okay, I don't see any other lights, clerk will continue.

- [Clerk] We're now going to go to reports of the redevelopment authority, the June 12th, 2018 and June 15th, 2018 meeting.

- So this is Item L in your packet. What are your wishes regarding this report? So motion to approve by Alderperson Dorff, seconded by Alderman Scannell. Any items on this report you wish to handle separately? One. Somebody needs to pull six. Six. Alright, hearing others all in favor of the remainder of that report, please signify by saying aye.

- [Aldermen] Aye.

- And those opposed, nay. The ayes have it. Under the report of redevelopment authority, all items have been approved, the exception of Item One and Six, and Alderman Wery, if it's okay, can we take six first?

- Mayor?

- Yes?

- [Alderman] On that Items number Two and three,

- Right.

- [Alderman] Need the record to reflect that I,

- [Mayor] Okay.

- [Alderman] And Mr. Bayer is

- Alright. Alright, so we'll note that, clerk. Alright, so we are now on to Item Six under the report of redevelopment authority. What are your wishes regarding this report?

- [Alderman] Approved.

- Motion approved by Alderman Scannell, seconded by Alderperson Dorff. Alderman Scannell, I'll start with you. I'm the one who asked that, this agreement package and you guys.

- I think Barb pulled it.

- I pulled it.

- [Mayor] Alright, go ahead.

- I would wonder if we could open the floor to have Green Bay Packaging come forward and talk.

- [Alderman] Second.

- [Mayor] Alright, we have a motion by Alderperson Dorff, seconded by Alderman Steuer, to open the floor to hear from interested parties. All in favor of that motion please signify by saying aye.

- [Aldermen] Aye.

- [Mayor] And those opposed, nays, the ayes have it, the floor is open. So we're discussing under the report of the redevelopment authority specifically item six, item six is to approve the development agreement, the

Green Bay Packing Incorporated for a project at 1500 North Quincy, 1600 Leo Frigo Way, 900 Raddison, 733 Weise, 1809 Webster, 1700 Webster, 1800 Webster, 831 Raddison, 1910 Quincy Street. And then it lists the tax parcels. This project went through the redevelopment authority on June 15th and is now before the City Council. Brian or John, is there anyone from Green Bay Packaging who would like to address the council? Yeah.

- Sorry.

- Yeah.

- [Mayor] And then Brian, just for the record, I need your name and address, you can.

- Yeah. Thanks Mayor, good evening, everyone. My name is Brian Hollenbach, I am executive vice president of Green Bay Packagin. So, we're here to talk to you about the major project, but before I get started I thought we'd show you the video that I think gives a pretty good idea of what we're talking about. So, Bill, if you can get that started.

- My grandfather started what we would call Green Bay Packaging today in 1933. He started making corrugated shipping containers. It gradually grew from one little place out on Broadway Street, Green Bay, and started a folding carton operation which is the chip board, started this Green Bay Paper Mill in 1949, just continued to add over the years. Today we have 3,500 employees. We're in 14 different states and we have 30-plus different operations Talking about this for years. Our mill here still runs well. As time goes on, again, technology changes and we've upgraded this mill.

- The Green Bay Mill's over 70 years old. Long term, if we're gonna compete, what do we need to do with this mill?

- And if you're familiar with what's happening in Wisconsin, there's been numerous mills that have closed down over the years, they get old, they get inefficient. And to reinvest is huge. You know, looking at this, like I said, for years, what to do, I've decided that our best course of action is to build this mill right here, right on our current site. And one of the big keys is we have a lot of great employees here. If we build a new mill right next door, everybody that's working at this mill is gonna be working at the new mill.

- We have to make advancements in how we make paper, so we're going to be building a facility that will be state-of-the-art, that will give us a competitive advantage through more efficiency from an energy consumption perspective will be more efficient. We'll be able to make a higher-quality product that serves our customers and their needs better.

- I think for them to choose us is, we take great comfort in that. I mean it's a good decision for Green Bay Packaging and for the Kress family, but you know, it's a gift for the city of Green Bay.

- Well, for Brown County it means, we currently employ over 1,100 employees. So it means those 1,100 employees have a long-term job. It also means we're gonna be investing $500 million into this area.

- We're estimating right now that we'll actually have 1.5 million man hours from tradespeople on site.

- [Man] We'll be making over double the capacity that we make today, so the logistics jobs that are gonna follow this are gonna be hugely impacted in a positive way.

- There are many different businesses that rely on Green Bay Packaging being located right here in northeast Wisconsin. And not only the jobs that they emnploye here locally, it's all the other ancillary jobs that are benefiting from that.

- You know, the mill of today is very different from even the mill of 20 years ago. And the technology that we will be employing in this operation is quite frankly cutting edge. So what we need to see in our employee base and what we need to develop in them are really strong skills in troubleshooting, automation, automation management.

- You know, people come to work here, they wanna be here, they wanna do their jobs, they wanna be very good at their jobs. It's a great family-owned company, and everybody's respected when they come to work.

- I am definitely proud to be a part of this family. As a matter of fact, the owner and I are on a first-name basis, so it's important to me that they have this new mill coming online that is job security.

- And if the new asset is put into place, that's be stable for the next 32 years, which it'll take me to retire.

- For us to be able to effectively execute this project, we're going to begin training our workforce from day one.

- The Green Bay Packing mill will expand our production capabilities, which will have a great economic benefit for this area. But while they do that, they're going to be doing it in an environmentally sustainable way.

- This is something really special in terms of their process and what it means to protecting the water quality.

- Green Bay has a great opportunity to be the home of a state-of-the-art paper mill that is energy efficient and improves air quality, and it doesn't discharge any wastewater to the Fox River.

- I think every city, every mayor has their, their flagship corporations that they rely on, that they really look to for what's going on, and in Green Bay, that's Green Bay Packaging.

- [Man] It really sends a strong message to the community of Brown County. that they're committed to this area. And they're committed to making sure that Green Bay Packaging remains part of our community for the next couple generations.

- At the end of the day, we thought we could get the city, the county, the state, everybody involved to help, we could make this the right move not only for Green Bay Packaging, but for Brown County and for the whole state.

- [Mayor] Thank you, sir.

- So a pretty good story, huh? So, it's an exciting day, I said this a few times in the last few weeks, and this is another step in the process. So I thought what I would do, obviously the video tells you a lot of the story, but I thought I'd spend a few minutes talking about how we got to where we're at today. And of course take any questions if that's okay. So, as Will says in the video, that mill was built 71 years ago, okay, and we've rebuilt it three times, the most recent in the '90s. It's been a great machine for us, we've got a great group of employees there, it's been an efficient machine. But technology's changed. I mean at the end of the day, it's a 71-year-old mill. It's 164 inches wide, and not to get into too many details, but 164 inches wide in today's world doesn't fit. Because it sells to what's called corrugators, and those corrugators used to be 80 inches. So you run this big roll of paper and you cut it in half and you sell it. Now those corrugators are 100 inches, so 164 divided by two doesn't make,doesn't work out too well. So we needed a wider machine, okay, and we needed new technology. So what happened was over the last few years we really started looking at it, and about six months ago, we dove in very deep, myself and a few of the leaders of the company. And frankly we came up with a few different options. Some of these options you're probably not going to hear about, but since you know what we came up with, you're gonna be happy about it. But one of the options, we took a long hard look at was should

we just shut down the mill and buy paper? We'd still keep our box plants running. But in today's world you can buy paper, and frankly you can buy it at a pretty good price. What that does for Green Bay is, yes there's less employees, but as a company, we're also not spending $500 million. So we had to take a look at that option. Then we looked at an option, at the same time we looked at multiple options, but then we also looked at an option of if we decide to build a new mill, where should it go? And frankly the first places we were looking at was lower Midwest. Because from a simple logistics point of view, to get our fiber into the mill, it's much more economically viable to do it that way. And frankly to ship to all of our box plants, it makes more sense. And we looked at even more drastic measures, frankly. But at the end of the day, what we ended up doing is we came in and spoke to Will Kress, our president and CEO, as well as the board of directors, and made a presentation. And said, there's another option, and that's to build a mill, if you look at these, if you get a chance looking at these renderings, right on the current site. It's tight, and may not be as economically smart, but there is a way to do it. And what the board of directors said and what Will said is if we can make this economically viable, let's do it, because number one, we got a great group of employees. Number two, our name is Green Bay Packaging, frankly, and the Kress family feels very close to Wisconsin, as well as many of our employees as well. So we started going down that road. So what happened was, I think it was early February, we called a meeting that I facilitated that lasted for about an hour, we asked the mayor to join us as well as the folks from Brown County, the WEDC, Mark Hogan and that group, the DNR, and a number of other folks, and we kinda mapped out, here's where we're at, and here's the cost challenges we have, and we don't want you to make up all of those, but what can you do to help? Can you all work together, like I say in the video, can we all work together to figure out a way to make this happen at Green Bay? And at the end of the day, everybody did work together. I think it went incredibly well, it was some tough negotiations back and forth, but I think it was very, very positive. And very good for the community. So what's Green Bay Packaging doing? So we're committing to spend $500 million or more right at that current location, okay? Across the country we've got about 3,600 employees, a little more than that. In the state of Wisconsin we have 1,534. I know those numbers exactly. In Brown County we have over 1,100. We're committing to keeping all of those jobs in the state, okay, and keeping all those jobs in Brown County and Green Bay. And we're also committing to add another 200 jobs over a period of time, many of those in Brown County and many of those in Green Bay. So we're committing to that. We're also, if we're gonna do this, we wanna do it right, because we want it to be an asset. The last mill lasted 70 years. I don't know if this one will last 70 years, 'cause you don't know what's gonna happen with technology, but we want it to last 50. We want it to be a key foundation for frankly the city of Green Bay. And to do that, we've always been an environmentally friendly company, and we wanna make this if not the most, one of the most environmentally friendly paper mills in United States. So what does that mean? Well the current mill has a coal fire boiler, okay? We're gonna shut that down, okay, this is going to be natural gas boilers. In fact that's one of the first things we're gonna do. We're gonna build the two natural gas boilers. The other thing we're gonna do is we're working with New Water and we're gonna do something called a water reclaim system which will be one of the first in the country, there's one other company doing this, we'll be one of the first in the country that we will have zero wastewater discharge to the Fox River, zero. That's pretty cutting edge, and it's pretty exciting. So it's significantly better, our current mill's pretty good for the environment, but this mill will be significantly better for the environment. And again, it's gonna last over 50 years. Some of the other things are gonna happen. So this type of project's so big it takes about 2 1/2 to three years to do, okay? And we're on a very, very fast track. So today, I spent part of my day over at Lambeau Field, we're negotiating with the two potential companies we might buy the paper machine from. And we're hoping to finalize that negotiations at the end of June so we can put the machine on order. Because a new paper machine has a lead time of anywhere from 22 to 24 months, okay? If we miss that lead time, then we're not in their cue anymore, so then that 22 to 24 months becomes 30 months or 35 months and then we have to say, hold on, we gotta re-look at the project. So we're on a fast, fast lead time here without question. Fast track. What's gonna happen there in that 2 1/2, three years? Well, the nice thing is we've contracted for the building, and with a general contractor, with Miron Construction down in Neenah. Now Tim Kippenhan and that team have told me they're gonna have anywhere from 450 to about 800 of their employees or subcontractors on that site for 2 1/2 to three years. That's pretty good for the economy. That's a pretty big positive. When it's all said and done, the production off of that machine, Matt Szymanski, who handles our mill operations, works for me, great guy, he mentioned in the video that the production's gonna

be two times. It's gonna be more than that. I'm hoping it's gonna be 2 1/2 to three times, frankly. So what that means is that suppliers we use, and we use over 700 suppliers in Brown County right now, okay, we do business with over 700 Brown County suppliers. So some of that business is gonna increase, obviously, if we're producing more. Obviously, the supply chains, so the freight companies that we use, the trucking companies like CTS and others are gonna get more business, so it's gonna be good for the whole system. So it's pretty exciting, so that's what we wanna do, we're on a fast track. We need your help, we certainly appreciate the negotiations we've had with Jim, with Mayor Schmitt and Kevin and others. And when we mentioned this, I think it was, the days are going quick here, but I think it was last week on Tuesday when we all did a big announcement, I said, I said if you've got one thing, you got a hardworking mayor, 'cause he and I were onto fall many Fridays, many Sundays, talking through this thing. And I'm happy to say that we're very happy with the package that's been put in front of us, and we're looking forward to moving forward. So with that, can I take any questions, is that okay, Mayor?

- [Mayor] Right, that's fine. Sure, Aldermen, if you just wanna hit your request to speak, and if there are any questions. Again, it's a new system, I'm not seeing any lights. Does that mean nobody wants to speak? We sure appreciate your time, stick around, we're gonna debate this now.

- Okay.

- [Mayor] Kevin's gonna go through what we've talked about, and, I may bring you back up here if there's more questions

- That's fine, okay.

- [Mayor] Right, is there anybody else who would like to speak to this specific item that's here tonight, anyone else? Anyone else wishing to be heard, okay. Alright, there's motion by Alderman Steuer.

- Second.

- Second.

- [Mayor] Second by Alderperson Dorff to return to regular order, all in favor of that motion please signify by saying aye.

- [Aldermen] Aye.

- [Mayor] And those opposed, nays, ayes have it. Alderperson Dorff.

- Thank you. Well Mayor, I'm on the RDA Committee, and I'm absolutely thrilled with this proposal. I went to the press conference the other day where we were given a more in-depth explanation. I am just so pleased for this city of Green Bay that we're gonna have these jobs that are gonna be not only retained, but increased here. That the environmental friendliness of this plant is going to be amazing. And I'm just fully in favor of this project moving forward. Thank you.

- Thank you. Anyone else? Alright, so there's a motion and a second on the floor, if you'd use the board, this is approving Item Six, the development agreement with the City of Green Bay and Green Bay Packaging. Alderman Van Der Leest, Alderman Galvin,

- [Woman] He can't get his cursor to move. You couldn't get yours to move the other day.

- [Man] Gotta use your notes.

- No.

- Did it work? Have to show it.

- Or not.

- No?

- [Man] Don't think so.

- [Mayor] It looks technical, but I can tell you, it passed unanimously, so congratulations. Yeah, Brian, that's it, I mean it's over, you got it. You can stay, you're welcome to stay 'til midnight. We're gonna be here, but I just, Alderman Steuer and I were talking, as, I know you met a lot of the aldermen on their way in here. We're grateful, we like what you're doing, what you're going to do, and what the city is doing with the property of DD Matthew and relocating our storage which is something we needed to do, and a pago tip is something that is in our wheelhouse, and we couldn't be happier to be doing that with packaging. So thank you again.

- [Brian] Yeah, thank you Mayor, doing great work--

- Right, okay, great. Alright, thank you. Okay, Clerk, let's continue.

- [Clerk] Okay, we're now onto item one of the report of the redevelopment authority.

- Alright, what are your wishes regarding this report? Alright, there's a motion by Alderman Scannell.

- [Alderman] Second.

- Second by Alderman Galvin to approve Item One under the report of the redevelopment authority. And that is the development agreement, 1802, with the city of Green Bay for the shipyard at 100 West Mason Street. The address is listed on Broadway, Pearl, and Maple. Alderman Wery, we'll begin with you.

- [Wery] Thank you, Mr. Mayor, I think there are some people here who would like to speak on this, so I make a motion of the floor.

- [Alderman] Second.

- [Mayor] Alright, so we have a motion by Alderman Wery, seconded by Alderman Scannell, to open the floor to hear from interested parties. All in favor of that motion please signify by saying aye.

- [Aldermen] Aye.

- And those opposed, nays, the ayes have it. The floor is now open, we're discussing Item One under the report of the redevelopment authority, and that's a development agreement with the city of Green Bay for the shipyard at 100 West Mason. Is there anyone here tonight who would like to speak to this specific item? Anyone wanna comment on this, shipyard? Anyone wishing to be heard? Alright, we'll let the record show no one came forward. Motion by Alderman Steuer.

- [Alderman] Second.

- Seconded by Alderman Galvin to return to regular order. All in favor of that motion please signify by saying aye.

- [Aldermen] Aye.

- And those opposed, nays, the ayes have it. Alderman Wery, you have the floor.

- Thank you, Mr. Mayor. I do have several questions. And the first one would be, I noticed that we pretty much for this project are purchasing all the properties in that area except one. Is there any reason that we didn't approach that, that one property, or don't we need it, or? Perhaps Mr. Vonck can explain that.

- [Mayor] Dr. Vonck, you wanna?

- Sure, one of the properties in question, I believe you're referring to the Arts family that owns Our Family restaurant. You know, we've talked to the Arts family before in terms of our plans, I think what they do and then how they serve the community is a great asset. There's no need for us to do anything at this time. I think if the council decides to move forward with the development agreement, we would like to speak with them about a right of first refusal on the property. Should they choose to sell at some point in the future, I think it would be in the city's or redevelopment authority's interest to acquire that property to control the future development. But as far as space or sight lines, utilities, or anything of that nature, it's not necessary for this project at this time.

- Alright, thank you, I appreciate it. The reason being is, I mean, that property is dead smack, right, almost right in the middle of the Broadway access. And we're not trying to get that property gain control, but across the street is a large property that we are trying to get control over, for $1 million give or take, you know, if you round up. And so, just curious that we're going for something that's not really in the immediate plans for $1 million, but something here that would be. I know last time when we discussed this, last year, the purchase of that property across the street I don't believe was included in the development agreement. Correct, Doctor? I have a copy of it here. Development agreement, I don't see any mention of purchasing the properties across the street. And that of course had a much more intensive use with the ballpark.

- [Vonck] Are you referring to development agreement from December?

- It doesn't have the month on here, but it is from last fall.

- [Vonck] Ch ch ch ch ch ch ch ch.

- I'm just wondering why we would need that property now. 'Cause it's been, you know, it's been vacant for, I don't know, 17 years or so, and people have been trying to sell it for a very long time, it's next to railroad tracks and might have some low issues there with some flooding. And seems like we're paying a pretty penny for property that really nobody, nobody's interested in.

- [Vonck] Sure, if you look at the recitals of the development agreement, development agreement that's before you today, I believe you're referring to the Badger sheet metal property that is across the street. And if you look at, in terms of what the funds are going to be used for on the current development agreement, if you go down to, um, ch ch ch ch ch ch, so I get the right spot here, Page Six, under Section Three, sub B for uses, one of the things we look at is the acquisition of that property, so in number four, $995,000 to acquire 419 South Maple, 420 South Broadway, and 402 South Broadway. Tax bars sells two dash 947, three dash 569, and three dash 572. So those are the Badger sheet metal properties. Generally it's off Broadway, all the way west of Maple Street. We did look at those the first time around, so I think if you look at development agreement 1704, which is the amended one, those three properties are listed in the recitals in terms of us acquiring them. At that time, during that agreement, we were still negotiating at a purchase price for that. But it was contemplated as part of the development for a few reasons. One, it's a significant piece of property in terms of size and location, and for us talking with the RDA in terms of acquisition can serve a number of purposes. First off, as a storage facility, some short-term uses that the city may have coming down in terms of short-term

facility needs. The medium-term was to look at using it for surface parking to accommodate the area. I think as we looked at the size and scope of the event center and the athletic field and how much, you know, off-street parking we're going to need, that was going to address some of the concerns about reducing the impact on the neighborhood. And then the long-term aspect would be as a future development parcel. And I think when you have, you know, in a downtown area, there's limited opportunities to get, you know, size, sites that are over an acre large. And the staff and the RDA felt it was important to gain control over this property, you know, for that purpose so we could control the future developmen on it. And as for the price, I think we're just talking a little bit over assessed value, which we feel is a fair price for the city and acquisition.

- Alright, I appreciate it. I just found it interesting that the plan from last year, we had far more parking on the site, and we didn't, didn't even include the property across the street. So it's not like we really do need parking. We planned for it last time without that property, just seems like $1 million that we probably wouldn't have to spend right off the bat. And I do have a question about the multi-use field, the synthetic field, that's probably about $1 million right there.

- [Vonck] Sure. So one of the things that we are proposing right now, based on discussions with our staff, our parks and rec department, and potential users, we feel that a synthetic field would be the most versatile in terms of giving us options for using that field in the future. You know, if you look at our season, and this spring was no shortage of having good examples with rains and snows that we're able to have a field and have a facility that we're able to stretch, you know, earlier into the spring and later into the fall. One of the other pieces that we looked at, having this be a year-round facility, and if we're going to look at putting a sheet of ice over it over the winter, you know, the drainage on it off in the spring, we're able to recover from that much more quickly. We also looked at, again, I think we'd still like to have the opportunity to have some large-scale concerts here where we may have, you know, four or five, up to 8,000 people on that field at one time. And the ability to, you know, bounce back from a large event we would feel is quite important. I think one of the things we've discussed a little bit more, and this is some further discussions with some of the potential partners, including the school district, you know, as proposed, you know, right now we have some grass berm seating. I think in order to qualify for things like high school sports or WAA tournaments, we may have to look at some fixed seating and/or a press box as part of this. I think the plan would be, you know, in front of you today is a concept plan. And if we move forward, we look at allocating some funding to work on designs, and with that, provide some options for, you know, constructing as presented with kind of grass berms or an alternative to build on some fixed seating or other amenities. But then we would balance that with, in that time, our ability to negotiate leases with some potential tenants. And I think, you know, looking at the school district as one of those potential tenants, you know, we've talked to some football, soccer teams, we wanna make sure that we're building the right type, size, scope of facility that we can generate the income to help pay for those improvements and also the operations and maintenance. But with that, we feel that the synthetic turf would give us the most versatility in terms of options for users and generating revenue.

- [Wery] How many signed commitments do we have right now from various teams or clubs?

- We have none at this point. I think one of the things that, where we're at is we have a concept, but we don't actually have anything to offer them in terms of the specific size or scope of facility. I do know Mr. Anderson has been working with a number of interested tenants. You know, he can go through and discuss, you know, their letters of interest or contacting us I think after the first iteration of this, you know, didn't move forward. And I think with that we have a lot of serious commitments. But with that, you know, trying to work on the size and scope of what we're designing, you know, until we have a better handle on what exactly that field will look like, we won't be able to negotiate a proper fee for service for those. But I do know Mr. Anderson has some details on a lot of the user groups that have contacted us who would be interested in using the field, and we feel very much so that we could program the field and use the field as many dates if not more dates than the previous proposal.

- Alright, thanks. I just have this feeling that we're building, we're overbuilding for a lot of uses that really aren't gonna generate much revenue. They're gonna have the players, maybe a couple fans who watch the team, maybe a few others, probably won't be able to to afford to pay much for it. And as far as the high school, I think they're still not committed on where they wanna play. You know, this past six months really, there hasn't been much, there probably should've been more of a community discussion of where West High School wants to have its field. Is it gonna be at West, or is it gonna be down here, wher,e you know, as you mentioned, there's no fixed seating, I know they have to have press box, fixed seating, greatly expanded locker rooms, I mean if you're gonna have 100 football kids, you know, they have to have a place to change and shower. And what was designed isn't even close to that. I don't know if we would wanna build it that big. Controlled entry because they have to charge admissions. You know, right now is a pretty open concept. There's no way to control who comes in. So there's some serious concerns for whether or not West can even play their games here or if they want to. You know, in talking to people the last six months, they'd have to bus there for their home games. And who's gonna pay for that, they have to bus there for the practicing, who's gonna pay for that? So I think before we start talking about schools, we need to have a serious conversation in the community about whether West even wants it there. I talked to the Packers about it, you know, they'll help get the application for the grant wherever the community wants it. When I talked to them as of last week, they hadn't even seen the plan yet, they thought it was still the same one from last fall. So hopefully we can talk to the Packers, who would help get, you know< this field, but it was news to them. From last year's plan, I'm glad I kept all my paperwork here. For 1.5 million, we could do all of the following. Waterfront improvements, a multimodal path, 10 feet wide, concrete pavers, asphalt, crushed limestone, a floating dock to accommodate no less than 12 boaters, accessible kayak launch and a children's play area, parking improvements for 400 spaces. I don't, perhaps Director Vonck, why don't we take that approach of building some minimal amenities to really start getting interest interest in the area and perhaps drawing in some businesses who wanna locate there, and then once we start getting the tiff built up, then put in some of the more grand schemes like the field or the property across the street?

