MINUTES OF THE FINANCE COMMITTEE

TUESDAY, JANUARY 8, 2019, 4:30 PM
CITY HALL, ROOM 207
IMMEDIATELY FOLLOWING PERSONNEL

A. ROLL CALL.

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

Others present: Ald. Brian Johnson, Ald. Chris Wery, Finance Director Diana Ellenbecker, Purchasing Manger Rick Jensen, Police Chief Andrew Smith, Network Specialist Jason Bamman, Fire Chief David Litton, Police Capt. Jeremy Muraski, Deputy City Attorney Joanne Bungert, Assistant City Attorney Kristen Johnson, Assistant Finance Director Pam Manley and others.

B. APPROVAL OF THE AGENDA.

Moved by Ald. Bill Galvin, 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 November 13, 2018 meeting.

Moved by Ald. Bill Galvin, 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. Report of the Purchasing Manager.
1A. Request approval to purchase 46 Panasonic Toughbook computers for the Police Department from Baycom Inc for $205,252.
1B. Request approval to award a 5 year contract for Cell Phones & Data for Police & Fire to AT&T FirstNet for $645,000 ($129,000 per year).
1C. Request approval to award a 3 year contract for Cell Phones & Data for all City Departments except Police and Fire to Cellcom for $302,187 ($100,729 per year), plus two 1-year renewal options.
1D. Informational report that the City has entered into a 3 year agreement with Tradition Energy to

facilitate contract pricing for natural gas to achieve a projected savings of $33,500 per year.

Moved by Ald. Bill Galvin, seconded by Ald. Kathy Lefebvre to approve 1A. 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 approve 1B and 1C . Motion carried.
Yes- Barbara Dorff, Bill Galvin, Kathy Lefebvre, Veronica Corpus-Dax, No- None, Abstain- None

Moved by Ald. Kathy Lefebvre, seconded by Ald. Veronica Corpus-Dax to receive and place on file 1D. Motion carried.
Yes- Barbara Dorff, Bill Galvin, Kathy Lefebvre, Veronica Corpus-Dax, No- None, Abstain- None

2. Resolution authorizing 2018 transfer of $15,079.90 from contingency for expenses related to referendum questions from the last election.

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

3. Consideration with possible action on requested amendments to Claims Administration Procedure Ordinance (GBMC 7.01 et seq).

Moved by Ald. Bill Galvin, seconded by Ald. Kathy Lefebvre to hold until the next Finance meeting, January 29th. Motion carried.
Yes- Barbara Dorff, Bill Galvin, Kathy Lefebvre, Veronica Corpus-Dax, No- None, Abstain- None

4. Consideration with possible action to approve an ordinance relating to the establishment of a Relief Fund and associated funding sources

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

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

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

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

Moved by Ald. Bill Galvin, seconded by Ald. Kathy Lefebvre to approve the ordinance. Motion

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

5. Consideration with possible action on the Report of the Claims Committee.

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. Bill Galvin, seconded by Ald. Veronica Corpus-Dax to go into closed session at 6:05pm. Motion carried.
Ald. Bill Galvin read the closed session language.
Yes- Barbara Dorff, Bill Galvin, Kathy Lefebvre, Veronica Corpus-Dax, No- None, Abstain- None

Moved by Ald. Bill Galvin, seconded by Ald. Kathy Lefebvre to return to regular order of business at 6:20pm. Motion carried.

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

6. Update with possible action on status of litigation in Dustin Krueger-Dunow v. City of Green Bay.

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. Bill Galvin, seconded by Ald. Kathy Lefebvre to go into closed session at 6:21pm. Motion carried.
Ald. Bill Galvin read the closed session language.
Yes- Barbara Dorff, Bill Galvin, Kathy Lefebvre, Veronica Corpus-Dax, No- None, Abstain- None

Moved by Ald. Veronica Corpus-Dax,, seconded by Ald. Bill Galvin to return to regular order of business at 6:29pm. Motion carried.

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

E. REPORT OF THE FINANCE DIRECTOR.

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

F. INFORMATIONAL.

1. 2019 Contingency Account:
$112,076.00

2. The next Finance Committee meeting will be held on Tuesday January 29, 2019 at 4:30 PM.

G. ADJOURNMENT.

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

H. VERBATIM MINUTES.

- Can't wait to call the Finance Committee meeting Tuesday, January 8th to order. Roll call. Alder Galvin.

- Here.

- Alder Corpus-Dax.

- Present.

- Alder Kath Lefebvre.

- Here.

- And Alder Dorff, here.

- All right. Agenda.

- Motion to approve the agenda.

- Second.

- All those in favor?

- [Members] Aye.

- Opposed? Motion carries. Approval of minutes.

- Motion to approve the minutes.

- Motion made by Alder Galvin, second by Alder Lefebvre to approve the minutes. All those in favor?

- [Members] Aye.

- Motion carries. I want to mention that Alder Brian Johnson is also here with us and there were some other, there was another alder but he may have left.

- Chris has left.

- He may have left, okay. All right, regular business. Report of the Purchasing Manager.

- I have four items on the agenda to discuss, and I'll probably talk about item 1b and 1c together because they're pretty much related, but the first item is 1a and that's a request for the approval to purchase 46 Panasonic Toughbook computers for the Police Department from Baycom for $205,252. This was publicly bid. We received four quotes and Baycom was the low bidder.

- Are these for the police cars? And will it help, then it will, they will not need to leave the car running? Because my understanding was that other computers would drain the battery. Is that why we're getting the police new ones?

- I can address that, but Jason Bamman is really our computer expert. My understanding is that computers that we have outlived their lifespan and this was a scheduled reintroduction of new computers. I don't these are gonna change the leaving the car running thing. We've addressed that with extra batteries and some changes we've made to the computer systems themselves, but Jason is probably the smartest guy when it comes to that if you have any questions about, he's the right guy to answer them.

- Okay, Jason do you think? Come on up because my understanding is that they're not supposed to leave the car running anymore and I was concerned unless that's just a rumor, there was concern about the computers failing then if--

- Yes ma'am. Currently the computers that we have in place shut down once they get to a certain voltage level. So once the batteries, you know if they were to drain to a certain point then they would go into a sort of soft shutdown phase. That's gonna be happening with the same, you know with the new computers as well. It's just once they get to a certain voltage, these are gonna have better backup, the same way that the old ones do. It's just these batteries are newer. They're gonna last longer. Things along those lines. The big thing is with the secondary batteries in the new vehicles, Ma'am. That will allow for a longer run time without us having to worry about the voltage draining to a certain point.

