



MINUTES OF THE COMMON COUNCIL

**TUESDAY, JULY 17, 2018, 6:00 PM
COUNCIL CHAMBERS
ROOM 203, CITY HALL**

A. ROLL CALL.

Present: Craig Stevens, Veronica Corpus-Dax, Kathy Lefebvre, Mark Steuer, Jesse Brunette, John VanderLeest, Brian Johnson, Andy Nicholson, Randy Scannell, Barbara Dorff, Bill Galvin, Chris Wery

B. PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE.

C. INVOCATION.

D. APPROVAL OF MINUTES.

I. Approval of the minutes of the June 19, 2018 meeting.

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

E. APPROVAL OF THE AGENDA.

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

F. REPORT BY THE MAYOR.

The Mayor thanked everyone for their help on the Fourth of July celebration.

G. ANNOUNCEMENTS.

H. APPOINTMENTS

1. New Appointment:

Economic Development Authority

Michael Peot, 1134 S. Baird St., Green Bay, WI 54301

Term to expire: June 1, 2021

Water Commission

Marty Briggs, 1907 Fiesta Ln., Green Bay, WI 54302

Term to expire: October 1, 2023

Moved by Alderperson Randy Scannell, seconded by Alderperson Barbara Dorff to confirm. 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. Re-Appointment:

Board of Review

Richard Laurent, 538 Robert Ln., Green Bay, WI 54311

Term to expire: July 1, 2023

Moved by Alderperson Randy Scannell, seconded by Alderperson Bill Galvin to confirm. 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

I. PUBLIC HEARINGS.

No one appeared.

1. Zoning Ordinance No. 9-18

An ordinance creating a Planned Unit Development (PUD) overlay district for properties located at 320 South Military Avenue and the 1600 Block of Western Avenue.

2. Zoning Ordinance No. 10-18

An Ordinance Amending the sign standards for an existing Planned Unit Development (PUD) located at 865 Lombardi Avenue.

3. General Ordinance No. 12-18

An ordinance amending Green Bay Municipal Code Section 13-1911 to amend the expiration of approval of Planned Unit Developments.

J. ORDINANCES - THIRD READING.

Moved by Alderperson Randy Scannell, seconded by Alderperson Barbara Dorff to suspend the rules to adopt the ordinances with one roll call vote. Motion carried.

Moved by Alderperson John VanderLeest, seconded by Alderperson Randy Scannell to adopt. 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. 9-18

An ordinance creating a Planned Unit Development (PUD) overlay district for properties located at 320 South Military Avenue and the 1600 Block of Western Avenue.

2. Zoning Ordinance No. 10-18

An Ordinance Amending the sign standards for an existing Planned Unit Development (PUD) located at 865 Lombardi Avenue.

3. General Ordinance No. 12-18

An ordinance amending Green Bay Municipal Code Section 13-1911 to amend the expiration of approval of Planned Unit Developments.

4. General Ordinance No. 11-18. An ordinance amending Section 29.307, Green Bay Municipal Code, relating to traffic regulations.

5. General Ordinance 9-18. An ordinance creating Section 1.67 in Green Bay Municipal Code, relating to the sustainability commission.

K. REPORT OF THE REDEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY (JULY 10, 2018).

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

1. To refer to staff the communication from June 19, 2018, of the Common Council by Ald. Brian Johnson, 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.

2. To recommend Common Council borrow two million dollars (\$2,000,000.00) to fund the first phase of The Shipyard (Development Agreement 18-02), including property acquisition; geotechnical and environmental testing; architectural, structural, and civil engineering and design; and preliminary site work. And to direct staff to bring the request for proposals back to the RDA.

The Common Council may convene in closed session pursuant to Sections 19.85(1)(e), Wis. Stats., for purposes of deliberating or negotiating the sale of public properties, investing of public funds or conducting other specified public business as necessary for competitive or bargaining reasons. 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 Alderprson Randy Scannell, seconded by Alderperson Mark Steuer to approve item #2.

Moved by Alderperson Barbara Dorff, seconded by Alderperson Kathy Lefebvre to go into closed session at 6:18 p.m. Motion carried.

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

Alderperson Barb Dorff read the closed session language.

Moved by Alderperson Barbara Dorff, seconded by Alderperson Andy Nicholson to return to regular session at 6:32 p.m. Motion carried.

A vote was then taken on the motion. Motion Carried.

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

3. To recommend Common Council adopt Resolutions designating the Redevelopment Authority (RDA) to perform all acts necessary for creating, amending, and/or closing Tax Increment Finance Districts (TID) Seven (7), Eight (8), Nine (9), Twelve (12), Seventeen (17), Twenty (20), Twenty-One (21), and Twenty-Two (22).

L. REPORT OF THE IMPROVEMENT & SERVICES COMMITTEE (JULY 11, 2018).

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

1. To approve request by Gary Baranowski for additional on-street overnight parking allowances at 1239 Shadow Lane through the end of 2018.

Moved by Alderperson Randy Scannell, seconded by Alderperson Barb Dorff to approve item #1. Motion carried.

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

2. To approve request by Platten Place Building (owner: Skip Heverly) to establish a rental agreement for 40 parking stalls in Lot F.

3. To approve request by Downtown Green Bay, Inc. to establish a new agreement with Department of Public Works for installation and maintenance of banners on downtown light poles.

4. To approve request by Bay Settlement Investments, LLC to dedicate the Eaton Heights Storm Water Facility to the City of Green Bay to take ownership of the pond.

5. To receive and place on file the 2017 Department of Public Works Annual Report.

6. To approve request by the Department of Public Works to amend General Ordinance No. 16-18, Section 8.11(4)(a), Green Bay Municipal Code, relating to Unmanaged Plant Growth.

7. To receive and place on file the report of actions taken by Department of Public Works

A. Award of contracts

1. To approve the contract PAVEMENT 2-18 (METRO TRANSIT DRIVEWAY) to the low, responsive bidder, Peters Concrete Co., in the amount of \$82,355.

2. To approve to award SEWERS 5-18

Part A was not awarded.

Part B to the low, responsive bidder, Visu-Sewer, Inc., in the amount of \$318,798.90.

B. Granting of Licenses

N & L Concrete Const. LLP

C. Real estate acquisition for Webster Avenue

1. Agreement for Purchase (Parcel Number, Address, Owner Name, Amount)

22, 1005 Berner Street, Ronald Tordeur, \$84,000

2. Relocation Payments (Parcel Number, Address, Owner Name, Amount)

2a, 816 N. Webster Avenue, Maria Hernandez, \$950

2a, 816 N. Webster Avenue, Maria Hernandez, \$7,050

2a, 816 N. Webster Avenue, Maria Hernandez, \$1,140

7a, 1108 N. Webster Avenue, Anthony Shea, \$6,450

10, 1032 N. Webster Avenue, David & Jeanne Klaus, \$1,350

14a, 101 Day Street, Jenny Sill, \$1,350

14b, 1001 Day Street, Rebecca Eckhardt, \$5,700

14b, 1001 Day Street, Rebecca Eckhardt, \$1,140

15, 916 N. Webster Avenue, Craig Process, \$2,147

22a, 1005 Berner Street, Regina Donaldson, \$375

8. To approve the report of the Purchasing Manager:

To purchase streetlight poles and related equipment from Neher Electric for \$74,152.

9. To approve the following plat of right-of-way:

Sitka Street from Superior Road to Ontario Road AND Superior Road from Gilbert Drive to Sitka Street AND proposed streets north of Sitka Street between Superior Road and Easy Street AND

Superior Road Storm Water Management Facility.

M. REPORT OF THE PROTECTION & WELFARE COMMITTEE (JULY 9, 2018).

Moved by Alderperson Andy Nicholson, seconded by Alderperson Randy Scannell to approve with the exceptions of items #3, #14, and #17. Motion carried.

1. To hold an appeal by Lisa Trotter, objecting to the decision that her dog was declared dangerous.

2. To receive and place on file a request by Ald. Wery to review, with possible action, the ongoing illegal keeping of five dogs at 1271 Hickory Hill.

3. To recommend that Council waive the ordinance requirements for an outdoor licensed premise and to approve the proposed outdoor premise as presented by Green Bay Sports Service Inc. at 1265 Lombardi Ave., which includes an additional plaza area in front of Johnsonville Tailgate Village (subject to 2/3 votes at Council and with the approval of the proper authorities).

Moved by Alderperson Randy Scannell, seconded by Alderperson Chris Wery to approve item #3. Moved by Alderperson Brian Johnson, seconded by Alderperson Andy Nicholson to refer back to the Protection & Welfare Committee to discuss payment in lieu of taxes. 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

4. To approve a request by Delaware North at 1265 Lombardi Ave to hold a special event July 26-29, 2018, subject to complaint.

5. To approve a request by Richard Craniums to hold an outdoor event on July 28 & 29, subject to complaint.

6. To approve a request by Brewski's On Broadway to hold an outdoor event on Aug. 4, 2018, subject to complaint.

7. To approve a request by Brewski's On Broadway to hold an outdoor event on Aug. 25 and Sept. 15, subject to complaint.

8. To approve a request by Anduzzi's at 900 Kepler Dr. to hold an outdoor event July 26-July 29 with music on Friday and Saturday until 11 p.m., subject to complaint.

9. To approve a request by ZZQ at 1035 Vanderbraak St. to have an outdoor event July 27, July 28, July 29, subject to complaint.

10. To approve a request by Soriah Hospitality LLC at 1139 Main St. to amend their liquor license to extend to the adjoining building (currently used as Al's Upholstery) and include an outdoor seating area, with the approval of the proper authorities.

11. To approve a renewal application by Karaoke Mexican Restaurant, LLC at 418 S. Military Ave. (Filed with Clerk's Office June 7, 2018), with the approval of the proper authorities.

12. To hold for 60 days a "Class B" Combination renewal application for Los Banditos East at 1258 Main St. (filed with Clerk's Office June 26, 2018).

13. To grant a "Class A" Liquor License to Kwik Trip, Inc. at 935 Lombardi Ave. (Currently has a Class "A" Beverage and "Class A" Cider License), with the approval of the proper authorities.

14. To deny an application for a "Class A" Liquor License by Kwik Trip, Inc. at 515 W. Walnut St. (Currently has a Class "A" Beverage and "Class A" Cider License). (3-1 Vote)

Moved by Alderperson Randy Scannell, seconded by Alderperson Barbara Dorff to approve item #14.

Moved by Alderperson Brian Johnson, seconded by Alderperson Barbara Dorff to hold for 60 day to adequately address concerns and have the Protection & Welfare Committee and Common Council review after the 60 days. Motion carried.

Moved by Alderperson Brian Johnson, seconded by Alderperson Mark Steuer to open the floor for discussion. Motion carried.

Moved by Alderperson Randy Scannell, seconded by Alderperson Mark Steuer to close floor for discussion.

A vote was then taken on the motion. Motion carried.

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

15. To grant a "Class A" Liquor License by Kwik Trip, Inc. at 1712 E. Mason St. (Currently has a Class "A" Beverage and "Class A" Cider License), with the approval of the proper authorities.

16. To grant a "Class A" Liquor License to Kwik Trip, Inc. at 1871 Shawano Ave. (Currently has a Class "A" Beverage and "Class A" Cider License), with the approval of the proper authorities.

17. To grant a "Class B" (wine only) license by Badger State Brewing Company LLC at 990 Tony Canadeo Dr., with the approval of the proper authorities.

Moved by Alderperson Randy Scannell, seconded by Alderperson Mark Steuer to approve item #17.

Moved by Alderperson Randy Scannell, seconded by Alderperson Andy Nicholson to refer back to the Protection & Welfare Committee. Motion carried.

18. To grant an available "Class B" Combination License by the Booyah Shed LLC at 1800 S. Ashland Ave., with the approval of the proper authorities.

19. To approve an appeal by Ian Geurts in regards to the denial of his Operator's License.

20. To approve an appeal by Vongilay Khounanan to the denial of her Operator's License.

21. To refer to Clerk staff a request by Ald. Wery that all City campaign finance reports shall be accessible on city website for duration of elected official's term and five years after leaving office. Records are to be permanently kept (electronically) and available upon request.

22. To hold until next month the request by Ald. Wery, which reads: "Due to constitutional concerns, conduct a complete review with possible action of changing or removing the City's Code of Conduct & Ethics Ordinances."

23. To receive and place on file the Liquor Violation Reports from the Police Department for July 9, 2018.

N. REPORT OF THE PROTECTION & WELFARE COMMITTEE GRANTING OPERATOR LICENSES.

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

I. Report of the Protection & Welfare Committee granting Operator Licenses.

O. REPORT OF THE PLAN COMMISSION (JULY 9, 2018 AND JULY 12, 2018).

Moved by Alderperson Randy Scannell, seconded by Alderperson Veronica Corpus-Dax to approve with the exception of item #8. Motion carried.

Alderperson Jesse Burnette wanted to be noted as abstaining from item #5.

1. To revise properties located at 1003 Pine Street and 1000 Main Street from Medium Intensity Retail Office Housing (MIROH) to Commercial (C). (July 9, 2018 meeting)

2. To amend the previously approved Conditional Use Permit to allow a car wash in a Community

Center Commercial (C3) District, located at 1053 Velp Avenue, subject to the following conditions:

- 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 east elevation façade transparency.
- e) Approval of a circulation plan and signage that permits one-way travel behind the subject building acceptable to the Zoning Administrator, City Traffic Engineer and the applicant. (July 9, 2018 meeting)

3. To authorize a Conditional Use Permit (CUP) for a two-family home in a Low Density Residential (RI) District at 891 Howard Street, subject to the following conditions:

- a. Compliance with all other regulations of the Green Bay Municipal Code not covered under the Conditional Use Permit.
- b. Compliance with the applicable Uniform Dwelling Code (UDC) building requirements related to a two-family dwelling. (July 9, 2018 meeting)

4. To amend the previously approved Conditional Use Permit for a shelter facility in an Office/Residential (OR) District located at 1660 Christiana Street, subject to the following conditions:

- a. Affected Tax Parcels are combined into one Tax Parcel.
- b. The capacity of facility is limited to 27 bedrooms and there shall be no expansion of the use without Plan Commission review and approval.
- c. Compliance with the former program statement and operating plan.
- d. A site plan is submitted and approved by staff as part of the standard site plan review. (July 9, 2018 meeting)

5. To amend the previously approved Conditional Use Permit for a shelter facility in an Office/Residential (OR) District located at 411 St. John Street to permit a temporary summer shelter use, subject to the following conditions:

- a. The temporary COTS emergency homeless shelter is limited to the former St. John's School gym located at 411 St. John Street (Tax Parcel No. 13-106) through October 2018. Hours of operation are limited to 9 pm to 6:30 am and no residential occupancy shall be permitted on the second floor of the structure.
- b. If the temporary emergency facility use at 411 St. John Street is discontinued, the operation is dissolved, or if the Green Bay Catholic Diocese of Green Bay no longer manages the facility, the use shall terminate immediately. The use/operation shall not be renewed or reestablished without the

Plan Commission and City Council review and approval.

c. At the discretion of the Common Council, Plan Commission, or the Planning Director a review may be required by the Plan Commission and Common Council to ensure compliance with this conditional use permit and identify any areas of concerns with the temporary emergency homeless shelter including but not limited to: Police calls, other documented safety concerns and inadequate facilities.

d. Sex offenders required to register under §301.45, Wis. Stats., are prohibited from any stay at the facility.

e. A mandatory background check for all shelter residents is required.

f. St. John the Evangelist Homeless Shelter staff shall maintain a history of residence during the temporary use.

g. A site plan is submitted and approved in compliance with Chapter 13-1700 Green Bay Zoning Code.

h. Approved building plans shall be made available to staff and available on site.

(July 9, 2018 meeting)

6. To create a Planned Unit Development (PUD) for the development of an apartment campus at 1060 Gray Court, subject to the draft PUD. (July 9, 2018 meeting)

7. To amend the Green Bay Zoning Code Sections 13-1500 and Section 5 of 13-200 as related to Historic Preservation, as proposed in the attached draft text amendment. (July 9, 2018 meeting)

8. To create a Planned Unit Development (PUD) in the 200 Block of North Van Buren Street, subject to the draft PUD. (July 12, 2018 meeting).

Moved by Alderperson Randy Scannell, seconded by Alderperson Barbara Dorff to approve item #8. Motion carried with Alderperson Brian Johnson abstaining.

P. REPORT OF THE FINANCE COMMITTEE (JULY 10, 2018).

Moved by Alderperson Veronica Corpus-Dax, seconded by Alderperson Bill Galvin to approve with the exception of item #1. Motion carried.

1. To approve the request to borrow two million dollars (\$2,000,000.00) to fund the first phase of The Shipyard (Development Agreement 18-02), including property acquisition; geotechnical and environmental testing; architectural, structural, and civil engineering and design; and preliminary site

work.

The Common Council may convene in closed session pursuant to Sections 19.85(1)(e), Wis. Stats., for purposes of deliberating or negotiating the sale of public properties, investing of public funds or conducting other specified public business as necessary for competitive or bargaining reasons. 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 Barbara Dorff, seconded by Alderperson Bill Galvin to approve item #1.
Motion carried.