- Sure, the previous agreement, most of the funds, you are correct, were looked at, were being allocated towards building a stadium and a facility. We did, however, feel it was important to include some amenities for the public along the waterfront. With that, it was a pretty simple version of, you know, what we have on the east side of the river, and that was a multimodal trail with some proper landscape and lighting. And then putting in a dock for transient boaters and a kayak launch. And really that was it in terms of what we were going to provide, with the thought is, okay, has the project progressed, maybe there're some other things that we'd like to add down there. With this iteration of the project, I think we've shifted money away from the athletic facility and tried to spread it out more evenly throughout the site in providing other amenities that will draw people down to the site, not just athletic groups, but by providing things like an urban beach, playground, splash pad, the container park with pop-up restaurants and retail. You know, a lot of other things that are going to generate additional sources of revenue and additional sources of visitors. I think in terms of where we're at, you know, with negotiations and in terms of some of the parties who are interested in developing in that area, they would like to see us put more than a trail there. And I think in order to incent, you know, additional development in that area, they wanna see that the city is committed to doing something that's going to be programmed and have a lot of activities and have a lot of energy to get in the area that's going to be more than just a trail and a dock.

- [Wery] Alright, thanks, that's all I have for now.

- [Mayor] Alright, thank you. Alderman Van Der Leest.

- I think I make a motion to amend the shipyard development agreement. My motion reads as follows. No money will be spent of dispensed on the shipyard project until at least 30 million in new development in the Broadway area is approved and confirmed by the city of Green Bay. The 30 million in new development is in the minimum amount needed in order to support the overall project. That's my motion that I'd like to amend this. And I--

- [Mayor] Okay, let me get seconds on the floor and we'll discuss it. Alright, so there's a motion and a second regarding Alderman Van Der Leest's amendment and the amendment is to, I was writing this down, but to secure $30 million in development prior to moving forward with the project.

- Okay.

- Okay.

- [Mayor] You have the floor.

- I feel that they're asking for two million I think up front, is that correct, from the, in other words, to get the project even started. And the project has a $10 million price tag. I feel that we have to see development, in other words we need development there to sustain what we're trying to do. And the city can't fund everything that comes across the desk, and that's my thought on this, and, we just have to look a little harder, I think the, you know, the development will help sustain it. I think that's the key, so.

- [Mayor] Alright, thank you. So we're discussing the amendment offered by Alderman Van Der Leest. I'm gonna go Alderperson Dorff.

- Thank you, Mayor. While I agree with Alderman Van Der Leest that we certainly need some development happening down there, as I sat at RDA and listened, it seemed to me that we needed commitment by the city, a show of commitment by the city, to entice businesses to commit. And I'd like to hear from Director Vonck what kind of an impact something like this would have on the shipyard project.

- [Mayor] Doctor Vonck, on the amendment?

- In terms of the impact of the amendment?

- [Dorff] Yes.

- We'd probably be looking at a vacant site in 30 years. I think where we're at here is a situation where the private sector is looking for commitments from the city to do something in that area and to follow through with something in that area. And with that, they can look at, you know, making a better investment in this area. I think, you know, when we talk about some of these projects and we're talking about, you know, office, residential, other things where companies, you know, are investing, you know upwards of potentially $10 million, they wanna make sure that their investment is going to, you know, be secure into the future and that they're not gonna be out there on an island without, you know, anything else going on. I think one of the things that we will look at is if we're tied to the $30 million price tag, we don't have at least on the radar at the moment a $30 million project. So what we're going to have to do then is put together a variety of projects to, you know, make this work, and what that is going to do is developers are gonna have to rely on other developers to honor their commitments, and, you know, we're going to probably get this stack of commitments that again, if a piece falls apart or we don't hit the $30 million threshold, you know, we could spend years working on it and eventually never move forward. I think the, you know, $30 million that has been discussed as far as staff is concerned, $30 million was put out there as if this project moves forward and we were to bond the full amount of $9.5 million and just run projections at, you know, what our borrowing rate's been, you know, close to 4%, that we would need to get $30 million of development within the next eight to 10 years in a tax increment district around that area to keep this project 100% off the levy. That is something that is, you know, I guess a continuation of the last iteration of this project, where there was some concern about spending levy dollars on this type of project. But with that, we feel that the $30 million, in terms of you look at development patterns historically in the city and where we're at, as far as where projects are coming in, you know, in terms of their value between eight, 10, 12, $15 million, that that is something that is very

realistic and very doable. One of the things we did not consider is that assumes we're borrowing the full 9.5 So, you know, as we move forward and pursue and look at, you know, in this agreement, we have opportunities for, you know, naming rights, this does not include any grants or other sources of revenue in terms of what we additionally borrow. And then also the assumptino is, you know, we assumed that nothing would happen, you know, until eight years. So I think as that, you know, we start to put these pieces together, I think what we are offering the proposal in terms of, again, a package that, a park that does not, you know put a drain on the community and put a drain on the levy. With the tax increment district, we do have time to make up that revenue. But again, going bacfk to talking with, you know, parties who have been interested in this party, and then we have closed-session language available on here if you would like to discuss in the nature of where, you know, negotiations are at or have been for some of those parties, you know, we feel that that $30 million is possible and very realistic. But as far as, you know, making sure we have $30 million of written commitments ready before we begin, development's good in Green Bay, but it's not quite that fast, and again, in terms of tying projects to each other, we have some businesses that are ready to go. And if we're not ready to go, then they'll go elsewhere.

- Thank you, Doctor Vonck, so with that, you know, I think it affirms my understanding that, and I think it's realistic to not expect developers to come in unless they see some sort of commitment from the city. While I do believe that the $30 million development is something we want to have, I would not wanna put that as a precondition. So I would have to vote against the amendment, thank you.

- [Mayor] Thank you. Alderman Brian Johnson.

- I don't support the amendment either. And I think to vote for the amendment is to support the status quo. And for the last 30 to 40 years, when the city has owned this property, we've been waiting for $30 million of development to come. And it hasn't. And I think it's time for us to try something new. If you think about any other park, and essentially that's what we have here, is we have a very nice park that we're proposing down here that offers a number of amenities, we don't add these types of contingencies onto parks when we put them in. When you think about neighborhood investments, the creation of a subdivision, what's almost always the first thing to go in? A park. And why do we put the parks in? We put the parks in and we make the public investment because we're trying to incent people to move into those neighborhoods and to invest. And so I think for us to be debating the shipyard, I would argue that to vote for this amendment is really to say that we really shouldn't even be here debating the shipyard, because what we have in front of us is a design that's been provided for us today, but we could be waiting, to Doctor Vonck's point, another 30 years before we have $30 million. Hopefully not that if the city makes the investment. But this whole design is different. In which case, it's a moot point for us to be even debating the shipyard in the first place. Thank you.

- Thank you. Alderman Randy Scannell.

-Excuse me, thank you, your honor, yes, I also don't support the amendment. I see this as a lot like, on the East Side here, we invested in the city deck. And that was just radical in promoting the development on the East Side here. And so I think we need to do the same thing on the West Side. The West Side needs a little loving from the city and it's about time it got it, thank you.

- [Mayor] Alderman Wery?

- Thank you, Mr. Mayor. I'll support the, the motion. I keep hearing from staff and from other alders that we have to have some, some sort of commitment, I totally agree, this is an area that's right for, you know, this type of activity. But do we need to be all in right away on the if come? Used to be Alder Zima's favorite saying, one of his favorite sayings. Fi you build it, they'll come. Well, we just saw last year that for one 1.5 million, we can put in a 10-foot trail along the water, docks, kayak launch, play areas, 400 parking spots, trees, really beautify it and make an attractive place. And then work in partnership with people as they come in to improve it. If people don't come in, well hey, we've built a nice area for people to go and recreate. But if the

developments don't come in, and we know that happens, economy goes south, people decide to move, you know, the Packers lure them to their site instead of our site, things happen. Then we're stuck with all in and nothing around to pay for it. Why don't we do it in increments, beautify it, make it look attractive, and say, hey, we really wanna improve this, but we're gonna build a little bit at a time. So I'm in favor of it, thanks.

- [Mayor] Thank you. Alderman Mark Steuer, on the amendment?

- Thank you, your honor. I had a chance to talk with Director Vonck today. And I guess I'm encouraged by the fact that, that we can look at a development down the road, $30 million down the road by eight years. And I think a lot of folks in Green Bay feel that they want instant, they want instant gratification for whatever develops. And I feel that something like this is gonna take some time. This area's been underutilized forever. I will admit that, you know, we've only had a chance to look at this plan for about a week and a half, so I agree with some of the alders saying that, you know, let's start small and incrementally work up. If you do it that way then what happens is these larger developers may not wanna come in. So it's a bit of a roll of the dice, but looking at our waterfront, we need to be competitive. You go to many other communities around the Midwest, and they have music venues, they have any number of athletic fields, different things out there that draw people to your downtown area. You need a strong downtown. Now granted, the reason I had supported this project before with the Bullfrogs wa looking at going all the way down to Ninth Street and improving the residential stock as well. So, I see both sides of this, but I feel that we need to move forward. We need to look at this project. I think over time we will be able to amend some things as time goes on. But we have to start somewhere. And I feel that looking at $30 million of investment over an eight-year period, I feel that's doable. I think that we could work that out, so I'm against this as well.

- [Mayor] Thank you. Alderman Bill Galvin.

- Thank you, your honor. I worked down in that area for just about 36 years. And from day one, it's been a sore spot. It's been deprived, it's been neglected. The people down there have been hurting for a long time. They've watched the rest of the city get development funds, and I think they've been waiting their turns. Everything's risky in life. And you know, as a council, we have to take a certain amount of risk with these projects. Colburn Pool, we were on the cusp of spending several million dollars with no guarantees, we were told that there might be some swim meets there, but no guarantees. And we were being asked to spend $7 million for a park that was gonna enhance that entire area. And so I think we have to look at this and look at the potential, we've heard in closed session some of the potential investments that it's out there waiting to see a commitment from us. You know, we can point the finger on the Bullfrog thing, but some of that I think is to be pointed at us. We languished, we vacillated, we tried to get certain guarantees, and the project fell through. And you know, quite frankly, I think shame on us for letting that happen. I like what I see here, I understand this is not set in stone what we're necessarily proposing. But I've seen places like the pier, what they've done with their park along the river. Oshkosh, music venues, all these kinds of things are happening In the Fox Valley, very near to us. And we are a large central community. We can draw those kinds of numbers if we offer it to them. And I think that this council needs to think about what the potential is here. What we can gain from this, what this community can gain. Not just the West Side, but our entire city. And so I think we need to take the risk and I'm not gonna support this amendment. Thank you.

- Thank you. Alderman Steuer, did you want to talk again? Okay. I don't see any other lights, so we use the board on this. Are you seeing the lights, alright. Mike. Well.

- I don't see any.

- [Mayor] No. Yeah. I mean I'm happy to recognize you, I just wanna go ahead, gonna go to Alderman Brunette.

- Yes, thank you, Mayor. I think it's a good motion, amendment, and I support it. Possibility of borrowing $9.5 million and I know this might be the elephant in the room, but according to things that I've heard and read recently is that the grant, the $1/2 million grant is now in question, so we basically are moving forward with a possibility of borrowing $9.5 million without some sort of development to offset the money that we may be borrowing to build this project. Granted, eight to 10 years is a decent amount of time to generate $30 million of development, but I don't understand, I don't understand how if we don't have this idea now that, quite frankly, has only been public for a week, week or two, that now that the community knows that this is what the city is proposing, although maybe not approving tonight, then with that concept, maybe people come forward, maybe businesses come forward, maybe housing developments and affordable, apartments and things like that that could go to really put a shot in arm of this development. We need revenue in the city, we gotta stop borrowing money. Later on tonight we're gonna be discussing the possibility of a wheel tax that tax our citizens $20 per vehicle to pay for roads that if we'd done correctly, this property could generate some taxable revenue to be used for infrastructure. So I'm not against the project in its entirely, I just think that we need to think about adding development to offset the risk of borrowing money to make this project work. And I agree with Alderman Galvin. He worked the area in law enforcement, I actually lived in that area, I grew up a street parallel to it, I worked at that restaurant that was referenced earlier. So I know, having lived there and still going to that restaurant from time to time that that has been an area that's been neglected for 30 years. I'm 37 now, I remember seven, eight years old, fishing down there, and you know, climbing the coal piles, I suppose that wasn't the safest thing to do. Having grown up in that area and knowing that people putting their, you know, just moving out of that area, we need something in that area to attract residents, visitors, tourists. I'm in favor of the project, but I think if this motion doesn't pass, we'd need to look a little more hard at getting some development to go along with this borrowed money that we're taking on, thank you.

- [Mayor] Alright, thank you, Alderman. Alderperson, I don't see your light, but, Lefebvre?

- I think I'll support this amendment. The reason is that I'm really concerned about the future commitments. The city has, we've been borrowing a lot of money on different projects. And I wanna make sure that we have more solid commitments before we start on things. And I agree with Alderman Wery that the playing field, I mean $1 million, and, from what I've heard that West was not really interested in it, there'd be a lot of logistics like with the transportation of the students and then getting people there. But I do know the area does, like everyone else has said, I have gone in that area, I know it really needs some development. And I think this would be good down the road for development. The one thing I would like to see started first is housing. Once you have housing, these people want something to do when they're off work. And a lot of young people like living close to work, if they work downtown, they wanna live close to downtown. Then they want to also have amenities that they can walk to. So the plan is a good plan, but, I think we have to have some caution on the amount that we're spending on a, I don't wanna say a gamble, but, I think we need some more, well I would say what Alder Brunette had mentioned is that I think if we all agree that this is a good idea to go forward if we have these other commitments, people, how do I say this, people know that we wanna do something. And I think then we can go, and I think other people will get excited. Once we get it out in the news, people hear about it, and we talk about a little bit more about it. So thank you.

- Thank you. Alderman Johnson?

- So, I think back to the last time that we missed an opportunity on this development. And I think one of the biggest contributing factors to our inability to get that done is stacking up development agreements. And we complicated it to death. We literally strangled it. And it created an inability for us to get something done, we lost opportunities, and quite honestly, we lost an amenity in that neighborhood that those residents, from conversations that I've had, desperately want and need. But the thing that disturbs me I think most about the amendment is the thing that I'm hearing as people talk is that we like the concept of the shipyard. Maybe we'd like to see, you know, a smaller scale investment up front, we'd like to see, you know, something different about it. But ultimately by approving this amendment, we're killing the deal. We don't have $30 million of development to bring to the table which means there's no merit in even discussing the shipyard if we approve

the amendment. So if you want to discuss the shipyard and you wanna discuss what other versions of it could possibly be out there, I encourage you to defeat the amendment, because otherwise, we don't have a shipyard project to discuss. We have $30 million of development to secure. Thank you.

- Thank you, Alderman. Alderman Galvin.

- Thank you, your honor. I'd like to point out something I heard when I was at the Green Bay Packing announcement. And I believe it was something to the effect that the city averages lately about $80 million a year in development. Now we're asking for $30 million just in that focused area down there. $30 million. How long is it gonna take us to generate $30 million in development before we can push the go button on this? We haven't even started looking for other revenue sources to fund this so that it's not all bonded by the city of Green Bay. And there's a good chance there's other sources out there that we could be looking at for revenue to help build this thing. And I agree with Alder Johnson, we're strangling this thing to death with this $30 million commitment. Can anyone out here that wants this amendment tell me where do you think we can put $30 million worth of development down there in a short period of time, even within 10 years? If they don't see anything to build for, why would they commit to building, there's nothing down there. Someone has to start the process, and I think it has to be us. Okay, again, I urge you to consider, take this risk, let's start the process. We've done it before in other places, it's worked, and I think we need to take the chance and do it here. Thank you.

- Alright, thank you. I'm gonna ask you to use the board here. This is on the amendment, I'll read the amendment back. The amendment reads, no money will be spent or dispersed on the shipyard project until at least $30 million in new development in the Broadway area is approved and confirmed by the city of Green Bay. The $30 million new development is the minimum amount needed in order to support the overall project. So a yes vote supports the amendment. A no vote defeats the amendment. So if you support, then no money's gonna be spent until we get $30 million, that would be a yes vote. Alderman Van Der Leest, we need you to vote. Okay, and that motion fails on a vote of, is there a problem? Okay, a vote of four to eight. So we're back to the original motion before you. Which again is L one. Alderman, can you cue up for this, I got Alderman Brunette's light on.

- [Man] That's fine,

- Alright. Alderman Galvin?

- I'll make a motion to accept this.

- Alright, there's a motion, do we have that on the floor? Okay. We have a motion by Alderman Galvin, second by Scannell, to approve this item. Alderman Brunette, I wanna get to you.

- Sure, on the motion I referred to the elephant in the room, could we address the elephant in the room, the status of that $1/2 million grant that I just read or heard in the recent development? Director Vonck, or perhaps Mayor Schmitt, if you could comment on that.

- Sure, so, as you've read, there's been disagreement with the stadium board in terms of the status of the grant. As it stands today, the stadium board awarded a $1/2 million grant to the city for a project. That project, the shipyard, involved a list of contingencies, one of the contingencies on that was working with a operator to operate and manage the facility. The stadium board awarded that grant to the city about a year ago. On that, the city has until June of 2019 to meet all of those contingencies. Since the major tenant and potential operator left the city in March, we've been working on creating a new plan. And with that, we have been working to try and amend our grant with the stadium board. So we have submitted a request to amend the grant that was made with the city, to amend the contingencies and replace it with a list of contingencies that were approved at the time. And replace that list with the development agreement that is before you

today. It's our feeling that the spirit and intent of the project has remained totally the same in terms of investing into athletic field, providing waterfront amenities, stimulating economic development, drawing tourists. All the things, all the reasons that that grant fund was established, we feel we still fit into. And that grant with the city should still be valid. And we would like the opportunity to amend. We presented that to the executive director. We asked the chair of the board on that. And yesterday had an opportunity to go before the whole board and ask for that amendment. It was made clear from the board that they would like us to, that they believe and it's the board's belief that the old grant is no longer valid because the project has changed too significantly. With that, the city has not yet admitted or confirmed that we can't fulfill the contingencies of the grant. But, what I would look at pursuing is they would like us to submit a new grant. And I believe, based on the plan that we have before us, that we can do all the things that we said we were going to do before, if not more, in terms of generating, you know, revenue and users and those other types of things. So we will be talking about the stadium board to see what that process is in terms of, you know, the potential of acknowledging or rescinding our current grant simultaneously with submission of a new grant application to receive the funds for this project. Again, we feel based on what we have here today that we could, you know, secure the $1/2 million as originally planned, given the economic impact of this. Ultimately this is up to the stadium board to decide whether they want to continue to fund this project. But we believe, again, given the criteria that the stadium board has for their grants, that we fit just as strongly in with this project as we did with the prior project.

- Okay, if the grant was denied, I understand you'd have to reapply. How long would we need to wait on a decision on that grant?

- [Vonck] Our goal would be to talk to the stadium board now and work to get on their next agenda. I believe their next meeting is in two months. And work with them so that they generally like to have the applicant work through with their staff first to get a better understanding of the plan and the project. But we believe that, again, you know, we're not differing too far, that we could be on the next agenda. And we would ask for the board to take action at that time.

- Okay. Thank you, I have no other questions at the time.

- [Mayor] Alright, thank you. Alderman Van Der Leest?

- If the vote passes on this shipyard project, where will the money come from directly? Will it be bonding from the two million, is that correct? And what could be the first steps.

- Sure. So if the development agreement is approved this evening, our plan would be to come forth in July with a bonding request for $2 million that would involve 1.2 for the property acquisition for us to acquire all the property and leave $800,000 for design and professional services. That would allow us to go forth and, you know, take the concept plan that we have here today and go forward and estimate the true cost of construction for all of these elements and allof these items. I think that's an important thing to do to get a better handle on, you know, what exactly all these elements are going to cost. I think it's important to involve the public as part of that in terms of when we talk about the proper size and scope of facility that we're going to be building. And I think it's also important to cost out these elements so we can run in, or if we do encounter a situation where we have some options where we may be under or over budget, it's up to the purview of the redevelopment authority and this council what items are included or not included. I think with that, you know, allowing for a few weeks for this design and development, it will allow us some time to get back before the stadium board to request our funding. It allows us some time to go out and seek other grants or naming rights opportunities. It also allows us a little time to secure some future development before we would go forward and, you know, potentially bond the up to $7.5 million. I think again, you know, in that time period, our goal, just being a financial steward, would be to bond as least amount as possible moving forward. So with the phased approach, I think that would allow us a little time to perhaps build some other sources before we actually brought the final bonding request for construction before this body.

- My thoughts are this is a pretty heavy-duty project as far as the bonding part of it. The city doesn't have a lot of money on hand that we could be dipping in, bonding more. That's why I'm in favor of, you know, getting some development. If you went to a bank with this project, a normal bank, a business transaction, they'd tell you to come back. They wouldn't wanna approve it. 'Cause there's not enough on the plate to make a difference, we couldn't pay the bills. But the city of Green Bay feels comfortable in bonding almost $10 million. If we look at the number of parks that we have in the city of Green Bay, we have a lot of parks. Myself personally, I'd like to see a real development down there. Maybe a commercial development, could be industrial. I think there's a lot of other options that this property could be used for. You know, the river part of it, you know, could still be the city's. But I think as far as being financial positive, it's just not there. There's just not the money there to do it. And the city's gonna be on the tap for almost 10 million. So I can't support it.

- [Mayor] Alright, thank you. Alderman Chris Wery?

- Thank you, Mr. Mayor. I'm gonna vote no. I think we should vote this down tonight. We don't have any concrete developers or investment other than the city in what we're going to borrow. As I said before, it's really on the if come. Why can't we at least have one or two people who say, you know what? You build this, you bet. Should be here tonight, saying, you know what, you build this tonight, we're gonna build something here. But we don't even have that, I haven't seen that, I don't know if anybody else has. I'm really not comfortable, especially with the $1 million being paid to obtain the property across the street that nobody wants and it's really not needed, it's for extra parking. And it's from an LLC that just got the property two, three years ago. And Doctor Vonck, who were the members of that LLC?

- [Vonck] Are you referring to Badger Capital Investments?

- Badger Capital Investments, yeah, they just obtained it, interestingly enough, two, three years ago.

- [Vonck] The members of Badger Capital Investments are Rick Churnick, Brad Hayness, Jim Wachinski, Greg Klemmick, and Jim Appleton.

- [Wery] Okay. Are the Decasters involved anymore in that?

- [Vonck] They are not.

- Okay. Yeah, so I'm just curious why we're really so doggone determined to give that group who just got it a couple years ago $1 million for something we really don't need right now. I don't know, maybe just pass the smell test on that one. The $1 million synthetic field, I really am not sold, I don't think we're gonna have West High School playing there. It doesn't have the amenities it needs to play varsity games there. And to put it in, you're gonna need more money. So the school district, if you're asking them to pay money, they are as cheap as they can come with some of their athletics, especially when it comes to West, poor West is always the bottom of the bucket, it seems like. Now, my daughter plays for West, she plays varsity soccer, and you ask any of their players, any of their friends where they'd rather play, they'd rather play at West. So I think now that this has been out in the public the last six months, there's some pride that West is taking in their field and they don't wanna have to bus, bus to home games and bus to practices and not have the ability to play there. So, and with that then, if it goes to West, you lose your $1/4 million grant that the Packers would help with from the NFL, so there's another 1/4 million. That 500,000 from the stadium grant, as Alderman Brunette mentioned, I think is iffy at best. I think it's not coincidental that tonight, Mr. Mayor, your axing our three members from the city of Green Bay. Now they haven't gone along with it, so they're gone. And we're putting in three people who I guess might be more open to it. I don't think it's coincidental.

- [Mayor] That's not true.

- I didn't ask your opinion, I was just stating mine.

- [Mayor] Well, it wasn't true. I said it's not true.

- No, but you can--

- [Mayor] You can't say that, that's not true.

- You can step down if you want to debate.

- [Mayor] You can't say things that aren't true.

- I can give my opinion.

- [Mayor] Yeah in your opinion--

- Okay, and if you wanna debate, you have to step down, that's right in our ordinance.