- But the reason why we're replacing these is basically because the old ones are outdated--

- It's time.

- And they were starting to fail on us and this was a planned purchase last year.

- Yes.

- Okay, good.

- What do we do with the old ones?

- Oh they will get recycled sir.

- What?

- Oh they get recycled, electronics recycling.

- Take the stuff out of them and then go through them?

- Yes sir. I mean we'll continue on with the lifespan for whichever ones we have in place. We may have to do slight to better change of parts and things along those lines but then it'll be electronically recycled sir.

- And 46 represents the entire fleet?

- That represents the entire fleet plus one spare. So we have a spare in case one of the pieces of equipment breaks then we can swap that in place while it gets repaired.

- So we're talking like the CSIs?

- The CSIs have been replaced. We did those two years ago. These now are for the 43 black and white marked squads as well as we have two animal control trucks and then, 43 marked squads, two animal control trucks, and then that will leave us with the one spare.

- Okay, all right thank you.

- What is the general expense?

- Yes that's what I was gonna ask.

- These are gonna come with a five year warranty ma'am. So this will offer five years and then once you get past that point, the hardware and software are no longer supported. So anything that breaks, that's gonna be on us to, you know any additional cost for drive failures, for fan failures, things along those lines. That would be on us for that cost. Typically we go four to five years just due to the nature of driving these things around, going over bumps, being jostled constantly, we typically reach four or five years and we start experiencing hardware failures which is what we're going through now.

- Okay, any other questions?

- I'm good.

- Thank you. Do we wanna do these item by item staff or just take them all once? What would you like?

- You certainly can approve this one and then we can move one

- Okay, I'll entertain a motion to approve.

- Motion to approve item 1a.

- Okay, is there a second?

- Second.

- Motion by Alder Galvin. Second by Alder Lefebvre. All those in favor?

- [Members] Aye.

- Opposed? Motion carries. I just want to point out that Alder Chris Wery is with us, so thank you.

- I have not left the building.

- All right, the next item.

- Items 1b and 1c have to do with our wireless cell phone contract. We've been under contract for many, many years with Cellcom but there has been a significant change in the industry as it affects public safety departments and I'll have one of the chiefs explain that, Jeremy or whoever wants to explain it. AT&T Firstnet has a wireless service for Public Safety departments only. It's a dedicated line. Well they're gonna be able to explain it better better than I did. In a nutshell, what we're proposing and essentially kind of in the middle of testing equipment and et cetera is a signing a contract to AT&T for police and fire and then all other city accounts will remain on a Cellcom contract. Both these contacts are administered through the state of Wisconsin. The cost for both services are essentially neutral. They're the same. All of the providers on the state contract charge approximately the same rates, so many dollars per line, so much for data. So the cost doesn't come into play as much here as the significant change with the advent of a public safety network. So I'll let whoever wants to take take it from here.

- Good evening and Happy New Year to everybody.

- Happy New Year.

- I think the important part about this new network just stepping back a little bit of the history. I think it was five years ago the federal government recognized the fact that we had a radio problem in the country with interoperability, being able to talk with the neighbors and people of different frequencies and so forth and so on, and so the international police chiefs and fire chiefs basically got together and started pushing for the FCC to designate a bandwidth just for Public Safety. They went out and they went from a what's called a wide band down to a narrow band. Wavelengths, doesn't make a lot of, that really doesn't matter but they created space. They had a public bid on that for all the national companies and AT&T came away as the winner in that bid. Verizon bid on it. Cellcom is much too small to bid on a national thing like that but the major providers all bid and AT&T was the successful bidder. What's that do for us? Well in the immediate term I will tell you that it gives us priority and preemption. So what that means is is if you've ever been at field on a game day and you try to use your phone and you get that little thing that sits there and spins and spins and spins, what would this Firstnet program it gives police and fire personnel these devices priority in preemption. If it's too busy it will kick all of you off and put us on. It puts us to the front of the line and it's got a designated tunnel so to speak for Public Safety. So we did some testing with this out there this year after the system came out and it's not fully built out yet. They have five years under the contract to fully build it out across the country, but we did do some testing here in the city and we sat our Cellcom phones right next to our AT&T phones that we were using as demos. We sent the same document. The document on the Firstnet or AT&T system we got almost instantaneously and while the Cellcom one sat there and spun for like five minutes and we still hadn't got it at that time. And that happened numerous times over the last seven or eight weeks of the season that we were out there. I think one of the bigger things it's cost neutral as Rick said before. I think one of the other things that down the line, they're gonna build out what's called push to talk and at some point not immediately, but at some point down the road we may be able to eliminate our portable radios that we're using. So Motorola charges you know $6,000 a portable radio for us to be able to talk on a 700 megahertz digital system. At some point down the road, two, three, four years down the road here we may be able to, that's kind of what they're kind of guiding us to be able to eliminate those costs both of the police and fire department. So that's a huge potential savings there for both of our departments.

- Would you have like, you had said instantaneous communication are you still have to dial the phone?

- No, it's basically push to talk so it would be just like pushing our radios. It'd be the same thing only we'd be using cell phones.

- Good.

- And they got some ruggedized cell phones that are out. The technology is gonna get much better over the next several years but there's that potential cost savings out there as well. I think that's really kind of the biggest thing that you know all of our special events that were operating at when things are very busy in the city. This gives us the ability to immediately talk to each other. It gives us the ability to immediately get documents back and forth. It will give us the ability to get to the live feedback from drones if we deploy a drone for crowd control measures, if we put it up in the air and looking at what crowds are doing and those kinds of things. Looking at fires from the sky, all those kind of different things. The police are doing a hunt for somebody, we're gonna be able to get an instantaneous feedback on the system.

- With the system, not the future--

- Right now.

- So right now Fourth of July fireworks, we would put a drone up, every officer could access that drone I guess if they're allowed to?

- I'm not sure how that all will work as far as every officer but I know the command center will be able to pull it in on their screens and they'll be able to--

- And they'll be able to communicate by phone if they need to go over a secure channel so to speak?