2. To approve the request by the Purchasing Manager to amend the Purchasing Policy from the \$10,000 approval threshold, to \$25,000 for all single expenditures and all yearly supply/service agreements over \$25,000 which require a Committee or Commission and Council approval prior to award." Quarterly reports are to be brought back to Finance Committee on said purchases between \$10,000 and \$25,000.

3. Purchasing Report

4. To approve the purchase a Respirator Fit Testing System from Jefferson Fire & Safety, Inc. for \$13,267.

5. To approve the purchase a Gravely UTV with Kimtek Slide in Transport Cot from Ambrosius Sales & Service for \$19,200.

6. To approve the issuance of a 2 year contract for Voice Over Internet Protocol Service through the Wisconsin State Contract to AT&T for \$55,512 (\$27,756 per year).

7. To approve action regarding entering into a 2 year agreement with Associated Bank for Banking Services, with options for four 2 year extensions by mutual agreement.

Q. REPORT OF THE PARK COMMITTEE (JULY 11, 2018).

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

1. To approve the Dragon Boat Fundraising Event and allow beer on CityDeck for the event on Saturday, July 28th, 2018.

2. To approve the amended Design, Construction & Dedication Agreement with the Friends of the Bay Beach Wildlife Sanctuary Inc. for the construction of the 4K addition to the Nature Center, and waiving the fee for City inspections listed in Section III.E.

Moved by Alderperson Barbara Dorff, seconded by Alderperson Randy Scannell to approve item #2. Motion carried.

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

3. To approve the request by the Baird Creek Preservation Foundation to donate trail signage to the Baird Creek Greenway.

4. To approve a Wisconsin Public Service Easement at Edison Park for a new electric service for the ballfield and tennis court area.

5. To approve hiring Ramaker & Associates Inc. for a total cost of \$94,000 to complete engineering bid documents for Colburn pool upgrades, which include replacing the pool mechanicals/gutter system and installing a pool liner.

6. To approve the purchase of a pull behind brush chipper from Vermeer Wisconsin for \$74,000.

R. REPORT OF THE PERSONNEL COMMITTEE (JUNE 26, 2018 AND JULY 10, 2018).

Minutes of the Common Council

Moved by Alderperson Kathy Lefebvre, seconded by Alderperson Mark Steuer to approve with the exception of items #3, #6, and #8. Motion carried.

1. Informational Only: Approved adoption of findings of fact and conclusions of law on Standards of Conduct/SRO Expectations grievance. (June 26, 2018 meeting)

2. To approve request from the Police Department as amended to fill one (1) Lieutenant position with one (1) Patrol Sergeant position and all subsequent vacancies resulting from internal transfers. (July 10, 2018 meeting)

3. To approve request to amend the Public Arts Coordinator position from a limited term employee to a permanent part time employee (.75 FTE). (July 10, 2018 meeting)

Moved by Alderperson Randy Scannell, seconded by Alderperson Brian Johnson to approve item #3. Motion carried.

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

4. To approve request to reclassify the hourly position of Deputy City Clerk (Pay Grade G) to a salaried Deputy City Clerk position (Pay Grade H) at a projected annual cost of \$5,777, and to fill the position and all subsequent vacancies resulting from internal transfers. (July 10, 2018 meeting)

5. To refer to staff the request by Ald. Wery to explore options to restore an assistant to the City Council position (full time, part-time, intern, etc.) (July 10, 2018 meeting)

6. To approve request by Ald. Dorff as amended to increase the Mayor's salary over the next four (4) years to \$94,863 in equal increments and that 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. (July 10, 2018 meeting)

Moved by Alderperson Barbara Dorff, seconded by Alderperson Mark Steuer to approve item #6. Moved by Alderperson Mark Steuer, seconded by Alderperson Bill Galvin to open the floor for discussion. Motion carried.

Moved by Alderperson Andy Nicholson, seconded by Alderperson Mark Steuer to close floor for Minutes of the Common Council

discussion. Motion carried.

Moved by Alderperson Barbara Dorff, seconded by Alderperson Randy Scannell to amend item #6 by replacing \$94,863 with \$102,298.55 (this includes a cost of living increase of 2%). Motion carried.

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

8. To deny request to add a second parking permit to the alderpersons' benefit package. (July 10, 2018 meeting)

Moved by Alderperson Randy Scannell, seconded by Alderperson Craig Stevens to approve item #8. Motion carried.

7. To approve request by Ald. Johnson to have the HR Director prepare an orientation program for alderpersons and solicit items from alders and department heads. (July 10, 2018 meeting)

S. REPORT OF THE PUBLIC ARTS COMMISSION (JUNE 27, 2018).

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

1. To approve of the Strategic Plan for the Green Bay Public Arts Commission with recommended changes.

2. To approve the Annual Grant Program application from Navarino Neighborhood Association.

3. To approve the Annual Grant Program application from Beau Thomas.

T. REPORT OF THE TRAFFIC, BICYCLE, AND PEDESTRIAN COMMISSION (JUNE 18, 2018).

Moved by Alderperson Randy Scannell, seconded by Alderperson Mark Steuer to approve with the exception of item #6. Motion carried.

2. To refer to staff the request for speed control measures on 12th Avenue between School Place and the railroad intersection, with potential solutions including speed enforcement and establishing a 4-WAY STOP condition on 12th Avenue at School Place.

1. To deny the request to establish a NO PARKING zone on the south side of St. Anthony Drive between University Avenue and St. Lawrence Drive, including the cul-de-sac, and to establish a NO PARKING zone on the west side of St. Ann Drive between St. Anthony Drive and 2540 St. Ann Drive.

3. To establish and adopt by ordinance a 2-HOUR parking zone on the north side of Crooks Street from a point 105 feet east of Webster Avenue to a point 90 feet west of Clay Street.

4. To remove the 2-HOUR 7 AM TO 7 PM MONDAY THROUGH FRIDAY parking zone on the north side of Stuart Street from Monroe Avenue to Webster Avenue.

5. To establish and adopt by ordinance a 2-HOUR 7 AM TO 7 PM MONDAY THROUGH FRIDAY parking zone on the north side of Stuart Street from Monroe Avenue to Jackson Street.

6. To remove the eastbound RIGHT TURN NO STOP condition on Deckner Avenue at Alpine Drive.

Moved by Alderperson Randy Scannell, seconded by Alderperson Mark Steuer to approve item #6. Motion carried.

U. TAX INCREMENTAL DISTRICTS JOINT REVIEW COMMITTEE (JUNE 28, 2018).

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

1. Received and accepted the TID annual reports.

2. Receive and place on file the staff report on the performance and status of each district governed by the Board.

V. RECEIVE & PLACE ON FILE.

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

1. Building Permit Report for June 2018.

2. Municipal Court Report for June 2018.

W. RESOLUTIONS.

Moved by Alderperson Randy Scannell, seconded by Alderperson Barbara Dorff to suspend the rules to adopt the resolutions with one roll call vote. Motion carried.

Moved by Alderperson Randy Scannell, seconded by Alderperson Mark Steuer to adopt. Motion carried.

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

1. Resolution authorizing transfer of funds.

2. Resolution for state trust fund loan / Neighborhood Redevelopment Projects.

3. Resolution amending the conditional-use permit authorized at 1660 Christiana Street.

4. Resolution amending the conditional-use permit authorized at 1053 Velp Avenue.

5. Resolution amending the conditional use permit authorized at 411 St. John Street.

6. Resolution authorizing conditional-use approval at 891 Howard Street.

7. Resolution accepting Relocation Claims for North Webster Avenue.

8. Resolution for Purchase and Sale of Real Estate for North Webster Avenue.

9. Resolution drawing final orders to contractors for July 2018.

X. ORDINANCES - FIRST READING.

Moved by Alderperson Mark Steuer, seconded by Alderperson Bill Galvin to suspend the rules to advance the ordinances. Motion carried.

Moved by Alderperson Mark Steuer, seconded by Alderperson Bill Galvin to advance with the exception of items #3, #8, and #9. Motion carried.

1. General Ordinance No. 14-18. An ordinance amending section 29.307, Green Bay Municipal Code, relating to traffic regulations.

2. General Ordinance No. 15-18. An ordinance amending section 29.208, Green Bay Municipal Code, relating to parking regulations.

3. General Ordinance 17-18. An ordinance creating section 33.08(7)(i), Green Bay Municipal Code,

relating to online ordering and curbside pickup of alcohol beverages

Moved by Alderperson Randy Scannell, seconded by Alderperson Barbara Dorff to advance item #3 to a third reading.

Moved by Alderperson Bill Galvin, seconded by Alderperson Andy Nicholson to suspend the rules to take action on item #3 but it has to be unanimous. Motion carried.

Moved by Alderperson Bill Galvin, seconded by Alderperson Andy Nicholson to deny item #3. Motion carried.

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

4. Misc Ordinance No. 2-18

An ordinance adopting an amendment to the Smart Growth 2022 Comprehensive Plan of the City of Green Bay to revise the land use of property located at 1003 Pine Street and 1000 Main Street from Medium Intensity Retail Office Housing (MIROH) to Commercial (C).

5. General Ordinance No. 18-18

An ordinance amending and creating sections of Chapter 13, Green Bay Municipal Code, Relating to the Historic Preservation of Sites, Structures and Districts.

6. Zoning Ordinance No. 11-18

An Ordinance creating a Planned Unit Development (PUD) overlay district for Property located at 1060 Gray Court.

7. General Ordinance No. 16-18, Section 8.11(4)(a), Green Bay Municipal Code, relating to Unmanaged Plant Growth.

8. General Ordinance No. 19-18, an ordinance creating Section 4.18, Green Bay Municipal Code, relating to Municipal Vehicle Registration Fee.

Moved by Alderperson Randy Scannell, seconded by Alderperson Bill Galvin to advance item #8 to a third reading. Motion carried.

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

Minutes of the Common Council

9. General Ordinance No. 13-18. An ordinance amending Sections 2.04, 2.05 of the Code relating to Protection and Policy Committee.

Moved by Alderperson Randy Scannell, seconded by Alderperson Mark Steuer to advance item #9 to a third reading.

Moved by Alderperson Barbara Dorff, seconded by Alderperson Bill Galvin to suspend the rules to adopt item #9 tonight. This vote has to be unanimous. Motion failed with Alderperson Andy Nicholson voting no.

A voice vote was then taken on the motion. Motion carried.

10. Zoning Ordinance No. 12-18

An Ordinance creating a Planned Unit Development for the proposed residential development located in the 200 block of North Van Buren Street.

Y. REFERRAL OF PETITIONS & COMMUNICATIONS.

Moved by Alderperson Randy Scannell, seconded by Alderperson Bill Galvin to refer the petitions and communications to the appropriate Committee or Commission. Motion carried.

Request by Alderperson Kathy Lefebvre to the Improvement & Services Committee to discuss options for partial reimbursement (or temp waiver of wheel tax) for residential properties that paid road improvement assessments in the past 3 years.

Request by Alderperson Kathy Lefebvre to the Improvement & Services Committee to look at overnight parking - 8 unit apartment was approved with 8 parking spaces (only room for 8) so they cannot have overnight guests (no overnight street parking for apartment units). Special situation here, can we make exceptions for this 8 unit, as the City approved it.

Request by Alderperson Veronica Corpus-Dax to Council for reconsideration of the Council's June 19th decision on the report of the Ethics Board dated June 14th based on reading the opinion of the lawyer representing the Ethics Board.

Request by Alderperson Barbara Dorff to the Parks Committee to consider putting in a baseball field at Red Smith Park at the request of neighbors in the area.

Z. ADJOURNMENT.

Moved by Alderperson Randy Scannell, seconded by Alderperson Barbara Dorff to adjourn at 8:51 p.m. Motion carried.

Kris A. Teske
Green Bay City Clerk

VERBATIM MINUTES

- Hey Kris, your mic is on.
 - So we have, this person wants to talk for two things. This one's only here in case she needs to talk.
 - Oh that's okay.
 - Zoning. Oh wow, these are all different.
 - Good. Setting all night. Aren't you guys at 601, or where are you going?
 - Alderman Johnson, are you in? Hey, what'd the Bullfrogs call their stadium? You watching that at all? The Bullfrogs are announcing their big stadium tonight.
 - [Attendee] Oh, are they?
 - [Attendee] Chris? Chris?
 - Chris? Can we get going? Ready? We good, Celestine?
 - [Celestine] Yes, Mayor.
 - All right. All right, good evening. I want to call to order the meeting the Common Council for Tuesday, July 17th. It's my understanding everybody is logged into the meeting. Kris?
 - [Kris] Twelve are present, Your Honor.
 - Okay, terrific, all right. Well then we'll proceed. I just wanna welcome everybody tonight. We have a lot on the agenda, so let's begin. If you'd all please rise of the Pledge of Allegiance, and then remain standing for the invocation.
 - [Assembly] 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, as we enjoy the summer months we thank you for all those who help make our community an extra special place to live. We're grateful for our Parks Department who work diligently to assure the people of Green Bay have enjoyable and educational experiences during the summer. We're grateful for the volunteers who work throughout the summer months to bring us unique venues and summer music and outdoor activities. As we
- Minutes of the Common Council

work to better our communities here in Green Bay we pray that throughout these United States and around the world we work to make relations and communities better for all. How proud we all were when the whole world came together and prayed and practiced to rescue the soccer team in Thailand. We ask that you always watch over first responders and their families as they protect so many of their people. We appreciate their efforts each and every day. Let us always be mindful of people in need, those who are hungry, our constituents in need of gainful employment, families who struggle with domestic violence, and neighbors who seek adequate housing. Help us always work together to continually address these needs. We ask you to always watch over our military, especially those serving on the U.S.S. Green Bay. We ask this all in your name, Amen. All right, with that we can move to the approval of the minutes. There's a motion by Alderman Andy Nicholson, seconded by Alderman Randy Scannell to approve the minutes of the June 19th meeting. Anyone wish to speak to these? Any corrections or deletions? All right, seeing no lights, all in favor of approval of the minutes please signify by saying aye.

- [Assembly] Aye.

- And those opposed nay. The ayes have it, and the minutes for the June 19th meeting have been approved.

- [Kris] Approval of the agenda?

- [Attendee] Motion's approved.

- All right, so it's the motion of Alderman Scannell, seconded by Alderperson Dorff to approve the agenda that is before you. Anything here you want to change? Seeing no lights, all in favor of the agenda please signify it by saying aye.

- [Assembly] Aye.

- And those opposed nays. The ayes have it, and the agenda, it's on the table there for our visitors, guests, before you has been approved.

- [Kris] Report by the Mayor.

- So that's nice to see everybody. That month off is interesting, isn't it, but I'm glad we're back here to, we've got a lot of work to do tonight. So just two things. First of all, I just wanna thank all of you who helped out with the Fourth of July. And that was just a great event. Little bit of rain, but nonetheless 100,000 people came down here and had a most enjoyable day. But I did wanna give a shout out to Alderman Randy Scannell. He took the lead, relax, Randy. He took the lead on the whole Liberty Bell ceremony, which is the proper way to start the Fourth of July. Just reminds us of 242 years of independence, and a little bit of a history lesson there for all of us, but just a great way to kick off the holiday. And then of course that went into another nine hours of festivities, and that was led by Alderman Brian Johnson. And I just wanna thank you and your staff for all the support. We had great reports from many, many people on the Fourth of July, so I wanna thank you two especially and everyone who participated. And then secondly, and this was just, I'd sent you a letter last Friday, and I was gonna follow up with you over the next month. I think all of you attended my State of the City, and that's when I lay out what I wanna get done in the next year, and I just wanna discuss term limits with you. And we can sit down and talk. Three of you have come in already, and one of you have called, and just I don't know exactly what it looks like yet, but I think something to talk about. I'd like to be part and lead this initiative, but it's gonna take us all working together. So in the next month or so if we could get together and talk, that's what my letter requested. That's what I'd like to do. That will conclude my report.

- [Kris] We're on to announcements.

- I wanna get this ... Just wait. I'm sorry, you guys. I'm sure somebody had announcements. Mike? As I say every meeting, we have a new software system that is getting good reviews. I wouldn't call them rave just yet, but all right. So Alderman Johnson, we'll begin with you announcements. Alderman Johnson.

- We have a business in my district, Monsou Bakery, who today is celebrating 10 years in business. So I just wanted to give them a quick shout out. No business is ever easy, and 10 years is quite an accomplishment, so congratulations to them. Secondly, this might be a little bit self-serving, but the Ignite Market, which on Broadway runs down in the district, is going to be hosting their second run of the year this Saturday, and that event was recognized by the Wisconsin Main Street Program as the best special event in the state of Wisconsin. So I encourage everybody to come out on that for Saturday night around the Neville Museum from five to ten. And then third and lastly, Habitat for Humanity, I posted this on my page, and it got a lot of engagement. People were really excited about this new program that they've come out with, \$1,500 for small repairs. So I encourage all of you, if you have residents in your district that would benefit from the use of that program, the threshold to access to some of that funds isn't as stringent as of course building a house. So I encourage all of you to consider that program. Thank you.

- [Jim] Thank you, Alderman. Thank you, Alderman. Alderman Steuer, announcements.