- [Woman] Get back to the business at hand and not have--

- [Mayor] Yeah.

- Is this a point of order or is she yelling at me?

- [Mayor] Just go ahead, you got the floor, go ahead.

- Okay, I'm just stating, you cannot debate from the chair unless you step down and that's right in our ordinances. You do this a lot. Former Mayor Jadin, when he wanted to debate, he would step down. And Council President Johnson would go up and run the meeting. So I'd appreciate it if you'd keep your comments and your debates to yourself. Thank you. I also think we're not buying that key piece of property, the Our Place restaurant, the Arts property. You know, there's a lot of speculation as to why that may be. I'll just leave that there. I think we should bring it, we vote it down, we bring it back with a one to $2 million waterfront improvement property plan. Do all those things that we were told we can do for one to two million. Really beautify it. Put in a nice walkway and trees, and nice seating, and put in the docks and the kayak launch. Can do all of those things, you can have people bring in the container things, that's more of a capitalistic thing, people can come and take advantage of that. I think we turn this down and we bring back that smaller plan and incrementally, as I just heard, incrementally do the plan. So thank you.

- Thank you. Alderman Johnson?

- I'd like to thank Doctor Vonck, we've probably over the last 10 days here, we've I think spent at least five hours together talking about this issue. And my point is is that he's been incredibly accessible to ask a lot of questions. And he's answered most of mine to the level that I am comfortable with this, however, there are a few questions I think that have come up through the debate, and maybe some that Doctor Vonck and I have discussed that I would like to just maybe ask in the spirit of some transparency and informing the public, so, Kevin, could you talk about the purchase of the Badger sheet property? What is the current assessed value of that property?

- Sure. Just wanna get my notes correct here. It's about, it's three parcels, as assessed today, I think it's around 950,000. But let me just make sure I get the right number for you. Ch ch ch ch ch ch ch. You know what? If you can do the math fast, it's right on the recitals of the development agreement, 293 plus 611 plus 39.

- [Mayor] Is that what it is?

- [Johnson] Okay, so $943,000 is what I have.

- [Vonck] Yes.

- [Johnson] What are we offering to purchase that property for?

- Our agreement, which is contingent upon approval by the RDA and this City Council is for $995,000.

- [Johnson] So pretty close to the assessed value.

- That is correct. One of the things that we looked at was, and I can discuss this in closed session, the negotiations that were had on that, but it is lower than where we started and what we feel is a fair price for the city. We also feel in terms of, you know, timing for this, back to what I discussed earlier, interim uses for storage, medium-term uses for parking, long-term uses for development. When this project moves forward and development starts to come, this piece of property will only get more expensive.

- [Johnson] And so that was gonna be my next question, in your professional opinion, do yoU see the property, the value of this property, depreciating, staying the same, or increasing? It sounds like increasing.

- If we move forward with this project and the city says we're gonna make an investment in the shipyard, the value of this property will increase.

- [Johnson] Okay, so based on the difference of what we're paying that property and what it's assessed at, do you feel that the city of Green Bay would pay more to rent record storage space elsewhere?

- In terms of the time that we would need it to be able to either secure a facility, outfit it properly and/or rent it, that would more than account for the difference.

- [Johnson] Okay, thank you. My point with that of course was to demonstrate that I feel like we're offering a fair price for that, and I think we can debate of course whether or not we should purchase it. But it seems to me at least that the price is market rate and fair. I wanna look back a little bit, the city deck development. Do you recall approximately how much did we invest in the city deck development?

- That was before my time, but I believe--

- [Mayor] Wasn't before mine, '13. '13.

- '13, okay. And do you recall again, I'm okay with ballpark numbers, how much new increment that that created after the city deck was put into that location?

- [Mayor] Little over 80.

- [Johnson] 80, okay. And how long a period of time did it take to create that increment?

- [Mayor] Nine years.

- [Johnson] Okay. Thank you. I think that speaks for itself. Again, I stated the fact before that the shipyard to me is essentially, when you look at it, it's a park. We're asking the city to build a park down there. Is it common practice to build parks using tiff, or is that normally done through the levy? And so by comparison,

when I look at investments we've made, I mean the two most recent parks that come to mind would be Colburn and the Pocket Park downtown, how were those funded?

- I believe Colburn was looked at levy funds. And I believe ultimately I think Park came out of the tid.

- [Johnson] Okay, so the park came out of the tid, so it's not an unprecedented practice.

- No, but I think one of the reasons that we've looked at looking at a tax increment district for this area was again that this park is really tied to development, and ultimately will be run more like an enterprise like Bay Beaches or, you know, like the RDA does with the KI Convention Center. And so it's while a city park, there's some revenue- generating elements of it, and I think this goes to, there's a lot of discussion right now about levy dollars and how those are spent and where those are done, so we felt it was best to come forward with a plan that moving forward could stay off the levy.

- [Johnson] Okay. The commitment to the neighborhoods. I think this is an important thing that needs to be discussed, and so, we have properties over in that neighborhood that's targeted as part of this development that are well below the city's average assessment. We have a commitment of $1 million as part of this agreement. Could you please explain how that $1 million will be funded?

- Yes, so the objective is to fund $1 million three years from the culmination of this agreement, first year will be 300,000, second year 400,000, and then 300,000. In each of those years, we plan to allocate $100,000 of neighborhood enhancement funds. That is our city program that really doesn't have a lot of strings attached in terms of use for those purposes. The remainder, the 200, 300, and $200,000, we will look at block rent funding and home funding. I know we are dependent on federal sources for those revenues. Caveat being, I think the recent budget that was passed, we should have those locked up at least for the next two years. If something would happen, we would fall short on that, I think we would honor the city's commitment and look at a way to continue to fund those investments so we do continue to put $1 million in the neighborhood. I think it's important, the partnerships that we've built on this, how we've looked from both city staff perspective, but the other groups who want to invest in this neighborhood, the Broadway District, that we have those funds, but they can leverage their funds to make maximum impact in that neighborhood. And I think that's a critical piece of this development.

- Okay, thank you, Doctor Vonck. So a couple things that I would just say, I mean, $1 million investment in that neighborhood I think is, I've been working with a number of groups, that $1 million is only gonna grow. And I think what's important about the $1 million in particular is that it's been discussed here with the prior proposal that well, gee, that's money that's out there that people can get already. But what this development agreement does is it creates a commitment to that neighborhood, it creates a commitment that, you know what, we recognize that you are some of the oldest infrastructure in our community and we understand that you have not seen the level of reinvestment that some other parts of our city have, and that we're going to do something about it, we're going to help you, we're going to make improvements there that are desperately needed. One of the things that I think that hasn't been talked about is there will be an opportunity for public input through the design process yet. I too am not, I wasn't to feed in on this proposal either. But knowing that there will be an opportunity for public input, the council will have the ability to approve the different phases of funding that comes before it I think is an important thing that we need to be cognizant of. And this is important because this facility is designed to expand. And when it's designed to expand, it allows different users to step forward and make that investment. That was something that unfortunately we don't have any longer, we lost our user, we lost a management company. But the way this design sits right now is it does allow us to recapture a party and make those investments down the road. I think it's time that the city be a leader. This is a site, as I alluded to before, that we have sat on for 30 to 40 years and have seen absolutely no interest or no development. And if we don't want to lead as a city, why would we expect anyone else to do it on our property? People assess the quality of life on a number of things in a community, one of the biggest things is amenities. And the way that our neighborhoods are invested in. And an amenity doesn't, and what's

unique about this amenity is it doesn't commit the levy. This is amenity that will be fully supported through the tiff, of course unless the tid investment is insufficient. And I think, you know, that's out there, that's the nature of tids, that's what they are. And it's a park, we invest in parks. We invest in parks all the time as a city. We don't require additional development to come with it. That's a very rare thing, I'm not sure that I've ever seen that. But I implore you to not let us lose this opportunity again. Please do not let us squander the opportunity to invest in a district in our city that desperately needs it. The residents need it, but I think more importantly, the entire city of Green Bay will benefit from the investment in this, thank you.

- [Mayor] Thank you, Alderman. Alderman Jesse Brunette?

- Yes, thank you, Mayor, I do have some questions for Director Vonck. Mainly around the area of enhancement funds for the neighborhood. Director Vonck, what types of things would those enhancement funds be used for?

- [Vonck] Sure. Generally, within a neighborhood enhancement program, we have a number of things. Right now we do have a team internally in our department who's going around to the neighborhood and really taking an account of where those funds could be best allocated. I think we're looking at properties, existing properties that could use funds to help the home owner fix up something in the home, in terms of whether it's some structural repairs, a new roof, a new porch, you know, other things that can help stabilize, make a home safe, and increase the value of the home. We are looking at properties that maybe are currently rental and might benefit from conversion grants to move over to an owner-occupied unit. We are looking at parcels that maybe are too far gone. And maybe the city should look at acquiring and taking down for a new development in that area. And so with that, also, you know, combining some properties together to allow for maybe some new housing projects that don't exist in that neighborhood but are needed in the community. When we look at maybe like townhomes, you know, some owner-occupied duplexes, just other things that we feel would benefit the area, those are all things that the neighborhood enhancement fund could be used for. In addition, I mean there's stipulations that allow for some, you know, beautification, streetscaping, other things like that. But the primary goal is to take those funds, leverage those with other groups, you know, we've talked with Habitat, we've talked with Neighborworks, private developers, and really maximize how far those funds go to get a good impact and as maximum an impact as possible.

- Is it residential use or commercial use or both? I mean obviously residential, but is it also commercial use?

- [Vonck] It is targeted towards residential use. There are some cases where you look at neighborhood enhancement funds for potentially commercial use, if those fall outside, out of the jurisdiction or general guidelines for neighborhood enhancement funding, it needs a special approval from the redevelopment authority and council to go outside of that. We feel we have some other products available in terms of a facade demolition grant that the city has funds into. High revolving loan fund. But those are things that we can target and offer business owners in addition to tax increment financing for the commercial properties in that area.

- The money used to fund this fund, if you will, that's borrowed money, that's bonded money entirely?

- [Vonck] That is correct, so, tonight before you is on redevelopment authority report, it's also on the finance report. That is out of the state trust fund, the latest proposal would be for $1.5 million to be withdrawn over three $1/2 million increments. So with those, with that, we'd be looking at designated 300,000 of that towards this specific neighborhood. We wanna go into it during the portion of it, we discuss at the RDA and then can talk tonight just about how those funds have been used and leveraged to generate additional property tax revenue then that goes back on, you know, to the tax levy to help generate additional property taxes that can support the debt that's been taken out.

- Okay, and what percentage would a good portion of this be of revolving loan fund that the city has used in other areas of property improvement? Like the homeowner that would qualify for such a payment that they would pay back the money, and then that fund would build to be available for future properties?

- [Vonck] We haven't allocated a specific amount yet. But that's one of the things we could discuss in terms of I think there's some appropriate levels to, you know, provide a balance of, in some cases, we provide just direct funding, grant funding. In other cases we work it as a loan that is paid back through agreed-upon pay period. There's other cases where we tie it to a loan that's basically tied to the mortgage of the home. So it's held until the property is sold. Again, the money went to do some improvements, so the incremental value that was increased will help pay back the city's assets. But with that we do not have a specific amount to what exact program we're going to be putting those in at this time.

- Okay, thank you, that's it as far as questions go on the motion. I don't want it to be thought of that I'm against the project in its entirely, I just think it's too soon, I mean, this just came out to the public and to the alderpersons a couple weeks ago, not the project, the past project, Bullfrogs, and what was proposed there. So the council members who were here prior to April obviously have heard and seen this play out over several months if not years. I am concerned though that maybe they're burnt out, but the public really hasn't spoken to us tonight on this. There's no real, I haven't fielded a single phone call from a constituent that said, yes, this is the one, let's go forward with this. I think if there were more time for the public to understand this, absorb it, more questions from the public, who we are all accountable to, and who we are, through this city government, going to borrow money to fund much of this project, we're accountable to them. And I just think it's too soon to go ahead with this without some sort of trademark development or some sort of taxable property that we can point to to say, see, the city's not taking the risk on entirely this corporation or this entity or this restaurant or this strip mall developer, someone is going to think so highly of this project and the details to at this stage work with the city to bring that development to the shipyard. So I think the motion to move forward with it, let's not get frustrated to the point that we're making a bad decision on borrowing money or committed to borrowing money at this stage. There's more work that needs to be done before I can approve it, thank you.

- [Mayor] Thank you. Alderman Van Der Leest.

- I just like to re-edify that the city of Green Bay has a large debt now. And another $10 million in debt service I think is a lot. We bonded for that five million for Bay Beach. And we were only gonna pay interest for the first five years on that project, and I think we got the money for like 3.3%. And that came to almost $1 million for the six-year period that would be almost into $1 million just on that one project by not making a principle payment on. I look at, you know, the amount of money that we have here in the city, I think we have to be very close, keep an eye on how we're bonding and how we're spending the money. You look at the road projects and things, we're talking about, I know when the wheel tax comes up here a little bit later in discussion, we're talking about the special assessments, and it sounds like, you know, we don't even have enough money in our coffers to take care of the special assessments. But yet we're gonna, you know, we're gonna drop a couple million right up front, and then maybe another eight million. I just feel that some of these projects, you know, they've been out there for a while, but I don't think it's the right fit at this time, I just don't. And not as far as our finances go. Our finances are not that strong. We gotta, I was on the committee last year on the property tax force, we could find some ways to save a little bit of money. Nobody really came forward and said, look, John, we can save 1/2 a million right here. We can give you 1/2 a million, we can do this with the 1/2 million, nobody came forward and said that wehad any extra money. So I think as alderpersons, we have to be more fiscally responsible in how we're spending our money. And you know, we got a lot of projects coming up. And I'm not saying that, I'd be in favor if we could get some development up front to help offset the cost, but for the city just to say, yeah, we're jumping in, you know, it sounds great, it sounds very nice, but you know, we gotta look at the facts, dollars. And that's where I'm coming from. And I feel that it's too much money at this time. Thank you.

- Thank you. Alright, so that's the last light. You'll use the board on this, please, this is the motion by Galvin and seconded by Scannell is to approve, this would be L One under the report of the redevelopment authority, and that's to approve the development agreement with the city of Green Bay for the shipyard on 100 West Mason. Alderman, Alderman Van Der Leest, you need to vote. Alderman, can you help him? There you go, alright, thank you. Alright, and that motion passes on a vote of eight to four. So we will proceed. Thank you, alright, Clerk, let's move on.

- [Clerk] We're now onto presentations.

- [Mayor] Council, if I could just, on the presentations, the anti-harassment training by Rick Behr, our insurance carrier is Civmec, and they, we need to go through training with them. He needs a half-hour block three times, I didn't think tonight was the best night, so I put it off 'til the next meeting. But we can't not do it, so this is just something that's by law, we've gone through this a few years ago with some of you who are on the council now, and it's something that we're committed to do, and he will be on the presentation agenda for our next meeting. Now with that said, I also asked Celestine Jeffrys, my chief of staff, to just give you a very quick two-minute presentation on the emergency contacts, and you know, a lot of you were part of that, but when we had that water main break, there was a little confusion on who played what role with the Red Cross, the United Way, the water department, fire department, police department, so Celestine just has a little sheet so that we're all on the same page should something like this happen again in this community, and in a city our size, something like this will happen again. So I just ask for a couple minutes to update the council. Do you wanna stay there or do you wanna come up here?

- [Celestine] I'll stay here.

- Alright, go ahead.

- Thank you, Mayor. So as I sent all of you alders a link to the 211 website, as well as the battalion chief's telephone number, so I'll just fill Out the edges of my email. So in any type of event, whether it's a specific emergency with your constituents, a flood, a hurricane, a tree down on a house, your best bet is to have your constituents call 211. So 211 is a round-the-clock service, they have all the resources, they have lots of information. You as an alder can also call 211 to marshal services and resources for your constituents. You may also call the battalion chief. I just wanna emphasize that the email that I sent you, the number for the battalion chief is not a public number. Battalion chief is on 24 hours a day, seven days a week. That person, our fire department, is our emergency manager. They can marshal those services. 211 is a great resource for individuals as well as alders. But in terms of emergency management, battalion chief can marshal the Red Cross and lots of other services in order to help people who are in need. In Alder Dorff's communication, she was very specific about having a point person in the city who would navigate community services, charities and resources, be able to connect citizens in crisis with appropriate city departments. That person is the battalion chief. So you have that number. Also in terms of communication flowing upward toward the mayor's office into City Hall, the battalion chief communicates directly with Chief Litton or Assistant Chief Goplin. Assistant Chief Goplin is here with us today 'cause Chief Litton is out of town. So those two gentlemen, along with the battalion chief, are always on duty, always on call. You can communicate with the battalion chief. The battalion chief will communicate with the chief and the assistant chief who will communicate with the mayor. That will be the protocol. So we will always have someone able to manage those services for constituents, and especially on a Friday, at four o'clock, there is somebody here. And that is 211 for individuals, and for alders specifically, 211 or the battalion chief. And if you have any questions, email me.

- Alright, thank you, Alderman Wery, did you have a question? I have you on as a speaker. Alright, thank you. Alright, thank you, Alderperson Dorff, for bringing this to everyone's attention, I know it was your district where some confusion happened, and Celestine, thanks for updating the council. Okay, Clerk.

- [Clerk] We're now onto appointments. New appointment. Police and fire commission, Vanye Kepke, 880 B Leedman Court Number Eight. And then we have Green Bay Brown County professional football stadium board, William Galvin at 1244 Emilie Street, Kristen Johnson, 3504 Layden Drive Apartment Nine, and Leah Weycker at 425 South Military Avenue, Suite 206.

- Alright, there's a motion by Alderman Nicholson and seconded by Alderperson Dorff. Comments on this?

- Ask for separation between the police and fire commission and the Green Bay Brown County professional stadium board.

- Alright. Fine, we'll just take the police and fire commission appointee. If you'd use the board on this. Alderman Van Der Leest is on the, thank you.

- [Van Der Leest] Sorry.

- THat's fine. Alright, and that passes unanimously. Thank you. Alright, we're now onto the appointments of the Green Bay Brown County professional football stadium distrcit. Did you want to comment on that?

- Yeah, please.

- Alright.

- [Mayor] Alderman Wery?

- Thank you, Mr. Mayor. This kinda harkens back to what we were talking about earlier. I know that their terms are coming up, but they've been reappointed now for a number of years and have served quite admirably. And I spoke to one, and he, that gives you a little hint, he was pretty shocked that he was being replaced, had no idea. Loved what he did, thought he served with honor with the city, had no contact with City Hall, anybody at City Hall. And so me telling that person was the first they heard of it. I think it's no coincidence that they're all being replaced right now when we're having our little feud and throwing around lawsuit ideas, which really can't come unless it comes from the City Council, Mr. Mayor, so I wouldn't be throwing those around without the City Council's backing. So I'm gonna vote no, because I'm content with who's in there now and they haven't expressed any desire to leave. And they're quite surprised about it, actually. So I just see it as a power move and a little vindictive, thanks.

- Thank you. Alright, if you'd please use the board. The board, not your phone. Alright, very good. Alright, those appointments are confirmed by a vote of 10 to two, thank you.

- [Clerk] We're now onto reappointment economic development authority Pam Parish, 2214 Nicolet Drive, Apartment 14.

- Move.

- Second.

- There's a motion by Alderman Nicholson and seconded by Alderman Scannell to reappoint Pam Parish to Economic Development Authority. Please use the board here. Mr. Van Der Leest, just, there you go. Alright, and those pass on a unanimous vote, thank you. Alright, now we're onto your.

- [Clerk] We are now onto ordinances first reading.

- So in your packet, or on your screen, we're going to Item Z, which are first reading general ordinances. So that's the next item on the agenda that we approved.

- [Clerk] I can't settle this current,

- Pardon me?

- My system won't let, now it got it.

- Alright. So what are your wishes regarding Item Z?

- [Alderman] Motion to advance.

- Well there would be a motion to advance by Alderman Scannell, second by Alderperson Dorff. So that would take all five ordinances. Is there any one you wanna handle separately?

- [Alderman] One.

- Item one. Okay, then on the remainder of them, I'll do this on a voice vote, all in favor of advancing items two, three, four, and five, please signify by saying aye.

- [Aldermen] Aye.

- And those opposed, nays, the ayes have it. Those for first reading ordinances have been advanced to the third reading. What are your wishes regarding ordinance Item One, Z One?

- [Alderman] Motion to advance.

- Motion to advance by Alderman Scannell, seconded by Alderman Dorff. Alderperson Dorff, I think you pulled this item.

- [Dorff] But I would like to yield the floor to Alder Scannell.

- Alright.

- Oh. Well, I'd just like to make motion to open the floor, I know there's a few people who would like to speak towards this.

- [Dorff] Second.

- [Mayor] Alright, so we have a motion by Alderman Scannell, seconded by Alderperson Dorff, to open the floor to hear from interested parties. All in favor of that motion please signify by saying aye.

- [Aldermen] Aye.

- [Mayor] And those opposed, nays, ayes have it. And the floor is opened. So the council right now is discussing advancing the first reading ordinance, it's general ordinance nine dash 18, and it's an ordinance and it's creating section 1.65 in the Green Bay Municipal Code regarding to a sustainability commission. So that's what we're talking about right now, it would be, if it's approved tonight, it would be advanced to the next meeting, and then for final approval. So I have five people who signed up to speak to this. If I could call you and you could just cue up at the podium. Terry Lee, and that's followed by Cassandra Erickson, and then Ned Dorff. If you'd like to comment on this ordinance, the floor is now open.

- Thank you, Mayor, and City Council here. This is a great opportunity for the city. When you think of green, you think of environmentally friendly these days. And I think the city taking this new direction here and bringing this top-down approach of things will help the community and be able to live better lives here in the city. It's important that we are friendly to the environment. And making sure that buildings are sustainable when it comes to energy use. Any ways that we can reduce our energy take when it comes to fossil fuels and increasing renewable energies is crucial as we move forward in life. This should be something that should be very natural. We think that this is always happening and is always part of a community. I think having this now is a good opportunity when it comes to being more business friendly. Because as businesses nowadays are increasingly listening to their customers, and customers do want more green-friendly communities and businesses. This is a great opportunity for the city, I think we need to embrace this and move forward, thank you.

- [Mayor] Alright, thank you, Mr. Lee. Cassandra Erickson.

- Hello, my name is Cassandra Oceana Erickson. I am Green Bay's local mermaid. In 2015, I founded a local environmental charity, and as of last April, I was elected to serve a three-year term on the Wisconsin conservation congress. On behalf of the WCC, during this annual spring vote and election, 65 Wisconsin counties voted to pass laws and legislation that support renewable energy in a collective effort to fight climate change on a local level. Again, that's 65 counties. Now with that being said, not only will the Green Bay sustainability committee be supported by the rest of our great state, but our actions today will lead our country into a brighter and better future. Thank you.

- Thank you. Mr. Dorff, and that's followed by Pam Fischer.

- Thank you, your honor. Ned Dorff, 1321 Emilie Street. I have long believed that a government body looking at sustainability issues would be a benefit to the whole city. And especially a body that can have the authority to make recommendations to the city council. Back 10 years ago, you may remember the sustainability task force that was a group of well-intentioned, well-meaning individuals, we got together, we talked about environmental issues. But there was really no formal way to get the ideas from that task force in front of the council. A lot of great ideas that came up during those meetings. But again, they kind of died in those meetings as well. So, I believe the commission proposal addresses some of the structural flaws that were inherent in the old task force. And I think that if we can pass this commission and approve the formation of the commission, we can look forward to be an active participant with the city as we move forward into sustainability together. And that means looking at energy efficiency issues, cost savings, clean air, clean water, clean soil, and also equity and health issues for our residents. So please support the formation of this commission, thank you.

- [Mayor] Thank you. Pam, I just, after you is, I can't really read this, is it, Seth, Seth Hoffmeister on Law Street. You first, Pam.