- Yep.

- And this 29,000 extra a year compared to the Cellcom is because there are more phones involved or?

- Rick I'm not sure about the money on that.

- I'll answer that. That comes because we have a number of officers that still carry the traditional flip phones and those are just under voice contract. They don't come with any texting or any data. So to go to that data and texting contract that's $40 per phone and that's where that extra fee comes in because it's more expensive to get that data plan than it is the standard voice. In order to access that capability, you need to have a smartphone.

- For a while officers we're being allowed to use their own cell phone. Are we now issuing a cell phone for every officer?

- Yes, each officer will be issued a cell phone.

- So that is an apartment phone?

- That is correct.

- And all the other stuff that goes along with it will apply to those correct?

- That's correct.

- Are there gonna be allowed to carry their private phones with them?

- That I don't, is that it?

- [Rick] Yeah they'll be able to still use carry their private phones with them while they're working in case of an emergency from family whatever, but they'd be expected to use the city phone for all city things. For instance, documenting crime scenes, making date recordings, photographic evidence of anything, all those types of things will be done on the city phone.

- So it becomes our searchable?

- And along with that we also did include in our pricing structure a ruggedized case for it because obviously police are out in all kinds of weather as are firefighters so we wanted to make sure that they're protecting the city's investment by having good ruggedized cases on all of them. That will be mandatory as well.

- All right, thank you.

- Any other questions? No, we'll entertain a motion then.

- I make a motion to approve item 1B and 1C together.

- Second.

- Okay motion by Alder Galvin. Second by Alder Corpus-Dax to approve 1B and 1C together. All those in favor?

- Aye.

- Opposed?

- Motion carries.

- Item 1d is really just informational reporting that I met with Finance. I was contacted by a vendor that provides energy audits and long story short, this vendor provided an energy audit for the city's natural gas usage and because of their expertise in the industry, they can affect a savings of about 33,000, 33 to $35,000 per year over our current rates. How does that work? We gave our account information. So all of the facilities, we all are assigned a separate account. We provided all that information to Tradition Energy.

- Just to clarify it's all of our information from WPS?

- Yes.

- All of our accounts at WPS.

- And Tradition Energy worked with WPS and analyzed all this data. This type of savings doesn't affect WPS. My understanding WPS makes their money on the transmission of the natural gas. They don't mark up what they pay for the natural gas. They make the money on their transmission lines if that's the appropriate term. Tradition Energy did a bid with natural gas as the commodity and they were able to reduce the cost per decatherm, whatever that is. I don't know if that's a pound or a cubic yard or what a decatherm is but reduced the average cost over three years from $4.20 to $3.50, and that's a about a 20% savings. This company, I check the references. They are a member of US Communities which is a National Property contract that we've used in a number of cases. So and then we brought them in for interviews with the finance department and we also had the contract thoroughly vetted through the law department. So the good news is that over a three-year period of time we'll save a little over $100,000. The only downside is that the contract won't start until November of this year because the WPS have contract commitments that have been in place up until that time. So I guess what I'm doing is just reporting that we've entered in this agreement with Tradition Energy to reduce the price of natural gas throughout the city.

- So just a motion to receive and place on file? Would that be appropriate?

- I would think so.

- Okay motion by Alder Lefebvre.

- Second.

- Second by Alder Corpus-Dax. All those a favor?

- Aye. - Oppose? Motion carries, all right. D2, resolution authorizing the 2018 transfer of $15,079.90 with contingency for expenses related to referendum questions in the last elections. Staff.

- Back in on September 11th our finance committee we did, the committee had approved to use an estimated cost for $15,000 for the referendum cost. At that point we said do what use contingency and we said we'd also bring it back to the committee once we knew the final amount and then we take your resolution. So this is really a follow-up to that September 11 finance which went to the council on the 18th of September.

- So then it just has to go back to council again then?

- Right, the resolution will go to the council next week and again with the estimated cost it would be $50,000. We have aline item invoice from Brown County and that's where the 15,079.90 came from.

- Okay, any discussion?

- Motion to approve.

- Motion to approve by Alder Galvin.

- Second.

- Second by Alder Corpus-Dax. All those in favor?

- Aye.

- Opposed?

- Motion, did you say aye?

- I said I because it's already done so.

- Okay motion carries unanimously. All right, number three. Consideration with possible action on requested amendments to claims administration procedure ordinance GMBC 7.01 et seq. Staff.

- I'm gonna turn it over to our legal team.

- [Attorney] So this draft is really relating to the claims administration process. I believe it was previously discussed in detail by City Attorney Chavez back in August with the committee. So it's the same version that was discussed before. It's just an actual draft ordinance format form if you need to review. It has to basic changes. It's changing the level of the financial level of authorization from 500 to 50,000 to better and more expeditiously settle claims and it also changes the makeup of the claims committee structure by adding in the risk manager and a paralegal.

- I remember the discussion. That's what we asked for. Yes.

- If you look at the Relief Fund I think we got a conflict because here says that the claims settle all claims, everything and then our Relief Fund we're saying that we are going to if it's denied from the claims that we are going to make a determination on payments. I think there's a conflict.

- So between the two the Relief Fund are not, the Relief Fund would not be applicable to claims. So these are claims, essentially claims that are denied that would qualify within petition for funding or relief assistance from the Relief Fund.

- But in the Relief Fund it says if the claims committee denies it comes before us and we can make the determination. Here it says that the claims committee makes the final decision.

- It's a different--

- So I'm just-- I just want to make sure that is clear.

- It's a different source of funds

- It's a different source of funds.

- Right.

- It has nothing to do with--

- So the claims committee--

- [Attorney] Right, the claims committee is making a determination as to negligence and liability and the amount that it should be settled at or whether it should be denied based on the fact that the city is not negligent in any way or there isn't any liability assessed to the city.

- I can't remember does it state that, that's the negligence and all that in here? Would it have to be stated in this one?

- [Attorney] It stated a claim filed under state adoption of state law which it provides of 7.01. State law provides the procedure on how you file a claim against a municipality for property damage.

- So that would cover it then?

- [Attorney] Yes.

- Okay, I just wanted to make sure because we're not gonnaand I wasn't sure. It sounded like a conflict.

- [Attorney] Sure.

- Okay, any other discussion? Alder Wery.

- Thanks. Happy New Year.

