



MINUTES OF THE COMMON COUNCIL

**TUESDAY, NOVEMBER 5, 2019, 4:30 PM
COUNCIL CHAMBERS
ROOM 203, CITY HALL**

A. ROLL CALL.

Present: Craig Stevens, Mark Steuer, Kathy Lefebvre, Randy Scannell, Brian Johnson, Veronica Corpus-Dax, Andy Nicholson (arrived at 4:50 p.m.), John VanderLeest, Chris Wery, Jesse Brunette, Barbara Dorff, Bill Galvin

B. PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE.

C. INVOCATION.

The invocation was led by Alder Brian Johnson, District 9.

I. Invocation led by Alder Brian Johnson, District 9.

D. APPROVAL OF MINUTES.

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

I. Approval of the minutes of the October 15, 2019 Common Council meeting.

E. APPROVAL OF THE AGENDA.

Moved by Ald. Randy Scannell, seconded by Ald. Veronica Corpus-Dax to approve. Motion carried.

F. REPORT BY THE MAYOR.

G. ANNOUNCEMENTS.

H. RECOGNITIONS AND AWARDS.

I. Nancy Quirk, 2019 Distinguished and Outstanding Alumni Award, University of Wisconsin-Platteville.

Nancy Quirk spoke about her employment history.

I. APPOINTMENTS.

1. I. New appointments:

Ethics Board

Cheryl Renier-Wigg, 626 S. Jackson Street, Green Bay, WI 54301

Term to expire: April 1, 2021

2. Reappointments:

Landmarks Commission

Veronica Corpus-Dax, 335 Traders Point Lane, Green Bay, WI 54302

Term to expire: April 1, 2020

Justin Balsley, 324 N. Ashland Avenue, Green Bay, WI 54303

Term to expire: October 1, 2022

Green Bay Area Room Tax Commission

Warren Wanezek, 2365 Donarski Court, Green Bay, WI 54302

Term to expire: November 1, 2020

Wendy Townsend, 850 Ernst Drive, Green Bay, WI 54304

Term to expire: November 1, 2020

Moved by Ald. Randy Scannell, seconded by Ald. Barbara Dorff to confirm the appointments. Motion carried.

Moved by Ald. Randy Scannell, seconded by Ald. Craig Stevens to confirm the reappointments.

Motion carried.

J. PUBLIC HEARINGS.

Six people spoke in regards to the 2020 Proposed City of Green Bay Budget.

I. Zoning Ordinance No. 9-19

An Ordinance amending Zoning Ordinance No. 16-13 for Northeast Wisconsin Technical College Campus Planned Unit Development to adjust the Campus boundary and amend the signage plan (2740 West Mason Street).

2. Zoning Ordinance 10-19

An Ordinance rezoning property located at 154 Berger Street from Low Density Residential (R-1) to Varied Density Residential (R-3).

3. Public Hearing of the 2020 Proposed City of Green Bay Budget.

K. ORDINANCES - SECOND READING FOR ADOPTION.

Moved by Ald. Randy Scannell, seconded by Ald. Andy Nicholson to suspend the rules and take up items 1 and 2 with a roll call vote. Motion carried.

Moved by Ald. Randy Scannell, seconded by Ald. Veronica Corpus-Dax to adopt items 1 and 2. Motion carried.

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

1. Zoning Ordinance 10-19

An Ordinance rezoning property located at 154 Berger Street from Low Density Residential (R-1) to Varied Density Residential (R-3).

2. Zoning Ordinance No. 9-19

An Ordinance amending Zoning Ordinance No. 16-13 for Northeast Wisconsin Technical College Campus Planned Unit Development to adjust the Campus boundary and amend the signage plan (2740 West Mason Street).

L. REPORT OF THE REDEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY (OCTOBER 29, 2019).

Moved by Ald. Chris Wery, seconded by Ald. Barbara Dorff to approve with the exception of item 2. Motion carried.

1. To refer to staff the communication from Ald. Johnson (District 9) "To create a policy

Minutes of the Common Council

guaranteeing City Council oversight and disbursement of funds related to Affordable Housing Extension Resolutions for TIDs 7, 8, and 12," and to report back to the RDA in March 2020.

2. To approve Development Agreement 19-04 with TWG Development, LLC, and DDL Holdings, LLC, for TWG 2 @ The Rail Yard at 419 Donald Driver Way (Tax Parcel 5-1772), subject to minor legal and technical revisions.