- My name is Pam Fischer, I live in Green Bay at 1273 Marian Lane. And I'm here today to speak in support of the Citizens' Sustainability Commission Ordinance as an individual, but also on behalf of the Joshua Environmental Justice Team. I think everyone in this room would like to have a good life. For most of that, that includes the basics like good health, easy access to clean water and air, healthy land for growing nutritious foods, education and job opportunities that build safe and vibrant homes and communities. But here and around the globe, communities face huge challenges to holding onto or attaining even the simple necessities of a good life. Challenges to water quality and access, land viability, air quality, extreme weather affecting local, regional, and global economies, social and human suffering caused by environmental destruction, disproportionately affecting low-income groups and people of color. Sadly, instead of helping us reduce pollution and shift to safer alternative energy technologies that better support economic and social stability, far too many elected officials at state and federal levels are moving in the opposite direction. They hide truths from us and treat us like kids who aren't able to face the scary facts or make the hard decisions necessary to

resolve complex situations. But we need those truths and facts to help us face and make difficult decisions that will allow future generations to benefit and learn from our choices and our actions. We need a local citizen sustainability commission. Based on research done personally and with the Joshua environmental justice team, I believe this is a perfect time to establish such a commission for Green Bay. Many Green Bay citizens already participate in groups searching for and creating solutions to address current challenges to have that good life. But efforts are slow and less effective for lack of a city-wide plan and collaborative space to coordinate and make best use of all these great actions and motivated people. A sustainability commission can provide that and help us turn ideas and dreams for a healthier, more regenerative community into a reality. There are already communities around our state with mature and growing commissions we can learn from and call on as mentors and guides. Our social environment is full of people marching for clean air and water, for science, and more effective eco-friendly energy initiatives, for justice awareness and neighborhood designs that provide access and resources evenly across the board. We have the desire and we have the talent here to make great use of what a sustainability commission provides. That's why I and the Joshua Environmental Justice Team support approval of a Green Bay citizens' sustainability commission, and we ask that the Green Bay City Council do the same. Thank you.

- Thank you. Alright, Charley Frisk? I mean, go ahead, Seth, and Charley Frisk will be after you.

- Thank you to the Green Bay Common Council for allowing me the opportunity to speak this evening. I'm Seth Hoffmeister, I'm a resident of Green Bay. I'm also the field director with Wisconsin League of Conservation Voters. We're a non-partisan, non-profit organization dedicated to the protection of our natural resources. And I'm speaking here tonight in support of the ordinance before you that would create the sustainability commission to advise the city on matters of sustainability. Our energy landscape is changing. The Pulliam Power Plant is scheduled to go offline in 2020. The coal piles on the Fox River might finally be moved. Energy providers across the state and the nation are looking to increase their renewable energy portfolios. Major solar projects were just announced in southwest Wisconsin and in northern Manitowoc County, and just down Highway 29, our friends in Eau Claire just pledged to be 100% renewable energy by 2050. People all across the world, United States, and Wisconsin are turning to renewable sources of energy to meet their needs. But, because state and national institutions have been unresponsive to sustainability issues, particularly related to climate change and energy, local governments both have an opportunity and imperative to step up and implement grassroots solutions that will allow our communities to do our part to mitigate climate change. In order to fully realize the potential our city can have to reduce our dependence on foreign fossil fuels and to provide a more sustainable, livable, and healthy community, a collaborative space needs to be established to realize our options. A sustainability commission has an opportunity to bring together folks from all across the community towards common goals. With city, business, and community leaders sitting at the same table, we can explore and recommend specific solutions that can improve the quality of our economic, environmental, and social wellbeing. With stakeholders represented at the table, our possibilities are limitless, but we have an immediate opportunity to upgrade public buildings, to improve efficiency, and to generate renewable energy, embark on community solar projects, help homes, and help businesses become more energy efficient and work towards 100% renewable energy future. With this commission on sustainability, we can provide sound advice and recommendations to the city council and mayor on practices, plans, and policy matters. We can raise community awareness, understanding, and appreciation of matters related to sustainability, and we can collaborate with the good people of Green Bay to achieve our goals and to make this place a better place to live today and tomorrow. I urge you all to support this ordinance tonight. Thank you for your time.

- [Mayor] Thank you. Charley, I see you didn't want to speak, but, I don't really, from what I know of you, you seldom turn down a microphone, so I thought I'd, I didn't mean to call you up.

- Yeah, I hadn't signed up to speak, but just a couple of comments. I think that this goes well with the expansion of Green Bay Packaging. I taught environmental science for 31 years and I think every single one of those years, I talked about how Green Bay Packaging had the closed loop with their water facility, where the same water was used over and over and over again. And a lot of times, the whole environmental thing is

presented as well, we either have strong business or we have strong environment. And Green Bay Packaging has shown for, the entire time I've been in Green Bay, that it's possible to have both. And have them really, really well done. And I think that this sustainability commission could hopefully steer a lot of the rest of the city of Green Bay, industry, city, otherwise, to be doing what Green Bay Packaging has been doing by themselves all these years. So I strongly urge that we go ahead with this, because I think it's a good way to work with industry to make some positive accomplishments. Get everybody else playing on the same level that Green Bay Packaging plays on. Thank you.

- [Mayor] Thank you, Charley. Is there anyone else who would like to speak? This is the first reading ordinance, if you just want to come up to the podium, please. Take a break right after this. Gonna get this done.

- My name is Dave Boyce, and I'm a former, well actually I was the last member of the, the Sustainability Commission. So I wish to address the council and citizens of Green Bay from the perspective of being the last alderman assigned to the Sustainable Green Bay Commission. At the time, the commissioner was Paul, the head of the commission was Paul Linzmeyer, who avoided a face-to-face meeting with me for months. When we finally met, he did not seem to want to be there. Suddenly he came alive and told me that he was the only outside board member of the United Seven Generation gasification effort. Linzmeyer spent the last half of the session trying to get my vote on the project, mainly because it was my seventh district. Some of the monthly sustainability missions were attended by a special non-local special interest employees. Everyone was looking for opium, which is other people's money. The sustainable issue has always been a wedge to drive into the local governments that have nonpartisanship as their organizational foundation, in my opinion. I resent the opportunity for us to reestablish another sustainability commission fiasco. We must learn from past mistakes and move on. This issue is today presented to us as a novel concept as if it never happened before. This time its chief support comes from Alderman Randy Scannell. And the support of the Joshua Program concepts, Joshua has promoted communism in the Catholic Church, among other things, Bishop Rekin is aware of this. Using the information from the compass, weekly publication of the localthe Joshua website has awarded massive pledge clad for safe getting at that time, a mission statement that revealed that it was controlled from Brooklyn, California. Parts of their representatives, pairs of their representatives

- [Mayor] You got one minute, Dave.

- Yes?

- One minute.

- One minute? Okay. I request additional time, please.

- [Mayor] Just finish up here, you're opposed to this.

- I'm reading as fast as I can.

- [Mayor] Yep, go ahead.

- Needless to say, Joshua fiercely opposes nonpartisan governments who contribute, who contribute to, oh, I'm sorry, okay. The sustainable issue is back in our faces again after it has died a proper death already. I reject some parts of the agendas of Alderman Scannell. If you are curious about the last part of Sustainability Commission activity, the commission was finally pulled out by the roots and I was appointed to the Historic Preservation Commission instead. The commissioner's pathetic and sporadic internet postings withered on the vine. The central constituency of sustainable Green Bay were people that grew things and are close to nature, amazing and wonderful people. I've come to the conclusion that these innocent people were used as a Trojan horse to legitimize the creation of Sustainable Green Bay. In review of his existing commissions, they mostly

work very well, especially in dealing with sex offender issues, variances, and stuff like that. The new public arts commission is politically polarized, but serves most of the public interest and is working very well with resources of the art garage that bring our community together for enhanced creativity and skill sets. Some efforts to fuse the commission to Green Bay government did not end well. Recently, the beautification commission had to be pulled up by the roots because it reverted to publishing bizarre agenda items that were not related to its mission statements.

- [Mayor] Okay.

- While beautification efforts were lost in the shuffle. The core community of people that grew stuff were short sheeted by the sustainable commission and left swinging in the breeze. They were unaware that Mr. Linzmeyer had simply faded away at that time. These people met independently towards the end.

- [Mayor] Alright Dave, I'll give you 30 more seconds, but then you're over, you're well over five minutes, we usually give three, so.

- As the city of Green Bay our copy of the commission reports and, okay, the sustainability commission has proven beyond sustainable, basically. And I think, well, I thank you all for your time.

- [Mayor] Thank you, Mr. Alderman. Anyone else wishing to speak to this, Jim?

- Hello, I'm Jim Solansky, from Green Bay, Wisconsin. 496 Menlow Park Road, Green Bay, 54302. And I'm the president of Joshua. it's an affiliate of the Wisdom Organization in the state of Wisconsin, we have 12 affiliates throughout the state of Wisconsin. To the best of my knowledge, neither I nor anybody else that I've worked with in these organizations are communists. So I'm not gonna get into this real deep. But what I would like to get into is that there's a number of counties and communities throughout the state of Wisconsin who have decided to put together their own groups to look at the feasibility of, you know, cleaning up the environment and working hard. Now I don't know, is there anybody in here that would like to see the coal piles gone? I can think of one for sure. but it's something that we have to work on all the time. When we get rid of the coal piles, there'll always be something else. And we all know that. And we're not asking for millions of dollars, hundreds of thousands of dollars, or thousands of dollars to do this work. We're asking for pretty much an awful lot of volunteer work for the city of Green Bay and Brown County. And that's where we're coming from. And I don't know, I'm just sort of, like overwhelmed by how wrong somebody can get a story.

- Alright.

- Thank you.

- [Mayor] Thank you, Jim. Anyone else wishing to speak to this first reading ordinance, anyone else, anyone else? Entertain a motion to return--

- [Dorff] Motion to return to regular order.

- [Mayor] By Alderperson Dorff, and seconded by Alderman Scannell. All in favor of returning to regular session, please signify by saying aye.

- [Aldermen] Aye.

- [Mayor] And those opposed, nays, ayes have it, we're back in regular order with the floor, okay. Alright, Alderman Scannell, this is a, there's a motion to second to advance item one, that's what we're talking about, Z One.

- Z One, yeah, I think the public has spoken that, I don't have anything really to add to this, I think it's an excellent thing for us to be doing, I look forward to it, and I see no problems with this or issues that need to be addressed. I think we should just move forward, so let's go. Thank you.

- Alright, so I could do this on a voice vote. So there's a motion to second to advance ordinance nine dash 18. All in favor, please signify by saying aye.

- [Aldermen] Aye. And those opposed, nay. Ayes have it, that's been advanced. You guys wanna take a quick break, or do you wanna keep going? Alright, let's take a five-minute break, what?

- [Alderman] Go to break.

- Alright, five-minute break. Alright, lets reconvene. On the agenda, we're on, we're already on page two. We're on page two, under public hearings. But Alderman Scannell has a request to move one of the reports up. So Alderman Scannell, if you could spend the rules for that with the motion. So motion is to suspend the rules to move up--

- The protection and welfare report banks.

- [Mayor] Alright, so we have a motion by Alderman Scannell, seconded by Alderman Steuer, to suspend the rules and move up report N as in Nancy, which is the report of the protection welfare committee. Do you wanna speak to that? Okay, so all in favor of that motion, please signify by saying aye.

- [Aldermen] Aye.

- [Mayor] And those opposed, nay. Is there anything else we wanted to talk about, or else we'll go to Report N. Adlerman Wery?

- Thank you, Mr. Mayor. Since we're talking about the agenda, we're trying to dispose of items that people are here for, I believe next we were taking protection welfare, right?

- [Mayor] Yes, sir, N, as in, mm hm.

- Okay, and then after that, if we could take W.

- [Mayor] The report of the ethics board. Is that what you're asking?

- Yep.

- [Mayor] Okay. So can someone second that? Alderman Scannell? And I'm gonna ask, all in favor of that motion, please signify by saying aye.

- [Aldermen] Aye.

- And those opposed nay, okay. Alright. Alright, see no other lights. Alderman Brunette, did you have something?

- [Brunette] No.

- Okay, alright. Then let's continue, Chris, we are going to go to--

- [Clerk] N, report of protection welfare committee.

- [Mayor] Alright, what are you wishes regarding the report of protection and welfare committee?

- [Alderman] Approved.

- [Mayor] Motion approved by Alderman Scannell, seconded by Alderman Steuer. This is the report of protection and welfare committee for the meetings that took place May 22nd and June 11th. Are there any items in this report which are 28 items that you'd like to handle separately?

- [Alderman] Yes, you're honor. Three. Yeah, they do. Go through quickly.

- [Dorff] 14.

- 13?

- 14.

- [Alderman] 14. And the...

- [Alderman] 12. Thank you.

- 12.

- And number 12.

- Thank you.

- [Mayor] Okay. Alright. We're good, so hearing on others, all in favor of the remainder, Alderman Nicholson.

- [Nicholson] Chris, our clerk, numbers to abstain.

- Okay.

- You want me to list them?

- Well, yeah, could you announce it please?

- [Clerk] He's abstaining from PNW report 11, 13, 26, and 28.

- Alright. We noted that. So we had a motion and a second to approve the report, all in favor of the remainder of the report, please signify by saying aye.

- [Aldermen] Aye.

- And those opposed nay, and then we pulled a number of items, and we'll take those one at a time now. We'll begin with item three. What are your wishes regarding item three?

- [Alderman] Motions approved.

- There's a motion to approve by Alderman Scannell.

- [Dorff] Second.

- Second by Alderperson Dorff, Alderman Scannell, that is yours.

- Yes, I would just like to refer that back

- [Alderman] Second.

- [Mayor] Alright, so we have a motion by Alderman Scannell, seconded by Alderman Nicholson, to refer item three back to the protection and welfare committee. Discussion here, see no lights, all in favor of referral please signify by saying aye.

- [Aldermen] Aye.

- [Mayor] And those opposed, nays, the ayes have it. Item three has been referred back. We're now onto item 12. What are your wishes regarding item 12?

- Motion to approve.

- [Mayor] Motion to approve by Alderman Scannell. Seconded by Alderperson Dorff, Alderman Scannell. Yeah, go ahead.

- I wasn't at that May 22nd meeting. What was the main reason that you want to change the name there?

- Just to signify that there is a change in the committee, usually when the changes in the committee like the pedestrian bike and traffic, used to be pedestrian traffic, wanted to expand that to include bicycle. It was just traffic, and we wanted to include ped and bicycles to show that that's a change in our attitude and a change in our perspective and it's something we wanted to emphasize. So we're changing our parameters at this beginning so I think it's appropriate that at least some

- [Alderman] Protection and Welfare Committee?

- It'd be the protection of policy and that some of us--

- [Mayor] Right, here, let's just go and keep the floor. And you can ask questions, but he's got the floor right now, and it's regarding item 12, and item 12 is a request by Alderman Scannell to rename the protection and welfare committee the protection and policy committee, so that's what we're discussing.

- Yes.

- [Mayor] Don't you take your microphone and?

- Ah, thank you. All I'd like to do is change the wording that we remove what's in parentheses from, is that--

- [Mayor] But also.

- But also, and then everything in parentheses.

- [Mayor] Okay. So we're discussing item 12, that's the motion on the floor to approve, Alderman Scannell wants to amend that to remove the from but also restricting to policies. We need a second, anyone talk about it?

- [Dorff] Second.

- [Mayor] Okay, seconded by Alderperson Dorff.

- Talking with staff, they just feel that there's no need to be using those kind of specifics. That it's better to keep it a little more flexible so that when an item comes up, staff can determine which is the best place to place an item, so we can remove those items.

- [Mayor] Alright. Anybody wanna discuss that? Okay, see no lights. So there's a motion to amend this on the floor. Motion and second, all in favor of the amendment, please signify by saying aye.

- [Aldermen] Aye.

- And those opposed, nay. Okay, now motion to adopt as amended would be the appropriate motion.

- [Scannell] Motion to adopt as amended.

- [Alderperson] Second.

- Alright, there's a motion by Alderman Scannell, second by Alderperson Dax to adopt this as amended. Alderman Wery?

- [Wery] Thank you, Mr. Mayor. Perhaps just a question fro the chair. It was my understanding that the changes were to add the redistricting administrative procedures policies or other items. By taking that out, it doesn't appear there's any changes, maybe I'm missing anything. Mr. Chairman.

- [Mayor] Go ahead, you can answer that.

- The intent was, I was asked to give some examples and I gave some examples and that's why I included it in the original, but the intent is really for the protection and welfare committee to, since it's the only standalone committee, there have been times in the past where items came up that had, how shall we say, no home. There was no place to put them, and they ended up going to advisory or the council of the whole. And I think it's better that we want, every item should go through a committee before it comes to the council, I think that's better that it's that way. And advisory, there's always with a problem with advisory in that we always have problems getting a quorum. It was chaired by the president of the council and all the members were all the chairs of the committees. And we, there were times items would sit there for half a year or a year. I think that's very efficient. And so it's just to do a little cleanup and make us a little more efficient. Before anything that might come up. That's it.

- [Alderman] Could you just read the amended motion please?

- [Mayor] To approve a request by Alderman Scannell to rename the protection and welfare committee to protection and policy committee and have the committee include not only fire, police, safety, health, license, and permits, or any other item that does not fit into the agenda of any other standing committee.

- [Wery] Okay, so that last part is in there. Alright, perfect, thanks.

- [Mayor] Alderman, hang on, you guys. Alderman Johnson?

- More of a question for staff, whoever wants to answer it. But this, sometimes you don't know what you don't know, is there gonna be any fiscal impact to the city for this change? I mean, administrative time required for a committee name change?

- [Mayor] We didn't, in discussions, in talking to you, we didn't anticipate anything.

- Okay. So really, I mean, steering committee, then, to take on that steering committee responsibility as opposed to policy.

- [Alderperson] Well maybe, okay, we could change it to the name.

- Yeah, I mean if we're not too far into this, I would say steering is a more appropriate phrasing of it than policy, policy could be misleading of other things that it's doing. But I'm indifferent about it, but.

- [Alderman] I think whatever the council would like. I mean, I'm not, I threw in a name, any name.

- [Mayor] Can we try protection and policy? Okay, get some heartburn.

- I'm not gonna move to change it.

- [Mayor] Okay, alright, okay. So with that we have a motion and second to adopt item 12 as amended. All in favor please signify by saying aye.

- [Aldermen] Aye.

- And those opposed nays, the ayes have it. 12's been adopted. Alright, we're now onto item 14. What are your wishes regarding item 14?

- [Alderman] Motion to approve.

- Motion to approve by Alderman Scannell. Seconded by Alderman Craig Stevens. Alderman Scannell?

- Yes, I was contacted by Mr. Sanders. And he cannot be here. So he would ask that we reconsider his denial. Which is his right to come to council, but this is his last chance to do that, and he asked me to read a letter. So I guess--

- [Mayor] Is your microphone?

- Oh, I'm sorry.

- You have the floor. You have the floor.

- Okay. So I'll just read the letter. Hello, members of the Green Bay City Council. I am sorry I cannot be there today, I know this is much better heard directly from me. Despite my efforts, I could not secure a sitter for my three children under 10. I wanted to make a few points and expand upon some inaccuracies from my meeting with the protection and welfare committee which resulted in a denial of my permit for our third dog. Although I was prepared to defend myself and my wife of being responsible dog owners, I feel that the meeting was more focused on my character, flawed as it may be, and not the real issue of the day. Here is a semi-quick recap of the events as I recall them. December 23rd, 2016, we purchased a puppy for our daughters, aged five and three that year. Our other dogs were 13 at the time and show signs of their age. We wanted a dog the girls could play with, care for, and ease the pain of the inevitable of our older dogs, Einstein and Curie. We did not realize at the time the limit on dogs in the city and it is our failure not to have looked into it. On April 27th, 2017, we were visited by Malorie Meevis, pft, Mavis, sorry, for a noise complaint. We were upstairs putting our new baby's room together. My wife forgot she had left the dogs outside. We could not hear them over the music that was playing in the room as the windows were still shut that time of year. When I realized where they were, I went to retrieve the dogs and was met by Miss Mavis with the complaint. She informed me

that in the city of Green Bay, you cannot have more than two dogs. She also stated she was walking around the property for about 20 minutes trying to get our attention and the dogs were barking at her. In my opinion, this is a normal dog behavior. She said if we intended to keep the puppy, she would send us a permit. It was not given to me that day. I could not find it in my file cabinet with the complaint. In May we had our child, and while I intended to call and get the permit, I had forgotten with the excitement and responsibility of a new baby. When I received the reminder a year later, I filled it out promptly. On June 11th, at the Protection and Welfare Committee meeting, Miss Mavis gave her testimony to our permit. My concern about her statements are twofold. A, she described me in an unkindly light which I felt swayed the committee away from the subject of the dogs. B, she stated parts of the letters as fact without investigating them for validity, such as, one, she stated I told neighbors I had a permit for our third dog when I actually said I was going to get one. Two, she stated the neighbors said my dogs charged the fence between us aggressively, this is false. Their body language and behavior did not, nor to this day, display aggressiveness. I would not keep them around my children if that were the case. We did mention we had video footage, but it was not asked to be seen by the committee. Three, she stated there were lapses in our licensing. This is correct, I get my licenses from the vet when the dogs have their annual health checkups in March. I was not aware until recently when Miss Mavis informed me the renewal in January regardless of when purchased, which I will correct in the future. Four, she stated that when she told me the permit was denied by her, that I got aggressive and combative on the phone. I may have sounded that way to her, but I was merely trying to give my side of the story. At times I may have interrupted her because I felt she wasn't listening to my point of view, but I was never verbally yelling at her or using vulgar language. I have a recording of the conversation and the subsequent apology I left on her machine for the misunderstanding, which she failed to mention at the meeting. I did receive copies of the letters the neighbors sent. Of those, two in my opinion were just general comments about the neighborhood as a whole. There are dogs in the neighborhood that do bark other than my own. The last two, or they were stapled together in my request, stated some inaccuracies in regards to our dogs and our treatment of them. Honestly, we would have had some issues with barking mostly along the back fence. Our house is mere feet from the sidewalk. We have been closing the front door to the porch, leaving windows closed, not let the dogs outside if the neighbor dogs are out, bring them in when they get out of hand, we have heard the complaints from the neighbors, and while my immediate reaction might have been, to say the least, off-putting, we do try to correct the issue. Miss Mavis was not returned to our property for noise since the initial complaint. I plan to put a solid face around our backyard next spring. I have been asking my wife for years, but she has finally agreed. The lot floods in the spring and I want to get them both done at the same time. Costs prevent me from doing that immediately. I have been against bark collars in the past. I felt they were inhumane. Having had some experience now with Harley's, the puppy, training collar, I know they are not and I would be more than willing to purchase them. I brought it up to our alderman when he suggested I call back Miss Mavis and ask her to ask the neighbors. She said they declined both the fence and the bark collars. They would wear them breakfast to bedtime and be recharged daily. As I mentioned, the youngest dog, Harley, has a training collar and we teach her not to bark with the command and hand signal. It mostly works but she's a puppy and still learning. The other dogs, Einstein and Curie, are 14 now, and in a year, we would most likely not even need the permit and will not pursue a third dog while residing in Green Bay. I have behaved poorly and have made some bad choices in my interactions with a couple of my neighbors. I should not have spoken to them in such a manner. It's not something I want my children to see or hear. It is something I hope they let me apologize for one day and we can put all this mess behind us. However, I feel that my personal feelings should be judged separately from our appeal for our third dog permit, as I believe they are unrelated. I can be a real jerk at times, especially as it pertains to my family, flesh or fur. It is something I continually try to improve upon. That doesn't mean I don't care properly for my animals. Our animals are well-fed, well-loved, well-cared for, and a part of our family. Our older dogs most likely don't have that much time left and I implore you not to break up our family for my actions.

- [Mayor] That it?

- Almost. To be fair, I did make some mistakes with the way I communicated with my neighbors and I have been reintroduced to the golden rule. A couple times a month while my wife's father undergoes cancer

treatment, said I had permits, read letters as fact, charging fence,since initial complaints. I did call after talking with an alderman, and his suggestion again, when the puppies' records were inaccurate, letters, oh, I don't know if that's really part of that, I don't know what that is.

- [Mayor] Alright, so.

- So, um.

- [Mayor] Motion on the floor is to deny.

- Deny, and I still support that motion.

- [Mayor] Alright, thank you.

