MINUTES OF THE FINANCE COMMITTEE

TUESDAY, OCTOBER 9, 2018, 4:30 PM
CITY HALL, ROOM 207
AMENDED

A. ROLL CALL.

Present: Veronica Corpus-Dax, Barbara Dorff, Kathy Lefebvre, Bill Galvin,

Also Present: Ald. Mark Steuer, Ald. Brian Johnson, City Attorney Vanessa Chavez, Finance Director Diana Ellenbecker and Asst. Finance Director Pam Manley.

B. APPROVAL OF THE AGENDA.

Moved by Ald. Kathy Lefebvre, seconded by Ald. Veronica Corpus-Dax to approve the agenda. Motion carried.
Yes- Barbara Dorff, Bill Galvin, Kathy Lefebvre, Veronica Corpus-Dax, No- None, Abstain- None

C. APPROVAL OF MINUTES.

1. Approval of the minutes from the September 25, 2018 meeting.

Moved by Ald. Veronica Corpus-Dax, seconded by Ald. Kathy Lefebvre to approve. Motion carried.
Yes- Barbara Dorff, Bill Galvin, Kathy Lefebvre, Veronica Corpus-Dax, No- None, Abstain- None

D. REGULAR BUSINESS.

1. Update from staff on requested amendments to Claims administration Procedure ordinance (GBMC 7.01 et seq).

Moved by Ald. Bill Galvin, seconded by Ald. Veronica Corpus-Dax to refer to staff to continue

working on this. Motion carried.
Yes- Barbara Dorff, Bill Galvin, Kathy Lefebvre, Veronica Corpus-Dax, No- None, Abstain- None

2. Consideration with possible action on Notice of Decision from the US Dept of the Interior regarding the intent to take land into trust – Cornelius, Kestell, and Debenedetto parcels.

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

Moved by Ald. Veronica Corpus-Dax, seconded by Ald. Bill Galvin to go into closed session. Motion carried.
Closed session language was read by Ald. Veronica Corpus-Dax.
Yes- Barbara Dorff, Bill Galvin, Kathy Lefebvre, Veronica Corpus-Dax, No- None, Abstain- None
Moved by Ald. Bill Galvin, seconded by Ald. Veronica Corpus-Dax to return to regular order of business. Motion carried.
Yes- Barbara Dorff, Bill Galvin, Kathy Lefebvre, Veronica Corpus-Dax, No- None, Abstain- None
Moved by Ald. Bill Galvin, seconded by Ald. Veronica Corpus-Dax to have staff follow the direction that was given in closed session. Motion carried.
Yes- Barbara Dorff, Bill Galvin, Kathy Lefebvre, Veronica Corpus-Dax, No- None, Abstain- None

E. INFORMATIONAL.

Moved by Ald. Bill Galvin, seconded by Ald. Veronica Corpus-Dax to receive and place on file the report of the Finance Director. Motion carried.
Yes- Barbara Dorff, Bill Galvin, Kathy Lefebvre, Veronica Corpus-Dax, No- None, Abstain- None

1. The next Finance Committee meeting (Joint Finance/Personnel Committee) will be held on Tuesday October 30, 2018 at 3:00 PM.

2. 2018 Contingency Fund:
$86,366.39

F. ADJOURNMENT.

Moved by Ald. Veronica Corpus-Dax, seconded by Ald. Kathy Lefebvre to adjourn the meeting. Motion carried.
Yes- Barbara Dorff, Bill Galvin, Kathy Lefebvre, Veronica Corpus-Dax, No- None, Abstain- None

VERBATIM MINUTES.

- Alright, here we go.

- Okay, I'm calling the Tuesday, October 9, 2018 meeting of the Finance Committee to order. Roll call, starting with Alder Lefebvre, who's here. Alder Veronica Corpus-Dax?

- Here, present.

- Barb Dorff, here.

- Galvin, here.

- Galvin here, okay. Approval of the agenda.

- I so move that we approve the agenda.

- Second.

- By Alder Lefabvre to approve the agenda, seconded by Alder Corpus-Dax, all those in favor?

- [All] Aye.

- Opposed? Motion carries, approval of the minutes?

- Motion to approve.

- Motion to approve by Alder Corpus-Dax.

- Second.

- By Alder Lefabvre, all those in favor?

- [All] Aye.

- Alright, regular business. An update from staff on requested amendments to the Claims Administration Procedure Board. So, who's going to be doing that? I thought Vanessa?

- Joanne, are you taking that one or is that Vanessa?

- Oh, it's Kristen.

- [Joanne] It's Vanessa.

- Vanessa.

- Okay, I saw Vanessa 15 minutes ago and she said she'd see me here, so we might be just a minute--

- Going on to--

- The second item is actually hers also.

- It's also hers, so--

- Oh yeah, there's three, yeah

- I could give you a slight update, I know you had asked a little bit about--

- I did ask a little bit, let's do the Director's Report.

- Okay, let's jump ahead a little bit, just the 2019 budget, we are just in the middle of the normal process of the budget, the restraint that we are under this year is some tentative expenditure restraint and a levy limit that is capping how much we can increase on the '19 budget. So we have, we are trying to stay under that levy limit. All the departments have submitted their requests. At this point, the mayor has asked some personal reduction. This past week we've met with most of the departments. We will be rolling out the budget by the end of this week and by next week, we have to put our public notice, our public notification into the newspaper and we will be handing out budget books by Friday, October 19, so in the next week it's gonna be all rolled up and it'll be, the year's budget will be presented, available, and then we will be handing that at the Joint Personal and Finance meeting on October 30. Do you have any other questions on the 2019 budget?

- Do you know why our levy limit is so, so small?

- There's a couple things. The levy limit, the rate is calculated, it takes your last year's levy limit, so whatever levy limit we had last year and then it allows you to go up net new construction.

- Net?

- Net new construction, which means new construction less anything that you've raised or that you've torn back down, so for the city of Green Bay, ours is .98 this year, last year was 1.5, so there's a reduction there, so that allowed us to go up from 53,000,700 up to 54 three, so basically levy cut by about 550,000 on our levy limit, on a base of $53,000,000. Then there was a change to the personal property aid, so for locally assessed personal property for machinery tools and patterns, that has gone away. The state has made that go away, so to make us whole, the state has given us about $275,000 to replace what had come off of assessed value, which was less tax dollars coming in, so our levy limit allowed us to go up about half a million dollars, however, that 275,000 has been subtracted from levy limit. As the state gave us more money, they subtracted to the levy limit, so we could have went up about five to 600,000, now that 275 is reduced, that allows us about 270,000, $271,000 we can go up on our levy limit. Then there's other options, if didn't use all your levy limit last year, you can use that, however, we used everything but a thousand last year, so that's option number one. Option number two is you can use any levy limit that you didn't use for the previous two to five years before that. The only way you can use that and there was some available levy limit 'cause there was several years in a row that we didn't raise a levy but your current outstanding debt must be lower this year than it was last year and because of last year's bonding more, our current outstanding debt is higher than last year. Now that can be in one year if you buy the lesser, you know, you could turn that around and then the following year you could use that as an option. So that option is not available to us but then the third item's a referendum, which we've already missed the deadlines to go any farther with, so at this point, for the 2018 levy limit, we are capped at $270,000 increase.