The Council may convene in closed session pursuant to Sections 19.85(1)(e), Wis. Stats., for purposes of deliberating or negotiating the sale of public properties, investing of public funds or conducting other specified public business as necessary for competitive or bargaining reasons. The Council may thereafter reconvene in open session pursuant to Section 19.85(2), Wis. Stats., to report the results of the closed session and consider the balance of the agenda.

Moved by Ald. Chris Wery, seconded by Ald. Jesse Brunette to amend item 2 to have removed the 1 percent for the arts from the development agreement. Motion failed.

Yes- Andy Nicholson, Chris Wery, Jesse Brunette, No- Barbara Dorff, Bill Galvin, Brian Johnson, Craig Stevens, John VanderLeest, Mark Steuer, Randy Scannell, Veronica Corpus-Dax, Kathy Lefebvre
Moved by Ald. Brian Johnson, seconded by Ald. Barbara Dorff to approve item 2. Motion carried.

M. REPORT OF THE IMPROVEMENT & SERVICES COMMITTEE (OCTOBER 23, 2019).

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

1. To refer to the Mayor's Office to direct Public Works to coordinate and enact a short term plan to avoid preventable flooding this fall, winter, and spring along Hillcrest Drive and Westway Drive to include but not limited to removing debris from ditches, pumping water to available storm sewers, and providing sandbags to residents to protect their property.

2. To receive and place on file the request by Ald. Steuer to study and report out on the feasibility of utilizing the "even-odd" residential address overnight parking scenario, as is done in Milwaukee, in order to relieve the parking problems at residences with limited parking spaces.

Moved by Ald. Mark Steuer, seconded by Ald. Andy Nicholson to refer item 2 back to the Improvement and Services Committee. Motion carried.

3. To approve the 2020 Department of Public Works new and replacement equipment plans.

4. A. To approve the award of contract PINE STREET PARKING RAMP TOWER REROOFING to

the low responsive bidder, Northern Metal and Roofing Co., Inc., in the amount of \$56,935.

B. To approve the award of contract BAY BEACH WILDLIFE SANCTUARY OBSERVATION BUILDING RTU REPLACEMENT to the low responsive bidder, Milbach Construction Services, in the amount of \$47,650.

C. To approve the award of contract DPW BOILER ROOM & UPPER ROOF REROOF, PARAPET FLASHINGS AND CHIMNEY REPAIRS to the low responsive bidder, Weinert Roofing, in the amount of \$129,475.

N. REPORT OF THE PROTECTION & POLICY COMMITTEE (OCTOBER 28, 2019).

Moved by Ald. Randy Scannell, seconded by Ald. Craig Stevens to approve with the exception of item 5 and 6. Motion carried.

1. To approve an application for a "Class B" Combination license by Phat Headz II, LLC at 420 N. Clay St. with a licensed premises description as "1 story building, sold in main bar, beverage store in main bar, shelving in locked office, walk-in cooler," with the approval of the proper authorities. (Previously licensed as Live Entertainment, LLC).

2. To recommend that Council waive the ordinance requirements for an outdoor licensed premise and to approve the application for an available "Class B" (wine only) winery license for Noble Roots Brewing Company, LLC at 2790 University Ave. with a licensed premises description as "outdoor patio, brew pub/taproom area," with the approval of the proper authorities.

3. To approve an application for a "Class B" Combination license for Ofelia Gruetzmacher at 1706 Main St. with a licensed premises description as "bar, restaurant with full service kitchen, full bar, stage, restrooms, dining (booth and table), coolers," with the approval of the proper authorities. (Previously licensed as Homemade Southern Cuisine, LLC).

4. To hold to the next meeting a request by Ald. Chris Wery regarding the policies and procedures of the Inspection Department as it applies to communicating and working with constituents who request their alderman's assistance. Further, to discuss customer service standards and work expectations of inspectors. Investigate the addition of evening and/or weekend inspection hours (recommendation to be made to Personnel Committee only pursuant to GBMC 2.06(9)), which was referred to the Protection & Policy Committee at the Improvement and Services Committee meeting September 25, 2019.

5. To refer to staff a request by Ald. Brunette to create an ordinance allowing golf carts on city streets.

Moved by Ald. Randy Scannell, seconded by Ald. Mark Steuer to approve item 5.