- [Mark] Thank you, Your Honor. This weekend the Artery Art Tour Inc. will be having a festival, and the Strike a Cord group that I belong to is working along with them, and we're encouraging folks to come out. It's Friday, Saturday and I believe Sunday. So it'll be around the downtown area, and the various music festival activities. There'll be an article in the paper on Thursday, the Press Gazette, talking about it in the entertainment section, so thank you.

- [Jim] All right, thank you, Alderman. Alderman Randy Scannell.

- [Randy] Thank you, Your Honor. Thank you, Your Honor. I also have three items. First of all, Steam. Steam Engine Six is coming up July 25th. Always a great time and very educational, 6:30 to 9:00 at The Neville. Then there's Fit in the Park, one of their programs, Pound. Join Dana from Edge, music inspired fitness for a new, exciting workout that includes lightly weighted rip stick and an infusion of cardio and strength with drumming. Every Wednesday on City Deck at 5:00pm. And then lastly, Summer in the Park event Thursday, concerts, Whitney Park, 11:30am to 1:30pm. Enjoy live music over lunch at this family-oriented event. Children will enjoy the playground area. They have a dog park area for the dogs. This Thursday Talk of the Town performs. Thank you, Your Honor.

- [Jim] All right, thank you, Alderman.

- [Kris] That's it, no more. [Jim] Okay, I don't see any other lights. All right, Kris.

- [Kris] Around to appointments. New appointment, Economic Development Authority, Michael Piatt, and Water Commission, Marty Briggs. [Jim] I would need the motion. A motion to approve by Alderman Scannell, seconded by Alderperson Dorff. If you'd please use the board here.

- [Andy] Your Honor, I got a question. [Jim] All right. Alderman Nicholson.

- Marty Briggs, I'm gonna support this, but under his description or bio, what does business leadership, experience in business leadership mean?

- [Jim] I know he teaches at NWTC. Do you know any more, Celestine

- [Celestine] He has experience with unions. Beyond that I am not 100% sure.

- [Andy] Or the teaching, I thought. I mean, did Marty write this?
- This is gleaned from what he had provided to us, yes.
- [Andy] Okay, that's all I wanted to know, thank you.
- [Jim] All right, thanks. Okay, if you'd use the board here, please. This is on the Economic Development and Water Commission appointees. What's that? Yeah, that's what I want, okay. Thank you, and those two pass unanimously. Okay, Kris.
- [Kris] We're on to reappointments, Board of Review, Richard Laurent.
- All right, there's a motion by Alderman Scannell, now seconded by Alderman Bill Galvin, for the reappointment of Richard Laurent. If you'd please use the board here. There you go. And that passes unanimously as well, thank you.
- [Kris] We're on to public hearings. Zoning ordinance number 9-18, an ordinance creating a planned unit development overlay district for properties located at 320 South Military Avenue and the 1600 block of Western Avenue. Zoning ordinance number 10-18, an ordinance amending the sign standards for an existing planned unit development located at 865 Lombardy Avenue. And general ordinance number 12-18, an ordinance amending Green Bay Municipal Code Section 13-1911 to amend the expiration of approval of a planned unit development.
- This is the public hearing, so we'll see what the public, and then we'll get into the ordinances. But right now as the clerk lists this is the public hearing on the two zoning items and the one general ordinance. This is item 1 in your report, items one, two and three. Is there anyone here from the public who'd like to comment on any of those three items the clerk just stated? The PUD on Military Avenue, the signage at 865 Lombardy, or amending the municipal code with the planned unit developments? Anyone wishing to be heard? Anyone wanna speak to this? All right, we'll let the record show no one came forward.
- [Kris] We're onto ordinances third reading. You may under suspension of the rules adopt ordinances one through five together with one roll call vote.
- All right, there's a motion by Alderman Scannell and seconded by Alderman Dorff to suspend the rules so we can take all these up at one time. All in favor of suspension please signify by saying aye.
- [Assembly] Aye.
- And those opposed nays. Ayes have it. Alderman Vander Leest, did you wanna adopt these? All right, there's a motion by Alderman Vander Leest to adopt, seconded by Alderman Scannell. They all voted already? They all voted already? Can you use the board for this? These are the third reading ordinances, one, two, three, four and five. This is moving along. All right, and those ordinances are approved by the City Council as well. Thank you.
- [Kris] We're on to report of the Redevelopment Authority, July 10th, 2018.
- [Andy] Second.
- All right, there's a motion by Alderman Scannell, seconded by Alderman Nicholson to approve the report of the Redevelopment Authority, and that was for the meeting held on July 10th, 2018. Are there any items in this report you wish to handle separately? Item two. All right, hearing and others all in favor of the remainder of that report please signify by saying aye.

- [Attendees] Aye.
- And those opposed nay. The ayes have it, so items one and three have been approved. What are your wishes regarding item two?
- [Randy] Motion to approve.
- Motion to Alderman Scannell, seconded by Alderman Steuer to approve this. We'll go to Alderman Wery.
- Thank you, Mr. Mayor. Now I know this is later in our agenda as well I believe under finance, so if it's more appropriate to handle there, we certainly can. This is just a recommendation. Any advice from legal? Would it be better under the finance one, or do we handle it here?
- [Attendee] Doesn't really matter.
- [Jim] No, we talked about that. I mean, this is the Redevelopment Authority. It went to Finance. It's the same thing. It's two million dollars for the initial investment in this shipyard, so why don't we just take it up here? We got closed session on here, if you'd like. It's pretty much the same thing, two different committees, so I'll leave that up to you.
- I had a couple questions perhaps for Director Vonck. One is did we have any progress on purchasing the one lone building that I had brought up last time that's kind of right in the middle of the development?
- [Jim] You can take it one at a time. All right, Dr. Vonck.
- Yes, I believe you're referring to the Our Place Family Restaurant. We presented an offer to the parties. The parties have until the end of the month to accept the offer or come back for negotiations.
- [Chris] I was wondering was the offer less than what the property was worth?
- I would prefer not to discuss negotiations in open session of where we are at.
- [Chris] I'm just curious. Rumor has it that they were offered less than what it's worth, and the property across the street that we paid a million dollars for. Of course we gave more than it was worth, so I would be curious to hear about that.
- [Attendee] Should I move to go into closed session?
- [Jim] Do you have one more question, or do you, okay. All right, so we have a motion by Alderperson Dorff, seconded by Alderperson Lefebvre to move into closed session. It's proper to read the Common Council and then convene. Would you do that? Let me get you a mic.
- The Common Council may convene in closed section pursuant to Sections 192851 or LE Wisconsin statute for purposes of deliberating and invoking the sale of public properties, investing in public funds or conducting other specified public business as necessary for competitivereasons. The Council may thereafter reconvene in open session pursuant to Section 19.852, Wisconsin statutes, to report the results of the closed session and consider the balance of the agenda.
- All right, thank you. So if you'll use your board here, and again the motion and second was to move into closed sessions for the reasons stated by the alderperson. Yes or no.

- [Attendee] We're good.
- [Jim] All right. All right, so that passes on a vote of 10 to two. So I'm gonna hit the pause button for the taping of this. Alderperson Dorff.
- [Barbara] Motion to go back into regular session.
- [Andy] Second.
- All right, there's a motion by Alderperson Dorff, and that was seconded by Alderman Nicholson to go back into regular open session. All in favor of that motion please signify by saying aye.
- [Assembly] Aye.
- And those opposed nays. The ayes have it. So we're back in open session obviously discussing item two under the report of the Redevelopment Authority. Alderman Wery, you still have the floor.
- Thank you, Mr. Mayor. I appreciate the information in closed session. It answered my questions. I have two more. The first one will probably be for our finance director. Three or four months ago we were advised, we had a pretty formal letter from our bond counsel that we were dangerously high in our borrowing, and it wasn't wise to borrow more. And it just happened to coincide of course with borrowing \$1.5 million or so for Coburn Pool. And that helped sway things and push it in the direction it went. So I wanted to know has that recommendation changed? Do we have another letter saying well, you know what, four months have gone by, we're not in danger anymore?
- No, nothing has changed from Moody's. The only difference in this case is one's general fund borrowing, and this would be TID borrowing.
- Okay. Appreciate it, thank you. And then Director Vonck, myself and I know a lot of people I know live in that area are very concerned about the West athletics thing, and they brought it up last time. Most people, the students, the parents and coaches who are out west don't want to see West High play there. Now you're gonna get maybe a different answer from the higher ups in the school district because they probably see it as a cheap way to not have to build one at West. Well, I can tell you the West High football coach is fundraising right now, and would like to go after that quarter million dollars from the NFL. And if we build one down here, guess what? There's not gonna be any money, any quarter million dollars for West. So what can you tell me about the West High athletics? Because right now we're doing some engineering and architecture, so I would imagine we're gonna try and plan for whatever future use.
- Sure. We have been working with Mr. Tim Flood at the district office. I believe he's the Director for Co-curricular Activities. Myself, Co-Director Anderson, Ditscheit, have been working with him. One of the things that we have now if this moves forward tonight is an opportunity to present at least a little bit more refined scope of a facility to them in terms of will this fit their needs. And I think one important thing to look at is I know we've discussed West High School playing here, but I think we would design the facility so that it could serve the whole school district, whether it's West, East, any other high schools who could potentially use this facility whether for games, for practice or other types of activities. And so I'd want to make sure that we work with them to design a facility. I know some concerns have been brought up about bleachers, seating, concessions, press box, security. I think those are things that we're going to be putting into consideration as we move from this concept plan to the actual design. And then I think one of the things that we'll look at in the design process is making sure we have a number of alternatives. And that is we'll have the base field and burms, but then will be the additional cost for providing some of these additional features like the bleachers, press box, securing fencing, concessions, those things. And then as a trade off for what would be the revenue potentially we'd be able to generate from a lease or an agreement with the school district. So I think in terms

of West's decision to play here or not, I think that's a school district decision. But as far as the city is concerned, we would like to see the school district in some way, shape or form participate in terms of using this event space.

- Thank you, yeah, I don't disagree that you might see an occasional game there or some kind of special event. But I know southwest, obviously Mr. Downen in the group, and they spent a million dollars on a brand new field. They have a great facility over there. I can't see them wanting to ship everybody downtown when they have a beautiful facility. East just spent a lot of money on their field at the Packers. Prebble I think is well on the way to get their field, so I don't really see a lot of the high schools doing too much down here. I would just like some confirmation, Director Vonck, that this action, if it passes tonight, in no way commits the city or West High School to holding their athletic activities here.

- No, it would not. I think that's important for the public to know because they're working hard on their own to get a field at West, and I don't want them to think that this cans it right here.

- [Chris] I think that's the end of my questions. Thank you very much.

- [Jim] All right, thank you. Alderman Vander Leest.

- Thank you, Mayor. My thoughts are on the two million dollars that I don't think anybody really took a look at our general fund where the money that we take in. Why don't we work that two million right into our regular operating budget and not bond for this two million? We're quick to bond for, you know, just about everything. My thoughts are why don't we, did anybody really look at trying to do it without bonding the two million right now?

- [Attendee] Of course.

- In other words, the Redevelopment Authority, they're quick to say yeah, let's bond two million. Well, the bonding has a consequence. You know we bonded five million for Bay Beach, and now we're gonna bond another two million. And you know when we talked about the road program, we didn't have any money. We're trying to put in a wheel tax. I feel that we should be looking at ways to do things without bonding. I think our bonding is, you know, we're kind of at the limit on some of there things that are for bonding. And if a rainy day happens to come by, we won't have much money to really dig into. I don't think we can approve every project that comes across the desk, and if you don't have the money on hand, I think it's hard to do business. My thoughts are that we should look a little, before we jump into heavy bonding, five million here, \$10 million here, where is this money coming from? Do we have enough economical development in the city to support all this without going skyrocket on all the other things that we really wanna do? My thoughts are we should be a little more cautious as far as how we're bonding, bond for everything. And it's just not a good way to do business for the City of Green Bay, my thoughts. I can't support the bonding. Thank you.

- [Jim] Thank you. Alderperson Lefebvre.

- Yes, I really do not think the high schools would be appropriate for this because as Alder Wery mentioned they have already been spending money on what they have. They're not going to, and they also don't wanna bus their students. It's not safe in a way, you know, and I just don't feel that's right. And I really don't like building something if you don't have something concrete that's gonna go there. I would like to see something else that would be more positive that would use the field. I mean that's a million dollars I think you're talking about spending. I have some concerns about that. I know there are some other things in the plans that I would approve, sound very good, but it's this field that I have questions on. Thank you.

- [Jim] All right, thank you. Alderman Johnson.

- Thank you, Mr. Mayor. I think it's important reiterate that, I mean, the bond for this is coming against the TID. It's not coming against the levy. I mean that's why we created a new TID down there. And also I think it's important also to point out that, I mean, we passed this. And of course we're talking about the first phase of the funding, and so I think it's important that our discussion be directed at the funding component of it. And so to that point I do have one question I guess that's specifically related to the design portion of this funding process. So Director Vonck, if you could just verify for me or comment I guess, will there be an opportunity for public input on the design process of this project?

- Yes. So two pieces. Right now staff is preparing a request for proposals for design, engineering, technical services for this project. The Redevelopment Authority made a request that they would like to see that RFP before it goes out, so it will be going back to the RDA for their approval. So that's public meeting. There'll be an opportunity to comment on that process. And then one of the things that we will look at in terms of one of the criteria is public involvement as part of this. I think it's important as we move forward to look at what we're designing here. It's really important to focus on some of these details, and when we talk about, you know, identified on this concept plan is a playground. Well, what does the community want and need in terms of specific features? And we're talking about, you know, again the field, and what does the community want and need in terms of specific amenities for that field? And so it will be a part of the process in terms of creating this final design.

- [Brian] Okay, thank you.

- [Jim] Good, all right, thank you. Alderman Scannell.

- Thank you, Your Honor. Dr. Vonck, just the engineering. We are looking to do a multi-purpose field, right? It's gonna be soccer, possibly football, possibly ...

- [Attendee] Cricket.

- Cricket, yes, thank you, not croquet. Other sports, so that will be taken into account in engineering, and we're really not counting on any specific one sport coming in. It's gonna be open to many possibilities. So if indeed the school district decides they want nothing to do with it, that really has nothing to do with going forward with this, correct?

- [Kevin] Correct. As I mentioned I think one of the things we'll be looking for in terms of a final product for the design services is a list of some alternatives in terms of maybe a base package of development options with some add ons maybe for bleachers or a press box or those types of things. So as we move forward in the coming weeks, months, to work with potential tenants or users, we'll see what interest is there. And as I said, if we have revenues potentially sufficient to add on those amenities, I think that would be beneficial to move forward. But with that, taking a step forward with the development agreement, taking a step forward with this, allows us to continue to have those conversations and really start to refine, okay what, and as Alder Johnson had said, the community is looking for, allow us to really kind of refine exactly what we are building here.

- [Jim] Alderman Scannell.

- Yes, I'm done.

- [Jim] Okay.

- Thank you.

- [Jim] Alderman Wery.

- Thank you, Mr. Mayor. I did have one other question that I had forgotten. It's for Co-Parks Director Mr. Anderson. Do we have any letters of commitment by a soccer club or other sports team right now? Or is it build it and hope they come? Spend a million dollars and hope they come?

- We've had a lot of communication with many different user groups, and I think a lot of them are waiting on the support to move forward. And part of that process over the next couple weeks or months, as Director Vonck stated, they would be involved in how this field and what amenities the field has in it so they can make sure that they can use it and we can maximize those user groups. So like he stated, everything from rugby, soccer, football, lacrosse, and also don't forget about the festivals, concerts, the different, that multi-use field would be very important to maximize the number of days we utilize this facility and get people down to that area. So yes, we have talked to a lot of user groups, yes.

- Thank you, I was just wondering if we had a firm commitment from anybody. Not the other uses, but it sounds like we don't.

- [James] We've had a lot of--

- Interested parties, but not anybody saying you build it, yes, we are going to be there.

- [Jim] Right, true.

- Okay, then I just wanted to make one other comment on the TID borrowing. Yeah, it is TID borrowing, but if it fails, guess who's on the hook? We are, so I don't want that to sound like it's just some free money, it's play money. It's still, we're responsible. If this thing fails, guess who's on the hook? So you can't just throw it out there and say ah, that's TID money, because otherwise we'd fund everything that way. All right, thanks.

- All right. Yes, we will use the board on this, so--

- [Kathy] I have a request.

- Okay, Alderperson Lefebvre.

- Parks kind of answered a little bit of this, but I was concerned about spending for the field prep work and everything. We spend the money, and then we have public hearings, and people don't like it at all. They want something else there. Are we going to be spending money on something that maybe we won't use? I just have a little concern about the cost on that. I wish we could kind of just, I know things are tied together, that you gotta do certain things to get it done and everything. I'd almost like to see wait and make sure you've got the go ahead on doing this, you've got commitments or you have the backing of the community. But the one thing that Parks did mention is the concerts. Now that might be something that people might be more willing to have there. I just have a little concern about that.

- [Jim] This doesn't buy the field. We talked about what the money's gonna be used for and that.

- No, I'm just saying all the site and prep work you're already gonna start spending money on, that you have to pay for the consultants and everything. You gotta pay for that ahead.

- [Jim] What's that?

- You have to pay ahead for the consultants and, you know, to get that set how it's gonna be put in, and you have to have that done ahead, right?

- [Jim] The design work.