- Still support it, okay, I voted to deny not because of his behavior and not because of the permitting issues, which can happen. But because there were several letters from the neighborhood wanting us to deny it. That there was issues with barking, and that he needed to take care of those issues first, and then try, make amends with his neighbors, and then come forward with that permit if he still needed to. So it's really not about his behaviors, it's not about the permit, it's about the barking that needs to be controlled first. The cart before the horse is not a good way to go, so.

- [Mayor] Thank you. Alderman Galvin?

- Thank you, your honor. While I wasn't at the protection and welfare committee, I did field quite a few phone calls from the neighbors. And from the gentleman who wrote the letter here. I also had quite a few phone calls with Officer Mavis. While he's asking that we don't make a decision based on his behavior, I think that has to be one of the core blocks for the decision making, in that it's his behavior which has created the problem for the neighbors. They're terrified of him. This has been going on for several years, according to the neighbors. And when they try to talk to him neighborly, without involving police or any other kind of authorities, his response was to become verbally aggressive and to treat them very poorly, to the point where they thought it was best just to sit in their homes, endure the barking, while it went on continuously because they were afraid to, again, either approach him or to call authorities. One neighbor in particular, after this last set started, they heard the barking, they saw the police were called, and they knew right away what was gonna happen and sure enough he came out and accused them of calling. And they didn't call because they didn't want that confrontation. So fast-forward, the neighbors are asked to submit letters, he doesn't comply with the orders to get the licensing and all that. He gets the letters and he confronts one of the neighbors out in public using quite crude and vulgar language to describe her, to the point where neighbor could overhear it and call the police because she was afraid for her. Now, he can apologize for his behavior, but, and I agree with Mr. Scannell, that I think we should deny this. We have found out in the past that we can say we're gonna put dog collars on them, we're gonna put fences up, but once we give them permission, we can't withdraw it if they don't comply with what they say they're gonna do. And his performance in the past, and this is what we're judging on, has been not to comply, and instead to be confrontational and abrasive to his neighbors. He has created an atmosphere in that area which has everyone quite, quite frankly, afraid to approach him or to say anything to him or any of the authorities about his dogs. And they've made everyone's life miserable over there. Thank you.

- [Mayor] Alright, thank you. Okay, so the motion on the floor is to deny. Use the board, a yes vote denies it, a no vote doesn't. Yeah, Mr. Van Der Leest? Okay. Alright, so that passes, that's denied on a unanimous vote. Did you want 22 or not?

- No.

- Okay. Alright, that takes care of the, all the items on the report of protection and welfare committee.

- [Clerk] Are we going to W now?

- Yeah. So now we're going on to item W, which is the report of the ethics board, June 14th, 2018. What are your wishes regarding this report?

- [Alderman] Approve.

- Motion approved by Alderman Scannell, second by Alderman Galvin. Did you wanna? Right, Item One, okay, Alderman Wery?

- [Wery] Thank you, Mr. Mayor. I'd like to make a motion to open the floor.

- [Mayor] Alright, so there's a motion by Alderman Wery, seconded by Alderman Steuer, to open the floor to hear from interested parties, all in favor of that motion, please--

- [Alderman] Your honor, I'd like you to specify that, I'm curious as to...

- Alderman Scannell.

- Yeah, well the agenda item is approval of minutes and the election. That's the minutes of the, that's what we're gonna discuss, the minutes. And, yeah, the alder,

- Oh, that's right. Oh sure, no that's right. We were told that the ethics committee itself that met, I don't Know, a month and a half ago, could not go on this agenda until this was approved. So this would be the only time, and the time, to speak to what happened to that committee. There was no other opportunity. And I'm looking at legal council, I mean, there was no other opportunity. So unless there's an objection from legal, we just open the floor.

- [Mayor] Do you wanna comment on that?

- I guess my only comment would be that yes, the minutes have to be approved by council until the last meeting.

- Okay.

- But, it would need to be approved, and which is why it's appearing on the agenda tonight.

- [Mayor] 'Cause the minutes have to be approved.

- Right.

- Alright.

- [Wery] And this is regarding the ethics committee itself and anything that happened there, because it has not been reported out to our committee. So any commentary on that meeting is tonight. Because it was not on any prior council meeting. And I was told it could not be until the minutes were approved. And that was from City Attorney Chavez. If I had my phone, which I lost, I could show you the email between us.

- [Mayor] We don't--

- [Wery] Okay. Just wondering why there's such a aversion to open the floor.

- Well he's the one who asked.

- [Scannell] Well I'm trying to figure out, because I've read the agenda report, the item. And if it listed an action of the committee other than the minutes and the election of officers, it would make sense to me, but it doesn't. If we do this, will there be another report coming from that committee about actions they've taken?

- No, this is the final report.

- [Scannell] This is the final report?

- The report is the minutes, there was no official action that was taken.

- [Scannell] Wasn't there action the meeting before?

- Their action was that the proceedings would be concluded without a decision. But a decision was not made.

- [Scannell] But that wasn't reported?

- That wasn't reported.

- [Scannell] And that won't be reported?

- It's being reported now.

- [Scannell] Even though it's not listed as such, okay.

- Right.

- [Scannell] Alright, but as long as, alright.

- There were no finings of fact and conclusions of law. The minutes are the report, which are being approved. And they were approved at the prior ethics meeting which took place about a week ago.

- [Scannell] Okay, well, I mean technically that's not here, but fine. If this is the only way to do it.

- Yeah.

- Yeah, okay. Fine, I'm ready,

- [Mayor] Alright, so we have a motion and a second to open the floor to hear from interested parties. All in favor of that motion please signify by saying aye.

- [Aldermen] Aye.

- And those opposed nays, ayes have it. We're now discussing the item W, which is the report of the ethics board June 14th, 2018. Specifically item one, which is the minutes of the April 30th, 2018 meeting which were approved stating that in light of the recent election results and because of the specific provisions under the code of conduct related to elected officials, the Ethics Board moved that these proceedings be concluded without a decision being made on the grounds of the board no longer has authority to exercise jurisdiction

over Mr. Zima since he's no longer an elected official. Anyone here tonight like to comment on this? The floor is now open.

- Attorney Janet Angus. I appeared on behalf of Alderman Guy Zima at the Ethics Committee meeting when this matter was denied for him to be going ahead with his hearing. Alderman Zima believes that this needs to be sent back to the Ethics Committee for a hearing for a decision for many different reasons. I'm here to give you a quick review of what I think is important. And I'm concerned about the first amendment. The first amendment states that Congress shall make no law abridging the freedom of speech. I believe that free speech and open discussion on matters of public interest is the bedrock of our American Constitution. As the Supreme Court Justice Murphy stated, the freedom of speech and other press guaranteed by the Constitution embraces at least the liberty to discuss publicly and truthfully all matters of public concern without previous restraint or fear of subsequent punishment. When you were all sworn into office recently, you took an oath. In that oath you said that you would support the Constitution of the Untied States of America and the Constitution of the state of Wisconsin. As an elected official, you need to understand that you are not an employee of the city of Green Bay. None of you are. You are a representative of the people. You do not fall under the employment laws of the employees of the city of Green Bay. You as an elected official, an alderman or an alderwoman, have the right to debate issues at council meetings. You have the right to ask questions. You have the right to argue about issues. Hearing the other side of an argument is critical to our society and our democracy, even at the small level of the City Council. We all know this, that allowing the other side to speak without interruption earns respect from the public, and the public is the actual party we need to accept the policies or change that we're after. Not each other, but the public out there, the people who voted for you. What you say is very important in here and what you debate is very important in here. The First Amendment as a tool for change is something that's far easier to understand than appreciating the benefits when all sides are heard. And let me say that again, I really wanna focus on this for you. Appreciating the benefits when all sides are heard. As a City Council member, you need to hear all sides of a matter and then make informed decisions. You need to discuss publicly and truthfully all matters of public concern without restraint or fear of ridicule and of subsequent punishment. And these discussions should not be one-on-one meetings when you're called in to discuss how you're gonna vote on an issue. They should be done here, at meetings, in the public, so that we know what the process is, so that we understand as voters when we come to these meetings that we can see and appreciate what you're debating. Not meetings behind doors on the shipyard project.

- [Alderman] Your honor, how does this even relate to the item?

- Who is allowed to choose what words are used during debate on the council floor?

- [Mayor] A minute left.

- Why would this council allow one person or a group of persons to decide what is proper speech? Why would this council allow one person or a group of persons to punish a council member for their word selection? Who defines what bad behavior is or what inappropriate behavior is? Who is on the current word police committee, bad behavior committee for the City Council of Green Bay? Each and every one of you is entitled to your opinions, and if you don't think someone knows what they're talking about, staff, you have the right to question them. You have the right to state your opinions here.

- [Mayor] Okay.

- By the way, let's talk about what happened here tonight.

- [Mayor] You got like 30 seconds.

- I'll have 30 more seconds.

- [Mayor] Alright.

- Mr. Mayor told Mr. Wery that he can't say something that aren't true. Barb Dorff then yelled at Mr. Wery to get back to the things at hand. There was a decision made, you have to get back to the order. You left the order and people were yelling at each other. Who has the right to do that? You have the right to debate these issues, if someone thinks that the mayor appointing various people to the stadium district isn't appropriate, you have the right to debate that. You have the right to discuss that. The case involving Alderman Zima is one that should be heard. He should have the right to have this matter resolved. It has great public importance, and the constitutionality of the Code of Conduct is involved. So you can make judgment and decide if this code of conduct is constitutional. Because you could be the next person, the next alderman, when someone decides they don't like how you said something, you could have a complaint filed against you. And then it may never be discussed, Mr. Scannell, and it may never be reviewed. Mr. Zima didn't hit anybody.

- Alright.

- He didn't assault anybody. And his case has not been allowed to be reviewed, because he lost the election.

- Alright, thank you.

- After reviewing--

- [Mayor] You're over five minutes. I usually three, max five, so--

- After reviewing the Green Bay Code of Conduct for elected officials, I truly believe the code is unconstitutional and you should revisit it before you are accused of violating it.

- [Mayor] Thank you.

- 'Cause it will happen to someone else.

- [Mayor] Thank you, anyone else wishing to speak?

- Good evening, your honor. William Van de Castle, I am the chair of the Ethics Committee. And I was asked to be here tonight in the event a response was called for. I don't really disagree with what Attorney Angus had to say about the First Amendment. That's the same argument that was made to the Ethics Board on April 30th. The problem is that she failed to address both tonight and then the legal issues related to the application of the Ethics Code. For some of you new alders, the Ethics Board has two primary elements that it oversees. One is the city's ethics code, and the other is the city's code of conduct. Both of those, both of those fields of review are authorized by state statute. They primarily come up under Section 19.59 of the state code, which is titled, the Code of Ethics for Local Officials, Elected Officials, Employees, and Candidates. In the crafting of the code of conduct for the city, it was just limited to elected officials. There is no application of that code for sanction purposes to city employees. If you look at the code it just deals entirely with elected officials. As a result of the election in April, it was my personal opinion that we had a concern of our ability to proceed after Mr. Zima was no longer an alderperson. That opinion was confirmed by legal opinion that we received from Attorney James Caldey, who was hired by the city to be legal council for the ethics board. So on the basis of that, we found that there was, we had no authority to proceed further. Most certainly, Alder Dorff was prepared and ready to go and would've liked us to proceed. So too would Alderman Zima at the time. But it was our conclusion that since it was limited to elected officials, and at that time, Mr. Zima was a private citizen, not an elected official, we had no authority to do anything. And again, understand, our authority as a ethics board is to be the trier of fact. We're like the judge and the jury. And then we make recommendations to City Council as to what sanctions you should impose. And the code gives you a list of sanctions. But again, those sanctions

relate to elected officials. So even if we had acted and gotten it to you, you would have no authority to do anything either. Because you can't impose any of the sanctions that were directed on a person who is no longer an elected official. So if you look at some of the preambles and some of the language in the ethics code, when it talks about discipline, it says its first intent is to change conduct. And if that fails, and change conduct of a council member. And if that fails, then to impose discipline. So the entire disciplinary process runs to you all as elected officials. Once you are no longer an elected official, the code as it currently is written does not apply. That was the opinion that we received. That was the opinion that the board acted on when we decided to halt the proceedings. So it was based on legal opinions that we received. That's as far as it went, that's reflected in the report that you received tonight. So I'm available to take any questions if there are any, but that was the decision of the board and the basis for it.

- [Mayor] Alright, thank you. Alderman Scannell, did you have a question?

- Yeah, just one. This is a semi-judicial public hearing, but since there was no hearing, I'm still assuming that the idea of innocent until proven guilty is still a basis of fact of law, so that Alder Zima really has no claim of injury. He's innocent.

- [William] There was no hearing that took place, there was no evidence that was presented. Neither side presented any evidence. There were arguments that were made by both sides regarding some of the procedural matters, but none of the evidence that Alder Dorff was prepared to present was ever presented. So we had nothing that we could act on. It was, the proceedings were halted before we even got that far.

- Right, and how many times was the proceedings extended at his request?

- [William] The first proceeding, Mr. Zima asked for a request 'cause his attorneys weren't available, and then the next time it was scheduled was April 30th, so that was after the election. So it was extended one time, and that was the mutual date that we all picked. Both Mr. Zima and Alder Dorff agreed on that date, the April 30th date, so that was our second meeting related to that complaint.

- Okay, thank you.

- [Mayor] Questions here? Alright, thank you, Will. Anyone else wishing to speak to this item?

- Good evening, everybody, good to see you all. And I have to say, Mr. Johnson, I've heard some of the things you said and I disagree with a lot of the things you said. Some thingsbut I think you're doing a good job. I've come here to speak first to what I think is the great unfairness of this process. Are we going to stand by and let accusations be made, slanders be made, against people, and then not have a hearing on them? Really regardless of the election result, not only the accused, but the public, has a right to know the result of the charges, the opinion of the ethics committee, and the decision of the Common Council as to the validity of the complaint and charges. Whether you have a right to do discipline really is irrelevant in this case. But having the hearing and having the decision made creates a record and precedent for present and future councils. It is not a moot exercise in futility. It's actually a part of justice. That people get a chance to defend themselves against what I feel like baseless charges. And a chance for advocation, or innocence. Yes, I think this should be sent back, they should have the hearing regardless of punishment, ability or not. It's about justice to the people being accused. We don't get a chance to have a say so, we don't get a chance to hear what the ethics committee thinks about it, nor what the council thinks about it. You've created a process, I myself think that a code being created that only applies to aldermen, and in this case, the mayor is part of the aldermen, I think that's highly suspect to start with. Laws that only apply to a few people, we all have to live under the federal laws, the state laws, the county ordinances, the city ordinances, and we adoptas I ordered, as our orders of business, those are the laws you gotta live under. Where does a code of conduct come in? I do a little research. I asked Mr. Scannell when we were creating this. He said, well there's other cities that had them, I asked him to name one and he couldn't. So I Googled it, I only found two or three little cities that had these

rather odd codes of conduct. But, since you've created it, and you've made accusations, the last you can have is a hearing on the matter and a decision. Whether it's punishable or not, doesn't matter. What matters is, what do you think is appropriate behavior and not appropriate behavior? It sets precedents, it gives an idea for future councils. And most of all, it gives justice to the accused. That's all nice fancy talk here. But oh, we lost the election, what's that got to do with it? So anyway, I'm asking that you send this back. And to have the hearing. To hear what the commission thinks about it, the ethics board thinks about it, and then again, what you think about it and what rules you think are appropriate. Not only here tonight, but many, many times, I've heard all kinds of people say all kinds of stuff. Now, are we really gonna set a precedent where, if it's convenient, maybe three months, four months, five months, six months before an election, people can throw crap at you?

- [Mayor] 30 seconds.

- And then you don't have a say so, you don't get a chance? You don't have a chance for vindication? So you can be casually slandered with no right to a hearing on the matter so that all in the world and the city can hear about it. I think this is of great public importance. It decides what is or what isn't appropriate behavior, what is or isn't free speech. Now if you all wanna

- Alright.

- Live under a system where you can be slandered and you don't even get your day in court, then go along with this, this is what the mayor wants, he's.

- [Mayor] Alright, thank you, Mr. Zima.

- Yeah, I'm, anyway, it's great injustice not to act upon it. Whether you have a right to punish or not is irrelevant. Is the behavior appropriate, inappropriate or something in between?

- Thank you.

- So I ask you to send it back and have the hearing. I'm ready, willing, and able to have it, and I'm willing to stand up against anything Miss Dorff has to say.

- Thank you, Mr. Zima.

- Thanks so much.

- [Mayor] Alderman Zima, you got a question here.

- [Zima] Questions, I just made a statement.

- [Mayor] It's just, alright. I'll entertain a, anybody else wishing to speak to this? Anyone else wishing to speak, yes, ma'am?

- I guess I just wanna say that, you know, he's put in 40-some years of service. And if he wants to have a hearing, to have his name cleared or not cleared, I think we as a city owe that to him. That's all I got, thanks.

- [Mayor] Alright thank you, I just need your name and address, please, for the clerk.

- Oh, sorry. Wendy Coreal, 1473 Grignon Street.

- Thanks.

- Thank you.

- [Mayor] Anyone else wishing to speak? Anyone else? Alright, entertain a motion of returning to regular order.

- [Scannell] Motion to return to regular order.

- By Alderman Scannell.

- Second.

- Second by Alderman Steuer. All in favor of that motion please signify by saying aye.

- [Aldermen] Aye.

- And those opposed nays, the ayes have it, we're back in regular session. Alright, Alderman Wery?

- Thank you, Mr. Mayor. I appreciate, you know, the people coming forward tonight that spoke. There's some merit to what they said. It is kind of a sad state that charges can be brought, can be leveled conveniently at election time, just miraculously, with precious little time to vet it really before an election. So I think that's really sad, and then you can't, can't even get any kind of ruling or any kind of day in court. So I would be interested in this going back for a hearing. We just heard that both parties wanted the hearing to go forward, and they were overruled by the ethics board. Both parties seem hellbent that they're right, so, let's clear the air, let's not let it remain a mystery. So my motion is to refer this back for a hearing. Or aren't we interested in the facts anymore?

- [Alderman] I'll second that motion.

- [Mayor] Alright, so we have a motion by Alderman Wery and seconded by Alderman Van Der Leest to send this item back to the ethics board for a hearing. Any else?

- I will be putting in a communication later due to constitutional concerns that we review our ordinance. I've had people reach out how work on this nationwide and they have concerns, so we should hear it out.

- [Mayor] Thank you. Alderman Scannell.

- Thank you, your honor, I have guest referral. I find that, Alder Zima is innocent until proven guilty, I find it odd that he thinks that just because charges are leveled, he's somehow guilty. He's putting justice on its, the justice system on its head, as if he's the injured party. The system works with there are people who perceive an injury and they come forward and file a complaint. They're the injured party. Not the alder, he's innocent until proven otherwise. And for me now, now that he's not an elected official, it's really up to these people who filed a complaint if I don't know what other recourse they may have, perhaps something in civil court or something, I don't know. But it's certainly not a matter of our business anymore. He is not a city alder anymore. This is a code of conduct for elected officials. And he's not, it makes no sense to go forward with this. He says punishment doesn't matter. The whole process matters, beginning to end. And we can't do that. The process has been derailed because he is no longer an elected official. And in my mind, he's innocent of all charges pressed against him. It seems odd to come to a prosecutor and say, prosecute me. I think that's just bizarre. The First Amendment issues, I don't quite understand that, that would be another issue, and if you wanna put that in, that's good, that's got nothing to do with what we got here. But I think for the ethics committee, I don't see how we can force them to have a hearing that they have decided is inappropriate, that just strikes me as inappropriate, and bizarre. This whole thing seems a little, putting justice upside down. The

injured parties are not Alder Zima. The injured parties are those who brought forward the complaint. And I could see if they want to pursue this in some fashion, you know, I don't know what's available to them, but that's up to them. Alder Zima's innocent, he's got no standing at all as far as I can see. And he is no longer elected official, so it's no longer in our purview, it's no longer our city business. We're here to do city business. Period. So I'm against referral. Thank you.

- Thank you. Alderperson Dorff?

- Thank you, your honor. I'd like to hopefully clear up a couple of misconceptions, maybe some misstatements. And I have prepared a statement that I'll read from a bit, but I'll probably also talk a little bit beyond the statement. Let's talk about the concern about doing it pre-election that was brought up. Well, as it happens, it was in December of 2017 that the incidents came to light that caused me to consider filing this code of conduct complaint. And it was against another alderperson. In January of 2018, after reviewing videotaped committee and City Council meetings, I did in fact file a code of conduct complaint against this alder. Then twice, after properly filing and revising the complaint at the request of the ethics committee, I came to the ethics hearing ready to present videotaped evidence of multiple violations of the City Council Code of Conduct. And twice, the hearing was postponed. Once because of a lack of quorum, and once because Mr. Zima asked for additional time to prepare beyond the 45 days that had already passed and that we were allowed within the code. There's a new council in Green Bay. Many of the alders cited civility and decorum at council as campaign goals. An end to the feuding and fighting and a strong interest and having a council that works more effectively and efficiently in accomplishing the goals of the city of Green Bay and their individual districts was sought. And the voters of this city made their choices. My stated goal, always, any time I was asked, my stated goal for filing the complaint was to end the inappropriate behaviors, in my opinion, the inappropriate behaviors of an elected official. The voters of District Nine ended those behaviors by electing a different alder. All the evidence that would've been presented is already public knowledge. The evidence is from videos of open meetings and those meetings and the topics from each of those meetings have been publicly identified. Anyone can go to any of those meetings, which are specified with dates of the meetings, the incident in the meeting, and anyone can find that. There are no secrets, no witnesses were to be called. And former Alder Zima was aware of that. There were no witnesses to be called, it was all based on clips from committee meetings and from council meetings that I found to be inappropriate and in violation of our elected officials' code of conduct. That Mr. Zima said things that I believe violated the code of conduct is not up for debate. I have it in video, you can see it in video. He said those things. That he has a First Amendment right, freedom of speech, it's not up for debate. But that his choice of speech might have had the consequence of being in violation of a code of conduct was what was going to be decided. He no longer answers to that code of conduct. He's no longer an elected member of this City Council. And we have no jurisdiction over him, and no way to remedy the situation. I believe, given the circumstances, it's in the best interest of this City Council and of the City of Green Bay to let go of the past, to move forward, and to focus our attention on making the city of Green Bay a better place for us all. I do not want this referred back, thank you.

- [Mayor] Thank you. Alderman Brunette?

- Yes, thank you, Mayor. I'm in favor of referring back, and I have a few reasons, but, just the vision within this council itself on this matter justifies referring back so former Alderman Zima can address the ethics board. Alderman Scannell said he's innocent. Then you hear what Alderwoman Dorff said, and it doesn't sound like he's innocent based on her testimony or her comments. So right there you have two varying opinions on this council. I don't know how an alderman can say that Mr. Zima's innocent when Mr. Zima hasn't had an opportunity to address the board that this council put in place to deal with these types of things. And that, in no way am I condoning or approving or accepting the behavior that he's been accused of. I'm just simply saying that any citizen, whether they're a former alderman who's been here for a day or 40 years or 80 years, it doesn't matter, everyone has the ability to address the board that's going to decide whether or not his or her name will be cleared publicly. I would want the same thing for myself, I would want the same thing for anyone throughout this community. 'Cause once you leave the city council, your role in this community does not

change. You don't disappear, you don't not have a voice anymore. Just recently, I mean we had a three-page letter, two or three-page letter read into the public record where someone who was denied the ability to keep a third or fourth dog, I think it was a third dog. And I'm not saying that that's not important, it very much is. So if we're gonna allow our system of government to hear this appeal, we most certainly should allow this government, this body, through our process, through the ethics board, to hear the appeal of someone who, love them or hate them, has served the city for 40 years. So with that, I'm, again, not condoning behavior, what was accused, anything like that. But I think that former Alderman Zima has the right to address the Ethics Board. So with that, I support the motion to refer back.

- [Mayor] Alright, thank you. Alderman Wery?

- Yeah.

- [Mayor] Hang on, you're not next, Alderman Galvin.