- Happy New Year.

- It's good to be going again. My apologies if I missed maybe some of the details of the earlier discussion but initially whose request was this? Was it an alderperson or was it staff?

- I'll be honest with you, I don't recall.

- I was gonna say originally then to change the claim ordinance was to change it from the 5,000 up to 50,000 and add two additional people. That was by staff correct.

- So made by department heads?

- Yes and Vanessa, Attorney Chavez.

- And why the change?

- Well, I think that when we looked at the claims as we're doing the claims every month that we needed to give more latitude to the claims committee because so many were coming here that were just of the smaller amounts and so that's, it's really that that they're adding someone to the committee and giving that committee some authority over large amounts.

- What's the most right now that a claim can be for the city? It it 50,000?

- [Attorney] It's 50,000 for personal injury are property damage not involving in a motor vehicle accident. So if it involves a car accident and so their injuries or property damage sustained due to an accident, a car accident then that cap is 250. Those anything above a 50k would still come to the finance committee for approval.

- Have we studied what other cities do?

- [Attorney] I believe City Attorney Chavez did look into that and based on what she had reviewed, those were her recommendations. It increases the 50,000. Because of that increase also add additional people to be part of the makeup of the claims committee to add in their review and assessment.

- That sounds well certainly a good part. Just in my review of other cities, that's quite the change going from $5,000 all the way up to 50,000 which is a max for probably the majority of our complaints I would think. You know if you looking at Milwaukee much, much bigger than us theirs is 25,000 that the committee it goes up to without approval of the city council. Janesville is 5000 and then the city council kicks in after that. De Pere everything runs through the De Pere City Council. Ann Arbor is 5,000. I didn't have time to Google everything to dig quite deep, but there's an example of a lot of cities see value in keeping the city council involved in these decisions. Otherwise you're cutting them out. I think it's our responsibility to hear appeals on some of these larger ones. You know maybe double it to 10,000 but I think we should stay involved. Otherwise really there's no appeal to us whatsoever. We'll come right out I think it denies citizens the right to appeal to their elected representatives. We're seeding our authority to an unelected panel for a pretty important part of what we do. So I will just urge denial of the request, sending it back to rewrite or just change 5000 to 10,000. Maybe keepor whatever. I think 50,000 is too much.

- That is a lot of money. Isn't it for the departments when they are requesting equipment or different things? What is that amount? Wasn't that--

- It was recently changed to 25.

- We changed that to 25?

- Yeah.

- So now we're going 50. That seems kind of high.

- But you know what I would like to do is maybe see if we can, I mean maybe we can't wait. But if we can wait until Attorney Chavez because she did so much research on this, just to hold this to the next meeting.

- Will she be back for the next meeting?

- [Attorney] Yes, she returns on Monday.

-

- Oh okay, I'm sorry.

- [Attorney] Yes, I will happily be handing this all back.

- How would you guys feel about?

- I have no problem with it. I make a motion that we wait until Attorney Chavez can address some things.

- Okay motion made by Alder Galvin.

- Then I'll second

- Should we just say date certain or til you know?

- How about--

- January 29th is our next meeting.

- Okay January 29th.

- Because you're not asking for large changes. You're just asking whether or not she would consider a different amount other than--

- I'd like to hear a little bit more about why that amount was chosen too and I don't remember because it's been a long time. So okay thank you Alder Wery. All right all those in favor of holding this till the 29th?

- [Members] Aye.

- Opposed? All right motion carries. Item four. Consideration of possible action to approve an ordinance for relating to establishment of the Relief Fund and associated funding sources. Staff.

- Yes so staff has finalized the draft ordinance which you have in your packets. It should implement all of the discussions and recommendations that have been made by the committee and by staff and ACA Johnson is here to answer any specific questions you have about the structure and language of the ordinance itself.

- I have a question on the uninhabitable. Some residents had contacted me to--

- Alder what section of the ordinance is that?

- Oh, I'm sorry. It's the, okay number one. Okay this talks about the uninhabitable. What do you mean by uninhabitable because their basements were flooded and you know it was excess rain and that but then the power went out and they had, the basements were coded that they could have bedrooms down there, you know family rooms and that. Well, they're upstairs is habitable but they're downstairs was not. So how do we? How is the determination on?

- [Attorney] Regularly determines whether or not homes are habitable. So they would likely go in and make those determinations. It's electrical systems, plumbing systems, things like that, big ticket items that are damaged it makes the home basically unlivable and you know that's, it was a lot of back and forth over what you know we were gonna recommend should be covered and shouldn't be covered. I know you guys are going back and forth a lot with City Attorney Chavez about this Relief Fund. She's done a lot of work on it. It's something that's unique to our municipality if we were to adopt it and the main reason that we structured it the way that we did is because we have to state a valid public purpose in order to use public funds. In the public purpose we were identified for this Relief Fund will be for protecting the tax base, trying to ensure that homes do not remain in a state of disrepair. You know so we would recommend that it shouldn't cover things like damages or furniture or somebody has, things like that but basically just returning the home to a habitable state so that it's on the tax roll and people are living in it and the citizens are well taken care of but we would have to limit it somehow and you know it is a draft. We don't know exactly what that would look like but we're open to suggestions and then we have to kind of figure out along the way how it's gonna work.

- These people these people had their, you know their furnaces were down and different things like that but they were still able to live upstairs parts. So you're saying actually what you got here uninhabitable, you're saying well they can live upstairs but--

- No, I think what she saying is that an inspector, our inspectors will determine whether it's habitable or an uninhabitable.

- Even if they have damage downstairs

- That would be I think and inspection issue.

- The wording it kind of throws me off on that.

- Right, and I understand that.

- Usually when there's damage done, say a vehicle drives into a home or tree falls on it, the city inspectors are called out. They'll inspect that site and make a determination whether they can live in there or not. If not they'll give him a list of what needs to be done before they can return and live in that. So you know if it's the middle of winter and the furnace is flooded and it doesn't operate any more, I could see where that would probably fall under such a situation. It's the middle of summer you don't need the furnace. Again so but--

- That's what happened with these people. So would they be qualified, would they qualify?

- No, well again it would be up--

- It would be up to whether the inspector said it was uninhabitable and I think we need to leave it up to an inspector to determine that.

- The health department could get--

- The health department could get involved.