- You're paying somebody for that, aren't you?
- [Jim] Right, \$800,000 maybe.
- That's what I'm saying, \$800,000.
- That's design work.
- Right, right. And say the public is really against it.
- [Jim] Part of the design is to engage the public.
- Okay, I'm just, you know, I just wanna make sure that we're not spending \$800 and then it's changed.
- [Jim] Right, right.
- That's just my concern.
- [Jim] Thank you. Alderman Nicholson.
- Thank you, Mayor. Question. If we build the stadium or this complex, are we, are the city's intentions to try to, like are we gonna charge people? Are we gonna charge the groups to use the field? Is that our intention?
- [Jim] Yeah, that will be a small part of the revenue. Maybe James, why don't you talk more about the leases?
- Sure. Yes, a lot of the user groups that will utilize this field will be charged. And then during the process we'll define within our current, we have current agreements, for instance shared use agreements with the school district. We also have current agreements with other sanctioned user groups within our city. They may get the field if they're considered a sanctioned user group, maybe a certain amount of days for free. But overall the intention is that this facility will bring in revenue, and part of that revenue is the field, along with a lot of other aspects of the facility. But yes, the intention is that a lot of these user groups, and a lot of them that we've been talking to and discussing this with are committed to having an agreement that would include a rental fee or a lease-type option that they would utilize this field, yes.
- [Andy] Roughly do you know how much? I mean ballpark figure. I mean you stated it's gonna bring in revenue, so you must have some idea of finances that should be coming in.
- [Jim] I sure do from an economic development standpoint. I mean we talked about that last month, you know, new development that's gonna come because of this development. But in terms of exactly what the field and container park are going to bring in from a revenue standpoint, I think a little bit how long is the rope? I mean it depends a little bit what we design, and when we go through this design process, which is what we're talking about tonight, I think we'll design something that would yield a higher revenue.
- [Andy] Okay, all right, thanks, Mayor.
- [Jim] All right, that's all the lights I have. The motion before you is to recommend to the Common Council that we borrow this, and this is we're on page two. Page eight is the Finance Committee, which is to approve the request to borrow two million dollars. So we're gonna see this twice tonight. This is the report of the Redevelopment Authority, item two. And there's a motion and a second, so if you'd use your board here, a yes would recommend the Common Council borrow the two million, and no would not. Passes on a vote of eight to three with one abstention. All right, Kris, let's continue.

- [Kris] We're now on to report of the Improvement Service Committee, July 11th, 2018.
- All right, there's a motion by Alderman Nicholson, seconded by Alderman Scannell to approve, we're on item L, the report of the Improvement in Service Committee for the meeting held on July 11th. Any items in this report you wish to handle separately?
- [Attendee] Item one.
- Item one. Hearing none others, all in favor of the remainder of that report please signify by saying aye.
- [Assembly] Aye.
- And those opposed nays. The ayes have it, and items two through six have been approved. What are your wishes regarding item one?
- [Randy] Motion to approve.
- There's a motion to approve by Alderman Scannell.
- [Barbara] Second.
- Seconded by Alderperson Dorff. Alderman Steuer.
- Thank you, Your Honor. Now we've gone back and forth over time with overnight parking. We've brought that up a number of times, and it's, you know, you hear people on both sides of the issue here. I guess my concern is that if this would happen that this might open a can of worms for other people. Other people might wanna do it as well, so I don't know if Gary is here to speak on that behalf, or somebody from INS, from the committee could tell me what the request is. Is it just indefinite parking until the end of the year? Or if anybody can fill me in on that? Otherwise I'm just saying that if this happens, if you allow this, then many other folks will come forward and do the same thing. So it's kind of like either we have overnight parking or we don't. So right now we don't have it. We've revisited this a number of times, but I would suggest that I would deny the request.
- [Jim] Should I see if Gary's here first? Is the petitioner here? We're on Item L. It's the report of the Improvement Service Committee for the meeting held on July 11th. It's item one. Gary Bernowski? Okay, he's not here. You wanna hear from Grenier or Andy?
- Yeah, they're both fine.
- [Jim] Okay, Director Grenier, you wanna comment on this?
- The way I understood the communication as it occurred at the committee last Wednesday, every property gets six occurrences.
- [Attendee] Right, right.
- Mr. Bernowski owns the property at 1239 Shadow Lane, which he rents out during the season, during the Packer season. This is a TRP property. So what he was looking to do was add on for the Packer games, taking a look at the home schedule throughout the course of 2018. Including the preseason there are 10 home games, so I would understand this to be 10 total for a total of 16 during the calendar year, and in 2019 he

would be obligated to come back before Improvement Service Committee and demonstrate a need for anything above and beyond six.

- All right, I guess the concern I have there is that we've talked to folks on Shadow Lane, and I know that Chris, that's in your district, and I've talked to some citizens there as well. And you know, they deal with the Packer houses. I mean I realize we have those there, but there are some of the neighbors that aren't very happy with the way things are set up. So with it being said, I still feel comfortable that we should keep it the way it is.

- [Jim] All right, thank you, Alderman. Alderman Wery.

- Thank you, Mr. Mayor. Yep, this is in my district, and all the different times we've discussed overnight parking it's been told to the public and to us that if we keep the overnight parking in place it's okay because there's a mechanism to get additional ones, and that's to come before the committee. So that's really meant, he's doing what we told him to do is to come before the committee. And you could only park in front of your own property, so it's like you could litter the street with cars. You really could only park in front of your property, and I think his house has maybe room for one, probably two. And of course it's to avoid having people drive somewhere where they shouldn't, especially after a game. You want them to stay put. So I think he's thinking about safety, and I haven't heard any complaints of the people on that street. He's a well respected person on that street, so I have no problem giving him the additional ones. I think it's a wise move, and he's just following exactly what we wanted since we didn't overturn the overnight parking. Thanks.

- [Jim] Wanna be clear. Do you agree then it is 16? I mean the way this is read it looks--

- Well, in watching the committee, I was gone last week. I watched the committee, and Director Pierlot I believe stated it would be an additional six, or it would be an additional amount through the end of the year I believe, so it might be 10, but it expires at the end of the year, and he's have to come back for anything in January. So it could be the additional 10, but it expires at the end of the year. It's not a starting here and going one year.

- [Jim] Thank you. Alderperson Dorff?

- I just wanna say that I attended that committee meeting, and I felt that Improvement Services vetted it extremely well. He had some good reasoning. He can only fit one car and two very small cars, as Alder Wery said, and I will fully support him getting this additional overnight parking allowance. The committee did a great job of vetting it, and I think we should go with what the committee recommended.

- [Jim] Thank you. Alderperson Lefebvre.

- I won't support this. To open up a Packer House, I mean you should know what the ordinances are. And I don't think that he should have special privilege. I have residents in my districts, there's a lot of older homes that have one stall garages, short driveways, they got teenage kids that have jobs and wanna drive. They have no place to put their parked cars overnight, and they're not allowed all kinds of, I mean they have to have it all the time then. They won't be approved to have on street parking, overnight parking for a vehicle for the whole year. They're probably not gonna get it. I won't support this, and I also have a, I'm gonna have a request to Improvement Services. Also there's a, the city went ahead with the planning for an eight-unit apartment building, and they only had room for eight spots to park, and they're having problems. So that's what I'm gonna, so this is a problem.

- [Jim] I hear you.

- Thank you.

- So we'll use the board on this one. This is item one, and it's to approve the request for the additional on street overnight parking. And the allowances are six or 10 or 16. I'm not sure we'll define that. All right, and that's approved on a vote of nine to three. Thank you. Okay, Kris.

- [Kris] We're on to the report of the Production Welfare Committee, July ninth, 2018.

- [Andy] Motion to approve.

- All right, there's a motion of Alderman Nicholson.

- [Randy] Second.

- Second by Alderman Scannell to approve the report of the Protection Welfare Committee, and that was for their meeting held on July ninth. Any items under this report, we have 23. Any items under this report you wish to handle separately?

- [Attendee] Seventeen.

- Hang on, you guys. Okay.

- [Attendee] Three and 14.

- Three and 14. Okay, hearing none others, all in favor--

- Mr. Mayor.

- Yes.

- [Attendee] The issue with ... ordering liquor on the corner.

- That is under first reading ordinance, I know you had called on that. Yep, it's a little bit later. So what we have now is the report of the Protection of Welfare and items three, 14 and 17 have been pulled. So all those in favor of the remainder of that report please signify by saying aye.

- [Assembly] Aye.

- And those opposed nays. All items have been approved with the exception of three, 14 and 17. What are your wishes regarding item three?

- [Randy] Motion to approve.

- So motion to approve by Alderman Scannell.

- [Chris] Second.

- Seconded by Alderman Wery. Alderman Johnson, was that you or Alderman Steuer.

- [Attendee] Either one. Johnson.

- [Brian] I'll go. It's my understanding that this particular property is, I mean it's the parking lot owned by the city of Green Bay. We lease it to Green Bay Sports Service. I guess what I would like to do is I'd like to see a

little bit more discussion around a payment in lieu of taxes because this is a property that is owned by the city of Green Bay, and they're allowed to operate there basically free of charge, and we're extending the premise. We've extended a number of things I think on this site over the last couple of years. And so I guess to that end I'd ... I don't know, Alder Steuer, if you wanna speak on it, but otherwise I would say that I would move to refer this back to committee for discussion around the topic of payment in lieu of taxes.

- [Andy] Second.

- [Jim] All right, so I'm gonna call it a referral, right? So Andy, I get you on here. There's a motion of Alderman Johnson, seconded by Alderman Nicholson to refer this item back for committee to discuss the possibility of pilot or some kind of payment. So we're discussing the referral. I'm gonna go to you, Alderman Steuer.

- [Mark] Thank you, Your Honor. I agree with Alder Johnson on this. I think payment in lieu of taxes would be important to at least study, and I guess I wanted to talk to Director Ellenbecker about what our, what kind of, we're referring this back, so this is something that you would study, your department?

- I think I'd end up working with the law department and figure if there's something we can do either looking at the current lease, or if there's could put a new document together and then put something in front of them, base it on some other pilot programs that we already have.

- [Mark] So is it too late for this one possibly, but you know, maybe for future ones? Or is this something that we can really study right now in your estimation?

- I don't know if you can tie the pilot program together with the change of the ordinance. I would kind of have to defer that to the attorney.

- [Jim] Vanessa, do you wanna weigh in on that?

- Yeah. So we are looking at two distinct but very related items. One is the granting of a license or extension of a license to an outdoor area, and the second is a pilot program. The reason they're related is because generally when you have a licensed premise, the landlord has to say that it's okay for them to have a, the extension on their property. Generally though you have it where it's the building that's owned by the landlord. In this case the Tailgate Village is owned by the tenant, or by the entity requesting. It's the outside area that is what we own, which is why asking for our consent to this would be appropriate at this time. So yes, we could do it at this point, we can look into it. They're not necessarily contingent one upon the other, but as the landlord, if we want to establish the terms through an addendum or something to the lease without having to revisit the full lease since this is something new, that is definitely something we can do at this point before we sign off saying that yes, it's appropriate for them to do this on our property.

- [Mark] Well, I just think there's more to study and needed to, so if you'd refer this back, I would agree with that.

- [Jim] All right, thank you.

- That's all I got.

- [Jim] All right, Alderman Johnson, did you wanna speak again on this?

- Yeah, I just wanna expand upon my comments a little bit more. I don't object to the use of the space for the purpose that's proposed. I think for me it's we've got a number of businesses in that area that pay property taxes, you know, which in turn of course is tied to their ability to generate revenue for their business. And

here we have an example of an organization that is basically tax-free that is selling a product and generating a profit from it. And so that's the reason I wanna refer this back is for additional consideration on that point.

- [Jim] All right, thank you. So if you'd use your board here, this is item three in the motion and the second to refer this item back for further analysis of the license and a possible pilot. What's that?

- [Attendee] Yes is to refer it?

- Oh, yes is to refer it, I'm sorry.

- [Attendee] It's not lighting up.

- Mark, you're the only one, there you go. All right, and that passes unanimously, so we will get back to the committee in a month or sooner. Thank you. Okay, Clerk.

- [Kris] We're on number 14.

- What are your wishes regarding item 14?

- [Randy] Approve.

- There's a motion to approve by Alderman Scannell, and that's seconded by Alderperson Dorff. This is denying the application for a liquor license at QuikTrip on Walnut. Alderman Johnson.

- Yeah, this is a, so QuikTrip had come before Protection of Welfare and actually had applied for a liquor license for I think all of their locations in Green Bay, and this was the only one that we voted on to deny. And I think there were a couple of different discussions that revolved around that point. I think in my experience since they migrated this facility to a 24-hour facility we've had some challenges with the neighbors in that area. And when we spoke about this at Protection and Welfare my concern was wanting to see some of those issues resolved before we proceeded with granting them a liquor license. However, my desire was to see a hold on this rather than a flat out rejection because I do feel that if QuikTrip, if it's kind of like hey, these are some of the neighborhood concerns we have, can you work towards a resolution on some of these, and sort of the outcome at the end can be that you have this opportunity to basically, you know, earn your license I guess. I mean we've done this with other situations where there's been problems. In fact we sat here a month against about an extra dog permit, and we said hey, you know, if you can make amends with your neighbors and play nice with your neighbors, we can come back and have that discussion. So I think it's important to note that if we put in a provision here that says whether it's 60 days, 90 days, six months, that we don't guarantee that they get it, but that we're not gonna flat out reject it. We're not gonna make you go through that application process again, but we are gonna come back at the end of that term and have a discussion about whether or not you've interacted with your neighbors and adequately addressed their concerns to the point where we feel that you're not a nuisance to the neighborhood, and so therefore we find it appropriate that you can partake in the selling of this product.

- I think you wanna offer an amendment. You got a lot there, so I think the amendment is to hold the item for 60 days to adequately address concerns to the approval of you or P and W.

- I think P and W. So that is the amendment I would like to offer. However, before I do that and we do a vote on there I would like to open the floor for interested parties.

- [Mark] So moved.

- So there's a motion by Alderman Johnson, now seconded by Alderman Steuer to open the floor to hear from interested parties. All in favor of that motion please signify by saying aye.

- [Assembly] Aye.

- And those opposed nays. Ayes have it. The City Council now is discussing item 14 under the report of the Improvement Service Committee, and item 14 is to deny an application for a class A liquor license to QuikTrip at 515 Walnut. Anyone here who would like to speak to this? This is the QuikTrip on Walnut getting a license. Anyone wanna comment on that? Anyone here wanna speak to that?

- Peggy Crabbe, 122 South Maple. I was totally opposed, against this, but after talking with Brian today, I think whatever you think would be the best to get better results for the neighborhood, I'll go along with whatever because it directly influences me, so thank you.

- [Jim] Thank you. I just wanna get your address, Peggy. Oh, she gave it, I'm sorry, wasn't listening. All right, thank you. I know where you live. I've been to your house.

- 122 South Maple.

- [Jim] Okay. Anyone else wanna comment on the QuikTrip, Walnut? Okay, I'll entertain a motion. All right, there's a motion by Alderman Scannell, seconded by Alderman Steuer to return to regular order. All in favor of that motion please signify by saying aye.

- [Assembly] Aye.

- And those opposed nays. Ayes have it. Alderman Johnson, you have the floor.

- So I would formally offer up an amendment. I would move that rather than denying that we modify this to hold for 60 days subject to review by the P and W committee at the end of that 60-day period.

- [Barbara] Second.

- [Jim] All right, so we have a motion seconded by Alderman Dorff on the floor now, and that's to hold this item for 60 days to adequately address some of the concerns, and have P and W do the final authority on this, or is that coming back here? How do you wanna do that?

- I think it has to come back here.

- [Jim] Okay, all right, fine. All right, let me see who's next.

- [Attendee] Whoa, whoa, whoa.

- [Jim] Well, I know I got, would you relax? I got four of you that wanna speak, and where did it pop up to vote? Give that guy a squeeze ball or something. Alderman Scannell.

- Thank you, Your Honor. Thought you were gonna skip me. I oppose this. We discussed this at Protection and Welfare, and it's not just the specific issues around this store. It's issues concerning the whole core area strip there from Mather all the way to Mason. And until all those issues are addressed as well I oppose issuing a liquor license to any of the businesses along that area, which there are four. This has been ongoing at Protection and Welfare for some time. This is not the first time this establishment or the other ones have come forward for a liquor license and been denied. I think until the whole area is ready to move forward with

this, I don't want to grant one liquor license to one establishment without being able to do it to all of them. That's just not fair, and so--

- [Jim] Just for the point of voting, you understand we're voting on the amendment.

- On the amendment.

- To hold for 60 days.

- And I'm against holding it. I want outright denial.

- [Jim] Okay.

- And as we discussed at committee, and the reasons why we did not go into holding it was because of these other issues, more than just the issues surrounding that particular store. So I mean, if that particular store met the particular requirements that some of the neighbors are concerned about, I would still be against issuing them a liquor license because of the greater issues involving that whole core, that whole strip. So I think to deny this, and then all the issues altogether get resolved, and then we can move forward. I don't think holding it 60 days is gonna ... is a superficial timeline that just doesn't do anything. I think it's just best to deny it outright, everything gets in order, they come back and apply. So I think that's the best way to go. I think this is very problematic just picking out this one store, giving them 60 days. It's not fair to the other stores until we're all ready to move forward and they can all get their liquor licenses just like everybody else in the city. I think we're moving in that direction, but we're just not there yet, and so I oppose holding it for 60 days. Thank you.