- Okay so, did we see this coming?

- Did we see?

- Okay, we knew the law had been passed on the taxing the--

- The personal property, they took that away. I did not know and I'm sure almost no municipalities knew that because we have a league that has been working hard with the state to try to have them change their allocation and not have it affect levy limits. We knew they were gonna make us whole. They were gonna give us the revenue, which normally would have came through in taxes, now they were gonna give it to us as state aid. We knew that was gonna happen. It should have made us whole. We didn't know that they were going to also take that extra money, cap our levy limits by the amount that they gave us.

- So, they didn't make, I mean, it's like, they didn't send that out.

- They made us whole as in they gave us kind of one time money. Instead of coming through the levy, they gave it to you in revenues but it hurt you on the levy limit.

- But they took it away.

- They did take it away.

- Okay.

- They took the capacity away for you to raise more money, get more money from the other residents or the constituents.

- So can we use that $275,000? Can we use it as we would use it if we have been able to raise the levy limit? Are we looking at this as we really have a half a million, not 270?

- No, we can only use 275, our levy limit is capped at $271,000.

- Okay, where did that 275,000 go, that other 275,000?

- They handed it to us.

- They handed it to us.

- It went right into the general fund.

- What do we have about it?

- It's already in, yes, it's in our general state aids, we get state aids from many different line ends. We put that 275,000 as a revenue source. It's 275,000 we didn't have as a state aid last year.

- So we have that more money than, does that help our budget by having that more money?

- We already bumped it in, that is additional revenue, correct, that was added to our budget.

- And what was the second thing?

- The second item--

- If our debt was lower but it's not, it's higher.

- So, it's potentially a onetime thing.

- Well, it's ongoing, every year they're going to, whatever they give you for state aid. They use 2017 levels for personal property for this line item, this type of, this category of personal property and next year they're going to, every year they're gonna raise that number by 1% but that is gonna have the same impact. They're gonna continue to give us the state aid but it's still gonna be a negative on your levy, so it's not a onetime thing going into this, this is the first year it affected us but it will be, going forward it will be also--

- So we can plan for it?

- We can plan for that. Some of the other things that have happened, we talked about one time money. That in the last two years, we've used one time money. Last year, $800,000 worth of an appliance surplus. The year before we had one time money of a million dollars. We used excess, at the time, where we approve a budget at the time we've used them, so in both cases, that's almost a million dollars of revenue now that we don't have a source of revenue, so that's a million more that we're trying to make up and then, of course, expenses continue to rise with contractual increases.

- Okay but because our debt went up and that keeps us from using our three years of levy that we didn't use--

- Correct.

- Okay and then there was a third thing too.

- A referendum.

- It's too late for that.

- Okay, how come we didn't see this coming in time to at least consider the idea of a referendum or did we see it and we just weren't made aware of it?

- I had not preplanned, well, part of it I'm gonna back, in the past, the levy limit hasn't been a problem because in most cases we haven't raised the levy, so it's always been expenditure restrained, so part of it is we were just watching our expenditure restraint as we were building this year's budget because that wasn't a problem. When we went to calculate it, that's when I realized it was a bigger impact and that they subtracted this personal property aid off of it. I wasn't aware of that 275, that's only a small piece of it.

- Right, so let's not consider that, that's a small piece of this whole problem that we're facing. How is it we didn't see the need at least to discuss the possibility of a referendum?

- Probably just the spreadsheets were not calculated ahead of time, I don't know if I have a, just, I didn't look forward to that and building this levy limit worksheet.

- 'Cause next year, going into this, for next year's budget, potentially we could put on more debt, which would preclude us from using unused levy from the three years prior.

- Correct.

- We will at least be aware of this other law change that took some money away from us.

- So we could plan for a referendum?

- Again, should we not be looking every year at that, at the possibility something like this could happen?

- But the referendum, even if we chose it, got a referendum to use more dollars, increase your levy limit, that's now a negative on your next year, that gets subtracted to the next year. So, if we decided to go up $300,000 a year next year, that we do a referendum, that's now a negative on top of the follow year's levy limit. Anything you referendum above your levy limits becomes a negative for the following year. We only have a capacity of 270.

- So there's no way to get this money and it's for the short term.

- Well, you're almost forced to raise your levy every year almost to the maximum.

- Correct.

- And we didn't do that.

- And we haven't done it for five years.

- Almost all municipalities, no matter what conference, what meeting we go to, almost every municipality will always take their right up to the levy limit and if for some reason they didn't need all their expenses, they have created a reserve, basically they use capital instead of bonding for something, they would use a capital reserve or they would set money aside for some expenses. So, not using the levy limit has kind of, over time, has hurt us because it's made our number smaller and smaller, the capacity that we can take our levy up, as expenses continue to go up, some of your reserves came down and started moving some capital into bonding, those are just a lot of things, a lot of one time decisions, over time.

- And you weren't in charge, this goes back, what, six, seven, eight years?

- Yep, there was about five years that no levy increase was--

- I can't believe someone didn't explain the fact that if you don't raise this levy, I mean, I knew when we gave that million dollars to offset raising taxes, I was even quoted as saying we screwed ourselves. Last year, taking $800,000 wasn't smart either but I just can't believe someone didn't explain at some point in time that we painted ourselves into a corner. I guess my next question is, is there a possibility next year that we get out of this corner or are we looking at several years of suffering here?

- We're looking at a similar situation next year. If we can borrow less next year and if we can get our total expanding debt less than it was this year, so it could be a one year, by next year we could bring our old standing debt down from the previous year. There is a potential we can use some unused levy limit, again, like I said, we'll use everything this year, we've used everything from last year, so there's a potential that there might be, year three and four and five or four and five that we might have some capacity that we might be able to use with a majority vote, I think that requires a two third vote instead, I mean a two third majority bote. I think that's something that the council could have approved too.