- [Attorney] Now if I could just interrupt. No matter what time of year is it it has to have a working furnace, a working AC system, working electrical, all things like that. So they typically wouldn't say--

- I just want to make sure that they wouldn't be you know left out from this because they could live upstairs because this is--

- But according to the legal definition.

- They will look at the home as a whole.

- Okay as long as that's--

- My concern what this is as I'm hearing you have a constituent that had flooding. I have one that had flooding because the city pump is not operating and they have plans to replace it but in the meantime the basement flooded. City comes out with a pump, the pumps out because it's a low lying area. The city brings a pump over every time it rains heavy but it still doesn't prevent the basement from flooding so we kind of look at this one incident on Humboldt Road but how much more is out there they were not aware of and how much more could we be liable for and how much more what the taxpayers be footing the bill? I've had people tell me you're running a business in your house, do you have insurance to cover the business being put out of operation? Is that their responsibility? You know I mean so there's things like go fund me pages that you see plenty of people are using nowadays and I feel for these individuals in this case. I feel sorry for anyone who has flooding but when you start looking at because of city services. Well what constitutes city services to some extent and so I've, I think, I understand what we're doing here is the intention is good but I think we're opening up

Pandora's Box. It could be down the road haunting this community pretty deeply financially and I have some greater concerns about this moving forward.

- Any other alders want to comment on this?

- Can we open it up to the audience?

- Yeah I was just asking if there are any alders first.

- Because Nancy, I forgot. Do you want to?

- We don't need to talk.

- You don't want to, okay.

- Okay, I think one thing to that they're a little concerned about that they will bemaybe. That you're going to look at the funds from--

- Where are the funds gonna come?

- We have not established that.

- And I have never personally heard it said that the water utility would be paying for any of this so I'm not sure where that came from but--

- They just want to make sure that, right.

- Because people talk about it besides us but--

- The PSC has specific rules that they cannot take ratepayers funds to pay for any of this.

- I think in the August meeting there was a suggestion whether or not the PSC would think about putting more money in their rates to help pay for water damage. If that was a recommendation or suggestion and at that point-- At the water utility and be whether or not that was something that we'd consider and that as a result we got a letter back saying that they're not able to do that.

- In this, in the ordinance I noticed there was a part about all insurances but is there and I can't find it but we had said that there should be something that in there that this would only apply if there was no insurance.

- There is a section.

- I'm sure it's in there. I just can't find it.

- Yeah it was but I don't know where the heck that was.

- I just wanted to make sure, sure, sure.

- It does say in here somewhere. Because we talked about it.

- I believe it's Section five, Section three. Section three, yes, sub c other revenue sources available to the property owner. Relief is unavailable and instances where insurance coverage is available.

- Okay I just wanted to make sure that was in there, okay.

- [Attorney] And again you know we tried to cover all of our bases but we were kind of starting from scratch.

- Right is there anyone in the audience that would like to speak to this? Well I just, we'll vote to open the floor. Okay, okay who'd like--

- Motion to open the floor.

- Motion to open the floor by Corpus-Dax and Alder Galvin. All those in favor?

- Aye.

- Okay the floor is open. Please come up and state your name and fill out one of the cards if you'd like to speak. And your address.

- Guy Zima, 1121 12th Avenue, Green Bay. You know I think it's important that we create some kind of emergency Relief Fund. I mean they're all kinds of situations that is not the homeowner's fault and yet they're suffering big losses. I can think we have an antiquated sewer system. I'd asked for a study some time ago and they estimated 50 to 100 million dollars to correct all the problems in our sewer system. Yet there are places in my district that water backs up when we have heavy rains so much so that it passes over the window wells of people floods their basement, causes them a lot of damage to furnaces and stuff like that through no fault of their own but because we have an antiquated system. So I think that we should have some kind of an emergency Relief Fund. We can maybe even make a 401c contribution where citizens could even contribute to it.

- That's a great idea.

- But I think at the very least we should look at this these hardships. In the past, with the Tif projects, we used to look at hardship. Hardship used to be a reason to recapture taxes to use to satisfy those hardships. I think we should look into creating you know some kind of ordinance where taxes could be credited from that property until such time as the damage has been recuperated for where we determined that there's been you know an emergency that was no fault of the people, and I think we have to trust these things. I mean I know people have abandoned their house because of the damage that was done. They just couldn't afford to overcome it. They had to abandon it and then it falls in a blight on the neighborhood, the city usually gets involved somewhere with the condemnation or something like that. We should be able to do something. Let's start to get creative about helping people when they need help when it's no fault of their own, whether it's helping with private collection to aid or whether it's to recapture some of the taxes just like we do with the real big operators.

- Would you say though that if it was covered by their insurance then that would--

- Oh this would have to be outside of insurance.

- Outside of it, just like we have.

- Oh yes.

- Outside of it, they wouldn't have any other place, the Relief Fund.

- Insurance, sometimes acts of God aren't covered,

- Yes, exactly what happened.

- Et cetera, but it would be outside of insurance of course.

- Okay, thank you. Anyone else would like to speak?

- I don't really have much to say since I feel like I kind of said--

- Could you say your name and your address please?

- I'm Brooke Sorenson. I have a house was the one that was flooded due to the Humboldt Road water main break. What's that?

- On Gregory Street.

- Well yeah, the water main that broke was.

- Right, I just need your address.

- Oh yeah, 3152 Saint Gregory Drive.

- Thank you.