- Thank you. Alderman Mark Steuer.

- Thank you, Your Honor.

- I am part of P and W. Sadly I wasn't there for that agenda item. I had to go to another meeting, but I've had a chance to talk to some of the neighbors as well on this. And I think, you know, it might be opening another stream here, but the fact is that there are a number of issues in the neighborhood. And we're gonna have that in other areas of the city as well where you've got commercial lining up very close to residential. And I think it's not so much just the liquor license. I mean we're just talking about that today, but one of the issues is the trucks that are coming in at different times of the night. And I think we need, you know Alder Johnson is saying that 60 days. I have no problem with looking at that. There's other issues that are being dealt with in that neighborhood, and it's not just the liquor license. It's cars or trucks idling for 45 minutes at a crack in a no parking area and keeping the neighborhood awake. So it might not be a problem for some people, but for those neighbors it's a big problem. So I really think it's important that we study all of that. So I'm gonna go along with Alder Johnson.

- [Jim] All right, thank you. Alderperson Lefebvre.

- Yes, I think I would deny the motion. I don't like this one because it is basically in a residential even though there is a busy street going past there. A lot of the other QuikTrips are in more commercial areas, so they don't impact really the residents. And I just don't like the area that I think where it is, so I would deny both. Thank you.

- Thank you. Alderman Galvin.

- Thank you, Your Honor. I was on Protection and Welfare two years ago when these were first becoming an item, and the alder at that time was concerned about the influence of hard liquor on the residents in that areas

and the problems it caused. And I don't think you can look at the supplier of alcohol as being the source of where the problem necessarily comes from. There are already, all those convenience stores down there are already selling beer and other alcohol related items, and I don't think it's just hard liquor that makes the problem worse. I think it's how an establishment runs its business and how it conducts itself within its community. And I think that's what we have to look at, not the fact that they're selling hard liquor or not. If the problem is, as Alder Steuer refers to, is trucks in the late hours, then that's a different situation, and it has nothing to do with liquor. If it is the fact that there's inebriated people entering in that store and being sold liquor, and they shouldn't be by ordinance, or if it's chronic drunks that are buying that liquor, and they shouldn't be by ordinance, well then that's a different situation, and that falls on the store whether it's beer or hard liquor. So I would like to see if it's possible to throw this in there, Chief, if we could have at the end of 60 days, if this does pass, if we could have a comparison and calls for service in the evening to early morning hours during that 60-day trial period and compare that to calls for service prior to that. And also the officers self-initiated and observations community police, if they wanna conduct a survey of the neighbors and see what they have to say. Not all of them are aware of what's going on here. Not all of them have the time to attend these meetings and voice their opinion. But I think if the CPs could get out and get the feel of the community, I think that would go a long way. So I would be in favor of a 60-day referral and see what goes on from there. Thank you.

- Thank you, Alderman. Alderperson Dorff, on the amendment.

- Thank you, Your Honor. I just would like clarification from Alder Scannell on what he was mentioning. Would 60 days be enough time to look at the issues that you were talking about and clear them up? Is there a timeline for clearing up those issues? Because I would not want that out there indefinitely either. Maybe this could be a forced timeline to make a decision about those other businesses.

- [Jim] Hmmm. Talking about QuikTrip, but okay, go ahead.

- This has been an ongoing issue, and one reason I vote to deny this is I have been in discussion with neighborhood associations and neighbors in the area, and this has been an ongoing process. So we've already got a lot of that information, and what I'm hearing from the neighbors is they don't want alcohol, these sales to go through just yet. They feel we're making progress, but they wanna see us get a little bit better. And I think to put an arbitrary timeline on that is arbitrary. I think the process is, what has been is we're working on, it's basically a homeless issue, loitering, littering, pan handling, and we've been making some big gains on handling homeless issues. I think we're moving in the right direction in that. There's a agenda item coming forward on that that's gonna make a big difference with that as well. And I think it's talking to the neighbors and saying are you ready for this now, which is what I've been doing. We've been having those ongoing conversations with neighborhood associations. And when they're ready, then I think we can get the word to these businesses okay, it's time to go forward. So that's why an arbitrary timeline is just, I don't see how that's productive.

- [Jim] Thank you. Anything else. Alderperson Dorff, it's your floor.

- Oh, nothing else.

- [Jim] All right. I got two more of you, three more. Alderman Jesse Brunette.

- Yes, thank you, Mayor. I agree with Alderman Scannell. I happened to grow up in that general area, and I know the challenges the neighbors face there. And QuikTrip is a well, you know, some people have opposite opinions, but QuikTrip to me seems to be a well ran respected company, and I know there are some frustrations some of the neighbors have in that area with them changing their business model after they built. Now that is an issue that will be worked out at another time, but let's not forget that the shipyard project that the council just approved funding for to borrow, part of this project is to enhance the neighborhood around that area. And I think that probably the last thing that neighborhood needs at this point is another

establishment that sells alcohol. So as Alderman Scannell said, the QuikTrip can come forward another time, but at this point I think we need to deny the license and let the dust settle. And then as neighborhood issues progress and improve, then we can take another hit at this. Thank you.

- Thank you. Alderman Galvin.

- Thank you, Your Honor. I would then ask Alder Scannell what are the metrics you're using? How do we measure success? I mean quite frankly alcohol's gonna be an issue I think, a problem in our community for, almost maybe forever. Who knows? But at least for the very, very near future, and homelessness and pan handling and some of these other issues. And this was an issue two and a half years ago, and we had the police department working on that. So I mean, to be fair to these businesses and to the community we have to have some way of measuring this, and I haven't seen anything yet. I mean, you say you've been working on it. I've heard nothing, seen nothing, and I guess I would ask for some proof of something being done. You say that it's almost solved. Or are we just changing the opinion of the residents?

- [Jim] It's world peace you want. I'll listen, go ahead, go ahead.

- No, it's the neighborhood, they're neighborhood businesses, and it's up to the neighbors to decide the value of that business and the issues around those businesses. And it's been an ongoing with the boots on the ground. That's my measurement. When the residents say, and they're the ones who've been telling me things are better, so I know things are getting better. They're the ones who are telling me they'd like to see a little more improvement, and then they'd feel comfortable going forward. So my measure is talking to the neighbors, the neighborhood associations. They're the ones, it's their neighborhood, it's their businesses, so I feel it's their choice. And so I'm just following their wishes, and as far as what we're doing, there's several things we're doing. Better policing, the businesses are doing better jobs of picking up the litter. We're doing a better job with just homelessness in general, with housing and so on and meeting their needs, which makes a big difference for the area. So there are several things going on that make things better, but my metric for going forward with this is the neighbors, the neighborhood associations. When they're ready, then I'm ready, and they're not there yet.

- [Bill] Okay, we've got one neighbor that showed up tonight. I received one email from an email that was against it. I don't know if that's the same person. Is this what we're basing it on?

- No.

- [Bill] And at what, how many neighbors? Eighty percent?

- [Jim] Okay, all right, motion's to hold this for 60 days. He doesn't agree with it. I don't know if you do, but we're gonna vote in just one minute here. Alderman Johnson, your motion.

- Thank you, Mayor. Just two final points I would make, and one, Alder Scannell, you brought it up yourself that the danger if you will of cherry picking. We're gonna let this person have it, but we're not gonna let this person have it. I think to that I would respond then unless we have something in place that prohibits them from having a liquor license, I think we need to honestly consider applications that come forward. And right now to my knowledge there's not a moratorium that exists for these gas stations other than we have some concerns in the neighborhood, in which case then I would say as a matter of fairness if they're a law-abiding organization, they should be able to do that. And that's what we're talking about here is giving them 60 days to basically show or demonstrate that they can be a good community partner. And I just wanna reinforce this one point, is that by voting today we're not giving them a liquor license. We're saying they have 60 days to demonstrate that they can be a good neighbor, and then they'll come before Protection and Welfare again for your consideration to say have you proven that you're a good neighbor. And that 60 days could also provide

adequate time to properly poll or gauge the neighbors in that neighborhood and to determine if we're making the appropriate amount of progress that we need to be making on those issues.

- [Jim] Alderman Steuer.

- Thank you, Your Honor. I concur with Alder Johnson on that as well. I guess one of things that we're gonna have to look at in this 60-day period is the fact that it's a 24-hour establishment as well. And I was at the original meeting two years ago when they had, when the owner kind of stalked out of the meeting because we were pressing him with questions. And I didn't really appreciate that at that time. And I really feel that, you know, if they wanna be a good neighbor, we need to look at all the angles, and that includes 24 hours. And I think that's where the issues come in with the neighborhood because these trucks that are often refrigerated will come into the alleys, and they'll park, and they'll leave their, they don't wanna turn off their trucks. They let them keep running to keep the refrigeration units moving. So you know, that has to be included as well. So we have to look at this comprehensively, so I'm still in favor.

- All right, so use the board. The motion on the floor is to hold this item for 60 days to adequately address the concerns. Yes vote holds it for 60 days, a no vote doesn't. Alder Steuer, one more time. All right, and that motion passes on a, hang on, vote of eight to four. So we'll hold that for 60 days, be back at P and W and then back in front of the council. Okay, we are now on to item 17, which is to grant the class B wine only license to Badgers State Brewing Company LLC at 990 Tony Canadeo Drive. What are your wishes regarding--

- [Randy] Motion to approve.

- Motion to approve by Alderman Scannell, seconded by Alderman Steuer. Alderman Scannell, this is yours? Okay.

- I would just to refer this back. There are some issues that need to be worked out, and this would be referred back.

- [Andy] Second.

- [Jim] There's a motion by Alderman Scannell, seconded by Alderman Nicholson to refer this item back to resolve a few issues. Maybe wanna see if anybody wants to speak on the referral. Okay, I don't see any lights. All in favor of that motion please signify by saying aye.

- [Assembly] Aye.

- [Jim] And those opposed nays. The ayes have it. That item's been referred back to P and W.

- [Kris] We're on to the report of the Protection and Welfare Committee granting operator licenses.

- [Jim] We have a motion by Alderman Scannell, seconded by Alderman Kathy Lefebvre to approve the report of Protection and Welfare Committee which is granting the operating licenses. This is report N on number one. Are there any items under this report you wanna handle separately? All right, seeing no lights all in favor of that report please signify by saying aye.

- [Assembly] Aye.

- [Jim] And those opposed nays. The ayes have it, and report N has been approved.

- [Kris] Report of the Planning Commission, July ninth, 2018 and July 12th, 2018.

- [Randy] Motion to approve.
- [Jim] All right, we have a motion by Alderman Scannell, seconded by Alderperson Corpus-Dax to approve the report of the Planning Commission meetings held on the ninth and the 12th. Any items on this report you wish to handle separately?
- [Attendee] Eight.
- [Jim] Item eight. Okay, hearing none others, all in favor of the remainder of that report please signify by saying aye.
- [Assembly] Aye.
- [Jim] And those opposed nays. Ayes have it. All items have been approved with the exception of item eight. What are your wishes regarding item eight? Motion to approve by Alderman Scannell?
- [Barbara] I'll second.
- [Jim] Second by Alderperson Dorff. Alderman Scannell. Pulled that, Brian. All right, Alderman Johnson.
- I just need the record to reflect that I pulled this simply because I need an extension on this due to a conflict of interest with Garrett Bader serving on my Executive Committee.
- All right, so with that we have a motion and a second to approve item eight in the discussion here. Alderman Burnette.
- Mayor, I apologize. On the committee I was expecting, I was going to pull item five just to abstain on that issue.
- [Jim] I can make that notation.
- Thank you.
- [Jim] I think you had called earlier about that. Okay, so we have a motion, a second to approve item eight. All in favor of that motion please signify by saying aye.
- [Assembly] Aye.
- [Jim] And those opposed nays. Ayes have it. Noting the abstention of Alderman Johnson on that and Alderman Burnette on time five. Okay, Clerk.
- [Kris] Report of the Finance Committee, July 10th, 2018.
- [Attendee] Motion to approve.
- All right, there's a motion to approve by Alderperson Dax, seconded by Alderman Galvin. This is the report of the Finance Committee for the meeting on July 10th. Any items in this report you wish to handle separately? Item one. Hearing none others, all in favor of the remainder of that report please signify by saying aye.
- [Assembly] Aye.
- And those opposed nay. Now what are your wishes regarding item one?

- [Barbara] Motion to approve.
- Motion to approve by Alderperson Dorff, seconded by Alderman Galvin. Alderman Wery.
- Thank you, Mr. Mayor. Same commentary as before. I just wanted to separate it for a display vote, please.
- [Jim] All right. So we talked at the RDA about the two million dollars for the shipyard. This is the report of the finances to approve the request to borrow the two million dollars for the shipyard. If you'd please use the board here. That passes on a vote of eight to four to approve the borrowing, so we'll continue, thank you.
- [Kris] We're on to a report of the Park Committee.
- Motion to approve.
- Second.
- All right, so there's a motion by Alderman Scannell, seconded by Alderman Nicholson to approve the report of the Park Committee for the meeting held on July 11th. Any items here, six items that you'd like to handle separately?
- [Attendee] Item two.
- Item two. Okay, hearing none others, all in favor of the remainder of that report please signify by saying aye.
- [Assembly] Aye.
- And those opposed nays. Ayes have it. What are your wishes regarding item two?
- [Barbara] Motion to approve.
- Motion to approve by Alderperson Dorff.
- [Randy] Second.
- Seconded by Alderman Scannell. Alderperson Dorff.
- This is the concern that I have. I attended that meeting, and I know that this refers to waiving the fee for city inspections, which was \$1,000. And at the meeting Parks representatives had said that upon the advice of legal they put the \$1,000 fee in because of the new law that went into effect to ensure that there was no conflict with the FOWLS, the Friends of the Wildlife Sanctuary, to be able to choose their own person to construct, and that it didn't have to follow the city bidding. So my concern is by waiving that fee I wanna make sure that we're not putting any of that in jeopardy. So my question is to legal.
- [Jim] Attorney Chavez.
- So the issue we have is, in waiving it is whether or not it would create an unfairness at this point because this is the first time it's ever happened. They've already done the fund raising. This council can choose to waive it at this point, getting it on the record that it's because of the nature of it, that they weren't aware that this would be something that would be required at the beginning, that it's appropriate for staff to do administratively we would never recommend that because this should be one of the default provisions. But in this instance if you

guys make a determination that it would patently unfair given the fact that this is a new agreement that's been put into place, there is no issue with waiving it.

- [Barbara] Okay, thank you, that's all I need to know.

- All right. So with that we have a motion and a second to approve item two. All in favor please signify by saying aye.

- [Assembly] Aye.

- And those opposed nay.

- [Attendee] No.

- All right, we'll use the board on this. This is item two on the report of the Park Committee to approve the amended design construction dedication agreement Wildlife Sanctuary for the construction of the four K addition, and waiving the fee for city inspectors listed in Section 3.8. Alderman Galvin.

- [Bill] My computer kicked me out. I'm trying to log back in so I can vote.

- Okay. All right, go ahead. Bill, can you tell us how you wanna vote? Okay, so we'll put that in for you. All right, item two passes then on a vote of 10 to two. Wanna take a break, you wanna keep going? All right, let's keep going.

- [Kris] Report of the Personnel Committee, June 26th, 2018 and July 10th, 2018.

- Okay, somebody else can speak up. Alderperson, this motion was made by Alderperson Kathy Lefebvre, seconded by Alderman Mark Steuer to approve the report of the Personnel Committee for June 26th and July 10th. Any items in this report you wish to handle separately? Alderperson Dorff, number six. Alderman Wery, number three. Alderman Burnette, item eight. Any others? Hearing none others, all in favor of the remainder of that report please signify by saying aye.

- [Assembly] Aye.

- And those opposed nays. The ayes have it. All items have been approved with the exception of three, six and eight. We'll begin with item three. What are your wishes regarding item three?

- [Randy] Motion to approve.

- Motion to approve by Alderman Scannell, second by Alderman Johnson. Alderman Chris Wery.

- Thank you, Mr. Mayor. This is regarding our new Public Arts Commission and a position that assists greatly with the commission. It's a commendable effort to try and add more public art. Can't imagine too many people against that. My concern would be the proposed change, which is taking a position that's a half-time limited term Public Arts Coordinator that makes \$20 an hour, and changing it into a three-fourths position, a permanent part-time employee who now makes \$21.24 to \$24.99, so basically it would be \$25 at some point. And with the full benefits package you're looking at \$46,000 a year, and it'll be, in our books it'll be on the payroll. It'll be part of our structure. And I know that the goal is to have it funded privately, but right now part of it would be funded with federal money, federal block grant money. And I can think of a lot of other things that that money can be used for than to turn this into a pretty nice job. I mean we're gonna be paying basically an art critic to be part of our staff, probably have an office here and get \$46,000 in benefits to tell us what art is nice and what isn't, and I think we can use that money elsewhere. I think the fund raising should be done

first. Bring forward your funds, and then we'll look at it, but I just have a bad feeling. Once it's in our table of contents or I don't know--

- [Jim] Organization.