Moved by Ald. Jesse Brunette, seconded by Ald. Kathy Lefebvre to amend item 5 to have staff gather data to determine whether or not an ordinance should be created allowing slow speed vehicles on city streets. Motion carried.

6. To approve the Green Tier Legacy Community Resolution, which was referred from the Sustainability Commission.

Moved by Ald. Andy Nicholson, seconded by Ald. Chris Wery to reject item 6. Motion failed.

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

Moved by Ald. Brian Johnson, seconded by Ald. Randy Scannell to approve item 6. Motion carried.

7. To receive and place on file the Liquor Violation Report for October 28, 2019.

O. REPORT OF THE PROTECTION & POLICY COMMITTEE GRANTING OPERATOR LICENSES.

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

Ald. Bill Galvin abstained from Jacqueline Leifker.

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

P. REPORT OF THE PLAN COMMISSION (OCTOBER 21, 2019).

Moved by Ald. Randy Scannell, seconded by Ald. Veronica Corpus-Dax to approve. Motion carried.

Ald. Brian Johnson did not abstain on item 6 because he doesn't report to that separate Board of Directors.

I. To receive and place on file the request to vacate an unimproved right-of-way located near Hillcrest Drive.

2. To amend Zoning Ordinance 11-13 to allow painted wall signage at 300 Dousman Street, subject to the amended Planned Unit Development District Ordinance (PUD).

3. To amend the Eaton Heights Planned Unit Development (PUD) land use boundaries, 800 Block N Huron Road/811 Barronwood Drive, subject to the amended Planned Unit Development District Ordinance (PUD).

4. To approve the Downtown Green Bay, Inc. 2020 Business Improvement District Operating Plan.

5. To approve the Olde Main Street, Inc. 2020 Business Improvement District Operating Plan.

6. To approve the On Broadway, Inc. 2020 Business Improvement District Operating Plan.

7. To approve the Military Avenue Business Association 2020 Business Improvement District Operating Plan.

Q. REPORT OF THE PARK COMMITTEE (OCTOBER 23, 2019).

Moved by Ald. Randy Scannell, seconded by Ald. Craig Stevens to approve. Motion carried.

1. To approve the request by the Baird Creek Preservation Foundation to install a bike skills course at Triangle Hill in the Baird Creek Greenway.

2. To approve the rental rates for the new banquet hall in the upper level of the 4K addition of the nature center.

3. To receive and place on file the request by Ald. Steuer to review the Parks Department Facility Use Policy.

4. INFORMATIONAL- To receive and place on file the proposed 2020 Parks, Recreation & Forestry Department's budget.

R. REPORT OF THE PUBLIC ARTS COMMISSION (OCTOBER 23, 2019).

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

1. To approve the RDA's decision to adopt Resolution 19-03 Regarding Percent for Art.

Moved by Ald. Randy Scannell, seconded by Ald. Barbara Dorff to approve item 1.

Moved by Ald. Chris Wery, seconded by Ald. Jesse Brunette to deny item 1. Motion failed.

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

Moved by Ald. Brian Johnson seconded by Ald. Randy Scannell to approve item 1. Motion carried.

2. To elect Kelli Strickland as Chair and Alex Zacarias as Vice Chair for the Green Bay Public Arts Commission.

S. REPORT OF THE TRAFFIC, BICYCLE, AND PEDESTRIAN COMMISSION (OCTOBER 21, 2019).

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

1. To receive and place on file the report by the Police Department of the 2019 3rd quarter serious injury and fatality crashes.

2. To refer to staff for a speed study of Skyline Boulevard between Finger Road and Hillside Lane.

3. For the Police Department to consider enhanced speed enforcement on West Mason Street from Packerland Drive to Hillcrest Drive.
4. For DPW to paint a high visibility crosswalk markings crossing the east approach of West Mason Street at La Count Road in the Spring of 2020.
5. For DPW to install enhanced pedestrian crossing signs along West Mason Street approaching La Count Road before the Winter of 2019/2020 if it is legal.
6. For the Police Department to contact the Oneida Tribal Police requesting their speed enforcement assistance along West Mason Street from Packerland Drive to Hillcrest Drive.
7. To refer to staff to study the request to put in a crosswalk lighting system on East Mason Street at Hartung Street, similar to crosswalk lighting on South Webster Avenue at the hospitals, for the East River Trail crossing.
8. To receive and place on file the request for the City of Green Bay to staff and employ an adult crossing guard at the intersection of Humboldt Road and Mount Mary Drive to assist Baird Elementary students to cross Humboldt Road.
9. To receive and place on file the documented speed study along Gross Avenue from 6th Street to Gross Court North.
10. To continue Police Department enforcement of the posted speed limit of 25 mph along Gross Avenue from 6th Street to Gross Court North.