- So one month from now we're almost a year, a full year to date where we've been living in completely terrible circumstances. Well everyone else has really good dry, mold free, healthy living space. Is this something that's our fault? No, but it is what it is. I believe the consistent foot-dragging on the part of the city is an attempt to get me to wait to litigate until our claim time expires and I know that insurance a speck was brought up which they're, we didn't have that option. So I don't know what else to say about that and I know the uninhabitable. I get that you said yeah it's a split level home so thankfully our bedrooms are upstairs but it wasn't just downstairs. I mean two floors of our home or completely gutted, gutted completely and that my, yeah I get it, my job didn't matter or whatever. Did home daycare but not only did the basement and the lower-level flood but when all that, so okay the house is enclosed, obviously it's winter so our furnace was completely submerged. So you know how cold it gets here in the winter. I have a little girl. I didn't have her there for three weeks. I'm not gonna have her somewhere where we had no water, no heat, no hot water. How do you live like that? You can't shower, bathe. You can't make any food. I mean she's sick enough already. I don't need have her continue getting sick which is another issue because now my husband is suffering from fungal infections in his lungs which I can put money down that it probably has to do what's the amount of mold that we're living in everyday for the last year, which I think is unfair. So yeah if you ask me, it's uninhabitable because even upstairs. I know there was one day, this is probably a couple days into it, we had people over, restoration, helping and they had all the blowers and stuff running and I went upstairs to change my shoes because everything is so wet. I took my shoes off and the carpet in my bedroom was not just damp, like pretty darn soaked because all the walls even inside my picture frames you can see that everything got wet. The entire house was wet so it's not just the basement and the lower level that was physically underwater that was damaged. My whole house was wet. My daughter already has respiratory issues and this is done nothing but made it worse and I'm pretty sure that any of you that have kids would not like to be in my boat seeing her gasp for air, constant nebulizers, inhalers. She was three. She's four now but it's a chronic thing and it's just gonna keep happening and sadly the one thing I want most is to get out of the house, get out of this city and we don't have it have that option. We couldn't sell that house to sell save our soul. Who wants a home that everybody knows it's been flooded. I mean 50% of our home was under water and I mean electrical panel was under water. We've now replaced that furnace twice since the flood so we can't make, we can't even begin to start fixing it because we've already lost so much and spent so much money on the necessities we had to replace. We have loans everywhere. I get that nobody wants to take responsibility because it's a lot of money but but how would you feel if it was your family's life, health and well-being constantly and again it just keeps getting pushed off. There's more important things. I get it it's a big city you have a lot going on but do you really, everybody knows about this and everybody can't just believe that nothing is being done about it. It's making people run away from Green Bay. We're a young, new family that came to Green Bay and all you're doing is scaring us away. I would not recommend people to move here after what we've been through. I mean this was supposed to be a starter home and now all I see I'm stuck in this home for the rest of my life and that's not fair. I think if it were your families you would not wish that on anyone. I know I got off topic but it's kind of hard not to. That's all I got.

- Thank you Brooke. Anyone else like to speak to this? No? Can I have a motion to close the floor then? Motion by Alder Lefebvre.

- Second.

- Second by Alder Corpus-Dax to close the floor. All those in favor?

- [Members] Aye.

- All right back to order business, alders.

-your thoughts? Alder Galvin do you have anything else you want to add?

- I certainly feel for the Sorenson family. I'm just not sure if this is, what we have here in front of us is the best solution to that. Like I said before because we are basically we're doing something that's never been done before. I'm very concerned of the unintended consequences that could occur from this and I'm not sure what more I could ask of staff, to look into this. They've done a pretty good job already looking at all of the potential pitfalls that we'd fall into but I'm just very concerned. We've had an alder up here, former Alder Zima talking about all the many homes in his district that have been damaged he says by issues with the city services and I started thinking in my head $50,000 a pop.

- [Brooke] No but if you're thinking about people that have 20 and 30000, yeah it sucks but you can move forward in your life. What you're talking about over $100,000, we're in our early 30s. How do we even move forward from that?

- Okay I understand and I have to tell you, that at this time you cannot speak. We can make a motion to open the floor again though if you wanted to come up and say something else.

- [Brooke] No that's fine

- So I'm just very concerned and then how do we fund it? Right now I don't see private organizations or people putting money into a fund for this. I really don't. Especially as they don't know unless it's a specific case-by-case basis. How much taxes would we have to raise for this and then how do we keep it funded? You know where as it was we took a 4% cut across the board last year on our budget and if we had 10, 15 of these claims, you're talking over half a million dollars and I just, again I'm concerned. I guess if we had somebody that could speak off when this happens, how many times people put in claims to the city for this kind of damage where their homes aren't habitable, I'd have a better grasp of what we're looking at but I don't know if that's possible to get that information.

- I thought we looked for that.

- That question was brought up at the last meeting and as the attorney had said we I really don't have a basis to come up with that number and it's really a unique situation of instances so we're not, we've discussed it we don't know how we would pull a number together for you to even give you an estimate.

- And then how do we fund it? Is it a year by year we put more money in until we hit a cap and then we maintain that cap? What is that fund is drained in one year? Where do we go then, contingency fund? We don't have that much in there.

- And if I could add one thing. It would be claims that were denied anyway because the city is not liable. So we wouldn't even know, we can do an analysis of claims that have been filed but that wouldn't even touch the claims where the city isn't liable for anything. So people that make claims typically in those situations, so we wouldn't know.

- I see.

- So again there's a couple of communities that have provided cleaning materials and pick up of debris and it sounds like there was some issues with that. They helped him get rid of it. It looks like I've been sounds like from what I've been told some of those things are being addressed but that comes nowhere near what we're talking about here.

- Other Alders?

- Maybe we need to look at funding some of these things that need to be proposed. Not the homes but I meant you know sewers and-- We need to really, we need to be proactive in some of that so we can. That's why the damage is occurring.

- Let's.

- I know, I know.

- Back on this. I share the same concerns as Alder Galvin as far as we don't know what's out there and what could potentially be coming our way. My biggest concern is how do we fund this? We don't have a place where we can get this money from. So to put this out there and I have the money to fund.

- Yeah, I mean everyone's real quick to have recommendations on how we should spend our money but every time we talk about raising taxes, everyone's real quick to tell us they don't want to pay any more than they're already paying. I've already received phone calls late last year and already early this year about people concerned about their tax bills complaining about how much their tax bills are and--

- Well I've been a proponent of this all along and I will continue to support it and in the end it's going to go to City Council and it's gonna be voted on at City Council and this is an ordinance. Does this take a 3/4 vote or is it just a majority? In the end it's got to go to the council floor I believe and whether you vote up or down, I'll bring it to the floor next week and we'll talk about it and we'll talk about I did like the idea. I heard from Alder Zima about, I'm sorry former Alder Zima about a 401c and that was an idea I had earlier talked about to my husband today whether there was such a thing? There are philanthropists in our community and perhaps but I didn't know the legalities of the city you know doing something like that because it'd have to be something that worked with the city and the inspectors and such and of course I had said to get it from the fund balance which won't be very popular at all judging by the budget meeting and the meetings after the budget meeting, so I don't have the answer of where. I feel the same way that Alder Zima feels or former Alder Zima feels that something should be done to help people when something happens that is no fault of their own. So I'm gonna vote in favor of this as I have all along and I'm still a proponent of it, and I fully realize that it's gonna have to be decided at Council, you know no matter what we decide today. It's gonna go to council next week.