- We're looking at less state aid for roads, the Greet Street Project and all that has been torpedoed.

- Correct.

- We're looking at an infrastructure for storm, sewer and related items that people are complaining about. We've got the wheel tags, thank god we did that.

- Right, that should be effective January 1st.

- But with all these needs out there, either we bite the bullet and we increase our debt, I feel like we're swirling the toilet than or else we, we just gotta bite the bullet and start cutting back services and other things that we're providing.

- Correct and that's what I think you're going to see this year, there are just some cases that positions have been either delayed or there might be a service or there's just gonna be some cuts in '19, which that might be a one time, that might get you enough that, well, we could start getting small increments that we can start getting back out of this hole next year, otherwise, will be very similar to this year's levy.

- Let me ask a question. So, what about, like a onetime use and I know our fund, I asked you about our fund balance and I know that it's low right now and I know that we're trying to make sure our bond rating is okay but we're in a pretty bad position and so and I know you can't tell me exactly how it might impact our bond rating but we could theorize, is it a percent of difference, a 2%, how much do you--

- I don't think a small use of applied surplus or a fund balance will change your rating that much because they already saved more loan, as our TIDs continue to come out, that'll help our bond rating. I don't think a little bit of a use of it, part of it is whether or not you want to, our internal policy is to stay between 17 and 25% of expenses. We have some unplanned expenses this year that we're going to pay out, that is going to eat up some of our fund balance, whether we may, toward this end of the year, we may fall to the bottom of that 17% if we decide to use, again, the more applied surplus that we may fall below that 17% but it could be a onetime thing and say that we're going to make some changes if we plan farther in advance that we might find a way to try to get ourselves back out of, I don't want to call it a hole but--

- Well, yeah.

- And a couple years from now, as the Mayor has said or someone else, if and when a TID would close, that's gonna bring some increment back to the tax dollars, but that's gonna be potentially two or three years away, like 2020, 2021, before our more profitable TID's gets closed.

- Then, let me ask you though, if we keep the debt down than we could have that to put back?

- We would have a little bit of capacity there.

- And the expenditure restraint, I was kind of reading more about that. There's that carrot we get, right, the million dollars?

- Correct.

- I mean, is that already included though, in the budget?

- Yes, the expenditure restraint on the money that we get in from expenditure restraint is already built in our budget and our expenditure restraint is not a problem, that allows, again, that uses also net new construction and it uses CIP, so CIP and that new construction, it will actually allow our expense to go higher than what the levy limit is going to allow this year.

- Okay, is it written policy that we don't go below 70%? Is it practice that we don't go below?

- It is a written policy. It's in our general fund policy but it is just a strong recommendation to stay within it and I could pull a copy of that down, that policy. It's just general practice to stay within there.

- Which is a good practice it just might be, this might be the one time we might have to think about doing it differently.

- Right.

- But I do understand why we wanna keep it.

- That is a possibility is to use levix and last year I think we used $820,000 of what we put into the 2018 budget of applied surplus. It depends upon how this year ends. If we run favorable, we won't have to use $820,000. If we run at budget, we'll use 820,000 of fund balance, 'cause that was already built into the '18 budget.

- Okay. I understand.

- I have a quick question, about the TIFs, I want everybody to understand, do we have any TIFs where the corporations or businesses have applied for the dark store exception?

- I don't know if it matters if it's in the TID or not. I don't think that has any impact.

- Yes, it does, yes, it was in the paper but the ones they listed I think were actual Green Bay but then you won't get all the tax payout.

- Dan, what were you gonna say?

- According to our assessor that we, unfortunately the city of Green Bay doesn't have, to date, we haven't been hurt by the dark store as much because the ones that they list right now are in the surrounding municipalities.

- I wanted to make sure, okay, good.

- Okay so, my understanding at the previous personnel meeting was the police department was down roughly, I think, 15 or 16 officers.

- Correct.

- Out of 194.

- That's where they're at right now, as they're trying to recruit. They've been currently recruiting.

- Well, they've never been at 194.

- Right, they just can't fill them as fast as they have

- Not only can they not fill them as fast but this city has a policy throughout all of the departments that we will delay hiring people for X amount of time because that's part of the only way they can make their budget.

- They have not been able to fill their positions. That has not stopped them.

- I understand that but they've delayed hiring.

- They've never been told not to hire.

- I'm not saying that. I'm not saying that.

- We've had this discussion with the the Chief, he has a different interpretation than what the finance has told them.

- In the meeting where it was explained to me here, okay, is that, as part of every budget, we understand that people are gonna retire or quit or things like that, so it is figured into their budget that this is going to happen.

- Correct, every year we have something called a department turnover.

- Right.

- For many years it was all just in a miscellaneous budget and it was right around 800, $900,000. Last year, we did bump it up, in total to over a million dollars of department turnover. A couple years ago, there was a decision to allocate it just to some departments, so it's in ballpark, so if the million dollars, what, 300,000 is the police's share, if through normal attrition, they, as a percentage of their budget, they have typically ran at about $300,000. So that's just through normal attrition. This is not planned. This is not telling them not to hire.

- But it is, it would throw a real monkey wrench into everyone's budget if nobody retired or quit during a calendar year.

- Yes. But historically, we have as trends, we can see that we have always, there's enough attrition that goes anywhere from 800,000 to a million dollars of vacancy, so it's just an allocation. There's no reason they have to meet that number. They can't go over what they budgeted for staff without council's approval or a department's approval but--

- But if we want them to have 100% of staff on the road all the time, it doesn't matter, police, fire, DPW, it doesn't matter, the only way to do that is anticipating people are gonna retire. They have people starting the day they quit.

- You have to over hire to get 100%.

- Yeah, you'd have to over hire.

- And there are departments that do that.

- Not in the city of Green Bay.

- Not in the city of Green Bay but there are departments I've talked to that do that.

- Okay.

- Now, my understanding too is the overtime budget, at least for the police department, has gone through the roof this year.

- Yes, their staff is down and they have, between their comp time and their overtime, they are over budget, yes.

- By quite a bit, if my understanding's correct. Now understanding too that to have all those officers hired that we're short, would still cost more than what the over time did?

- Correct but you're not paying benefits.

- Right.

- On the additional staff.