- Thank you, your honor. If we were to listen to Alder Brunette, then our criminal justice system would grind to a halt. Everyone that's ever been accused and had the charges dropped could then demand a hearing and a trial, to what end? Again, as Attorney Van de Castle said, our ordinance is quite clear. We have no jurisdiction. If we have no jurisdiction, we have no jurisdiction. If you wanna change the ordinance with a code for future cases like this, I don't have an issue with that. But we have no jurisdiction. Are we gonna take every ordinance that we now have, and every time we think there's an exception to the rule, we're gonna turn it around and not follow the ordinance? Why have the ordinance? Then we have a free-for-all. And I think that's kind of what we've been having for a while. I think we may feel, some people feel he needs a fair hearing, some people don't, some people say he's innocent. It comes down to the ordinance, no jurisdiction. And that's why I am not in favor of referral. It's over, it's done, let's put it to rest and move on. Thank you.

- [Mayor] Thank you. Alderman Steuer?

- Thank you, your honor. Can I ask our legal staff what your feeling is on this for us as city alders?

- [Woman] Unfortunately, my comments are limited and I'm restricted in giving an opinion. As you may know, our office was conflicted out of this matter.

- Okay.

- [Woman] And we hired outside council. So accordingly I can't divulge an opinion on what to do with the issue as I'm conflicted out.

- Well I heard that, you know, the ethics committee said that while we don't, we don't have any reason to move forward with this issue, both sides make sense on this, but I feel that there is a First Amendment right here. So I conclude with, I agree with Alderman Brunette on this one as well and I feel he should have his day in court. Thank you.

- [Mayor] Alright, thank you. Alderman Chris Wery.

- Thank you, Mr. Mayor. Just have a question here, why is the city's attorney's office conflicted out?

- [Woman] The city attorney was identified as a target of the alleged violations. Accordingly our office was conflicted out and we hired outside council, Attorney James Cahlmy, to advise the board in its decision.

- Perfect, thank you. And just to follow up from Alder Galvin, the charges weren't dropped, so it's not really a fair comparison, they weren't dropped at all. I mean we hear from Alder Dorff, and even you, Mr. Mayor,

you're pretty firm on the fact that you feel he's guilty. We've seen you over and over in the media, crucifying Alder Zima, I mean, you were even on Channel Five saying that he was the Harvey Weinstein of Green Bay. So it's hard to take that back. Unless you get your day in court. Stuff like that can't be undone, and I don't know, was that the purpose of it? To say all these things during those few months of election, and then oh, oh, you lost. We're done.

- [Man] Point of order.

- Referred back.

- [Mayor] Alderman Johnson.

- I'm gonna abstain from this vote, and I wanna make it clear why. I actually came into this with the intent, and I was prepared to actually vote on this. However, multiple occasions, it's been suggested that the purpose of filing the complaint was to basically derail an election of which I am the subject. So I just feel it's prudent to abstain from this vote for that reason. Thank you.

- [Mayor] Thank you. Alderman Nicholson.

- Thank you, Mayor. What does the code of conduct sate in this case? More specifically, the question I have is, does it say anything in the code of conduct, or, if the alderperson leaves because he was elected official at the time of the issue that surfaced, but does it say anything about leaving office?

- [Mayor] Do you know? Hang on. Go ahead

- My understanding is there isn't a provision in there regarding a elected official who leaves. The jurisdiction is over, it applies to elected officials.

- Okay. Well I guess I would have to support that, then. A referral, I can't remember who made the motion, but if something was in the code of conduct that would state if that person left, then it's basically erased, or just it's dropped. But if it states person is elected official, I feel that he should have some type of hearing on that. That's my opinion, thanks, Mayor.

- [Mayor] Alright, thank you. So I got Alderman Wery's light on. Galvin's light on. Andy? You wanna speak again? No, that's fine, I just wanna make sure. Alright, Alderman Bill Galvin.

- Just for a point of clarification, if charges can be dropped and also charges cannot be processed because jurisdictions have no jurisdiction, so again, I'm gonna reiterize, or restate, we have no jurisdiction. Now if you wanna change it, let's go for it, let's get it changed. But we have no jurisdiction. And if we follow this, this opens the door that anyone else can now use this as a basis to come before this council and even though we may not have jurisdiction, or, you know, the ordinance doesn't apply to them, they can demand to have a hearing in front of us. And to me that makes no sense. The law is the law. If he has a first amendment right, there's other avenues he can pursue. And we've seen that happen against the city. There's other avenues he can pursue to do that. There's civil court, there's federal court. We don't have jurisdiction, thank you.

- [Mayor] Thank you. Alderman Scannell.

- Yes, just two things, one, first amendment rights, that, what, how are we stopping him from speaking? He can speak anywhere, anyhow he wants. He can go to the public, can go on Facebook, he can go to any kind of media, he can stand on the street corner, we're not violating his first amendment rights. I find that an absurd argument. Secondly, it sounds like this is a lot about reputation. He's concerned about his reputation. Well, the alder has made his reputation over 40 years. Those people who think he's guilty think he's guilty, people who

think he's innocent think he's innocent in these issues. I remember when I first ran six years ago, I did a workshop in Madison. And talking to some of the other people from around the state, and they asked me, you know, what I was gonna be running for, I said the city alder in Green Bay. And they said, oh, I know one of those alders. I mean he already had his reputation then. I mean, to think that this is gonna change his reputation in any size, shape, or form, it's already set in cement. It's absurd. So we have no jurisdiction, it puts justice on its head thinking that he's an injured party. And if we do go forward, then what? Then what, let's say the ethics committee finds him, there's a call for action that we should take against him, what action are we gonna take against him? None, we have no jurisdiction, it's an absurdity. This just makes no sense. For someone to ask to be prosecuted is just weird. I don't get it. This makes no sense, it puts everything topsy-turvy. I won't be a party to that. No, I don't support this at all, thank you.

- [Mayor] Alright. Alright, so the motion on the floor is for referral. A yes vote refers the item back, a no vote keeps it here. Did you wanna say something? Hang on, clear your board, go ahead. Go ahead.

- I, Alder Johnson chose to abstain. And I'm wondering, Alder Steuer, if perhaps that might be something that you would consider based on a conflict of interest, thank you.

- [Mayor] Okay. Let's vote. A yes vote refers it back, I don't need speakers, a no vote keeps it here, there you go.

- [Man] I just wanna know Can I ask?

- [Mayor] Alderperson Dorff, Alderman Steuer would like to know why you think it would be appropriate for him to abstain.

- If he doesn't have a reason.

- [Mayor] Alright, that's fine, okay. Okay, here we go, let's go, just quite, We've already started the votes.

- [Alderman] Mr. Galvinhimself

- [Mayor] Okay. A yes vote refers it, no vote keeps it here. Two more of you. That's not, that's up to people, I mean you. Look, I think when you took your oath that if there's an inherent conflict, and we're not parents. Alright, let's vote. Alderman Nicholson, Alderperson Dorff, Alderman Galvin. Okay, Alderman Steuer, alright, got it. A yes vote refers it back, no vote keeps it here. Okay, so the councnil voted seven to five to refer this back to the ethics board. Alright, clerk, thank you.

- [Clerk] We're now onto public hearings.

- Go ahead, start reading them.

- [Clerk] I gotta get to it.

- Alright.

- [Clerk] Okay. General ordinance 10 dash 18, an ordinance amending Green Bay municipal code section 13 dash 205 sub D, sub one, to repeal regulation related to conditional use protest, section 13 dash 205 sub G, to amend regulation related to the conditional use expiration, section 13 dash 404, sub B, to amend the provision requiring nonconforming lots to be combined, and sections 13 dash 602, 13 dash 702, 13 dash 802, and 13 dash 902, to amend conditional use with various zoning districts. The second one is zoning ordinance eight dash 18, an ordinance creating a planned unit, development overlay district for 215 North Webster Avenue for the redevelopment of Whitney School and proposed townhomes. The third one is miscellaneous ordinance

one dash 18, an ordinance adopting an amendment to the smart growth 2022 comprehensive plan of the city of Green Bay to amend the future land use of property located at 1060 Gray Court from commercial and general industrial to medium and high-density housing.

- Alright, is anyone here tonight that would like to speak to any of these issues that were just stated by the clerk, general ordinance 1018, 818, and 118? Anyone wish to be heard, anyone wishing to be heard? Let the record show no one came forward.

- [Clerk] Thanks. I do have a comment.

- Oh, and we're gonna read into a comment from someone who couldn't make it hear tonight. Won't be as long as the dog letter, but it is a comment that needs to be read into the record. Go ahead.

- [Clerk] This is for zoning ordinance 8 dash 18, it's from the developers director of finance and investment. As the developer we will be moving forward with the plan. We have given plan commission and includes the townhouses, central green space, and redevelopment of the historic building. We are pleased with the support the city and community has shown for this project.

- Alright, thank you. Let's continue.

- [Clerk] We're now onto ordinances third reading, you may under suspension of the rules take up items one through four with a roll call vote.

- Alright, there's a motion by Alderman Scannell.

- [Alderman] Second.

- Second by Alderman Wery to suspend the rules for that purpose. All in favor of suspension please signify by saying aye.

- [Aldermen] Aye.

- And those opposed nays, the ayes have it, the rules are suspended. Motion to adopt.

- Motion to adopt.

- By Alderman Scannell.

- Second.

- Second by Alderman Wery. If you'd please use the board, this is one two three and four, Report K. Mr. Van Der Leest? Alright, thank you, those pass unanimously. Go ahead.

- [Clerk] We're now onto report of the improvement and service committee, June 13th, 2018 report.

- Motion to approve.

- Alright. There's a motion by Alderman Scannell.

- [Alderman] Second.

- Second by Alderman Galvin to approve Report Item M, which is the report on the improvement service committee for the meeting held June 13th. Any items in this report you wish to handle separately? Item one. Okay, hearing on others, allin favor of the remainder of that report, please signify by saying aye.

- [Aldermen] Aye.

- And those opposed nays, the ayes have it. All the items have been approved with the exception of item one. What are your wishes regarding item one?

- [Scannell] Motion to approve.

- Motion to approve by Alderman Scannell. Get this on the floor. Seconded by Alderman Wery. Alderman Galvin. So we're talking about, this is the wheel tax, right? We're talking about Report M, report of the improvement and service committee, item one, to approve a $20 wheel tax with the following stipulations. Alderman Galvin, you have the floor.

- Thank you, your honor. I make a motion to approve the original wheel tax proposal as put forward by Director Nier last year. And I have several reasons for that.

- Second.

- Second.

- [Mayor] Alright, so that's on the floor. Go ahead.

- Okay, thank you, your honor. As it's been vetted out by Director Grenier, we're looking to raise appximately $2.1 million with this wheel tax. This is gonna eliminate $750,000 of residential special assessments, $175,000 reduction of non-residential special assessments, and it's going to encompass alley reconstruction and resurfacing, which some people, alders aren't aware of how that affects our community, as they don't have them in their districts. Rail crossing repairs, bridge maintenance, and maintenance programming. After talking to Director Grenier, he's also willing to add in a five-year plan where he would project, based on current finances, a five-year plan of what is going to be redone. What bridges, what alleys, railroad crossings, and what streets are gonna be resurfaced. That can change year to year, and that plan, that five-year plan would be reviewed by INS every year on an anniversary date to check and see what the next year's projects are going to be, if they're staying to tune, and also to review the projects from the year before. He believes with a steady income source that he is going to be able to stick to this pretty much, and give proposals every year so we can anticipate what's going to be happening in our community. As it is right now, bridges, and I had to get an education on this, I thought it was the state and federal government, all but two bridges are the city of Green Bay's responsibility for maintenance. All but two in the city of Green Bay, and when you think about these, river, the Fox River, and some of the other streams and things that are out there, that we all have, we don't realize it, but if you went out after the last rain, you notice there's quite a few more than just the East River and the Fox River that we have bridges over. And we have not been doing bridge maintenance until just this year. This is the first time we've been doing any real bridge maintenance that we're paying for. And we bonded for all of it, okay? Railroad crossings are the responsibility of the railroad companies, but because of federal law, this city has been unable for decades to get them to do their due diligence and repair those railroad crossings. And it's left to us to handle, okay, and that comes off of bonding again. If you look at alley reconstruction, that is, as far as, and Steve, you can correct me on this, it is the city's and the property owner's responsibility for that, is that correct?

- [Steve] City only.

- City only. Okay, in some cases, in districts which are economically disadvantaged, we sometimes get some federal money for that. But that again is not guaranteed. And I've had complaints from my neighbors about the alleys that service their homes, and they don't have driveways, so that is their driveway. And when they're falling apart, something has to be done about it. So looking at this, this seems like the best bet for us going forward, and these things relate to roads. The bridges, the railroad crossings, the alleys, all of this relates to roads, including the maintenance. And we're still gonna need bonding. This wheel tax is not a silver bullet which means the city doesn't have to come up with any money on its own. But this relieves the levy from having to be raised to cover this to a certain extent. And we're in a pinch, folks. I said it before, we made a big mistake when we took $1 million from the stadium tax money to offset raising taxes. It's great when you don't have to raise taxes. But when you should've and you don't, you are painting yourselves into a corner, and that's what we've done. And we have not been able to make the commitment for going on 2 1/2 years that I've been on this council. And before that, to commit to keeping our roads in repair. We've heard about bridges and what can happen if you don't maintain them, okay? I think that we have to really think about this. And you look at the proposal, even if we were to spread that money out over all those entities to the extent that Steve is talking about for the first year it would still leave an almost $1/2 million to do more road resurfacing than we currently do at this rate. Now, when some of the alleys are taken care of or they don't need it or some of the bridges are caught up, that wheel tax money can be used for resurfacing even more roads. So it's not like it's gonna suck it up and it's gonna be all gone and we're gonna be constant, we don't have that many alleys. And we'll get caught up on those. Some of them don't need it. But I think we have to be thinking, I had an attorney, and he always talked about the long bow shot. And we have to think about that here. We have to think five years, 10 years down the road, where are we gonna be? It's a tax, folks, it's nothing but a tax. But it's better to do it this way than to throw it on the levy. If we want to, we can at any time review it. We'll be getting reviews every year, and if we ever wanna review it and reduce it or get rid of it because we don't need it, we have that ability. This money is locked into a segregated account that no one can ever rob Peter to pay Paul with. So that's locked in. And I urge all of you to think about this, we are facing a fiscal crisis. And if the bridge things start to become a real issue, it's gonna cost us, you know, the more you put off repair work, the longer it costs you in the long run. And I think we have to start not just putting our finger in the dike, we have to start replacing the entire dike and getting our city back on. And I think this is the best option we have going forward. Steve has assured me that it's not always gonna be spread out like this. It's gonna change year to year, and that goes to INS. His five year plan will lay that out at INS. And if we think we need to make changes at that time, we can do that. But instead of us getting caught short with a big bridge repair that we weren't anticipating that we're gonna suddenly have to levy for, I think this is the best way to make sure we're covering all our bases. All these bases cover roads. And that's what we wanna take care of. We can't tell people we're gonna have smooth roads up until you cross a railroad crossing. And there go your shocks and your tires, okay, we can't tell them we're gonna have great roads up until the point where you hit the bridge, oops. Now the bridge is closed or it's down to one lane. Because it has to have extensive repairs that could've been taken care of before. We don't have people who have to park in alleys getting stuck because we can't get in there. So I think we cover everything with this proposal and this plan, thank you.

- [Mayor] Alright, thank you, Alderman. Alderman John Van Der Leest?

- Thank you, Mayor. I don't favor this wheel tax. It's just another form of taxation. I think the city of Green Bay has been behind the eight ball for a number of years on taking care of our roads, mismanagement as far as, you know, we take care of our police and fire department, but we let the Department of Public Works fall by the way. There should've been a designated fund each year, for the last 10 years, that we're spending this much money, it's three million a year, $4 million a year, it should be right in our budget. To slap another wheel tax proposal forward for the citizens, I feel it's an injustice. I think there's enough taxation right now, we take in about $107 million a year. And we can't put aside at least 3 1/2 to $4 million a year for road repairs? I call that mismanagement. We can bond for this, we can bond five million for Bay Beach just like that. $900,000 for bridge lighting, decorative lighting. That's 5,450,000 that we bonded for those things. And on the Bay Beach one, it was $150,000 a year interest-only payment. I can't see putting another tax on the citizens of Green Bay when we have the money right in our own budget, it's a matter of how we handle our money. And we don't

have any fiscal responsibility to say that this is how we're gonna do it. We can take a little money from here, a little money from there, and we can work it into our budget. But as far as, you know, just slapping another tax on, I think it's an injustice to the citizens of Green Bay. And it gives us a poor name. That's my opinion, that we can do better as a council. How we handle the money, how we vote for the money to spend it. And I'm not supporting the wheel tax, I just feel that it's an injustice. The money is here, it's how we spend our money. And that's my thoughts on it, and I'm not voting for it.

- [Mayor] Alright, thank you. Alderperson Dorff?

- So I just wanna make sure, in the new motion that you made, that you did take out the part about reduction borrowing, that's not in there, is it? 'Cause that was in the original one, and I didn't wanna see reduction in borrowing. Program expansion yes, but not reduction in borrowing. Did you, that's why, I just am trying--

- [Man] No, I do not have--

- You do Not have it in there, good. That was one question I had. And the second part of this, is that I know that there has been a desire to see the amount of roads done being doubled, based on a wheel tax, and I just think it's important to point out that the assessment piece doesn't pay for everything. That if more roads are needed to be done, we're gonna have to bond in addition to the wheel tax, that we'll have extra that covers the assessments. So we really are not via a wheel tax paying for roads, that many roads to be done. And the other point of that is, some years roads are just resurfaced, some years they're reconstructed. It's really hard to know what one means by doubling the amount of work. Definitely I think the amount of work should increase, and did you say something in there about having a report go to improving the surfaces, that was in the original motion, yes, so

- It's in this one.

- Yeah. So that, you know, I would agree with all those parts and I'm gonna support that motion, thank you.

- Alright. We got a lot of lights on here. I need to know exactly what's on the floor. The, you read some things. There's a motion in front of us right now, talks about a five-year plan, the assessments. Is that different than this? What is exactly on the floor right now? Elimination of residential special assessments. Reduction of non-residential special assessments. Alley reconstructing and resurfacing, rail crossing repairs, bridge maintenance, maintenance programming. Is that everybody's understanding, I just wanna, this is gonna get voted down and I got a feeling it's gonna be a pretty close. Well it's not basically right, though, right? I mean we're talking about a $20 wheel tax and the uses. And the uses that Alderman Galvin laid out, I'm reading what we have here, and, I guess it is.

- [Alderman] Saying suggested uses. Restricting it. So, is the motion in those.

- [Alderman] Well, as I look at the one here, it says, reported to INS, but it also talks about, 1.6, the street improvements, 175 to offset the reduction revenue from non-residentials. 50 to railroad crossings.

- [Mayor] Alright.

- [Alderman] But that looks like all that was.

- And are you amending that? I just wanna, I want the council to know exactly what we're voting on.

- [Alderman] Alleys, rail crossings, and the maintenance program. Either we're doing the roads or we're just doing part of the roads. And I think we have to look at all of the roads if we're gonna be I would also, no I don't have a.

- No, look, I'm the one who kind of taking this, I just need to know what we're talking about right now. He didn't offer an amendment, he picked up item one. So if you're gonna amend it, I mean I really, I wanna get this thing resolved one way or another tonight. The motion on the floor is that was a motion and a second was report M, item one. Is that what you're supporting, or are you adding or deleting to that?

- [Man] I'm, I made a separate motion to accept Director Grenier's original proposal.

- 61417?

- Yes. And this kinda lays it out in bullet points instead of four or five pages.

- Need to be clearer than that. You guys all have his memo of 61417. Is that what's on the floor, or is what you just read to me--

- [Alderan] Where was the memo?

- We got it a couple times, but want me to get a copy of that for you?

- [Alderman] Could you? 'Cause it's been a year ago. Thank you.

- We'll get copies, wanna take a five-minute break? NO, alright. Just get one thing, I don't care what's ont he floor, just get something, that thing's three pages, that's one page. But I don'texact same thing. Look, I know you guys wanna get going, we're gonna take a two-minute break, I'm gonna make copies of both so that they're on your desk. So five-minute break. Alright, let's reconvene. I'll take some responsibility for this. We are on report of the improvement and service committee, which is page four in your agenda, item one. And Alderman Galvin spoke, and I've got six other lights here. I just wanna be very clear on what's on the floor. So I wanna go back to Alderman Galvin, clarify his motion, and we'll take It from there, so Alderman Galvin.

- Thank you, your honor, and I apologize, Council, for not having everything all tight here. I would refer you to the last page of the memo from 61417 that you were just getting. So it would be the back page of the second page that you received. My, I'm amending the motion to accept the recommendation from this document, 6147 and 17 that was made to INS. The only thing I'm asking to strike, if you go all the way down where you see the financial figures, where it says program expansion, reduction, and borrowing, that, strike that. And instead it should say, expansion of road resurfacing and construction program.

- [Mayor] Expansion of road, resurfacing.

- And reconstruction program.

- [Scannell] Would construction be included in that?

- Yes, if you talk to Steve, he'll explain to you

- Okay, just.

- How that works, and maybe can take a minute. But also to be included would be the five-year plan to project road, bridge, railroad crossings, alley repairs, to report to INS every year. Have an anniversary date to review past projects and the next year's project. And that's it.

- [Mayor] Okay. I'm gonna read this one more time, and then I wanna get a second, and then I'll start going through the council members. So. Item one is being amended to read as follows, to accept the

recommendation, which you have here, as outlined on the June 14th, 2017 memo. Strike program expansion, reduction, and borrowing, and add expansion of road resurfacing and reconstruction programming. Also, part of his motion is to add a five-year plan which would be submitted and approved by INS. We good with that, that's what's on the floor.

- Second.

- Okay. So. Alderman, do you have anything else to say?

- Just one more thing.

- Okay.

- Remember the main thing, folks, or one of the other main things here. Not only are we getting all our road projects into one basket being addressed at one time with a five-year plan. We're also taking away those assessments that have been so ornerous for our taxpayers. It is a tax, no one's saying it isn't. But it reduces those assessments and some of the horror, many horror stories we've heard of people either with property that comes out with assessments in the tens of thousands of dollars or individuals living off a very tight fixed income who cannot afford some of those assessments. And it spreads it out over many, many years. So I think this is a win-win for everyone. It also avoids the levy, okay? If we were to take $2.1 million and add it to the levy, and I would ask our finance director, would that put us over, or would it put us pretty darn close to the state limits?

- [Woman] Can you repeat the question?

- 2.1 million, if we were to add that to the levy. Okay. Alright, I'm sorry, I should have probably gotten ahold of you in advance, but, again, you think about our levy limit, you think about the caps that we have and the restrictions and the other projects that we have ongoing in the city, this leaves room for that to happen. And I think it's a fair and decent way to pay for it. Thank you.

- Alright, thank you, Alderman. Alright, so we got the motion on the floor, $20 wheel tax. Specifically what he said. And we will begin with Alderperson Lefebvre.

- I just want to bring this up that somebody, and some of the others probably received it also, made a request that we look at low-income people. I know there's no way that we could really feasibly do it, I just wanted to bring it up that he was concerned that there's low-income people that this impacts. And I just wanted to bring that up.

- Alright, thank you.

- Thank you.

- [Mayor] Alderman Jesse Brunette.

- Yes, thank you, Mayor. I do have some questions before I'll comment on that, well, I'm undecided on the motion. I have some questions that, depending what the answers are, then it would help me make a decision. A couple, I'll just start now. A few people when I was knocking on doors and fielding phone calls, talked about a sunset clause. Now, Alderman Galvin's motion doesn't include a sunset clause, which leads me to believe that this would be an ongoing tax 'til the end of time, possibly.

- Well as a council, we have the right, especially if we're reviewing it every year, and there's always a five-year plan going on, we have the right as a council to say, enough. We've caught up, we've got the levy where we

need it. You know, where other financial factors fall into place, I would see no need to keep this going if we don't need it. And it's our responsibility to review that, and I thiNk we, starting with INS, we would be reviewing that every year. And so, even though there isn't a sunset clause, I think it's our responsibility to be thinking that all the time. By putting it in there, I mean, you know, you can force the issue, but I think it's best that we just do our due diligence, be responsible, and we'll be reviewing this every year. And the citizens will be asking us about it.