- Barb do you think it needs more thought before it comes with like the 401K that you mentioned?

- I personally don't feel comfortable kicking it down the road again. We've been putting it off and putting it off and putting it off. I would like to have a discussion, but we have other alders here, too. You guys want to see this coming to council?

-to council. I think--

- Council?

- The longer we have we're gonna have find the magic answer.

- Alder Johnson.

- [Alder Johnson] I've said it before I'll say it again, the measure of a community comes from its compassion for its residents when they're in their highest moments of need and I mean we have a family here who I mean is struggling, is in crisis mode as a result of our failure to maintain our infrastructure. I mean we've done our, not necessarily our failure to maintain it. Obviously the negligence was not deemed there but it's the aging infrastructure and this is just one family whose anecdote I think brought the realization here and there are many more that we haven't discussed and I think that's a failure on our part to serve our residents, and so I would say if there is something here that we don't like, then we must be prepared to modify this. I mean let's have that discussion. I mean if we have alders who are fundamentally opposed to this that are going to vote no no matter what, I get that. That's going to happen but if there are just pieces of this that make us uncomfortable, I say move this on to council and let's be prepared to discuss what those pieces are and what the appropriate modification is. But for us to do nothing when we have residents that are being harmed by literally just living, that just does not feel right to me.

- I agree.

- Do we have to vote on this? We just have to go take it to council or do or can we say that this can pass it on to the council to discuss?

- I think it's gonna be we can vote on this and whether we vote whether the motion passes or fails, it can still be called to the floor at council. We can call it to the floor and we will discuss it and I can guarantee I will you know so, I think the best thing to do is to--

- Even this makes it through council, council passes this, we'll still will have to have a separate discussion on financing. The financing will not occur till 2020?

- Correct, as of this point there was nothing budgeted in the 2019 budget. There was the normal roughly $100,000 that was put in contingency for the 2019 budget but that's a normal contingency fund that is used throughout the year for items that were unplanned for and that anytime you use the contingency fund you do have to have a two-thirds vote by council to use any contingency fund and then the other option again in future is potentially to levy for it future budgets like 2020 but again you know then the question is whether or not you would make this retroactive or is it for new claims coming forward? How far back would you go if it's retro?

- And that's another concern. If it's retroactive, is it retroactive to this incident? Is it retroactive to the beginning of 2018, 2017? Does it include claims that haven't been made yet to the city the people see an opportunity here because something happened and now they come forward with other claims?

- I see it, I understand what you're saying.

- Well I'm not putting it down as a reason to vote yes or no. Are these things that we should address if this moves forward?

- So we're really from the council getting kind of the idea of should this move forward because we can't really have an ordinance without of funding source and we have to have a--

- [Attorney] Can I interject really quick?

- Yes.

- [Attorney] I believe City Attorney Chavez did mention that if the council or the committee wanted to approve the ordinance it needed to identify a funding source simultaneously otherwise you're just creating kind of a shell ordinance that doesn't really function because you don't have a funding source.

- So council we'll have to come up with funding.

- [Attorney] Correct.

- And then a date to start, which I will say January 1, 2018. That's what I'll propose be the date to start but we're not even there yet because it's almost like is council even interested in moving forward on establishing a Relief Fund? We can always do that first because--

- Well, I think if--

- What?

- Well if this goes to the council we have the name a funding source.

- Then council needs to name a funding source that night.

- Does council need to name it or do we name it here?

- [Attorney] Either way.

- Then let's let council do it because all we're doing--

- [Attorney] whether it's by committee or by council.

- Because council has a vote on it in the end anyway. I really think that maybe should this be a committee of the whole discussion. Is that a better way to do it?

- [Attorney] At this point I don't think that that would be the way to proceed as it has been an item that's been on the finance committee's agenda.

- Okay, so then it'll just--

- Right, it will be taken up as a whole by council if it's pulled to the floor.

- I'll make a motion to approve this and to include that staff be prepared to address possible funding sources, all potential possible funding sources for this ordinance if it's passed through council.

- At this point we did list the three possible sources. I'm not sure if between now and the end of the week we will come up with another.

- Say it one more time what are the three sources again?

- Well we talked about, well actually I should say that. In 2019 there's no funding and there was no money set aside specifically for this item. And in 2019 there is about $110,000 for, of contingency which is for any other unbudgeted item. Again that takes a 2/3 vote and then or future levying in 2020.

- I hear you say fund balanced. Is that another potential source? I mean we're looking at all potential sources.

- I guess it could be, yes.

- Okay so because that's the only one I can think of and whether that is gonna be approved or not you know, I don't know, but--

- I don't know, I'd have to look into that only because it builds on levy dollar and there's the fund balance from a levy item, I budgeted levy item and this, I guess I'll have to do some research on it. It wasn't originally in the budget and that's why we have levy dollars. There is, you know there's a fund balance based on what was levied in the budget. I have to do some research on that.

- Well I guess and that's the question. Could we look at unused dollars within departments as the year progresses? You know I mean we decided not to buy item A so we've got five thousand bucks there or we don't hire someone like the city is famous for not doing and we've got salary and benefits money. Is that a, so I guess I'm asking you to look at, to be creative to think of all possible if the city was really in a pinch, where would we get money from and if you can look at all those options plus what Mr. Zima mentioned before with a 401c.

- Is the 401 yeah.

- I don't know what they're called. I don't know what number it is, but some charity. The charity fund.

- Would that be by city. Would that be by the City, that would be a non-profit.

- It would have to go through like a foundation or something.

- Yeah that would not be something that the city would

- No, but it would certainly--

- Could a private foundation put money into that account?

- Sure they could, correct and then they could put it toward the fund.

- And then so I guess I want to hear how that could happen. So I guess if you could and I know it's a lot to do within a very short period of time, but if you can look at those funding sources.

- I didn't understand what that meant.

- I believe what he meant was that when your tax bill comes next year, your city portion you don't have to pay as it off sets that cost that you incur to rehab your house.