11. To receive and place on file the request to address chronic complaints regarding speeding on 12th Avenue.

12. To remove the NO PARKING zone on the north side of Pine Street from Adams Street to a point of 120 feet west of Madison Street.

13. To establish and adopt by ordinance a NO PARKING zone on the north side of Pine Street from Adams Street to a point of 50 feet east of Adams Street.

14. To establish and adopt by ordinance a NO PARKING 15-MINUTE LOADING ONLY zone on the north side of Pine Street from a point 50 feet east of Adams Street to a point 160 feet east of Adams Street.

15. To establish and adopt by ordinance a NO PARKING zone on the north side of Pine Street from a point 160 feet east of Adams Street to a point 120 feet west of Madison Street.

T. REPORT OF THE ETHICS BOARD (OCTOBER 10, 2019)

Moved by Ald. Randy Scannell, seconded by Ald. Barbara Dorff to approve with the exception of 2. Motion carried.

1. INFORMATIONAL ONLY: Election of Cheri Graham as Vice Chair of the Ethics Board.

2. To hold the Ethics complaint filed against Alder Kathy Lefebvre by Alder Andy Nicholson under the City of Green Bay Code of Conduct for Elected Officials until the next meeting and direct staff to research whether the complaint should instead be investigated as a violation of the state open meetings act.

Moved by Ald. Bill Galvin, seconded by Ald. Randy Scannell to amend item 2 to replace the words "should instead be" to "is being". Motion carried.

U. REPORT OF THE JOINT FINANCE/PERSONNEL COMMITTEE (OCTOBER 29, 2019)

Between items 3 and 4, Ald. Andy Nicholson made a motion, seconded by Ald. Chris Wery to send back the budget to the Mayor's Office for a 1.5% increase versus a 3.2% increase. Motion failed. Yes- Andy Nicholson, Chris Wery, Jesse Brunette, John VanderLeest, No- Barbara Dorff, Bill Galvin, Brian Johnson, Craig Stevens, Mark Steuer, Randy Scannell, Veronica Corpus-Dax, Kathy Lefebvre Moved by Ald. Mark Steuer, seconded by Ald. Kathy Lefebvre to restore the 2 percent wage increase for all general employees.

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

Mayor Genrich asked to suspend the rules and take items 22 through 40 with unanimous consent. There were no objections.

Moved by Ald. Barbara Dorff, seconded by Ald. Craig Stevens to adopt items 22 through 40. Motion carried.

1. To approve the report on the purchase of 22 vehicles for various City Departments off of the 2019 State of Wisconsin Vendornet Contract for \$700,232.

Moved by Ald. Randy Scannell, seconded by Ald. Craig Stevens to approve item 1. Motion carried.

2. To approve the purchase of new cars and light trucks that have been approved in the 2020 City budget through the State of Wisconsin Vendornet Contract, and report the results back to the Finance Committee after the purchases have been made.

Moved by Ald. Randy Scannell, seconded by Ald. Bill Galvin to approve item 2. Motion carried.

3. To approve the request by Department of Public Works to amend parking lot lease between Georgia Pacific and City of Green Bay for property adjacent to west side garage.

Moved by Ald. Randy Scannell, seconded by Ald. Barbara Dorff to approve item 3.

Ald. Brian Johnson had a question.

Moved by Ald. Mark Steuer, seconded by Ald. Chris Wery to approve item 3. Motion carried.

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

a. Administrative Clerk – Parks, Recreation and Forestry

Moved by Ald. Randy Scannell, seconded by Ald. Barbara Dorff to approve item 4.

Moved by Ald. Jesse Brunette, seconded by Ald. Kathy Lefebvre to approve, but not fill the position until 9/1/2020. Motion failed.

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

Moved by Ald. Barbara Dorff, seconded by Ald. Craig Stevens to approve item 4. Motion carried.

5. To approve the request for 2020 reclassifications during the individual departments 2020 budget approval.

Moved by Ald. Randy Scannell, seconded by Ald. Barbara Dorff to approve item 5. Motion carried with Mayor breaking the tie with a yes vote.