- Okay. Enough with the interrogation, I'm sorry if that's what it seemed like. This is, it boggles my mind that we're just finding out about this now and the fact that, do we have a plan or are we gonna be year by year, crisis by crisis or can we have a plan, a budgetary plan, city-wide, where, worst case scenario, best case scenario, how do we get ourselves out of this through good budgeting as quickly as possible? Okay, say worst case scenario, how do we budget our way out of this so that within two or three years we're actually starting to provide more services than what we are right now or what we've been all talking about, more storm sewers, better catch basins, more roads being replaced, how do we budget ourselves to the point where we can actually start thinking about doing that, 'cause right now it seems to me, the way you're talking, is we're gonna be cutting back some of these projects that we've been doing and then we're gonna be possibly cutting back on staff and other equipment purchases and things like that and so how do we budget? How do we think five years down the road? How do we think 10 years down the road and if things work out, hey, we've got a surplus. Okay, we don't have to raise the levy this year or we can pay down some of our debt, 'cause we're looking at a new police department, which seems to be to be getting farther and farther down the road, we're looking at more roads being replaced, we've got flooding and things, we've had several of these once-in-a-lifetime floods. So, is it possible to budget or set a budget plan for that?

- What I have started is a five year projection on both your levy limits and your expenditure restraint, so at least we know what our capacity is to go up, as expenses go up, we have to bring in as much revenue, if we can't do it by levy, we have to find other revenue sources to meet the 2% contractual salaries. We also are working on a combined CIP for the whole city, so right now, each department has their own little CIP, Capital Improvement Program and part of that is to bring it all together and then, in some cases, instead of each department figuring out what their priority is, maybe we need the council to help decide what are the overall city's priorities so that we're looking at, not all separate, to have it all has one combined CIP. So, at this point, all I can do it kind of do a five year projection on what--

- Well, not only a five year projection. I have a house and I just put a new roof on five years ago so I planned in 20 years I might have to get a new roof. I've got a motor vehicle. It's one year old, so if I take care of it, it should last me easily, 10, 15, 20 years but there's others things, I've got an older furnace, an older air conditioning unit, I have to constantly be planning, how am I gonna take maintenance and make them last as long as possible but how to replace them but on the other hand too, what if I want to do some improvements for my home, so how do I plan on that? So how do we budget, instead of just one year at a time, how can we have a budget plan that looks five years or more down the road?

- Okay, well let me just say that each time that the budgets came up, it wasn't the directive that decided on the budget. It was city council. We put ourselves in this position.

- Right and I'm certain--

- So no matter what great planning there is--

- What I'm asking for is guidance or can we get guidance so that we can make a more informed decision, well, absolutely, we're going to listen to it.

- Yeah, it would be good for us.

- But I think we have a council now that's more willing to listen.

- I think you're right.

- And I'm hoping that we can have some input that--

- Some guidance for this council that might help us make different decisions than past councils did.

- Right, if someone had stood up two years ago and said, hey, take this million dollars, don't raise a levy but you are gonna be paying for it two or three years down the road.

- I don't know, I think the decision would have been the same.

- Again, and she can make the best plan in the world for us and if we don't listen, we don't listen.

- And you're asking for a plan.

- I'm asking for some, I don't understand this finance thing and so I'm asking for her help in giving us some ideas on what we can do going forward and I understand the Mayor makes the budget but we need to have that input so that as councilmen, we're informed at this budget time, instead of looking for $50 here and 250 bucks here, we can actually look at some things to say, no, we can make some significant impact by doing A or B or C and then it's on us. You've given us your best advice and then we make that decision.

- So yes, part of that is long term capital improvement plan, as a citywide capital improvement plan that we've been discussing. We've been collecting some information to try and get that process started. That is something that I've heard from previous finance directors, several previous finance directors that that has not been a city of Green Bay type of thing as a long term CIP plan, so on overtime, all infrastructure improvements have all been put to bonding, they have never put that in a, or for many, many years has not been in our operating budget. Those are all things have eventually have to get back into your operating so you're not bonding for them, so that would be the long term plan is trying to figure out how to bring that back in but we have to find new sources of revenues because you're gonna, so part of it is maximizing your levy every year, that's one way of doing it.

- And there's TIFs and there's TIDs, I mean, there's all these things, I guess, that's what I'm looking for. You know, I can go to a financial counselor who tells me how to manage my money so I can look at a decent retirement or to pay for my kid's schooling or any of those other things out there, so, I guess that's what I'm looking for from your office is that, we've got this budget, we're gonna have to deal with it the best we can but I want some solid ideas moving forward that can give us some guidance, whether we choose to listen to it or not and then you can just say, hey, it's on you, that's fine, but, we have to quit doing this. Like you said, there hasn't been the will in the past to look long term for capital improvement projects but I know there's communities that pay for those projects through their levy. They're not having to do special assessments or any of this other stuff and they have programs and we need to start trying to replicate that process here.

- Correct and I like I said, it's gonna take time. It is a plan that I'm trying to get a planned approach to get out of this. It's small increments and I think, so that is what I will plan to bring back, try to give you at least a projection on some of these steps.

- One thing, can you try to get to someone else.

- I know.

- I'm sorry.

- I want to thank you for bringing that up. That is very important, what you've mentioned, we have to because you just can't, you can't go year by year anymore because costs sometimes, they just seem to be going up so much and you have to plan on some of this stuff, thank you.

- Corpus-Dax, do you have any questions on this?

- Not at the moment.

- Okay, thank you.

- So that is the end of the Director's Report. We can go back to regular business.

- Thank you very much. So, go back to agenda item one, which was the update from staff on requested amendments to the claims administration procedures ordinance.

- [Vanessa] So you had sent this back to staff for us to do some further research, specifically you wanted to know what other communities had been doing as far as relief fund goes.

- Relief fund, right.

- [Vanessa] And to remind you guys, there were two components to this potential ordinance. One was updating the claims administration process to change the makeup of the claims committee to include the risk manager and the paralegal, change the limit of authority from 5,000 to 50,000 to match both inflation and also the cap that we have for our lower level of claims and then, just make a couple of administrative tweaks to that one. Now, the second component was establishing the relief fund for people who were not able to, for who we had determined there was no liability cap on the city, creating a claims, not a claims procedure, a potential fund to help out those residents. So, we kind of went back, you guys had asked us and we tackled the easy one first, which is the claims procedure portion. You had asked for roughly the number of claims that we get every year. Over the last three years, we're averaging about 65 to 70 and most of those are much smaller in numbers. We are looking at a handful, really, in addition to what we do right now, problem is that we get a number of claims that come in that pertain to vehicles that are above that $5,000 limit, just cause anytime you have a motor vehicle accident, you know, cars are really, really expensive to fix and so especially if we have a super duty truck or something where just the side mirrors, we're looking at $1200, $2500 just to get those repaired and so, we can't get that threshold through as we would like to. Water main breaks and sewer backups, they're the ones that have potential to cause a lot of damages, the reason being is that that's usually ending up in basements and so if you have a finished basement, you have a lot of personal property in there, that can get really expensive really quick and then the other one is whenever we have some kind of hazards on the roadway, again, we're causing vehicles or people to get injured and so those are when we have those, so those are the ones that we're asking specifically for that.