- Table of organization, table of contents, table of organization it could slide the other way and be fully funded by the city, and I just can't see most people saying yeah, you know, that's a pretty worthwhile spot. We don't wanna pay an assistant for the council, you know, don't want that. We don't want maybe more help at the police department or more planning inspection staff, but we need to have somebody to tell us what art we need. I just don't think that's appropriate, so I'm going to move to, I'm just gonna vote no on this, and I would advise others to vote no as well. If they wanna come back later after they've fund raised and fund it all themselves, great, but I don't think we should be using our federal money for this. Thanks.

- [Jim] Thank you. Alderman Johnson, item three.

- Thank you, Mr. Mayor. I think to classify this position as an art critic is a gross mischaracterization of really what the position is. And I mean, when you look at communities that are very successful with attracting talent and create spaces where people wanna be, public art is a very critical component of that, and I think that's really what this role is about. It's adding a quality of life amenity to our community. Some people value bridge lights, many don't. Some people value roads. Some people value art, and I think this to me is a step in the right direction for the city of Green Bay. I think the way that I understand it right now it's being funded through the sales tax money. To your point, CDGB funds would do that afterwards. I have a proposal on the table that staff is looking into that was approved earlier to refer to staff about a percent for the arts program that could potentially fund this program as well. So unless I'm mistaken, I mean this is a position that we could pull from the payroll at any time in the future. And so I do support this position moving to three-quarters time, continuing to use the funds that are made available, that were laid aside for this particular position. And if sometime down the road we don't have a permanent way to fund this position, I would expect the council to have the courage to say our priorities have shifted, and we're not gonna keep that as part of our permanent staff.

- [Jim] All right, thank you. Did you wanna speak again on this, Alderman Wery?

- Yes.

- [Jim] Alderman Wery.

- Thank you. I know that sounds good in theory that in the future you could just cut the position out, but having been on council long enough, you work with people, you get to know them, and then when it's doesn't become just a position. It becomes a person, and then it becomes much, much, much, much more difficult to cut that person out. It really does, believe me, and it'll sway just enough votes that you won't cut it out. So I think you nip it in the bud now. Fund raise for those dollars. How many of you wanna go and tell people that we have a \$25 an hour job in the books, but we couldn't fund some of these other positions, but we had to get an art expert, if you don't like critic. We had to get an art expert, gosh, we had to get an art expert in here. Oh man, we've been dying for this for years. So it's up to you, but I just think we nip it in the bud now, thanks.

- Thank you. All right, use the board on this.

- [Bill] my computer working.

- Alderman Scannell.

- Yes. When we're talking about that position, we are talking a big part of it is fund raising. So you're asking to get the chicken before the egg or the egg before the chicken, whichever way you wanna look at it. We need that position to facilitate and bring forth those dollars. That's the big part of that position, and big component of that position, so to just get the fund raising first, we need the person there to do it. So we ran into a problem where this position was gonna be, we're gonna end up losing this person, and we're gonna end up like we did with many of our staff in the past, losing staff because we weren't paying them enough. We didn't have the funds to pay them enough, and they were being poached. So this is a position that we can, as Alder Johnson has said, when the time comes and we've got the funds, to take it in different directions, but right now this is grant funds. I think it's a good source of the funds. I think the public arts plays an important role in promoting development. It brings dollars to the community, so she's far from just an art critic, this position. It's very important to the committee that this job be filled, thank you.

- All right, now use the board on this. A yes vote approves the request. All right.

- One final point that I wanna make, and just to urge you to consider this in a different light. We're not asking for new funding. We're not ask, I mean basically the funding that's allocated for this position, this is what it's allocated for. It's not allocated for police. It's not allocated for public works. It's already restricted in terms of how it can be spent. All I think the request is doing is saying we'd like to spend a little bit more quickly up front than what we're authorized to do so that we can get the result that we're looking for on the back end.

- Like I said, use the board. Yes vote approves the request, no vote doesn't. All right, and that passes on a vote of eight to four. All right, Clerk.

- [Kris] We're on to number six.

- What are your wishes regarding item six?

- [Barbara] Motion to approve.

- Motion to approve by Alderperson Dorff, seconded by Alderman Steuer. Alderperson Dorff.

- Thank you, Your Honor. So I wanted to clarify this motion a bit. I went into the Personnel Committee using the study that was produced in June of 2017, and that study covered looking at mayor positions and city administrator positions from across the state of Wisconsin, looking us as being the eighth highest but the third largest city. So you have the information in front of you. It was passed out at the beginning of the meeting. So in the end what I chose to do to start things off because I know we're gonna discuss this. I know that this probably won't end up the way it is, but in order to clarify what I finally ended up doing, it was to increase the salary to \$94,863, which is what the salary would have been had that salary not been frozen the last eight years. If that position had gotten the two percent that the other city positions had gotten, it would have been \$94,863. And then the part that I don't believe is clear the way this is written is I wanted it to annually increase based on any general increases provided to the general municipal employees. I can't legally state it that way. I need to state a percentage, so I'm going to go with the two percent. So increasing it \$3,082.75 a year over the four years up to the \$94,863, but adding in the two percent each year. The final total then after four years would be \$102,298.55. And so that's how I would start the motion because the motion as written is not correct. And I also believe that we'll have a lot of discussion, and it may be changed in the end, but I think we should start somewhere.

- [Jim] So you wanna amend this request by Alderperson Dorff to amend the increase over the next four years to \$102 what?

- \$102,298.55, and that includes a two percent per year increase.

- [Jim] Okay, thanks.
- Okay.
- [Jim] I think there's somebody wants to speak on this. We gotta open the floor.
- Motion to open the floor.
- Second.
- [Jim] All right, so we got a motion by Alderman Steuer, second by Alderman Galvin to open the floor to hear from interested parties. All in favor of that motion please signify by saying aye.
- [Assembly] Aye.
- [Jim] And those opposed nay. Yeah, go ahead. Are you Patrick Doherty? Yep, we did, we just voted on it.
- Mr. Scannell, I wanna congratulate you because that's the first time, and I haven't been to a lot of meetings county or city, the first time that I heard anybody say that you listen to the people in your district. First time. And Barb Dorff, maybe you forgot about Act 10. Maybe you forgot about that, those guys in Madison, what they did to the city workers, to the public workers. And you wanna sit, and you wanna give a raise to an administrator. I know, I believe you were in administration in the school district, and I know how it works there because I worked there 22 years, ran for the School Board as a joke and won. It was a big joke. So I think before you talk about giving, whether it's a mayor, any administrator a raise, you better start thinking about the guy, the people that got taken over by those people in Madison, and start giving them a raise, and start giving their benefits back because I don't know if you know it or not, but supposedly the lady in food service two years ago got 15 cents an hour. That's a helluva lot less than what you're proposing. So I think you better take another look at it.
- Thank you.
- Thank you.
- Congratulations, Mr. Scannell.
- [Jim] Anybody else wanna speak to this? Anybody else, all right. Volunteering a motion to return to regular order.
- [Andy] So moved.
- By Alderman Nicholson, seconded by Alderman Steuer. All in favor please signify by saying aye.
- [Assembly] Aye.
- And those opposed nays. Ayes have it. You done? Alderperson Lefebvre, we'll go to you. Hang on. Alderperson Lefebvre.
- Yes, I'm on the committee, and proposal was for a lot higher increase each year, and I said it was like a 13% increase. And I brought up the exact thing that this gentleman came up that the regular employees didn't get a 13% ever raise. Their raises are always a lot less, so I didn't feel it was fair to give a mayor, I don't care, anybody, a 13% increase in their salary. So we brought it down to this level, and with the cost of living so that it keeps up with what's going on, which all the employees get a cost of living, and this is a small raise, so then I

approved it. I thought that was fair. And yes, I do feel for the employees that were with Act 10. It wasn't right I don't believe, but it's past, and we have to work with it. But I do feel that this was appropriate, bringing it down.

- [Jim] Thank you. Alderman Chris Wery.

- Thank you, Mr. Mayor. Could I verify the current motion on the floor?

- [Jim] The current motion is to approve the request by Alder Dorff as amended to increase the mayor's salary over the next four years to \$102,298.55, which includes a cost of living increase over the four years.

- Thank you, so it was amended from committee, which committee recommended I think \$94,863.

- [Jim] She put the two percent, Alderperson Lefebvre. Look, I know I have a dog in this fight. I think it was \$94,000 plus two percent year cost of living, and Alderperson Dorff put the two percent in to give you the total amount.

- [Attendee] That's exactly right

- I think there was may just some miscommunication.

- [Jim] So \$94 plus two percent, or \$102 all in. I mean, it's the same number.

- And I can explain the reason that that is like that. Under state statute and our ordinances the exact amount has to be established by ordinance beforehand. So we can't have a discretionary adjustment. It has to be set.

- All right, that's all my comments for right now.

- [Jim] All right, thank you. Alderman Nicholson.

- Thank you, Mayor. Question. With this raise, did benefits go up also? Retirement?

- [Jim] Well, I think the benefits, Joe, you wanna comment on that?

- I would just say your retirement goes up.

- The percentage for benefits for retirement is set by the state, so it would just go up based upon the salary going up, so it just will coincide with the salary.

- [Andy] So the retirement would also go up also.

- Yes, it goes up because the salary goes up because the percentage is set by the state.

- [Andy] Okay, so what is the final number then? Because that's gotta be part of it. It's called, isn't that a benefit package?

- [Vanessa] Benefits can actually be amended at any time. It's the salary that has to be established.

- [Andy] Okay, and then how does that affect retirement?

- [Vanessa] What do you mean?

- [Andy] Well, what I just asked is does the retirement go up? And according to Joe, he stated yes, correct?
- [Vanessa] So if you're asking what the total benefits package included is?
- [Andy] Yeah, how much will it be? Because you said we have to have a final number. Wouldn't that be part of it?
- [Vanessa] You have to have a final number for the salary component only. The benefits can be adjusted at any time, which is why when we were discussing whether or not to change the benefits of the council last year, we were able to do that because elected officials benefits are considered separate from their salary.
- [Andy] But the retirement will go up? Can the council say no, the retirement stays the same where it is, or will it go up with the?
- [Vanessa] I'll let the HR Director respond to that.
- [Jim] Go ahead, Joe.
- Alderperson Nicholson, I'm not sure if I heard the whole question, but the state does pay out the retirement benefits, so that would not be coming out of the city funds.
- [Andy] But doesn't the city match that?
- The employee matches that. It's paid in--
- [Andy] The employee, but then what's the match? Is that from the state?
- [Attendee] The city matches it.
- [Andy] The city matches that.
- That's correct, the city does match it.
- Okay, so actually it's just more than two percent then because whoever becomes mayor will also have an increase in retirement, so it's more than two percent. That's how I look at it. I mean, did anybody see it different? And I think it was Mr. Doherty stated that some food service person received 15 cent raise. Well, this is a little more than 15 cents. This is thousands of dollars. I don't know, when you really look at it, we can't even take care of our roads, and now we're giving out pay raises, and we're adding to the table of organization. I don't know, where are our priorities? I guess my priorities is infrastructure, taking care of the employees we have right now, and then whatever we have left over, we can take care of the fluff later. But boy, I tell you, and I been being stopped in the last four weeks since last month saying what is going on with the City Council? And I said well, you're gonna have to call your alderman. I mean, you're preaching to the choir here. I just can't believe it. Pay raises, we're adding positions, funding two million dollars for projects that really nobody has any interest in, no prospects, and we're left on the hook like Mr. Very stated. Boy, but we can't take care of our roads. But we're gonna tax the people for the roads. Okay, what's our property taxes for? What is that supposed to take care of? Benefits, salary, everything but infrastructure? I just don't get it. Please, someone straighten me because this is, just doesn't add up. Now is this fair to the employees? They receive two percent. Okay, someone gets two percent, it's 15 cents an hour. Cost of living? Someone's receiving thousands of dollars? I think that's a little more than cost of living? I mean if we really look at it, if you wanna give a pay raise, it should be a half a percent maybe, but doesn't the person who is in the position or becomes the next mayor, isn't that enough to live on? You look at the people on the northeast side of town

where I came from, of the east side, that's more than enough. It'd be on the far west side also. Boy, I don't know, where's our priorities? That's what I'd like to ask the council. Thank you.

- [Jim] Thank you. Alderman Scannell.

- Thank you, Your Honor. I mean, I'd like to address some of that. I mean, that was a real hodge podge stew that was thrown in there. Our roads are a separate budgetary item. You just don't throw everything all together. You can't take money budgeted for salaries and say oh, we're ignoring our roads. Our roads have a separate funding mechanism, and that has to be addressed as a separate funding mechanism. To say we're taking money to put it to development and not taking care of our roads is comparing apples and oranges. These are separate funds, separate monies, separate things we need to do. We need to do all these things as a government. That's what government is, we do all these things. You can't just say well, we give someone a raise, and now our roads are going to hell. Well no, the roads have a separate funding issue, a whole set of separate circumstances that I'm not gonna bother going into because that's off topic. We've had that discussion with our road when we discussed the wheel tax. I'm sorry you couldn't keep up with that. As far as raises for the mayor, it's been frozen for 10 years. This has been a concern of mine from the moment I was elected. I believe as elected officials there's a lot of bunk out there. We take a lot of ... There's an opinion out there that we're all corrupt, that we're all bums, that we're all in it for power or money, and I refute that strongly. A lot of us believe in public service, and we should be paid for that. The Mayor's Office is an important part, it's an executive, he's like the CEO of the city. It's an important position. It's a position that deserves a decent wage. This is not out of line if you look at what other mayors are making in similar situations. We are the third largest city in the state. It's kind of embarrassing that we pay someone so poorly. This is a matter of what's fair and what's practical for a ... Well, I just think that we need to stand up for ourselves a little bit as politicians. We deserve a better rap. We work hard, and we deserve to make a decent wage. And when you look at the job that the Mayor's Office has, what this mayor has to do, anybody in this position, and you compare it to other mayors around the state, this is very reasonable, and something we should do if we're gonna be, we want responsible governance. Thank you.

- [Jim] Thank you. Alderman Burnette.

- Yes, thank you, Mayor. I think it's important to make the distinction that this would be in effect for the next mayor, that the current mayor would not be, unless you run for reelection, which I know you're undecided on currently, but you would not be subject to this pay increase. That's correct, right? I think everyone has that understanding. So that being said, I don't think that the current salary that, where it is now, \$82,000 a year, is discouraging anyone from stepping forward and putting their hat in the ring. Currently we have five candidates, unofficial or official, including someone on this very council who currently is a heartbeat away from the mayor, no offense to Mr. Mayor who knows the stress of the job and whatnot. So it's not discouraging anyone, and we kind of have a rarity in that we have to take a step back and understand that the current person in the position is now nearing his 16th year in office. That's not common. That's not common for Green Bay. There's only been one other mayor who's done anywhere near that. So what I'm getting at is that the person, the people who are running for office are basically promising a four-year term because you never know what happens after the four years. You know, you lose election, lose interest, move away who knows what. So of all the candidates who have stepped forward, they're basically saying for the next four years of my life I'm willing to dedicate service to this city and get compensation in the amount of \$82,000 a year, with great benefits, with a lot of ability to effect positive change in the community. And it's a love of community service. It's a love of community. Mr. Mayor, whether people love you or hate you, and I know you have a bunch of both people on both camps on that side, I don't think anyone can dispute your amount of hours that you put in service to the city. I mean, I can only imagine the number of hours that you work. And so when you factor in all of the hours you work and your salary, you have many motivations I'm sure, but one of the biggest, and I've gotten to know you, is your love of the city. And I would say that hopefully the voters get it right and elect a mayor this coming election that has a love of the city. If you were to take, for example if we factored in \$112,000 a year, and assuming, and Mr. Mayor, I'm sure you work more than 60 hours a week many weeks, probably a

minimum of 60 hours, but if you were to factor 60 hours a week over 52 weeks a year, that's 3,100 hours roughly, it amounts to \$32 an hour. I mean that's not a lot to pay an executive. If you were to put in 40 hours a week, that amounts to \$49 an hour, all right? So I understand, I fully acknowledge that department heads make more, but also they're not elected. They serve under the discretion and hiring of the mayor, and many of those positions do require some sort of advanced degree, you know? Public Works requires education and training in that field. Police Science for the police chief, and firefighter and HR Director, City Attorney, you name it. There are always gonna be people in this city making more than the executive, and that is the case for many organizations as well. I mean unless you go into higher echelons of corporate business structure, executives oftentimes make less than their higher paid employees just because it's different. The qualifications for being elected mayor is getting a majority of the votes from the voters. Could be a high school dropout, could be a high school graduate, could be someone with an associate degree or an advanced degree, who knows? I hope we get a good pool of candidates. I hope we don't limit ourselves to just five. I hope more people step forward. And I have a feeling that the people who step forward are gonna do it because they wanna serve the public. They believe in that, and they're gonna commit to a four-year term, and maybe four years after that, and go from there. So I'm against the pay increase, not because I don't value the mayor and the work that he's done and his dedication to the city, but it's separate from the mayor. It's for the person coming into the position, whoever he or she is. So with that I will vote against the motion. Thank you.

- Thank you. Alderman Steuer.