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

6. To approve the Common Council 2020 Budget (page 13).

Moved by Ald. Randy Scannell, seconded by Ald. Barbara Dorff to approve item 6. Motion carried.

7. To approve the Mayor's Office 2020 Budget (page 17).

Moved by Ald. Randy Scannell, seconded by Ald. Barbara Dorff to approve item 7. Motion carried.

8. To approve the Administrative Services including Finance, Clerk, Assessor, Purchasing, Election, Board of Review, and Document Center 2020 Budget (page 21).

Moved by Ald. Randy Scannell, seconded by Ald. Craig Stevens to approve item 8.

Moved by Ald. Chris Wery, seconded by Ald. Andy Nicholson to eliminate the Welcome Center positions. Motion failed.

Moved by Ald. Jesse Brunette, seconded by Ald. Chris Wery to eliminate one Welcome Center position. Motion carried.

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

Moved by Ald. Randy Scannell, seconded by Ald. Brian Johnson to approve item 7 as amended.

Motion carried.

9. To approve the Information Technology and Equipment Replacement 2020 Budget (page 32).

Moved by Ald. Randy Scannell, seconded by Ald. Barbara Dorff to approve item 9. Motion carried.

10. To approve the Law 2020 Budget (page 42).

Moved by Ald. Barbara Dorff, seconded by Ald. Randy Scannell to approve item 10. Motion carried.

11. To approve the Municipal Court 2020 Budget (page 49).

Moved by Ald. Randy Scannell, seconded by Ald. Barbara Dorff to approve item 11. Motion carried.

12. To approve the Human Resources 2020 Budget (page 55).

Moved by Ald. Randy Scannell, seconded by Ald. Veronica Corpus-Dax to approve item 12. Motion carried.

Moved by Ald. Chris Wery, seconded by Ald. Jesse Brunette to leave the Human Resource Assistant I position unfilled. Motion failed.

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

13. To approve the Community & Economic Dev. & Equipment Replacement 2020 Budget (page 63).

Moved by Ald. Randy Scannell, seconded by Ald. Bill Galvin to approve item 13. Motion carried.

14. To approve the Police and Equipment Replacement 2020 Budget (page 78).

Moved by Ald. Barbara Dorff, seconded by Ald. Craig Stevens to approve item 14. Motion carried.

15. To approve the Fire and Equipment Replacement 2020 Budget (page 90).

Moved by Ald. Randy Scannell, seconded by Ald. Bill Galvin to approve item 15. Motion carried.

16. To approve the Public Works including Engineering, Operations, Traffic and Equipment Replacement 2020 Budget (page 97).

Moved by Ald. Bill Galvin, seconded by Ald. Randy Scannell to approve item 16.

Moved by Ald. Jesse Brunette, seconded by Ald. Chris Wery to amend item 16 to restore \$231,000 from the Wheel Tax Revenue to Public Works Budget.

Ald. Jesse Brunette withdrew his motion.

Moved by Ald. Brian Johnson, seconded by Ald. Randy Scannell to use the unallocated Wheel Tax funding from 2019 to fund black top materials and joint sealing for 2020 in the amount of \$231,000. Motion carried.

Moved by Ald. Randy Scannell, seconded by Ald. Craig Stevens to approve the DPW budget in its entirety. Motion carried.

17. To approve the Parks, Rec & Forestry including Admin., City Hall, Triangle Hill, Parks, Recreation, Pools, Forestry, Wildlife Sanctuary, and Equipment Replacement 2020 Budget (page 117).

Moved by Ald. Randy Scannell, seconded by Ald. Barbara Dorff to approve item 17. Motion carried.

18. To approve the Miscellaneous 2020 Budget (page 132).

Moved by Ald. Randy Scannell, seconded by Ald. Barbara Dorff to approve item 18. Motion carried.

19. To approve the Sanitary Sewer 2020 Budget (page 142).

Moved by Ald. Randy Scannell, seconded by Ald. Barbara Dorff to approve item 19. Motion carried.

20. To approve the Parking Utility 2020 Budget (page 146).

Moved by Ald. Randy Scannell, seconded by Ald. Craig Stevens to approve item 20. Motion carried.

21. To approve the Storm Sewer 2020 Budget (page 150).

Moved by Ald. Randy Scannell, seconded by Ald. Barbara Dorff to approve item 21.

Moved by Ald. Jesse Brunette, seconded by Ald. Chris Wery to refer to I&S to restore the levy.
Motion failed.