- So, between 5,000 to 50,000, the entire amount and then you said, you talked about adding two people but you had also previously talked about adding an alder or is that off the table?

- [Vanessa] So, one of the questions you guys had asked, that I accept question from alders so that we could start addressing those, one of the questions that I received was whether or not it would be beneficial to add an alder to the Claims Committee. So, I did some exploring to kind of see where that was falling. There are generally four ways that it's set up for claims administration, as far as the committee itself. The first isn't a committee at all, it's usually a person, designated, so either the risk manager, city manager, more often than not, the city attorney, just makes those determinations and actually says, here's where we've established this liability versus not and then they settle those claims out to the designated amount. The second option is to create a claims committee, kind of like what we do, where it's all staff involved and then with those, you are, you're really allowing staff to just kind of take the lead and make sure that the recommendations are based on what is in the best interest of the city without any external backwards and forwards in that. The third one is putting on other persons from different departments and then having your finance, your risk and your law make recommendations to them, so it would be essentially like this. We would be coming to you, the Claims Committee, every month. It's usually made up either of members of the public, public officials, other members of the senior staff, like the fire chief or someone like that and then the finance and risk and while I would actually advise those two of the liabilities and then they would make that There's another one I forget, but those are the main components of it. So, with that, after I explained that to the alder who had brought it up, he was comfortable moving forward with the approach that we have, which is having a staff. Now, anything that you guys want us to consider, we can always come back and draft it that way, that's why we wanted to bring it to you now so that if there are any edits, we can get those crafted the way you guys want it to look.

- I'm satisfied with it, without an alder, I think it would be pretty tricky, especially depending on who's district things would be happening in. I think it would get real tricky.

- [Alder Johnson] For clarity's sake, I was that alder.

- Oh.

- [Alder Johnson] Vanessa and I had a dialogue about it and after hearing an explanation and alternatives I was satisfied.

- Okay.

- Thanks.

- [Vanessa] So, as far as the claims portion of it goes, unless you all have any other recommendations, that's what we'll bring to you next time is that ordinance with those changes recommended.

- I'm pretty satisfied with that. Do you need any action on that from us or just?

- [Vanessa] No, we'll bring it in to you guys and then that's when you vote. The second point is the relief fund. What our research has indicated is that nobody else is doing this. This is something completely new and it would be kind of establishing new ground. So, the only other, again, municipality we were able to find that had done something similar was Eau Claire. They had a water main break, I think it was last year or early this year, sometime over the winter and they were able to provide assistance to their residents in the amount of about $300,000 total spent and it was to respond to about 52 different homes. There were a couple of things that happened with that that they felt required the response, which was not only was there a water main break, it also caused sewer back ups, so they felt like there was a big issue with having homes with human waste in them, so they felt then a response was necessary. What they did was restoration costs only. They did not do any replacement costs whatsoever and they only allowed people $1,000 so that they would be able to at least get something going. Outside of that, every other municipality we reached out to denies claims and they leave it at that. So, this is something new. What we had looked at going or proposing is kind of mirroring the requirements that we have, we have loans in the Community Development, so with that, it would be based on not necessarily on your income level but it would be based on the damages that were incurred, the types of stuff that would qualify versus what wouldn't qualify, you have to have those clearly established, which we can do that, that's not an issue and then we would cap an amount. The amount that's been proposed to start out would be up to half of the response, no more than $50,000. So, for example, you have a claim of $100,000 that's been denied and somebody's saying that they're still incurring these damages, they would only be able to receive $50,000 from the city as half of the claim. We would exclude a lot of personal things and we would exclude anything related to businesses. This would be limited specifically to owner occupied properties so that you're not displacing people who have no other option but to stay in their home. Outside of that, we'd be really looking for direction from you all as to what it is that you want to see happen with this process, so I guess that $50,000 was kind of the starting point, the reason being is that there should be some shared expense, if the city's not liable, we shouldn't be the city who's bearing the full cost of something and we looked at whether or not $100,000 was unreasonable to get a house back to a habitable condition. The answer is no, $100,000, if you're talking about HVAC and your electrical and all this stuff that you have in a basement, it's entirely possible that you will hit close to or near that $100,000 mark, so it's a definite possibility but again, whatever you guys feel is appropriate, it's entirely up to you and what you want to include as far as the limitations is up to you as well.

- So what limitations have been proposed, just what you've said?

- [Vanessa] So, we would limit it to the type of things that would qualify for it, so rather than trying to help people with their personal property, we would be focused on trying to get them back into a livable house.

- Like a furnace? Yeah, that's HVAC stuff.

- [Vanessa] Yeah. And then the other stuff we would put on it, it would have to be audited. So it's not like we would just write a check to somebody, they'd have to actually demonstrate that they've incurred the costs and then the amounts that come back to the city would actually have to be verified that they were conducted by a certified professional and that they're up to standards. We have the home owner actually sign off on the work, this way there's no claims that it wasn't done properly. All those things that we do normally with the rehab loans, we would mirror those conditions as far as the disbursement policies go.

- And we have that person overseeing it from within the city then? I mean, there has to be, kind of an owner of this, with city staff.

- [Vanessa] We would have to identify somebody who would be designated as monitoring that process.

- And you would figure that out, you would figure that out.

- [Vanessa] We can figure out who would probably be best able to do that. I think that somebody who's already had some experience in the rehab loan process would be somebody to either tap as a resource or at least the starting point for when it first starts up.

- It's not like hiring a new position for this though?

- [Vanessa] I don't know that that was contemplated as part of this process.

- No, it would be just, 'cause these are, okay, so did we ever figure out how any of these happened in the last year or two years?

- [Vanessa] Of this magnitude?

- Yes.

- [Vanessa] This is a unique situation.

- Okay, so it's not kinda often.

- [Vanessa] Correct.

- Which is good. It happened because the main shutoff was frozen and it took a long time to get that so that they couldn't shut it off soon enough to minimize the damage

- [Vanessa] And there were several homes that were affected as part of this one, so you guys are aware this was the only one that was above the $50,000 threshold limit for claims anyways, the rest of them were probably in the 10 to 15 range and that's usually where most of the claims fall, even with the sewer damage, the sewer backups, they're usually around 20, I don't know of them having exceeded 30.