- Thank you. Another thing that I've heard come up in the past was for property owners that have recently paid a special assessment, will they be exempt, and perhaps I don't know who is most appropriate to answer this question Director Grenier who created this document, or Aldreman Galvin, because it's his motion, but for folks that have recently paid a substantial special assessment, are they now going to have to pay a wheel tax or are we gonna carve out an exemption for these folks?

- [Mayor] You mean like me?

- Yes, or anyone else.

- [Mayor] I just had one, we kinda talked about that. That's gonna be a tough call, it's up the council, but,

- But the motion does not include--

- [Mayor] It just starts, this would start--

- [Galvin] Right, this is, I'm looking to get, let's address the roads. And yes, I had people that came to me, people that are severely ill, it was tight, they were hoping this thing, wheel tax would've passed two years ago, it would've saved them a lot of money. And I in good conscience couldn't stop those projects because I understand the cascading effect it has. As to how we handle those people that have just paid out, this'll be, like the mayor said, it's something for the council to hash out separately. You know, you go back five years, 10 years, one year, you give them all their money back through not taxing their vehicles for a number of years. If you look at some of those assessments, at $20 a year on their vehicles, even if they had two cars, it would take a long time to get something back and I don't know how we track that. Or, you know, how we go about that. Is it possible, yes, but I think that's something separate that we need to look at.

- During the INS committee, a city staff member, James Brunette, unrelated, by the way, that I know of, there are a lot of brunettes out there, he mentioned that some plates are exempt. He didn't quite know what plates, license plates were exempt. I did ask a question, he said he'd get back and perhaps Director Grenier or Alderman Galvin.

- There's a list here, and it's also in the amendment. Buses, motorcycles, mopeds, motorhomes, low-speed vehicles and trailers, trucks registered at more than 8,000 pounds or registered as farm or dual-purpose, vehicles registered as antique, collector, driver education, historic, military, hobbyist, human service vehicles, low-speed vehicles, medal of honor, municipal, state-owned, special X, one vehicle with X prisoner of war registration issued to any qualified individual, any vehicle with registration issued by Wisconsin Indian tribe or van, and vehicles displaying dealer, distributor, finance company, or manufacturer plates.

- Right, now, perhaps this is a question for city attorney, but because this is essentially a user tax and anyone that uses roads through their vehicle, paying the wheel tax that they should in essence be charged. I mean I think that's the fair thing to do. For my district, being entirely on the Oneida Reservation, 14% of the city is for the folks that do have a Oneida license plate, is there any way to ask, to require them for this, is it state law, I mean I don't know what the legal abilities is to do so. Because I think for me to say to some of my constituents, you have to pay this wheel tax, and to others not, I don't think that really is fair, and I think most people would agree with that. So, question for city attorney's office?

- I believe that the exemptions are, it's governed under state law. So I don't think we would have any ability to change those exemptions, if it's set by state law, then those are the exemptions that are set. If I'm speaking incorrectly, I defer to Director Grenier, he's a little bit more well-versed.

- So on the 105 vehicles that are licensed I guess you'd say within the corporate city limits, was the carfor all these special plates or all these plates that were exempt considered? Out of those 105,000? Okay, so the 105,000, those are, wheel tax would apply to the 105,000 vehicles that are not exempt from the plate restrictions.

- Correct.

- Okay. Now, another concern I have is to go onboard with this and approve it, we're basically taxing citizens through a fee. And I don't want them to get a property tax increase. What a slap in the face that would be. You know, here is a $40 wheel tax per household or 60 or 80, who knows how many cars families have throughout our city, so Mayor Schmitt, you obviously, you know, create the city budget and you forecast things, you know, where are you at or where is the city at financially that we could perhaps freeze property taxes or not increase taxes if this passes?

- [Mayor] Right. So we did our best to hold our taxes for about five years, and then, you know, we went up last year. I'm not commit that if, you know, like the county, you know, they brought in $30 million their half-percent sales tax and said we're not gonna do that. This $2 million when you look at the uses and some of the catch up there, look, I'll try my best not to raise taxes, but if you tie that to that, I don't know that I'd be on board. This is the first time hearing about it. I mean I would try not to raise taxes next year, you got my word on that, this is going to help.

- Publicly, you know, how it looks to the public--

- [Mayor] No, I get it.

- Yeah, I know, and I'm just saying, for the benefit of the other alders, then, thought of this way, but the way it looks to the public is okay, here's the city taxing us, got this revenue source to fix problems they should have been fixing all along. And that's not cheap shot, but that's just the reality. And now the additional of the tax on us for a vehicle, they're now gonna increase our property taxes. I have folks in my district that pay a substantial amount of money to the city for taxes and then to go to them and say, here's another tax, that that's what I'm wrestling with. And so--

- [Mayor] Alder Brunette, If I could just, one thing I'd like to point out. You're gonna approve the budget.

- Sure, yeah, that was my next and final question is that when I talked to Joanne from the city's attorney's office, Joanne, I forgot your last name, I apologize, but she mentioned that even if the council approves this plan tonight, then we would have to approve it in subsequent meetings of INS and resolution forum. Is that correct? So a vote tonight, in other words, a vote tonight doesn't necessarily mean we're bound by that vote in future meetings?

- [Mayor] I don't know about that.

- [Woman] I would defer to Director Grenier if that was

- There will be a requirement to adopt by resolution, plous there will also be subsequent changes to existing ordinance that will have to be revised to be consistent with the collection of a municipal vehicle wheel tax.

- [Brunette] So a vote tonight is a final vote, basically? I mean I can change my mind, I mean if I vote tonight and then through the resolution forum, if I get 100,000, 100,000's a bit much, but if I get,

- Next mayor.

- [Brunette] I'm a popular guy, no, but if I get perhaps, because let me be honest, campaigning I was indifferent, I really had no strong opinion going door to door. You know, more people understood this, it was 70-30, and you know, I'm probably leaning toward the 70% now, especially some constituents who are hit with rather large special assessments. So that's kinda where I'm leaning at, but, I just don't want, I don't like the idea that, okay, I'm voting to approve something, and then when some of these other questions that I have are not properly addressed or approved in this motion and then I get calls from constituents, it will appear before us again. We should not be bound to this decision because it's not a resolution, is that correct?

- [Mayor] That is correct, we, right, you're correct. The vote is for that, I mean we would anticipate that you would stay the course, but you're right. You have the prerogative to change your vote.

- [Brunette] Sure, okay, and I'm done with that, but I would like, I don't know if the time is appropriate now, but to make a motion to open the floor to hear from interested parties if you think the time is appropriate now.

- Sure.

- Second.

- [Mayor] Alright, so there's a motion by Alderman Brunette, seconded by Alderman Scannell, to open the floor to hear from interested parties. All in favor of that motion please signify by saying aye.

- [Aldermen] Aye.

- And those opposed nays, the ayes have it. The council right now is discussing report M. And it's report of the improvement service committee. And it's talking about a $20 wheel tax with the stipulations as outlined by Alderman Galvin. Is there anyone here tonight who would like to comment on this? Anyone wishing to speak to this wheel tax? It's a $20 wheel tax we're talking about with the, relieving the special assessments Yeah, come on up, just state your name and address, please.

- John Remington, I live at 3207 Westway Drive, Green Bay, 54303. You know, I went up in Colorado in 1980. 1985, the state of Colorado put an ownership tax on every vehicle in the state. They finished I-25, I-70, what they call the mouse trap interchange. They finished I-70 across the Rocky Mountains with the ownership tax, the whole state. I just retired a month ago, I'm a truck driver all my life. What we need is a statewide, you wanna call it a wheel tax, I'll call it ownership tax. At night, everything wasby truck. The roads aren't even plowed no more because there's no money to plow them. So the truckers out there, we risked our lives on roads that aren't even plowed. Not maintained because there's no money. We got the wheel tax, that's what we gotta have here. Your state road commissions are broke, county road commissions are broke, and the city's broke, they can't maintain the streets. It's the only answer we have, isn't it? I ask you, let's do something, thank you.

- [Mayor] Alright, thank you. Anyone else wishing to speak to this item? I can't believe you stayed this long. Anyone else wishing to make a comment, anyone else? Alright. Entertain a motion by Alderman Steuer. Second by Alderman Scannell to return to regular order. All in favor of that motion please signify by saying aye.

- [Aldermen] Aye.

- And those opposed nays, the ayes have it, we're back in regular session, and Alderman Brunette, you still Have the floor.

- [Brunette] I'm done for now, thank you.

- [Mayor] Alright. Did you wanna speak again, Alderperson Lefebvre?

- Yes.

- Okay.

- I did forget to mention one other thing. I'm on the water commission. And I don't know if everybody remembers what happened up on Humboldt Road with the water main break. And they cannot do these water mains unless we do our roads. So we need to do something tonight. I mean to get this going, to get these roads done, so that we don't have another major break like that. And what happened with that, the water department cannot help those homeowners, state law says they cannot take the rate pay, the rate payers' money to help these people, and their homeowners' insurance does not pay anything. So these people are really hurting. So we have to get something done now, thank you.

- [Mayor] Thank you. Alderman Johnson?

- Thank you, Mr. Mayor. Question perhaps for Alderman Galvin, who made the original motion. Under the recommendation, we have buckets that are identified. And if we were to approve the wheel tax, without a sunset, these buckets would essentially define how that wheel tax is allocated every year.

- [Galvin] The buckets define where the money's gonna go. It doesn't define the amount.

- That's what I wanna be clear about.

- [Galvin] Yes, in that, if we don't need to replace any alleys, then the money doesn't go into that bucket.

- So that's subject to the annual report, or request, that would be made by staff to the INS committee.

- [Galvin] We should be able to see, every year, we should be able to see five years out where they anticipate the allocations to go. It can change, you know, the CDGB money suddenly goes away for the low-income alleys, that could change it. But at least we can see five years out, for once, for once we will know five years out what the plan is with a annual yearly review. Looking back, and again looking forward. And so it's accountability for those dollars. And it's accountability where they're going and where they've been used.

- Okay, thank you. I just wanted to ensure that I understood the intent was not to segregate these amounts proportionately into those buckets.

- [Galvin] Exactly, that's just to give you an idea.

- So I'm good with that, leaving that open. The one comment that I'd like to make too is just, I would like to see us start having the discussion around a phased approach with how we fund roads. My preference would not be to have a wheel tax indefinitely. I wouldn't be in favor of a sunset because I don't wanna prematurely put an end to a program if it's necessary. And I think council in the future needs to have the courage to rescind it if that's the right decision at the time. However, I do think it's important for us to have this dialogue about why we're not able to keep pace with our needs. It's my understanding, I had a great meeting with Director Grenier as well, who was very informative about how the process works. And you know, as it stands right now, the city only budgets 200, $250,000 to essentially take care of pot hole repairs. And minor needs that the

roads may have. Reconstruction is not budgeted, it is bonded for, 100%. And of course, the debt service that comes from those bonds needs to be budgeted every year. I think you can offer whether or not, you know, that's the right approach, but clearly it hasn't served the city well up to this point. And I think it's time for us to have a dialogue about that that doesn't necessarily infringe on my vote tonight, but I would like to see that as a next step if this motion were to pass this evening. The other thing that I would say is, you know, and I get this a lot too, it's a tax, it'll never go away. You know what, taxes never do go away. And it absolutely is a tax. But I wanna talk about he cost of not raising the levy for so long of a period of time. If you look at our current mill rate of $9.02, I believe that's the number, $9.02 per thousand, on an average home of $150,000 you are looking, if you were to do consumer price index, cost of inflation, average, say two to 3% a year, that's $27.06 to $40.59 on $150,000 home for the city of Green Bay to keep pace with inflation. Our costs go up. The only thing that affects that, of course, is if we add more value and more increment. And so, a $20 wheel tax, by my calculations, is cheaper than the levy being raised to keep pace with inflation. And so I do support this proposal as it stands. Thank you.

- Thank you, Alderman. Alderperson Lefebre, your light. Your light's still on. She on for speakers? Mike, yeah, look at that, she's still up for a speaker. Alright, Alderman Wery. Alderman Wery.

- Thank you, Mr. Mayor. I can approve of this motion and efforts to address our roads, you know. Like any ordinance or initiative that we start, we tweak it along the line and try and perfect it. We can even kill it in the future if it's just not doing what we want. As Alderman Brunette mentioned, while campaigning I would say easily 2/3, probably more, and I made sure to ask people, were in favor of this. I think once they understood it, they leaned towards being in favor. I think the reaction at first was to be opposed to it, but more they learned about It, the more comfortable they were with it. I strongly approve of the yearly overview and oversight, review and oversight, I think that's very important. Because it allows the council's priorities to also help guide staff in what the citizens want. You know, where we should set things and what we're hearing. The five-year plan's vital, I like that. My goal, and I said all along, probably all of our goal, is to double our road work, do as much road work as we can get back to 3% or more, falling behind, and however we have to get there, that has to be our goal. Thanks.

- [Mayor] Thank you. Alderman Nicholson.

- Thank, you Mayor. Is the bonding on the levy for roads? Is the bond for roads--

- Is the bonding on, yes, sir, it is.

- 100, all of it's on the levy?

- [Mayor] I don't know what percent is.

- What's the breakdown? 'Cause all I hear is it's on the levy, on the levy. Is it on the levy? And how much?

- The debt service associated with the bonding goes onto the levy. So if you wanna draw an analogy to taking out a mortgage on a house, the monthly payment, your mortgage payment, is the same as the debt service payment. So the total, if you got a mortgage ona $200,000 house, you're not paying the $200,000 off in year one, you're spreading it out over 10, 20.

- Correct.

- However many years the bond issue is for. So the debt service is part of the budget, but not the full bonding bout.

- [Nicholson] Okay, I just wanted that stated for the record because that should be explained. Thanks, Steve.

- You're welcome.

- If you remember the excess sales tax we had for the Packers, that sales tax, we had a list of special interests that we just squandered basically most of the money. I know we used $1 million for tax relief, but there was a list of, Botanical Garden, we gave them money. Railroad Museum, toilets in Red Smith Park, Children's Museum. I remember Dwayne bringing a communication that basically after the $1 million, the rest of that money should be towards our roads. And we pulled it from Steve's budget to pay off, or just basically give the special interests. Chris Wery had in his newsletter. I thought that was a huge mistake. That was a huge mistake, and I thought it was very irresponsible, whoever was on this city council a year ago with me. Chris, I see it in your hand. Could you read the list off please of how much money we squandered? When a communication was passed that basically the rest of the money should go towards our roads? House of Hope, Kroc Center, okay, 10,000, another 10,000. Whitney Park lighting. 17-five, enhancement of old Main Street District, 25,000. Botanical garden expansion, 25,000. Strike a Chord Music Festival, $30,000. Children's Museum enhancements, $41,250 dollars. Military avenue gateway project, 50 grand. Elinn electric Greener Green Bay Project, $60,000. Saint Vincent de Paul outlet store improvement, 65,000. Green bay public arts, 75,000. National Railroad Museum, 100,000. I know on our budget we gave them money also in our budget. So they got an extra $100,000. Historical Preservation revolving loan, $100,000. New city website technology, we needed that. Neighborhood works, the Farmery, $142,000. Do you think we could use some of this money right now? I think we could. And like I said, Dwayne had a communication and it was passed 12 to nothing that basically after the $1 million, whatever was left over was supposed to go towards our roads. And we dipped into it, and I remember the night. Steve Grenier was so frustrated, it was pathetic. I think that's irresponsible what we did a year ago, and I had nothing to do with that, I supported the roads. And I voted against all these special interests. And that's the problem with government. Government never has enough money. Okay, Mr. Steuer at our meeting had a recommendation that this should be budgeted. And I agree with that, and it should trickle off the sales tax or the wheel tax. 20 one year, maybe 15 another, and just basically trickle down where it just disappears. You know, we used to bond I believe 3%, now we're down to, I don't even know what we're down to, and our bond rating has gone down. Used to be a triple A five, six years ago. Well, who's responsible for that? I mean I think there's some issues we have here as a council. But if we tax the people, only $20, I think it's irresponsible, and you put the burden back on the taxpayers while we had the money. We had the money, we squandered it. That's not right. The people in Green Bay look up to us to make the right decisions, we made a poor one a year ago. And now this is all we can do? To me, this is lazy budgeting. This is very lazy, and an out. I think the mayor should have a proposal other than a tax and bring it forward to us and see how we can get out of this mess. That's my opinion. What else do we do, I heard that, what else should we do? Or what can we do? We send it back to the mayor's office and have him bring back a proposal that's beyond putting another tax on the people. 'Cause is this fair? I don't believe it is. You have people live in cul-de-sacs, quiet roads, that'll never be repaired, so why should they pay in? And the people that live outside the city limits who work here, or trucks that are over 8,000 pounds. They're the ones beating up the roads. And the residents of Green Bay have to pay for this. I don't like it, I don't like it one bit. I think the council should stand up, be responsible, send this back to the mayor's office, he brings back a proposa without putting more burden on the taxpayer. Thank you.

- Appreciate it Alderman Steuer?

- Thank you, your honor. What Alder Nicholson alluded to, I'm just gonna read this. And this is one of the ideas that I had, I had talked about at INS. And it said over a five-year period, to collect as a wheel tax $20 in year one, 16 in year two, $12 in year three, $8 in year four, and $4 in year five for the purposes of road improvements and special assessment and special abatement. Years two, three, four, and five collection differences would be made up through bonding and the budget. Until such time that road improvements and special assessment abatement would be a normal line item in the Green Bay City budget. I said in addendum with study need be produced to look at reimbursing citizens with special assessments through a case-by-case

appeals process. Now like I said, it's just an item for discussion, it's not a motion right now, but these are the thoughts I had too, it could be, it'd be an alternative, so,

- Thank you.

- That's it.

- [Mayor] Alderman Scannell?

- Thank you, your honor. I support the wheel tax. I've been supporting it all along, campaigned on it. There's a lot of talk, I just wanna address a little bit, about the levy and sunsets and reducing this tax and us spending money, $900,000 on a bridge, I keep getting that, hearing that. And now with all the other things. You know, a city, we need to provide for our infrastructure and we're not the only ones who are struggling with infrastructure. Matter of fact, one of the reasons we're struggling with our infrastructure is we're no longer getting shared revenue from the state and the fed. And that's why, you know, you talk about taking it from our levy, alright, do that, every year, our budgets are online. I told my opponent about that, okay, where in the budget are you gonna cut? And then do that every year. That's gonna hurt. Our city is more than its infrastructure, it's also its life, its ambiance. You have to do both. As a city, we should be doing both. We shouldn't be either-or. We need to, all those things that were called up, the Botanical Gardens, they bring people to the city. That's an asset to the city. The Railroad Museum. That's the only national museum in the Midwest. That's an asset. We need to promote our assets, we need to build up our assets. That brings revenue to the city, that brings up, adds more to our levy. To just, its should not be either-or, we need to do both. And the way to take care of our infrastructure now, 'cause we've been waiting forever for federal or some state help to the point where we're gonna be asphyxiated if we hold our breath any longer waiting, we have to bear the burden, and yeah, that hurts. I feel that, you know, there's no good choices here. I mean to put it in our levy, we're gonna raise our levy. People are gonna pay for it one way or another. As long as we're not getting any help and this is all on us, it's gonna hurt. It's what's gonna be the best equitable efficient way to do it. No one's gonna be perfect, no way is gonna be perfect. But putting the wheel tax on the vehicle owners who use the streets by putting it at $20 and, you know, every year we're gonna, I don't see how we're ever gonna end up getting rid of the wheel tax, every year there's gonna be a need to do our roads, so how do you ever get, I don't think we ever get caught up. There's always gonna be, 30 years from now, we'll get caught up, we're gonna have to start all over again. I mean we need to find a mechanism to consistently take care of our infrastructure. And this does it. Now maybe down the road, maybe the feds will, somebody step up, maybe we can do, we still have the ability to make adjustments down the road. But for now I think the responsible thing is to take care of our infrastructure with a consistent, ongoing funding mechanism, and we need to provide for other assets of our city. It should not be either-or. Thank you.

- [Mayor] Alderman Brunette?

- Yes, thank you, Mayor. Now my main desire in this process is to eliminate special assessments for residential properties. That's something that when I was campaigning I heard and I think my first time in the council, I don't think I had anyone in my district at that time, a different district, of course, but that was spacing a special assessment, and if they did, I really wasn't aware of it, it wasn't brought to my attention. So now that I live in a different district and a little different situation out there, that's my main concern. Mayor, when you, if this does not pass, and to eliminate special assessments on residential properties, yearly, to eliminate special assessments on residential properties yearly, it's only $750,000. If this does not pass tonight, would you be able to find this in the budget without substantially increasing property taxes?

- [Mayor] We're cutting something else, right?

- Yeah, you would have to cut something else.

- [Mayor] Right, yeah, I've been doing 16 budgets that have all been approved by this council, so yes. The answer is, I mean, it's very simple, just like at home. It's revenues and it's expenses. And $750,000 is a lot of money. And, I don't know what you're looking for. Sure, I can fix it, no. I put this before this council 14 months ago.

- Right, I think, you know--

- I've talked to other mayors about it, I mean I don't know.

- My point is I think Alderman Nicholson had a interesting thought that, you know, refer back to your office so that you could, Alderman, er, alderman, Director Grenier created this document I'm sure with consultation with many people within the city staff, and Alderman, perhaps your office. But Alderman Nicholson had an interesting thought that if we refer this to your office, could you find a way to fund road improvements in this budget and propose something to this council? Here's the fact though, we have five new council members who have never been part, aside from myself, a part of the city budget process. We are voting on a $20 per vehicle tax without this council having gone through a budget process. So, I understand there's a difference between being a candidate and being an actual elected official. Your understanding of finances and committee structure, it just changes, it just does, it's reality. So we're basically voting on a very large tax to our constituency and the public without having a true grasp of the budgeting process, at least four out of the 12 of us. So the thought is, to refer this to your office, to, you know, say to council, whoever votes on this, say, okay, Mayor Schmitt, can you find a way to incorporate this in your budget that doesn't tax our constituency an amount that they would find unacceptable? Would you be okay with that motion, is that something

- No.

- That you would be willing to take on?

- [Mayor] No, no. Look, I proposed this wheel tax 14 months ago. I stand by it, I've gone through a budget with it, without it. Talked to other mayors, talked to constituents, like you. I don't think you go to as many events as I do. The public is okay with this wheel tax if we perform. They think it's fair, they think it's a user fee. Look, people aren't lining up to say increase my taxes, but when you sit down and talk to them and say, look, we're gonna try this, and look, we're the council, if it's not working, we're gonna fix it, we'll get rid of it. Or somebody said, if Trump really does come through with this huge infrastructure bill that's gonna, it's like, why would we tax people twice? But right now, the roads aren't any better than they were when we talked about this 14 months ago. I don't wanna raise taxes. Look, I get elected too, I go to events, but this is I think a responsible way to address a problem that has been around for a long time. And if it's a tie vote, I'm voting for it.

- Okay, thank you. My point is saying that, again, another thought I had is that this is a new council. This is our first budget as this new council. I thought Alderman Nicholson had a good idea, a good thought, and I just wanted to know your opinion on it. So I'll take you off the hot seat, that was just my question, thank you.