- And I was up until your, you know like if it's your furnace, until your furnace is paid off. So every year you'd have that fund.

- Very administrative. If somebody's tax bill is 2008, furnaces 10, 20.

- Yep exactly, so I guess that if you could be prepared to address any and all of those kind of questions that could come up at council. So that's my motion.

- Do you want me to open the floor?

- I'll second. Well do you want open the floor?

- Yeah we can first.

- I'll move that we open up the floor.

- Motion made by Alder Lefebvre to open open the floor.

- Second.

- Second by Alder Galvin. All those in favor?

- [Members] Aye.

- The floor is open. Mr. Zima.

- It just seems to me you're a little bit ahead of yourself. I think the person you're supposed to refer to this staff and develop some parameters, potential funding resources and including potential caps on what's the most we'll contribute towards something.

- We did do that though.

- Okay.

- That we did. That's in the ordinance.

- But it seems to me that you need to bring something concrete to the council and you know they can amend it one way or the other. My mother always said where is there's a will, there is a way.

- Right.

- It depends on what your priorities are and you know I just want to, you've got funding sources you can bond for things if you want to. You know we bonded to almost over a million dollars or about a million dollars just to light the bridges one time. So if we can like the bridges, we can also light the hearts of people and help where there's cases that fit our criteria, and also you could transfer from general fund. I think that was mentioned, and have you forgotten we have neighborhood enhancement funds? And you know we're not talking putting a million dollars into something like this, but I think you've got to show where your aim is at and you build this up over time and you do what you can and you help what you can and if this isn't neighborhood enhancement, what is? Well let something deteriorate? I don't know how these people can even stay in their house. I wouldn't stay in that house. But there's more than just this case and I appreciate Mr. Galvin's comments. You know what are gonna be the parameters? Because I don't think they can just be unlimited charity of course but it has to be where there's at least the potential of city neglect involved and of course the final say so should be the council on every case. So you have choices and you know there's no reason why we can't develop a fund. You know I've known the mayor to go out and collect all kinds of money for all kinds of purposes. If we can collect millions and millions of dollars to add new rides, can we collect some of those kind of bigger numbers to create a fund that says to people Green Bay takes care of itself? I mean I'm concerned about people abandoning the city from a number of different sources. Again where there's a will, there's a way. Are you trying to find a way not to do it or are you trying to find a way to do it? And I think you need to find a way to do it. I mean this kind of thing you just can't turn your back on, and I'm not just talking about just this one case. This is a pathetic case but there are other cases that really hurt people that we're not talking that kind of numbers but you can get something created. You need to get the parameters, hammer it out with the committee and at the council level and then fund it. You can find places to fund it even if it's just a couple hundred thousand that you take from neighborhood enhancement. That's what it is. If you have no other place, if you feel you can't take it out of your general fund or whatever but as again I'll say where there's a will there is a way and you got to decide whether this is important to you or not. If it's not fine. If it is okay, move forward, thank you.

- Thank you. Motion to go back to regular order of business.

- Motion to go back to regular order of business.

- Alder Galvin, second by Alder Lefebvre. All those in favor?

- Aye.

- Regular order. Okay we had a motion by Alder Galvin to approve. Was there a second by Alder Lefebvre? So my understanding is that we're gonna approve this, we're gonna vote on whether or not we're approving the motion as it stands. Okay, all those in favor?

- [Members] Aye.

- Opposed? All right this will move forward to council. Finance committee will hammer out some of the things. Just as I mentioned, anyone here who has not read the ordinance, read it because it does have a lot of parameters in it already. So okay. We're on to consideration with possible action on the report of the claims committee and would you like to go into closed session?

- Yes we do need to move into closed session.

- Motion to move into closed session.

- Second.

-Second. All those in favor?

- [Members] Aye.

- The council may convene in closed session pursuant to section 19.85 sub 1G Wisconsin statutes 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 an open session pursuant to section 19.85 sub two Wisconsin stats to report the results of the closed session and consider the balance of the agenda.

- Okay.

- The next time we might close again.

- I know, I know but we have to do it the right way. All right, I will, we're back in open session and I'll entertain a motion to approve what was decided in closed.

- I'll make a motion that we approve staff's recommendation for item five.

- Second.

- Second. A motion by Alder Galvin, second by Alder Lefebvre. All those in favor?

- [Members] Aye.

- Opposed? Motion carries unanimously. Now, number six. Update with possible action on the status of litigation and Dustin Krueger-Dunow versus City of Green Bay. We must go it's closed session.

- Yes.

- So I need someone to read and make the motion.

- I make a motion that we go into closed session.

- Motion by Alder Galvin.

- Second.

- Mayor Mortensen is gonna be a big transparency advocate.

- It's the law.

- It's a law to go into closed session for that.

- All right, so who wants to? Okay all those a favor?

- [Members] Aye.

- The council may convene a closed-session pursuant to section 19.85 sub 1G Wisconsin statutes 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 and which it is or is likely to become involved. The council may thereafter reconvene in open session pursuant to section 19.85 sub two Wisconsin statutes to report the results of a closed session and consider the balance of the agenda.

- All right, we.

- And that's distracted

- She's turning it on people.

- All right. All right we're back in session. I will entertain a motion as far as number six.

- I'll make a motion that we approve recommendations by staff for item six.

- I'll second it. All those in favor?

- [Members] Aye.

- Opposed? Motion carries. All right, report of the finance director.

- At this point I have to mention that we are starting our, we've completed our interim audit and we will be starting our year-end audit at the end of March and we just finished. Our budget books have been completed.

- It's on the website.

- So if you would like a hard copy of the budget books just let us know we can get, no? Otherwise it's on the website. There we go. I think that's it for report for the finance.

- Would you like us to receive and place on file?

- Yes please.

- Receive and place on file.

- A motion by alder.

- Second.

- Okay been seconded by Alder Corpus-Dax to receive a place on file. All those in favor?

- Aye.

- Opposed? Motion carries unanimously, and informational. The 2019 contingency fund is that $112,076 and the next finance committee meeting will be held on Tuesday, January 29th, 2019 at 4:30 pm. Entertain a motion to adjourn.

- Motion to adjourn.

- Site Alder Galvin, second by Alder Lefebvre. All in favor?

- [Members] Aye.

- We are adjourned.