- So I think the hardest part is gonna be figuring out what limits to put on this. This is only good for the following things, it's kind of like a city, if a piece of city property is somehow involved in it but the claim is denied by the insurance company, then, so okay, so the city tree falling on the car, we denied one of those, didn't we?

- [Vanessa] Yes.

- And I'm not suggesting that that's one we put in but also, if the insurance covered it than we shouldn't have to cover it, right?

- [Vanessa] Correct. And for example, on that one, that would not qualify under this process because if we're limiting it to homes, to get them back into a habitable state.

- That, that's good. I like that narrow focus. I don't know, anyone else feel about that narrow focus?

- [Man] What about a vehicle?

- A vehicle is their business.

- Well, we're not doing businesses. Businesses are not part of it, it was homes.

- Owner occupied.

- Owner occupied home.

- Are they also claiming they had a daycare at home?

- Yeah but that doesn't matter because I agree that we cannot start going to businesses and I don't know how big we can make this but yes, they did have a daycare.

- To give you an idea of what Eau Claire had covered versus what they didn't, they covered emergency service calls, equipment set-up, take down and monitoring, after hours charges, removal of debris, cleaning of laterals, personal protective equipment, respirator and cartridges, fan and air scrubber, water and sand extraction, dehumidifiers, anti-microbial agents and sanitizers, floor cleaning and scrubbing, tearing out carpets, personal cleaning supplies, tearing out drywall, paneling and insulation at the water level, furnace and water heater inspection and repair and then up to a $1,000 actual cash value of personal property per household and then expenses incurred from professional service provider. What they did not cover was replacement of furnaces and water heaters, restoration, including drywall, insulation and panel replacement, carpet and flooring replacement, displacement charges, lost wages or labor and inclement expenses from a non-professional service provider.

- You can see where they narrowed it down.

- They really narrowed it down.

- Well, because the cost of a furnace is like $15,000.

- Right. But we'd only pay half, I mean, what we're talking about is paying up to half of whatever the claim is, I don't know, it's not even just what the claim is, right? Isn't it, half of 50, correct?

- Half up to 50.

- Half up to 50 but of, like a certified claim, it has to be?

- [Vanessa] These would not be claims that are eligible for, it's something where we deny liability, so they're not valid claims against the city.

- Okay.

- Where would this money come from, sorry

- Oh no.

- [Vanessa] That's the other issue is that the council would have to decide how to fund this.

- Are we on budget this year?

- Well, we passed it.

-but we passed it?

- I guess.

- Alright.

- I mean, there isn't going to be any extra money in the budget and that's another one where, but if we have to keep replenishing it then there's always a one time thing one could come up, how do we keep replenishing of this fund, we would have to put money, we could start with an amount and then we'd have to put money in each year, keep it to a certain amount and it all went back to the initial purpose because we are a community and we are made up of members of the community and this is something that seriously impacts, it could happen anywhere in the city--

- Through no fault of their own.

- Through no fault of their own and no fault of the city and yet there is no help.

- Well, it sounds what Eau Claire did and I don't want that, like she just read off, if we were to apply that to the current situation, how much would that cover and I don't expect an answer, we'd have to--

- They only granted people a $1,000 per home.

- To cover those items that you listed?

- So a lot of the stuff they were doing, they were out there helping, so they were doing in-kind stuff.

- What was the 330,000 for?

- [Vanessa] It was for the 52 homes.

- Right but if there's only $1,000 per home, that's 52,000.

- [Vanessa] Yeah but, so if you're looking at 52,000 and the rest of it was then doing their in-kind services.

- Removal of the debris, for the city to come in and pick up.

- And they had city workers doing that?

- [Vanessa] Yeah.

- Then they paid them overtime out of that fund or?

- Wouldn't that be similar to DPW during this last flood, they went out there and picked up--

- So then it doesn't come out of DP county's budget, it comes out of that fund to make DPW's budget whole?

- [Vanessa] Correct.

- I still wanna go forward with the fund but it's really gonna be up to council to decide if we're going to do it and how we're going to do it and where we're going to get the funding from and I think we certainly can't take it out of contingency, we used most of that up. Obviously, I don't think there's any other place to take it, other than the fund balance, which we don't really wanna take money out of but we might, that might be an area they might have to look at and then how much do we start with?

- [Vanessa] So, when I'm going back, so we can get this drafted to bring you guys something to vote on, which way are you guys leaning, do you like the concept of kind of administering the home improvement loans, the rehab loans?

- The first way you described it. I mean, I do but I don't know about the rest. We have nods. Okay. How 'bout Alder Steuer?

- [Alder Steuer] I'm listening to you folks, I feel good with that. I mean, as far as just starting off. Are you looking for a certain number right now or?

- Are you looking for a number right now?

- [Vanessa] No.

- No, we're just looking for a process.

- [Alder Steuer] A process.

- A process.

- [Alder Steuer] I feel good with the process moving forward on this.

- [Vanessa] And then as far as--

- I'm gonna say, Elder Johnson, did you want to weigh in?

- [Alder Johnson] Could you just recap the different options?

- So, as far as this goes, what we are proposing or what we've looked at, which we think is gonna make the most sense is to create a fund that kind of operates in procedures similar to the rehab loan, so obviously this is not a loan, it's more of a grant, but what it would do is we'd offer up to 50% of the necessary costs to recover from the thing and then we would list the types of exclusions versus what would be covered and what's not.

- [Alder Johnson] Right and I'm sorry and I caught that but you were asking which option you wanted the committee to go with?

- Yeah, as far as what are they, what we present as far as the loan set.

- [Alder Johnson] Okay, I'm sorry, the way you asked that, I was thinking there were options there, okay, I'm good. I just was a little turned around.

- [Vanessa] I apologize.

- [Alder Johnson] No, that's okay.

- Right, it's a grant, right?

- [Vanessa] Yes, it's a grant. We're setting it up similar to the loan program in the sense that--

- Grant, right.

- [Vanessa] So it's not, it wouldn't be a loan program, this would be, in the sense that you have to go through that audit process, afterwards we would make sure there's no, everything's being done by a professional and that those numbers all add up and whatnot.

- Were you hoping for more?

- What was that, looking for, I was looking for 50.000.

- No, no, but I mean, are you looking for, like in this particular case, which is unusual, have given them $50,000?

- I'm hoping to but I know right now their claim was at 92, it might have gone higher than that but it's not what I'm hoping to do, it will be via the process to see what it would be.

- And I guess, 'cause listen now, she's talked a lot like, for instance, what Eau Claire covered.