- [Mayor] Thank you. Alright, you guys. Ladies and gentlemen, the motion's on the floor. Do you want? No, go ahead,

- Thank you, your honor. Alder Brunette, you mentioned that some of the members, they're new. And I'll tell you, the first time I sat through that budget process, after we sat through that long budget process, and we did this nickel and dime thing. $500 here, $250 here, you sat through it. We shift some money here and there, you know, we play this shell game. And then we come up with a budget that's, you know, we can accept. You're talking about, and I think Andy has a good point, but I think it was the same point that Brian brought up is that, okay, let's get this in place, and then let's start some real dialogue on creating a funding source going forward. So it's not just wheel tax. So that we can have those funds and we're not, we're not having to raise taxes or

add onto the wheel tax, but the reality is, $750,000, okay, let's not put lights on the bridge. $900,000, we're 150,000 in the black. Next year, well, we don't have any more lights to get rid of, so where do we find it? I'll pick on the police department, sorry, chief. 750,000 is seven cops. I mean I've sat here through two budget cycles. And I hear all this talk about taxes, but no one ever comes up with, how do we cut the taxes? And the only way you're gonna make that kind of money is with big cuts. So let's get rid of half of the community police or 3/4 of the community police officers. Or let's get rid of the drug enforcement officers. We can't get rid of the cars. Because those are already cycled through that, they're in such poor shape by the time we get rid of them they're worth nothing really for resale and other equipment. So it's gotta be, if you're gonna do that, 750,000 every year going forward. You've gotta come up with something more permanent, something where you can't just take 10,000 from here and that, it's just, I've never seen it add up yet to that kind of money. And it's, yeah, it would be great if we had some really fat object out there that we really didn't need. But I've seen the cuts. The amount of parks that we have open for children in the summer has been reduced, the amount of hours the parks are there are reduced. We've done reductions all over, every department has suffered, not so much police and fire, and I'm not picking on you guys, but because those are essential. But everybody else here, every other department head can tell you about the cuts they made over the years, the last several years. Partly because the economy tanked, and partly because we're trying to keep the levy down. But I don't see where we get that kind of money without making some kind of a major cut to our budget. And I don't see anything I've seen yet that I think we can really do without. Thank you.

- [Mayor] Alright. Do you have anything else, Andy, Alderman Nicholson?

- No, is it on?

- Yep. It's on now. It is, it's off now, thanks. Alderman Van Der Leest, you're the last light.

- Thank you, Mayor. The new revenue that we take as the city grows, I think it should be designated towards road repair, railroad crossing repair. It seems like we're real eager to slap in a wheel tax. We're eager to spend money on a lot of different programs. But the one that's really important is the roads. And we've sidestepped it so long, I say that we should, we have the money, we should be paying cash for the roads. As we get new money come in, pay for our roads right away. That would be the way to do it. How much growth did we have this last year, Diane, can you tell us how much extra revenue we took in this last year? In other words, increased our budget from the year prior. How many dollars was that?

- [Diane] I'm thinking it was about $2 million.

- $2 million.

- That was all salaries, that was all kinda compacted.

- [Mayor] Okay, come on.

- [Diane] Two to 3% increase in salaries,

- Okay, I'm not talking about that, I'm talking about money that we generate. With new businesses, new construction, new development in the city.

- [Diane] I think assessed value went up 1.9 million.

- [Van Der Leest] 1.9 million, okay.

- [Diane] Or 1.9%, sorry.

- 1.9%. And how much would that be in dollar-wise, roughly?

- [Mayor] Alright. Come on.

- [Woman] Five billion.

- [Mayor] Yeah, I know, what, so pick a number, 50 million.

- Well I'm not saying that we took in that--

- [Mayor] No, I'm just saying, you take the growth, you take the growth, we're at $5 billion.

- Let's just say that we took in an extra three million or 3 1/2 million with the growth of the city. Why was it never discussed that we designate half of that money or a quarter of that money towards our road improvements, and not to have to worry about all these special assessments and basically this has all been brought up because of special assessments against the that have high tax, in other words, when they'd be doing the roads. And I think it's more of, you know, just to slap the tax on, we're not looking very deep on how we're spending our money, how are we handling the money. You know, to me, I just can't see it. I think that, you know, we handle all the money, 107 million a year, whatever it is, and we can't figure out, let's say 3.5 million or four million that we just say, this is it for roads, this is gonna be it, and we vote on it, and it's done. But you know, all the paperwork it takes to create the tax, and you know, the state's involved, the city's involved. I think we should just designate a separate fund and just do it.

- [Mayor] Alright.

- And it would be much simpler, and, that's my proposal that we do it.

- Alright. Okay, let's vote. I'm getting tired.

- [Alderman] Mayor, I just wanna ask a question.

- [Mayor] Oh, alright, Alderman Brunette?

- I just wanna make sure that I heard correctly if you could confirm this or your staff confirm that if we vote yes on this, that this will still come before--

- [Mayor] Two more times.

- And that I can suggest items and amendments at that time if I don't feel that the item at that time's appropriate?

- Right.

- Okay.

- [Mayor] Okay we, right, we're voting this is on Alderman Galvin's.

- [Alderman] Is this all changed according to what you want?

- [Scannell] Assets, showing up no.

- [Alderman] I just wanna make sure that--

- [Alderman] Well yeah, this is, this,

- [Alderman] This is the original.

- [Mayor] That's for the $20 wheel tax with the bond stipulation.

- [Alderman] It's the motion that came forward in the packet, it's not the amendment.

- [Alderman] It's not the amended motion

- [Mayor] Okay. It is the amended amotion stated by Alderman Galvin. That's what we're voting on. We'll have that spelled out to the T in your resolution, but yes, that's what you're voting on.

- [Alderman] Alright.

- [Mayor] Alderman Steuer and Alderman Scannell.

- [Alderman] So, did you vote already?

- [Alderman] Yeah, I voted.

- [Mayor] Look, I'm getting tired.

- [Scannell] Yes, I vote yes, I can't vote.

- [Mayor] It's on there. Okay. Alright, that passes on a vote of 10 to two, alright. That's a good step. Okay clerk, let's wrap this up.

- [Clerk] We're now onto the report of the Protection and Welfare Committee granting operator licenses.

- Motion to approve.

- Second.

- Alright, so there's a motion by Alderman Scannell, seconded by Alderman Craig Stevens, to approve the report of the Protection and Welfare Committee granting operating licenses. Any names under this, this is report O, any items on this report you wish to handle separately? Hearing on, all in favor of that report, please signify by saying aye.

- [Aldermen] Aye.

- And those opposed nays, the ayes have it, report O has been approved.

- [Clerk] We're now onto the report of the playing commission from June 11th, 2018.

- [Mayor] Alright, we have a motion by Alderman Randy Scannell.

- [Dorff] Second.

- Seconded by Alderperson Barb Dorff, to approve the report of the plan commission for the meeting held on June 11th. Any items in this report you wish to handle separately? Hearing on all in favor of that report, please signify by saying aye.

- [Aldermen] Aye.

- [Mayor] And those opposed nays, the ayes have it, report P has been approved.

- [Clerk] We're now onto the report of the Finance Committee.

- Move to approve.

- Second.

- [Mayor] There's a motion by Alderperson Dorff, seconded by Alderman Scannell, to approve the report of the finance committee for their meeting which was held on June 12th. Any items in this report you wish to handle separately?

- Two.

- Number two. Hearing on others, all in favor of the remainder of that report, please signify by saying aye.

- [Aldermen] Aye.

- And those opposed nays, the ayes have it. All items have been approved with the exception of item two. What are your wishes regarding item two?

- Motion to approve.

- Motion to approve by Alderman Galvin.

- Second.

- Seconded by Alderman Steuer. Alderman Wery.

- Thank you, Mr. Mayor. I'm just inquiring as to what this would be for. Just states, approve the request by law department for an allocation of additional funds in the amount of 18,575 from the contingency I watched the meeting and read the minutes and there was no mention of what it was for. I don't think anybody even at the committee asked what it was for.

- Well, Law Department, just as a general statement, Law Department has seen an unprecedented number of legal expenses that have been generated on behalf of the city outside of our normal litigation, and that is the driving factor for the request of the additional funds for next anticipated cost and fees.

- [Alderman] We went through this at committee, I mean they broke it down for us.

- [Wery] The one I watched, they didn't, so is there, or was that something you read but didn't--

- There was a memo, a confidential memo that was prepared by City Attorney Chavez. It is in your board view packet, so you should be able to review it. And that has the details. I can't go into specific details, because we don't have an open session. We don't have closed session--

- [Wery] Can your office just forward that to everyone?

- It's on, it's in the board view packet. It's included in your packet.

- It is, okay.

- Yep.

- [Wery] Alright, I must have missed that, I appreciate it, thank you.

- Sure, mm hm.

- [Mayor] Alright, so there's a motion and second to approve item two, all in favor, please signify by saying aye.

- [Aldermen] Aye.

- [Mayor] And those opposed, nays, ayes have it. Okay, Chris?

- [Clerk] Report on the Park Committee.

- [Scannell] Motion to approve.

- Motion to approve by Alderman Scannell.

- [Galvin] Second.

- Seconded by Alderman Galvin to approve the report, the report R, the report of the park committee for June 13th. Any items under this report you wish to handle separately? Hearing on all in favor of that report, please signify by saying aye.

- Aye.

- And those opposed nay, ayes have it, all 10 items have been approved.

- [Clerk] We're onto report of the personnel committee.

- What are your wishes here, you guys?

- [Scannell] I move to approve.

- Motion to approve by Alderman Scannell, second by Alderperson Dax, to approve the report of the personnel committee for the meetings held on both May 22nd and June 12th. Any items under this report you wish to handle separately?

- [Wery] Number three.

- [Mayor] Item three?

- [Wery] On my paper sheet says number three.

- Alright, hearing on others, all in favor of the remainder of that report, please signify by saying aye.

- [Aldermen] Aye.

- [Mayor] And those opposed nay, the ayes have it. What are your wishes regarding item three?

- Motion to approve.

- Motion to approve by Alderman Scannell, second by Alderperson Dorff. Alderman Wery.

- Thank you, Mr. Mayor. I'd make a motion to amend this to say to approve the request by Alderman Wery, thank you for clapping. He's in favor, to approve the request by Alderman Wery to allow city council members upon their request to be provided with printed agendas.

- [Mayor] Okay, there's an amendment being offered by Alderman Wery.

- [Alderman] Second.

- Second by Alderman Brunette. Do you wanna say anything else on that?

- Yeah, if I could.

- Go ahead.

- The new system, great, but, it shouldn't make our life more difficult, I mean, our elected duties are important, right, I think we all agree to that. I mean many times, everybody will be scrolling through and looking for things, I've got it right here in my hands. Now do I have to come in and spend half an hour printing off agendas, really? Does that make any sense, I mean this is really for those who want it, only gonna be two or three of us, four of us maybe, who want an agenda printed off. Is that really too much to ask, I can't even believe we're debating this, but I'm a highlighter, note taker, I like my things right here. And that's something that the City Council can't have? That just boggles my mind, so I'm just asking, for those who want it, have them print it off, put them in the mailbox, you don't even have to mail them, save postage, that's fine. Thanks.

- [Mayor] Alright. We're using the board. Yes. Oh, alright, Alderperson Dorff.

- I just wanna say that I'd offered at that meeting, 'cause I come in and print mine. I have been printing Alder Wery's and placing it in his mailbox. I said anyone that wanted me to print one, 'cause it takes seconds to do it. It doesn't take a half hour, it takes seconds. And I just press instead of just printing one, I press two, three, four. Whoever wants me to print their agenda, I always come in ahead of time, I always print the agendas, and I will put them in your mailbox. So, I'm just saying. Thank you.

- [Mayor] No. Okay, go ahead.

- Appreciate the offer, but unless Alder Dorff is gonna be here in perpetuity for, you know, forever, this is gonna come up once she's gone for whatever reason, we just should be allowed the option to have them printed, it's really not a difficult thing, we shouldn't even be debating this, it's kinda laughable. I feel sorry, there's probably gonna be a lot of good clips. That's online somewhere, but thanks.

- [Mayor] It's the, okay. So, the amendment that you're voting on right now is to approve the request by Alderman Wery to provide with printed agendas, that's the 13-page agenda. That's not the whole packet.

- Any agenda. If you want an agenda on committee or this one.

- [Mayor] Okay.

- [Alderman] Comment, your honor.

- Alright.

- Lights are going on.

- [Mayor] Go ahead, go ahead.

- Okay, I did go in to print my agenda, and I had to have someone show me how to do it exactly, because I'm not a computer person. But anyway, I could not print the packet off, it was 300 and some pages. For me to sit there to try to, that was gonna take a half an hour to print that. And it took--

- [Mayor] That's not what he's asking for.

- No no, I'm just saying, she's gonna just print the agenda. He might want the whole packet. So that's different.

- [Mayor] No, that's not what you're asking for.

- The whole thing's printed. You want the whole--

- He's asking for the agenda.

- Just the agenda.

- Oh, just the agenda?

- [Mayor] For all the system we just bought.

- Because even, because I have the tablet, it's even hard, I went home to read the rest of it, it was hard finding it because it's small printed. I don't, to me I find that very hard on this tablet. Or even on the computer. It'd be hard to find it.

- I can't read that.

- No, no. I do like printed also myself, sorry. I mean I like this, but I also like printed on the packet to read the minutes. The county, we do give them, and we get all the minutes and we get all that in the paper form, which I like reading 'cause I can't go to all the committee meetings. It's easier for me to sit down with the paper and just go through it. So that's my, my view.

- [Mayor] Anything else?

- [Alderman] I just need clarification, are we doing the vote tonight?

- [Mayor] The, he, no, I wanna be clear on that. The motion on the floor is to, it's an amendment, and it's to approve the request by Alderman Wery to provide printed agendas when requested. So a yes vote would allow the printed one, a no vote would not. The vote.

- [Alderman] The amendment and the original motion?

- [Mayor] I'm gonna take it

- As the amended.

- Amended.

- [Mayor] As the amended, so be look out for an amendment so a yes vote, we print them, a no vote we don't. So just Alderman Nicholson and Johnson and Alderman Galvin.

- [Alderman] The vote, but it's not there. It's not there.

- [Mayor] What are you doing, Mike?

- [Mike] Have to do a voice vote.

- [Woman] Okay, so I'll read it off?

- [Mayor] This is on whether we're gonna print excuse me, agendas or not.

- Dorff?

- No.

- Dax?

- No.

- Nicholson?

- Yeah.

- Galvin?

- No.

- Stevens?

- No.

- LeFebvre?

- Yes.

- Scannell?

- Yes. If an alder wants it.

- Wery?

- Yes.

- Johnson?

- No.

- Steuer?

- Yes.

- Van Der Leest?

- Yes.

- Brunette?

- Yes.

- [Clerk] So seven yeses and five nos.

- [Mayor] Alright.

- Whatever. Okay, what else, let's go.

- [Clerk] Oh, where are we? Okay, I have to regroup.

- Okay, I'm done, I'm done. So what do we gotta do? Report of the Public Arts Commission, what are your wishes here?

- [Scannell] Motion to approve.

- Alright, second?

- Second.

- All in favor please signify by saying aye.

- [Aldermen] Aye.

- Okay, oh, what?

- [Wery] This is, I tried to ask earlier with RDA with item pull that one up, I don't know if it's supposed to be here or in RDA, I didn't see RDA was discussed by RDA Yeah, but I didn't see the Friday, right, right, right.

- I don't know what you're talking about.

- Number one.

- Number one, to approve

- [Clerk] Oh, public, it is, okay.

- Oh. To approve the increase, okay.

- [Wery] So this just talks about the hours.

- And you wanna know about the funding.

- [Wery] The funding was approved by RDA, but wasn't in

- RDA's report.

- Yeah, it should've been.

- Okay, so what do you want me to do?

- [Wery] Well could we perhaps hold this item 'til we get report L from RDA? Or should we just say Block grant funding?

- So, RDA has priority over the block grant funding, so that's why it just went to RDA for approval for that source. There's no living impact for this position. And so the, part of it will be funded through block grant funds, the other part will be funded through the public arts commission. Because the block grant funds are under guise or authority of the RDA, they made the decision to reallocate some of the block grant funds for that, that does not get reported out to council.

- [Alderman] I still would like to talk about it.

- [Mayor] Okay, go ahead.

- I'm gonna vote no on this, and I think we should vote no. The reason being, we're moving this position, it gets paid $20 an hour. And right now it's 20 hours, and it's paid for by the stadium block grant money. And I would assume that the goal is probably to fundraise and have the money to pay for that position. However, now we're using some of our federal money, the block grant money, that we in the past have used for other things such as community service interns, and I think it'd better be used for that. Community service intern, we have six on the books, our goal is 12. So we're six short, and right now we only have three. I think we're trying to get three more on board. I'd rather see that $15,000 go towards another CSI that is closer to the 12. Or, an animal intern I think is $9,000 and we have three right now, and we keep hearing from our humane officer that they can never catch up, they're always behind. Rather have it used for that, so, if the only way we can deny this is to deny it right here, then it shuts it off at the RDA level. We're saying we're not interested in funding it that way. I'd rather have more money go towards our protective services, whether the CSIs or animal interns than an art critic paid for by the city. So I'm gonna vote, I'm gonna say, make a motion to deny. Or just a vote no. That'd be easier than amending it, I'm gonna vote no and urge that same. I don't think we should be paying for that.

- [Scannell] I've got nothing to, request to speak.

- That's alright.

- Yeah.

- It's okay.

- [Mayor] Okay, what do you wanna say, Alderman?

- I want to speak it. This should be a one-time, and it's a small amount, this is a very important position for the committee. She is the main lead and organizer for fundraising and handling all our applications and she's really the backbone of that committee. A part-time position is problematical in that we're gonna end up like we had problems with our staff and why we needed to increase their wages is that they leave, she's getting offers, a full-time position, and we're gonna end up with that problem with anybody that replaces her. I mean we need

someone who's gonna be there, gonna be consistent, and can get the work done. After this one time, we should have the funding through fundraising to take care of it, so I ask you all to please support this, it's important for the public arts.

- Alright, fine.

- Thank you.

- [Mayor] Alright, use the board. A yes vote approves--

- Mayor? I just--

- Oh, go ahead.

- Needed clarification on the block grant funding, just for Alderman Wery, block grant does not fund any CSIs currently. That program has shifted over to the police department, so there are no block grant funds going to community service interns, I just think it's appropriate that the board know that.

- [Mayor] Alright.

- [Clerk] Can we voice vote?

- [Mayor] We can't use, we have to use voice vote?

- [Clerk] I would rather.

- [Mayor] Okay, Alderman Wery?

- Thank you, Mr. Mayor. It's interesting we don't have a council assistant. We got denied having our own legal representation. The CSI's historically were paid for from that fund. And it can be again, especially if we wanna goal of 12, this is not anywhere near remotely any kind of need. This is a want, go get your money first, then come back. This is way on the end, I understand it's important, but we shouldn't be putting any money towards this when we have other more pressing needs, so vote no.

- Alright this is, report of the public arts commission, item one is to approve the increase work horus for the public arts coordinator. Could they vote?

- [Scannell] Your honor, there is one question here though.

- Jesus, really, is there another one you got?

- Well I really, sorry.

- What?

- [Scannell] The RDA grant is the funding. The funding, the position's gonna be funded. We have no control over that, so approving the hours or not approving the hours.

- Then why is it on here? You chair the committee.

- [Scannell] I don't chair, okay, but it's on here because we as a committee took that action to take to the RDA. That the public arts committee recommends increasing her hours.

- I know, that's what you're voting on.

- Right.

- So?

- [Scannell] But, to vote no, I mean.

- Yeah, they, I mean don't make, don't make a bigger deal than here, vote yes.

- [Scannell] Alright. Well, okay.

- Okay, let's start voting here. A yes vote increases the hours to the public arts coordinator, a no vote doesn't.

- [Alderman] Mine didn't come up.

- [Clerk] Oh, 'cause I couldn't get it, I'll just, yeah, thanks.

- Okay, Alderman Johnson, Alderman Stevens, Alderman Steuer?

- [Alderman] I'm wondering, it's not coming up. Just give me a minute.

- Okay.

- [Alderman] Where are we at, what letter again?

- [Clerk] Can we, let's just start, let's just do it a voice vote. Okay, so you said yes, okay, thanks. And Johnson?

- Yes.

- And Steuer?

- I'm waiting.

- He's saying yes.

- Just say yes or no.

- Nicholson?

- No.

- And Brunette.

- Yes.

- [Alderman] I'll say yes.

- [Clerk] What did Steuer say, yes?

- Alright, so that passes on a, I'll show you the board, on a vote of nine to three. Okay.

- [Clerk] Okay, we're onto report of the traffic, bicycle, and pedestrian commission.

- Approve.

- Second.

- [Mayor] There's a motion by Alderman Nicholson, seconded by Alderperson Corpus Dax, to approve the report of the traffic, bicycle, and pedestrian commission for the meeting held on May 21st. Any items in this report you wish to handle separately? Hearing on all in favor of that report, please signify by saying aye.

- [Aldermen] Aye.

- And those opposed nays, ayes have it. Report's been approved.

- [Clerk] We're onto report of the economic development authority.

- [Scannell] Motion to approve.

- [Mayor] There's a a motion by Alderperson Dorff, secnod by Alderman Scannell, to approve the report of the economic development authority for the meeting held on June 11th. Anything here you wish to handle separately? Hearing on all in favor of that report, please signify by saying aye.

- [Aldermen] Aye.

- [Mayor] And those opposed nay, ayes have it, report's been approved.

- [Clerk] Receive and place in file.

- [Scannell] Motion to receive and place in file.

- [Mayor] Okay, there's a, this is item X. There's aamotion by Alderman Scannell, second by Alderman Stephenson, Stevens, I'm sorry, to receive and place in file the two reports, the building report, and the municipal court report. Any discussion here? All in favor of that motion, please signify by saying aye.

- [Aldermen] Aye.

- [Mayor] And those opposed nays, ayes have it, those two reports have been received and placed in file.

- [Clerk] We're onto resolutions, you may under suspension of the rules adopt resolutions one through seven together with roll call vote.

- Motion to suspend.

- [Mayor] Alright, there's a motion by Alderman Scannell, second by Alderman Stevens, to suspend the rules for that purpose. All in favor of suspension please signify by saying aye.

- [Aldermen] Aye.

- [Mayor] And those opposed nay, the ayes have it, the rules are suspended.

- Motion to adopt.

- [Mayor] So motion to adopt my Alderman Scannell.

- Second.

- Second.

- [Mayor] Second by Alderman Galvin, please use the board here. This is one through seven. Item Y. Item Y, that's a good way to end the night.

- [Alderman] It's not coming up.

- Nothing.

- Nothing's coming up.

- [Mayor] Okay, just.

- [Clerk] Okay, Nicholson?

- Resolutions.

- Yes.

- Dorff?

- Yes.

- Galvin?

- Yes.

- Johnson?

- Yes.

- Wery?

- Aye.

- Brunette?

- Yes.

- Van Der Leest?

- Yes.

- Steuer?

- Yes.

- Scannell?

- You betcha.

- Corpus Dax?

- Yes.

- And LeFebvre?

- Yes.

- [Mayor] Alright. That passes unanimously, finally the one we're looking for.

- Motion to adjourn.

- Motion to adjourn.

- [Scannell] Second.

- By Alderman Nicholson.

- No, no, no, no, no, no.

- Wait wait, no no.

- You have to recognize that.

- [Mayor] No, I don't. You know what, Andy, that's BB, AA is referral petitions and communications.

- [Scannell] I wonder if we have some.

- [Mayor] Yep. Go ahead, adl Brunette, we'll start with you.

- Thanks, Mayor, I'd like to send this to traffic commission to study traffic near the corner of Mirage and Ferndale with the possibility of adding yield and/or stop signs.

- [Mayor] Alright, thank you. Alderman Van Der Leest, do you have anything? Alderman Johnson.

- [Johnson] To refer to the redevelopment authority, to direct staff to draft a percent for the arts proposal that would assess a specified percent on all new and/or redevelopment projects for the purpose of public art installation, maintenance, and funding staff to support the public arts commission.

- [Mayor] Alright, thank you. Alderman Wery?

- Thank you. I have a couple, first is for protection and welfare. Due to constitutional concerns, conduct a complete review with possible action on changing or removing the city's code of conduct and ethics ordinances. Protection and welfare, review with possible action the ongoing illegal keeping of five dogs at 1271 Hickory Hill. Protection and welfare, all city campaign finance reports shall be accessible on city website for the duration of the elected official's term and five years after leaving office. Records are to be permanently kept electronically and available by request. Personnel and finance, explore options to restore an assistant to the city council position.

- [Mayor] Alright, anybody else? Do you have anything, you, Andy? Do you guys have anything?

- No.

- No.

- [Mayor] Alright, now.

- Motion to adjourn.

- Second.

- [Mayor] Alright, motion by Alderman Nicholson, second by Alderman Craig Stevens. All in favor of that motion please signify by saying aye.

- [Aldermen] Aye.

- Okay, so see you tomorrow at the bridge lighting, and then aton Thursday.

- [Clerk] Please remember to, on your tablets, to leave the meeting.