- Thank you, Your Honor. Some very good points, Alder Burnette. I guess the question I had is when was this frozen? When was the exact date that the wages were frozen? Was that eight years ago, six years? I don't know, it's been a little while. So I guess I just, I wanted to know why that happened. If anybody is out there that can explain the reason why that happened. You know, and I asked if I needed to recuse myself from this discussion. The law said I could speak, so I'm just asking on that point why that was. I mean, granted it is public service, and granted you are the CEO of the city. I mean, you look at baseball teams, the managers don't make as much as the ball players. You know, it's just the way it is, and that's understood I think going into that position. But I guess I had a difficult time understanding why things were frozen to begin with. If it was just a normal job, you would just move along, and then all of a sudden it's frozen, now it's piled up over eight, 10 years, and now we're dealing with it. So you know, it's just, I'm looking at it just as part of the smell test, does it pass the smell test? And you know, I think what Alder Dorff brought forward at least was fair in the sense that let's bring it back. Let's not do the 13%, but just bring it back to a point where it seems fair. So I'm fine with that, thank you.

- [Jim] Thank you. Alderman Johnson.

- I just have a question. I think legal could probably answer this, and it's more of just a clarification. If we do not, is Vanessa there?

- [Vanessa] Yes.

- Sorry, you're hiding.

- [Vanessa] I'm just short.

- If this is basically our only opportunity to provide a pay increase until another four years have lapsed. Is that correct?

- [Vanessa] There is a limited period of time that this can be done, yes. It has to be done before I believe all the candidates declaration, candidacies are due.

- Okay, so it would apply to the full term, and we can't just mid-term decided that we're going to alter that agreement?

- That is correct.

- Okay, and I only bring that up just listening to Alder Burnette's comments, which I greatly appreciate. The thing I just wanna make sure that we don't fall into is the trap of four years from now we're saying the same thing. And so the pay scale for this position has been frozen to my knowledge for eight years or two terms. If we don't take action, it could be a third term, and I just, I wanted to provide some clarity around that point.

- [Jim] Thank you. Alderman Galvin.

- Thank you, Your Honor. You look at the studies. What do other mayors make? Third biggest city, we're number eighth for paying. I mean, if you look at what city managers make. These are guys that go to school, get a degree, get education, get the training to manage a city the same way a mayor does. But are they there for public service? No, and they make far more, far more. And I think Jesse, you said \$112,000, I think it's \$102,000. So it's \$102,000, and you look at any city manager yet in the state of Wisconsin, they're making far more than that. So even if the next mayor, whoever it may be, he or she may be, \$102,000 still falls far below what a person who's doing this as a permanent job is going to be making. You look at department heads, yeah, they're making more. They have advanced degrees, and this is what they are working for. That's why they got those advanced degrees. But there's many employees that are making more, not just department heads, but many employees that are making more than the mayor is currently. And I remember when I was on the job I was always told, every once in a while you'd run into someone, hey, you're a public servant. You should be doing this because you wanna serve, and I did, I loved my job. But I'm not gonna lie, it was nice getting paid to do it, and I believe that we got a darn good wage and benefits at the time. But we're talking again about the mayor. We're talking, I've heard half percent increase and that. I think we've done a disservice to the position. Let's not look at the person. I think we've done a disservice to the position not to grant even a cost of living increase over the last eight years when all other city employees have gotten at least a cost of living increase, and we haven't even done that for the mayor. And I'm talking about the position, not the person. Next guy who comes in here, he may only work 20 hours a week, and there's not much we can do about it unless we do a recall or we vote him out in four years. But we have seen what some of the mayors have done in the past, and they put a lot of their life and blood into this thing. And I think that we have to recognize that that's the kind of person we want. Love them or hate them, that they're gonna put their life and blood into this job. And I think that position needs some more compensation than what we're currently doing now. And I just want you to think about that going forward. Thank you.

- All right, thank you. All right, the motion on the floor, now you do, now you do, you didn't have that.

- Because his light was always lit. No, I guess I misunderstood the goal amount because I understood it to be \$94,000, and then I think some of the media outlets reported that as well because I know when I was asked about it by a local station, that's the number they used. So I think there was a lot of confusion about that, that the goal was \$94,000, not \$102,000. That doesn't change things for me dramatically because the \$102,000 is a \$5,000 a year raise, five percent, over five percent a year for four years. And back eight, nine years ago when we were discussing the original freeze, it's because we had some pretty, you remember, Mr. Miller, we had some pretty tight budgets. A lot of the employees--

- [Andy] Oh no, don't, don't. You were there, don't tell me. I was at the meeting, I remember that, sitting upstairs, 604, Pat Buckley, don't, that wasn't it.

- All right, well thanks for that unwanted commentary.

- [Andy] Well, you just put words in my mouth.

- No, I said you remembered the tough budgets, and you did. Okay, we don't need to debate. I'm saying there were tough budgets, and employees had no pay raises, none. That's part of the original reason the mayor's salary was also frozen. Now did the employees, did the street workers and forestry guys, did they get to play catch up with five percent a year? No. You'd laugh them right out of the room if they asked for that. So like Alderman Brunette pointed out, you know we have five candidates running for mayor, probably more, right now for a position that pays \$82,000 a year. I'm thinking they're doing it because they love the city. They're not doing it for the money. Are we trying to say well, we also want people who wanna do a little bit for the money and that kind of like the city? You know, I understand raising it, that's fine, but five percent a year, \$5,000 a year, that's a bit extreme. Elected positions are about service, not salary. Is this a bragging rights thing? We're the third largest city, so damn it, we need to have the third largest salary. Come on. So you know, I guess if I didn't support the \$46,000 total compensation for an art expert, I certainly can't support a \$20,000 raise for the mayor at five percent a year, so I'm opposed. If you bring it down to what I thought it was of \$94,000, I'm all for that, but not this. Too much. Too much, too quick.

- [Jim] Alderperson Lefebvre.

- I'm getting a little confused. At our committee we approved \$94,863. It was \$3,000 a year increase, not the \$5,000.

- [Attendee] Kathy, no, we approved roughly \$3,000 some dollar plus cost of living every year, whatever the cost of living was, but because of ordinance and state law we can't wait to see if it's a one percent, half percent or a five percent cost of living increase. So that's what, Barb did some math, and we came up with that two percent every year for four. But that's what we voted on.

- [Kathy] Okay, so now I have a question on that. I don't have, that wasn't really present, I mean the whole thing presented that much. So now I have a question on that. Okay, all right. I don't think, I don't know if I'm gonna approve it now. I don't know. Thank you.

- [Jim] Okay. Alderman Scannell.

- I just want some clarification. The five percent, what we're doing here is we're doing two percent from the 80, and then adding another two percent from every year pay increase after that, correct? So it wouldn't be five percent once we get to 102. It's be the regular two percent after that, if I understand that correctly.

- [Attendee] What it was was we looked at the eight years there was no raise.

- Right.

- [Attendee] And we figured out what the cost of living had been over that period of time and came up with if he had been getting cost of living up until this year he would have been at \$94,000 and change. Then going forward for the next four years we added on another two percent anticipating a two percent cost of living increase over four years

- And then are we frozen then after that, or is it two percent after that?

- [Attendee] No, that's not, it's not.

- Okay, that's the clarity I needed.

- [Attendee] We're only looking at four years saying take it up again in four years.

- Okay, thank you, that's, thank you.

- [Jim] Alderperson Dorff.

- Hi, I just want to try to clarify one more time for Alder Wery and Alder Lefebvre. The salary was frozen. So if it were to have kept up, then immediately the very first year it would be at \$94,000, but that's not what we're even asking for. If the mayor's salary would be, at the two percent would have continually kept up with what everyone else got as a pay increase. Nobody had a zero percent pay increase during that eight-year period of time. I have the chart. Everyone got a two percent, but no, we're not saying let's catch him all up right away. We're saying over four years catch up to where he would have been, and then each year we're gonna give the two percent that we think is going to be the cost of living that other people will get. So we're really actually starting low on that first year, the second year and the third year. It's not until you get to really the fourth year that we're getting up to that \$94,000, although by the end of it when you're adding in that extra two percent, that's what makes it more. But the initial intent was just to bring it up to from where it was frozen to where it would have been headed not being frozen. That was the initial intent, but I felt it only right to say hey, wait a minute, but we did say we're gonna give the cost of living increase. I found out we can't just wait for that. We have to put some kind of a cost on it. I chose two percent because the last eight years that exactly what the employees got, was two percent a year, so I was projecting two percent for the next four years. So it's not kind of a bait and switch or that I'm changing anything. It's really exactly what I said it was at the Personnel Committee Meeting. Thank you.

- [Jim] Alderman Burnette.

- One last comment. When I was on the County Board I typically would vote against the salary increases for four-year termed officials, you know, County Kris, Register of Deeds, Sheriff, County Executive, you name it. And my reasoning then is similar to my reasoning now. When a person puts their name on the ballot for election to four-year offices, think of it as sort of a compensation package. For the next four years the position of Mayor in the city of Green Bay, if we keep \$82,000 a year is going to be making \$328,000. So guaranteed unless they're a complete screw up and get recalled, they're guaranteed a four-year term at \$328,000 a year. It's important to put it in that perspective. Department heads--

- Four years.

- Four years. I'm talking nonsense. I'm good with numbers, yeah. It was just when the cameras were on I maybe switch the numbers around. So \$82,000 a year over four years is a payment compensation of \$328,000 a year. You know, it's guaranteed money, like I said, unless they really goof things up. So that's a good salary for this community. Other thing to remember, department heads, anyone that is an at will employee, if they don't perform, they get let go. They get fired under the discretion of the mayor, whoever happens to be the department head. So there is security in the position of mayor. There's no security in reelection, but there's security in that they carry out the duties of their office. So I wanna be consistent with that. I think that keeping the salary at \$82,000 a year, when put in perspective that it's \$328,000 for a four-year term makes it completely reasonable that we could find qualified candidates to serve and represent the city. Thank you.

- [Bill] Alderman Burnette, can I just ask you a question?

- Okay.

- [Bill] Then at what do we increase his salary? I mean, what's the--

- [Jesse] I mean, every alderman, every alderwoman has gotta make that choice.

- Right, okay.

- [Jesse] My choice is the \$82,000 is enough.
- [Jim] Right, all right, we understand that. All right, you're done, you're done. You're ready.
- [Attendee] Ready.
- [Jim] I wanna clear this because I, the way I understand the motion on the floor is to approve the request by Alderperson Dorff as amended to increase the mayor's salary over the next four years to \$102,298.55, which includes the cost of living increase. All right, you can vote on this. Randy, you just wanna tell us.
- [Randy] No.
- Yeah, okay, we're done. All right, I know this is a start. All right, that passes on a vote of eight to four. All right, Clerk.
- [Kris] We're on to number eight.
- [Jim] What are your wishes regarding item eight? Motion to approve by Alderman Scannell, seconded by Alderman Stevenson. Alderman Burnette.
- Thank you, Mayor. I'm not talking numbers, who hopefully I can get this right. I just wanted to make sure that, I agree with this. I agree with the wishes of the committee, but I listen to the conversation at the community level, and I don't want it to be perceived that it was, that Alderman Wery was trying to get some sort of benefit. It was just discussed at the INS Committee a few times, and it was suggested or recommended by the City Attorney this should go to the Personnel Committee, which it did. But it's not that we were adding anything to the benefit package. At least that wasn't Alderman Wery's intent. His intent was really to get a duplicate parking pass for alders that have two separate cars. So obviously the committee spoke, and I'm in favor of what the committee said. I just don't want it to be perceived that it was getting over and above what we normally get. It was just a duplicate pass.
- All right, thank you.
- Thank you.
- All right, so there's a motion and a second to approve item eight. All in favor please signify by saying aye.
- [Assembly] Aye.
- And those opposed nay. Ayes have it, that passes.
- [Attendee] I just need a clarification of what we passed.
- We approved the request by Alderperson Dorff--
- [Kris] No, no.
- Oh, five. Item five was to refer to staff the request by Alderman Wery to restore options and restore an assistant to the City Council position. Yeah, that was approved. All right.
- [Kris] We're on to the report of the Public Arts Commission, June 27th, 2018.

- All right, there's a motion to approve by Alderman Scannell, seconded by Alderman Galvin to approve the report of the Public Arts Commission. That was for the meeting held on June 27. Any items in this report you wish to handle separately? Hearing none, all in favor of that report please signify by saying aye.

- [Assembly] Aye.

- And those opposed nays. Ayes have it, and report S has been approved.

- [Kris] Report of the Traffic Bicycle and Pedestrian Commission, June 18th, 2018.

- All right, there's a motion by Alderman Scannell, and that was seconded by Alderman Steuer to approve the report of the Traffic Bicycle and Pedestrian Commission meeting held on June 18th. Any items in this report you wish to handle separately?

- [Attendee] Number six.

- Item six. All right, hearing none others, all in favor of the remainder of that report please signify by saying aye.

- [Assembly] Aye.

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

- [Randy] Motion to approve.

- Motion to approve by Alderman Scannell, seconded by Alderman Steuer. Alderperson Corpus-Dax, that was you?

- So what had happened was previous alder, Alder Duane, had requested currently the, or not currently, previously the intersection at Deckner and Alpine was a no right turn, no stop. So if you're coming off of Deckner onto Alpine, and you're turning right, you don't need to stop there. That traffic in that area is heavy, especially during the school year because you have Prebble down the road from Deckner. So you have a lot of kids and adults not paying a whole lot of attention when they drive that intersection. I'm not sure whose request Alder Duane, former Alder Duane did this, but he did request to have that looked at to make it a complete stop. Instead of a right turn, no stop, make it a complete stop because a child had almost got hit at that intersection. My understanding is that a study was done. It was a one-day study where they looked at it for a couple hours. There was a cop there checking to see, to compliance, and there was about a 50/50 compliance there. Residents in that area do wanna keep that a complete stop, not revert back to a right turn, no stop. They feel that traffic does slow down, you know. Right now they're getting used to the change, so hopefully compliance will get better. If anything, residents in that area wanna bring more attention to that stop, maybe a flashing red stop sign. But I guess my request would be to deny this and keep it at a full stop instead of reverting back to the right turn, no stop.

- [Jim] Okay, I wanna do what you want here, so the motion is to remove the eastbound right turn, no stop. You don't wanna remove that. You do, right?

- Because the change is on a 90-day trial, officially on the books the trial period doesn't change the ordinance. So the ordinance currently carries that intersection as right turn, no stop. This will officially amend it to a stop condition, which is what you want. The 90-day trial has expired. You want it to become permanent. So we need to make this change.

- [Jim] Do you, you totally understand what the alderperson is saying?
- She wants it to be Deckner has a full stop before making the right turn onto Alpine. She wants the 90-day trial to continue.
- Okay.
- That's what this does. We're going to remove the right turn--
- [Jim] All right, so we wanna vote yes on this. All right, fine, it's already on the floor. All right. So we wanna vote affirmatively on this, and that's gonna get you what you want. Okay. I don't see any other lights, so there's a motion, second to approve item six. All in favor please signify by saying aye.
- [Assembly] Aye.
- And those opposed nay. All right, the ayes have it. Item six has been approved. Thank you.
- [Kris] Tax Incremental District Joint Review Committee, June 28th, 2018.
- [Randy] Motion to approve.
- All right, there's a motion by Alderman Scannell, seconded by Alderman Galvin to approve item U, the Tax Incremental District Joint Review Committee. All in favor of that motion please signify by saying aye.
- [Assembly] Aye.
- And those opposed nay. Ayes have it. Item U have been approved.
- [Kris] Receive and place on file building permit report for June, 2018, municipal court report for June, 2018.
- All right, motion by Alderman Scannell, second by Alderperson Dorff to receive and place on file the two reports stated by the clerk. Discussion here, seeing no lights, all in favor please signify by saying aye.
- [Attendees] Aye.
- And those opposed nays. Ayes have it. Item V, receive and place on file has been approved.
- [Kris] We're on to resolutions. adopt resolutions one through nine together with one roll call vote.
- All right, there's a motion by Alderman Scannell, seconded by Alderperson Dorff to suspend the sules for that purpose. All in favor of suspension please signify by saying aye.
- [Assembly] Aye.
- And those opposed nays. Ayes have it. Motion to adopt--
- Motion to adopt. by Alderman Scannell, seconded by Alderman Steuer. If you'd use the board, this is one through nine. Alderman Wery. Okay. All right, so those passed on a vote of 11 with one abstention.
- [Kris] We're on to ordinances first reading. You may under suspension of the rules advances ordinances one through 10 to a third reading.