- Yeah, what Eau Claire covered is something I--

- But I mean, are you looking to list specific things that will or will not be covered or we're just gonna say carte blanche, here's $50,000.

- No, no, only the things that would be covered to make a house habitable, like what Vanessa had listed, the HVAC system, the, maybe mold re, what is that called?

- [Man] Remediation of mold?

- They're not replacing water heaters, they're not replacing furnaces.

- No, they might be replacing furnaces.

- [Vanessa] So what we proposed is different from what Eau Claire was doing.

- It's different from what Eau Claire was doing.

- [Vanessa] So Eau Claire limited theirs, what currently qualifies under the rehab loan program is what and it's what's necessary to bring a house back up to code.

- Okay, alright. I misunderstood.

- [Alder Johnson] Assets and you could have someone with a 20 year furnace that's ready to kick, all of a sudden you'll now be replacing 50% of it, so I can see why they excluded those things.

- In a way, Ken, the other thing, let's think about property taxes. This home, as it stands right now, is no longer worth what they were paying property taxes on, so I think part of that is making sure that we're keeping our taxes--

- I understand but we also have to, we have to be careful. I just want us to be careful, 'cause like Brian said, what if we're replacing a 20 year old furnace that wasn't even really working or barely working or was set to be replaced and we're paying for a brand new one?

- This is a really rare occurrence.

- Okay.

- And so--

- We've had rainfalls recently that were only supposed to happen once every 1,000 years.

- It's nothing about rainfall.

- Let's talk about our systems, our storm sewer systems and all this other stuff that we could potentially, look at the claims from all those businesses, okay, homes, the apartment complex and everything else, so we could potentially be looking at claims for all of these things.

- Could we be? I thought it was only for owner occupied homes.

- Right, well, there was an apartment complex that was emptied out by Green Bay Fire and they had to seat, staying somewhere else, some of them for two or three nights.

- [Vanessa] Well, okay, so if you guys set it up for owner occupied, apartments wouldn't qualify, however, there were a number of homes that were affected.

- Alder Steuer, you have something.

- [Alder Steuer] Yes, thank you.

- Do you want to come up so you can hear?

- Oh, sure. Who would make the determination as far as damages, is that the city staff or would it be somebody that you would bring in?

- That's a good question.

- The way we have it set up is this one would be administered entirely by the Finance Committee and then all those recognitions will be accountable, so staff wouldn't be the ones who are making those determinations as to whether or not these damages are appropriate. It would be--

- Oh, I thought that you were gonna have an inspector going out there.

- That's what I was thinking that we'd have some city staff go out.

- I thought when I talked to Cheryl Renier-Wigg about this that there was some involvement with her department being--

- Only on the backend, to make sure that everything was done properly.

- Wow.

- What about prorating, like you said, if water heaters, like a 20 year water heater, what if somebody would go in and say, well, you got five years left on this and it would be prorated, if you decided to replace that in any way. There's different ways of looking at it.

- And how old do you still have to replace it, an old furnace?

- But you'd get x amount rather than the whole thing.

- Would this loan program, grant program that we're going off, did they have some way where people could bring, when people bring in these things they get those monies, did they have like an insurance investigator sign off on it or did they have to bring some certified paperwork so they knew they weren't necessarily, some people could just walk in and go, oh, I need all this new stuff and bring in a written sheet.

- [Vanessa] So, we're kind of looking at a fusing of two different things. The rehab loan is administered differently just because it is loans that are being given out, so people have to justify it as part of their loan application but when you were talking about whether or not something's been damaged, then I think we can add something to say that they have to have gotten some kind of verification from somebody, whether it's an adjuster or whatever, saying that these are wrong but at the same time, if they don't have insurance, they're not gonna have adjusters.

- They're not, right. And if they do have insurance, they're not getting anything from this fund, so there won't be ever an adjuster, really.

- [Vanessa] And with this, we were, what Eau Claire did is they had somebody going into all of those buildings because they were helping them take all that stuff out and doing some of those in-kind services, so they were aware of what was happening in each one of those homes.

- Oh, so anybody who has damage like that, they would have a company, one of those remediation companies come in and they tell them, this is what you're gonna have to do, all these things, drywall off so high, molding out, your furniture's gonna go, this will go, they'll say, well, it's gonna be mold if you don't get it out, so they would have that, maybe that's what they would have to bring forward to prove that this is what the company said, all this had to be done. Alder Johnson?

- I apologize, just a couple comments, I gotta head to another meeting but one is, again, going back to the furnace and the hot water heater, there's no difference than if you total a car. I mean, insurance company pays out on the appreciated asset, so I don't see anything wrong with us maybe doing something for those types of things, figuring out what the average lifespan is of hot water heaters, 10 years, if it's four years old, well, we're gonna pay out 60% of the value. I'm sure insurance companies have some type of algorithm that works on that stuff. Thinking about this too, it might be worthwhile to include a minimum claim, so that way we're not spending a lot of time and resources on someone bringing in a claim forward that's for $500 and so, just I want to toss it out there, it's something to, I guess, bat around and then, if, in fact, then that we do have claims of merit and value, that might be worthwhile then, perhaps, having a process where we contract out a service, much like an insurance adjuster that comes out and says, this is the value of the damage and maybe that is something we ought to consider, is there a third party that we can contract out for a couple hundred bucks and then tell us what the actual value of the damage is and then the last thing that I will close with is I understand that there is a certain situation that is prompting the discussion around this issue and I think that this is a very important discussion for us to have and I'm fully supportive of it, I just wanna make sure that we are crafting a policy that's not directed at solving a particular problem and instead is taking a holistic approach that says, this is the right thing to do for our community and not that we're necessarily doing it to help serve someone that might already be predetermined to be a recipient of the support. So, it's certainly someone that could be a benefit of it but I think this needs to be a program that's gonna benefit our community as a whole.

- And let me ask one question, try to answer one question. So, if all of these would have gone through claims first, what does Claims Committee require as proof? Are there things that you guys require as proof?

- [Vanessa] So, we require them to provide proof of damages, so that means that they have to submit to us actual, either costs they've incurred or they have to submit a estimate they received from somebody planning to do the work. We also require pictures.

- Okay.

- [Vanessa] Rarely require actual affidavit saying yes, this is all in existence, then we go through and we investigate the claim as well to make sure that it's accurate.

- And it would have gone through claims first before it even would get to this fund, wouldn't it?

- Yes.

- So it would have all been investigated prior, so maybe that is a good thing to know.

- [Alder Johnson] Yeah and again, I'm just thinking about a third party expert, right, because I feel like gives us a little bit of a buffer too, so someone doesn't come in and say, oh, the city's just low balling me or something, I mean, it's--

- [Vanessa] The other issue that we've run into, not that I believe that everyone's going to be dishonest when they come in here, but we have had people submit claims, for example, for damages to their driveways, saying, you cracked my driveway when you were out here and then we pull up Google Earth and it's clearly been that way for three years, whereas we wouldn't have that available to us if we were doing people's interiors.

- [Alder Johnson] Adjusters exist for a reason. It protects, I mean, the rate payers really are for insurance companies and they think we're dealing with the same situation. We want to protect the tax payers of our city while still taking care of those that are in need.

- Right, do we have an internal adjuster at all?

- [Vanessa] No, we use our, so the claims committee does part of the investigation but we now have a third party administrator through Symnic who is responsible for obtaining all of that information and the claims investigation.

- So we could get Symnic to do that?

- [Vanessa] They will do this part of the

- I gotta go, thank you.

- Alright, thank you, Brian.

- So you're looking for direction?

- I think what approval really needs, so knowing that you guys are okay with kind of mimicking the rehab loan setup, what we are really looking for at this point is what kind of things are you planning to include versus exclude? Do you want to have it set up more like what Eau Claire did where they gave a specific dollar amount to somebody or do you want it set up where anything's game?

- Well, not anything but to make the house habitable as you had said and the ideas that Cheryl had when I talked with her.

- And not to exceed though.

- And not to exceed and I mean, Alder Johnson's idea about a minimum is not a bad idea.

- [Vanessa] Okay, what would you guys propose for that?

- Five, 10? What do you guys think? Five?

- Five.

- I was thinking 25.

- You were thinking 25,000.

- I was thinking more like 200.

- Alright, 10? We go in the middle? Okay, 10, 10,000. Yes, Alder Steuer?

- [Alder Steuer] Well, with this incident that happened, what was the amount that they were looking for, was that like 90?

- Well, that's so far the amount of the damages.

- [Alder Steuer] The damage?

- Yeah.

- [Alder Steuer] But you're saying with this, what we're doing here, if you did 50, it would tap it?

- We're talking about paying half of, we're never talking about paying up to, up to only 50.

- [Alder Steuer] I think I did hear you say that.

- Yeah, that's what we're saying.

- Okay, thanks.

- [Vanessa] Okay, so I think we have direction with that.

- Alright, so it'll go to this committee next and then to council or to council?

- [Vanessa] Yeah, we will bring it back to committee 'cause we want to bring you guys the ordinance with those ideas incorporated, make sure that's what you guys were, I mean, this is kind of complicated so we wouldn't want to just throw it to council.

- That's true, okay, thank you so much for working on this, appreciate it.

- [Vanessa] Absolutely.

- Alright.

- Item two.

- Do what?

- Item two.

- Yeah, item two. Yeah, so are we? What?

- Does that have to be received and placed on file? I make a motion that staff continue to work on this.

- Second to staff.

- Okay, second by Alder Corpus-Dax, all those in favor?

- [All] Aye.

- Opposed, motion carries unanimously, thank you. Okay, item two is consideration with possible action on notice of decision from the US Department of the Interior regarding the intent to take land into trust Cornelius, Kestell, and Debenedetto parcels. and would you like us to go into closed session?

- [Vanessa] I recommend you go into closed session for this.

- Okay.

- Move to go into closed session.

- Second.

- Do I need to read this now?

- We read it before we vote, right? Yes, okay, yes, you need to read it.

- The council may convene in closed session pursuant to section 19.85 by G Wisconsin statutes for the purpose conferring with legal council for the governmental body who was rendering oral or written advice concerning strategy to be adopted by the body with respect to litigation in which it is or is likely to become involved. Council may thereafter reconvene in open session pursuant to section 19.852, Wisconsin stats to report the results of the closed session and consider the balance of the agenda.

- Okay, all those in favor?

- [All] Aye.

- Opposed? We are going into closed session.

- Oh, we're starting earlier on the next one.

- Oh, sorry, that's me.

- He's trying to wake everyone up

- Okay. So, we're back in open session and I'll entertain a motion.

- Yes, motion that staff follow direction that we gave--

- [Vanessa] You need a motion to go back into a session.

- We already did.

- [Vanessa] You voted it?

- We did.

- [Vanessa] Oh, I'm sorry.

- But we did it in closed session. Do we need to do it in open session?

- Oh, okay, I make a motion to move back into open session.

- Second.

- Second by Alder Corpus-Dax, all those in favor?

- [All] Aye.

- Opposed, okay, we're back in open session. Alder Galvin, did you have another motion?

- Yes, my motion is that staff follow direction that we gave them in closed session.

- Second.

- Second by Alder Corpus-Dax, anymore discussion? All those in favor?

- [All] Aye.

- Opposed? Motion carries unanimously, alright. We already had the Director's Report. Now the next Finance Committee is going to be the Joint Finance Personnel Committee with city council, right? It's the Budget Committee.

- Correct, it's Job and Finance and Personnel of the Joint meeting.

- Joint meeting with council and that starts at--

- That's just the four members here.

- Oh, it is?

- Yep, we meet that one and that we use, you really try to hammer out a lot of the changes there and then it goes--

- Just with us?

- Just the four of you.

- Okay.

- Now, in most cases, we've had almost, the majority of the council--

- Okay, that's what I was talking about.

- In most cases you have at least 10 in the room.

- Have we always held it in this room or do we go in council chambers?

- We've done it in council chambers in the past.

- Yeah, that's exactly what I was thinking of, 'cause we were there and most of the council--

- You share the meeting.

- Right and most of council is sitting there, that's what I meant.

- Then it will be followed up with, the actual budget meeting will be on Monday, November 5th.

- Right, so this is usually the long meeting, right?

-, we should.

- 3:00, maybe we'll have food this time. 3:00 on Tuesday, October 30th, alright and we already had the Director's Report earlier so the contingency fund is at $86,306.39 and we didn't spend any tonight, which is amazing.

- Alder Steuer brought it to our attention that you didn't receive a place upon my Director's Report so maybe you want to make that all as part of that informational section?

- Sure.

- Okay.

- Motion that we received and placed on file the Director's Report.

- Do I hear a second?

- Second.

- Second by Alder Corpus-Dax, all those in favor?

- [All] Aye.

- Opposed, motion carries, receive and place in file. Alright, now I will entertain a motion to adjourn.

- Motion to adjourn.

- Second.

- Second by Alder Corpus-Dax, second by Alder Lefebvre, all those in favor?

- [All] Aye.

- We're adjourned.

- Alright.