- [Attendee] Your Honor, I need to ...
- Okay, item nine you wanna take separately. Anything else.
- [Attendee] Number three.
- Number three. Okay, so these are the first reading ordinances, and these are gonna come back to see us again in a couple, well the next month, but ... I need a motion and a second to advance the first reading ordinances. Alderman Steuer, seconded by Alderman Galvin, and that's to advance one, two, four, five, six, seven and 10. So we have a motion and a second. Any discussion on those items. I understand three, eight and nine have been pulled. Okay, all in favor of the remainder of the first reading, advancing those, please signify by saying aye.
- [Assembly] Aye.
- And those opposed nay. All right, so those have been advanced. We have to deal tonight yet with three, eight and 10. What are your wishes regarding item three?
- [Attendee] Well, that's been advanced.
- Right, with the motion by Alderman Scannell, seconded by Alderperson Dorff. Alderperson Lefebvre.
- I don't feel that, if somebody wants alcohol, I believe that, I'm sorry, I think you should walk into the store and get it. I just don't like the idea of curbside picking up alcohol. It just, we promote too much alcohol here. If somebody's that serious, they wanna buy alcohol, walk into the store and get it because I still believe that there isn't, you're not gonna be able to guarantee that you can control who's getting this. I just have qualms on that. I don't think it's appropriate. Thank you.
- [Jim] Thank you. Anyone else wanna comment? This is item three. This is an ordinance creating a Green Bay municipal code relating to online ordering and curbside pickup of alcohol beverages. Alderperson Lefebvre, you're opposed to that?
- Yes.
- [Jim] Anybody else wanna comment on it? Oh, here you are, okay. I didn't see any lights before. All right, Alderman Steuer.
- Thank you, Your Honor. I'm not so sure I'm in favor of this either, unless somebody can tell me otherwise. I just feel that it's, you know, there's plenty of time. You know, we had issues with buying alcohol before eight in the morning years ago, and you know there's plenty of opportunities to get alcohol in this town, so I agree with Alder Lefebvre on that as well.
- [Jim] All right, thank you. Alderman Nicholson.
- Where did this come from? Who presented this? So staff is bringing this forward?
- [Jim] No, our staff did not bring this forward.
- Okay, well who did? I just wanna ask. No one?
- [Jim] Are you sure about that? How do you know that? Look, I got a little heartburn over this one, and I don't know, I thought you chair P and W.

- [Attendee] I thought it came from staff because it didn't say who it came from, so I just assumed it came from staff. I thought we were getting ready for the internet age. I saw no reason.
- [Jim] But did the request come, our clerk is saying that she thought it came through Walmart, but I don't--
- [Kris] We also had Appleby's.
- [Jim] This stuff doesn't just show up.
- Well, no kidding.
- [Attendee] That's why I thought it came from because it was so, no one came forward. Walmart wasn't there. It was never said that Walmart wanted this. It just came outside box staff We didn't really question it. We just thought the internet age, I guess. It's not regulated.
- [Jim] And yet, I mean Alderman Nicholson, I don't know.
- Well Kris, someone had to bring something to your office.
- [Kris] It's the latest thing. Pick 'n Save is doing it. All the grocery stores are doing it, so Walmart came forward and asked to do it.
- So if this passed, how does this take place? If someone that, how does it take place? Right, I mean what action? Do they set up a stand on the corner?
- [Jim] You wanna answer that?
- So the way it's set up under the ordinance is an existing business with a license, has to actually have a licensed premises, would be able to take order online, and then you'd be able to drive and pick them up. And so usually part of a grocery program, and so you can order your groceries and then pick them up at the curbside. They'll deliver them to your car. This is making it to where they can also do that with liquor.
- [Andy] Okay, thank you.
- [Jim] Do you wanna speak again on that? Alderman Scannell, did you wanna speak again on this?
- Just briefly. That was my assumption is that I knew there was online, that's a new thing now, ordering groceries online. I thought this was just a part of that, and we wanted to regulate it, that's all.
- [Jim] Thank you. Alderman Johnson.
- Yeah, I just wanna seek some additional clarity. So currently are these grocery stores providing that service?
- [Vanessa] My understanding is no, it's not currently provided.
- Okay, so to your knowledge they're not doing it already, where they're just seeking some clarity around the city ordinance so that they can do it legally>
- [Vanessa] To my knowledge. I would have to doublecheck with staff to verify that there isn't anything like that happening. But to my knowledge, no. This is something that would be new.

- Okay, so right now if they were to do it, they would be in violation of city ordinance?
- [Vanessa] Correct.
- Okay, and so the way that this new ordinance is written it would allow grocery stores to do it as part of perhaps a bigger package, or maybe it's the only order. Would this also allow other facilities to do it? Is there any kind of permitting or regulation around this?
- [Vanessa] Let me pull up the ordinance as drafted. I'm not the one who worked on it, so I couldn't tell you the specifics of the ordinance, but I can definitely pull those up for you. The second component of this is this is just the first reading. We don't take action on first readings because of our ordinance unless it's suspended by unanimous decision. And so what you're bringing up right now are questions that we can have for you at the next reading. So if you guys need to make any amendments or if you wanna send it back, you have that information handy so you can make that decision at that time. But I can pull it up for you.
- So I mean, if we just denied it today as part of the first reading, it's history, it's toast. So you gotta bring it back to P and W Committee than for reconsideration?
- [Vanessa] So what we've discussed in the past is that the way that the city ordinance reads right now is first readings, or every ordinance is entitled to three readings. You can advance to the third one. You're not supposed to take action on anything until it has that third, potentially second reading instead. And so the only way to do that, to take action on it tonight would be to actually suspend the rules unanimously to do that.
- To take action on it?
- [Vanessa] Correct.
- So we've already suspended the rules, right?
- [Vanessa] No.
- Okay, because we pulled these out separately, is that why? Okay.
- [Attendee] You suspend the rules
- Got it, okay, thank you.
- [Jim] Alderman Burnette.
- I'm against it because it doesn't seem that, according to what we're hearing, there is a huge need. Businesses coming forward contacting any alder, unless I'm mistaken, and I would like to hear the reasoning. Other than being cutting edge and ahead of every policy out there, that we're being proactive, I don't see a need to advance this quite honestly, unless we're hearing a huge outcry that this is needed. I don't think it's needed, so I'll vote against. Thank you.
- All right, that's all I got. No, you don't, but Alderman Steuer.
- All right. Like I said, I'm against this, too, but I guess the question I had is with this type of shopping, if you go and get your groceries, and you run up and get them, order online and you go get them, then you would have to park your car and then go inside to get your alcohol, right? It just, you know what I'm saying. I think the reason you're doing it is to try to save time and be efficient and get out, and I understand the reasoning behind it. But like I said, there's still plenty, plenty of time to purchase any and all places, so I'm against it.

- [Jim] Alderman Nicholson, did you wanna speak again on this?
- [Andy] No, I do not.
- [Jim] All right. Alderman Galvin, I do not have your light on.
- [Bill] I took it off.
- [Jim] Oh, all right, so we're gonna vote on this. Let me think here. There wasn't, well there was a motion to advance all of them, and then we pulled these three. So the motion to advance item three is what you're voting on.
- [Vanessa] So there are two things you could do. One would be to advance it to the next reading. The second would be to suspend the rules. Have to be done unanimously to take up this tonight.
- Motion to suspend the rules.
- Seconded.
- [Jim] All right, so there's a, let's see how that works. There's a motion by Alderman Galvin, seconded by Alderman Nicholson to suspend the rules to take action on this, but it's gonna have to be unanimous, okay? So let's do the motion first. So there's a motion and second to suspend the rules. All in favor of suspending the rules for that purpose please signify by saying aye.
- [Assembly] Aye.
- [Jim] And those opposed nay. Now what is the motion you want to do which has to be unanimous?
- [Bill] Motion to deny.
- Second.
- [Jim] Okay, so we have a motion by Alderman Nicholson, Alderman Galvin, second by Alderman Nicholson to deny item three. Did you wanna say anything on that? All right, why don't you use your board on this, please?
- Yes is a deny.
- [Jim] Yes denies, you're right, yes denies. There's a motion to deny.
- [Kris] The vote itself does not have to be unanimous. The decision to take it up tonight had to be unanimous.
- Oh, okay. Alderperson Dorff, I stand corrected on that. The motion to take action tonight had to be unanimous. Does that change anybody's motion to take it up tonight? This motion that we have right now does not have to be unanimous, and it's not going to be. Alderperson Dorff, after you vote. So that motion fails to advance on a vote of nine to three. To take it up. We all agreed to take it up. We didn't all agree on what to do. Let's move on to item eight. I need a motion to advance. This is the wheel tax. By Alderman Scannell, seconded by Alderperson Galvin. Alderman Vander Leest, this is yours.
- [John] That was my question about the wheel tax.

- Pardon me.
- That was my question. I pulled number eight was about the wheel tax.
- [Jim] This would be the first reading of the general ordinance related to the municipal vehicle registration fee, which was the wheel tax that we discussed last month.
- Right, I don't support the wheel tax, so I'm gonna be a no vote on this.
- [Jim] Okay, all right. Alderperson Lefebvre.
- Yes, on this wheel tax, it's concerning the people who have had to pay this year and last year. I've had several people contact me really upset that they're paying now. They're gonna have to pay, and then if this goes through, they're gonna be charged for this wheel tax. And if that goes through with the wheel tax, they're gonna be paying for could be 20 years, you know, for that road. They're not gonna get any benefit in a way from the wheel tax, so they're a little upset about having to pay full cost for the road, especially this year. And the ones that had to be done in my district this year tied to Webster. I couldn't put it off for next year so that they could get this benefit of the wheel tax. So they're very upset about it, so I would like, I don't know where I can go where we can discuss a little bit something that we can make some arrangements for these people. Some said well, they'd be willing pay something, but they don't feel it's fair that now they're paying the full cost of the road, and next year they gotta start paying the wheel tax. And also some even requested to extend the payments 10 years would help them. There's different things that people have asked me for, so I would like to have some discussion on this that we can make some amendments to this. I don't know where to go, who I would bring this forward to.
- [Jim] I just wanna say look, I'm one of those people. I think that was all discussed. Are we gonna go back on this? Are we gonna go back six months, one years, three years, and I think the decision was to do a wheel tax effective, you know, this first reading, doing the third reading, go to the DOT in October, November, when you start registering your vehicles. So I think, I don't know what to tell you. I think we've been through this.
- [Attendee] Just for clarity's sake, we would not need to unanimously approve this again to be able to take up the issue.
- [Attendee] So the first reading is your opportunity to find out what, if there's any issues with it, ask staff to bring some amendments to it and really just get some of those basic issues out of the way.
- Amendments to it?
- [Attendee] But as long as you're not taking any action on it, you don't have to do anything to spend the rolls other than just to advance it to the third reading.
- [Attendee] There's a motion on the floor that's taking action on it now.
- [Jim] The motion's to advance it.
- [Attendee] Yeah, it's just sending it to the third reading.
- I still would like to say I support the wheel tax, I do because I haven't heard of anything in place so that that would help future road, people with streets. I do believe in the wheel tax. I'd like to vote to advance the wheel tax, but I'm just saying I have people a little upset that this didn't pass before, so that's my concern. I don't know what to do about it. Thank you.

- [Jim] Well, you have the ordinance, right? 1918, now you wanna amend it, I mean it's ... I don't know what you wanna do either. You have the ordinance. It's right in front of you.

- Right, right.

- [Jim] So let me go to--

- I would like to amend it, but I don't know if that's a request I could make now.

- [Attendee] The proper procedure would be to ask staff to look into specific items and identify some amendments--

- [Kathy] So write it up here and direct it to staff.

- [Attendee] No, you can just talk to staff directly. So this is already going to, it has to go to a third reading or it has to be--

- [Kathy] Right, okay.

- [Attendee] And so you can ask staff to look into some options for you. This way you have some more information when you are making--

- For the next reading?

- Correct.

- Okay, thank you.

- [Jim] Alderman Steuer.

- I guess the question I had on that, you know, as well as let's say for Webb Stratton you're talking about the east side of the road. Those buildings were razed, correct? I mean most of them, or will be. So the assessment, the special assessment are you talking about on the west side of the street pretty much? I mean those would be the homes that would be, I guess I would like to know what the assessment would be along the west side of Webster.

- [Attendee] No, it's not Webster, no. It's St. George, St. George Street and oh, what's the other one? Smith, it's Smith.

- Smith. All right, so I don't know if I could ask Director Grenier about that. I realize there might be some other monies coming in besides city for Webster Avenue, but I just wanted to know right now what that might cost. What are the special assessments let's say right now? I mean we haven't passed the wheel tax completely yet, but if this goes through, if we have to wait, what's the cost for the owners along Webster? Is that pertinent to this conversation or not?

- Oh, I don't know if it's pertinent or not, but those costs won't be computed until we're a lot closer to construction.

- [Andy] Okay, well I'm just seeing if there's anything out there that we can point our finger to on this.

- One of the differences that you will see, currently the way special assessments for pavement construction work, all properties have to be levied equally. But if there are city-owned properties, we don't levy an

assessment against ourselves. There's nothing to collect, okay. The way that this ordinance is written, if there are city-owned properties, the equivalent dollar value of what would have been assessed will be taken out of the wheel tax money and put into the construction fund. So we're actually going to be realizing a revenue stream on city-owned properties which we didn't realize previously. Following your logic, on a project like a Webster Avenue where fully one half of the assessable footage is going to be owned by the city of Green Bay, we now have a revenue stream to pick up what would have been assessed and would have been lost through special assessments.

- [Andy] That's good, thank you.

- So there's a motion and a second to advance item eight. And if you wanna use the board here. And that passes on a vote of 10 to two, so we'll see that next month, and Alderperson Lefebvre, there's gonna be some small amendments to it. Let's work on that. Okay. We're on to item nine. What are your wishes regarding item nine? By Alderman Scannell, seconded by Alderman Steuer. Alderman Scannell had pulled this. Go ahead.

- In talking with staff it would be very beneficial if we would suspend the rules unanimously and adopt this tonight, so that we'd adopt it after our first meeting. It wouldn't go on to a second or third. The reason for that is there are a number of items that are waiting to go on our agenda as the newly reconstituted protection and policy, and the quicker we could get to that, the better it would be. So I don't know that going to second and third reading really makes a bunch of difference for this policy. We're not really slipping anything past the public here. This is really for how we do our own business, and it helps ourselves here. So staff, I've been speaking with staff. I'm going to ask that we unanimously vote to suspend the rules, and then vote on just adopting this ordinance after its first reading here.

- [Jim] All right, there's a motion by Alderperson Dorff, seconded by Alderman Galvin to suspend the rules. All in favor of suspension please signify by saying aye.

- [Assembly] Aye.

- And those opposed nay.

- [Attendee] No.

- Okay, the rules aren't suspended, sorry. You wanna make a motion to advance.

- [Randy] I already did.

- Okay, so we'll go back to that.

- [Randy] Go back to that.

- All right, so there's a--

- [Randy] We'll go to the second reading then.

- Well, you could make a motion to suspend the third reading, so it'll go next month so.

- [Randy] Oh okay, right.

- So that's the motion. So there's a motion and a second on the floor to advance item nine to a third reading. All in favor of that motion please signify by saying aye.

- [Assembly] Aye.
- And those opposed nay. The ayes have it, so we'll see this in a month.
- [Kris] We're on to referral of petitions communications. We will not accept any late communications you may have. Alderperson Lefebvre.
- Yes, I have a request to Improvement and Services. Request to look at overnight parking. Example is I have a eight-unit apartment was approved with eight parking spaces only by the city, so they cannot have overnight guests, overnight parking on the streets for apartment units, special situation here. Can we make exceptions for this eight-unit apartment as the city approved. They should have known that there wasn't enough room for the parking, should not have been approved. Second one I was said yes, I should bring this to INS, discuss options for partial reimbursement for temporary waiver of wheel tax for residential properties that are paid road improvement assessments in the past three years.
- [Jim] In the past what?
- Past three years.
- [Attendee] Oh, the mayor likes that.
- [Jim] Well, you didn't give me a raise, so. All right, anything else? Okay, all right, wait, we're not done. No no no. Alderperson Corpus-Dax, Alderperson Dorff all have, Alderperson Corpus-Dax, wanna go to you?
- This is I guess referred back to council. Request for reconsideration of the council's June 19th decision of the report of the Ethics Board dated June 14th based on reading the opinion of a lawyer representing the Ethics Board.
- [Jim] Thank you. Alderperson ...
- We had addressed this once before that the way that the council has adopted it, I think it was Alderman Nicholson who had one that came, and then at the following meeting. And because the council has been operating in that fashion that you can reconsider at that next meeting, that's been allowed by this council. Again, it's stuff that we can change, but you've been doing it this way. That's an ordinance, not a procedural.
- [Jim] Alderperson Dorff.
- This is to Parks to consider putting in a baseball field at Red Smith Park at the request of the neighbors in the area.
- We're there. All right, hang on, you guys, we're almost done.
- [Attendee] There was a request for reconsideration a while back. I don't recall, I just remember there was a request for reconsideration. I believe so, I don't recall specifically.
- [Attendee] Reconsideration on ethics.
- No.
- [Attendee] No, it's been a long time. I don't remember, it was a long time ago.
- Hang on, we're not there yet.

- [Attendee] Last time this came up--
- Can you, this is a, you can talk to her about that. Okay, I need a motion, no no no. I need a motion and a second to refer all petitions and communications to the proper authorities.
- [Bill] Second.
- Motion by Alderman Scannell, second by Alderman Galvin. All in favor of referral please signify by saying aye.
- [Assembly] Aye. Now.
- [Randy] Motion to adjourn.
- By Alderman Scannell.
- [Barbara] Second.
- Second by Alderperson Dorff. All in favor of adjournment please signify by saying aye.
- [Assembly] Aye.
- And those opposed nays. Ayes have it.
- [Attendee] Whoops, we got somebody yelling.