Yes- Andy Nicholson, Brian Johnson, Chris Wery, Jesse Brunette, John VanderLeest, No- Barbara Dorff, Bill Galvin, Craig Stevens, Mark Steuer, Randy Scannell, Veronica Corpus-Dax, Kathy Lefebvre
A voice vote was taken on the original motion to approve item 21. Motion carried.

22. To approve the Transit 2020 Budget (page 155).

23. To approve the Bay Beach / Bay Beach Capital 2020 Budget (page 166).

24. To approve the Debt Service 2020 Budget (page 171).

25. To approve the Neighborhood Enhancement 2020 Budget (page 174).

26. To approve the Workers Compensation 2020 Budget (page 178).

27. To approve the General Liability 2020 Budget (page 177).
28. To approve the Health Insurance Escrow 2020 Budget (page 180).
29. To approve the Revenue - General Fund 2020 Budget (page 182).
30. To approve the Revenue - Sanitary Sewer 2020 Budget (page 194).
31. To approve the Revenue - Parking Utility 2020 Budget (page 195).
32. To approve the Revenue - DPW Equipment Placement 2020 Budget (page 196).
33. To approve the Revenue - Storm Sewer 2020 Budget (page 197).
34. To approve the Revenue - Bay Beach 2020 Budget (page 200).
35. To approve the Revenue - Debt Service 2020 Budget (page 201).
36. To approve the Revenue - Equipment Replacement Funds 2020 Budget (page 203).

37. To approve the Revenue - Neighborhood Enhancement 2020 Budget (page 208).

38. To approve the Revenue - Workers Compensation 2020 Budget (page 209).

39. To approve the Revenue - General Liability 2020 Budget (page 210).

40. To approve the Revenue - Health Insurance Escrow 2020 Budget (page 211).

V. RESOLUTIONS.

Moved by Ald. Randy Scannell, seconded by Ald. Barbara Dorff to suspend the rules to adopt resolutions 1 through 5 together with one roll call vote. Motion carried.

Moved by Ald. Chris Wery, seconded by Ald. Barbara Dorff to adopt resolutions 1 through 5. Motion carried.

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

1. Resolution drawing final orders to contractors for November 5, 2019.

2. Resolution approving the 2020 Operating Plan for the Downtown Green Bay, Inc. Business Improvement District.

3. Resolution approving the 2020 Operating Plan for the Olde Main Street, Inc. Business Improvement District.

4. Resolution approving the 2020 Operating Plan for the On Broadway, Inc. 2020 Business Improvement District.

5. Resolution approving the 2020 Operating Plan for the Military Avenue Business Association 2020 Business Improvement District.

6. Resolution adopting 2020 budget and tax levy.

Moved by Ald. Barbara Dorff, seconded by Ald. Randy Scannell to adopt resolution 6. Motion carried.

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

W. ORDINANCES - FIRST READING.

Moved by Ald. Randy Scannell, seconded by Ald. Veronica Corpus-Dax to suspend the rules to advance ordinance 1 through 3 to a second reading. Motion carried.

Moved by Ald. Randy Scannell, seconded by Ald. Veronica Corpus-Dax to advance ordinances 1 through 3. Motion carried.

1. Zoning Ordinance No. 11-19

An Ordinance amending Zoning Ordinance No. 11-13, relating to a Planned Unit Development District on the east side of North Broadway (300 through 600 Block), to amend the signage requirements on the structure located at 300 Dousman Street.

2. Zoning Ordinance No. 12-19

An Ordinance amending the Eaton Heights Planned Unit Development (PUD) land use boundaries, 800 Block N Huron Road/811 Barronwood Drive, subject to the amended Planned Unit Development District Ordinance (PUD).

3. General Ordinance No. 22-19

An ordinance amending Section 29.208, Green Bay Municipal Code, relating to parking regulations.

X. REFERRAL OF PETITIONS & COMMUNICATIONS.

There were no petitions and communications.

Y. ADJOURNMENT.

Moved by Ald. Andy Nicholson, seconded by Ald. Mark Steuer to adjourn at 10:10 p.m. Motion carried.

Kris A. Teske

Green Bay City Clerk

These minutes in their entirety, are available in the City Clerk's Office and on the City website at greenbaywi.gov

VERBATIM MINUTES

- Call order to the meeting of the Common Council for Tuesday, November 5th, 2019. Clerk.
- [Clerk] I I are present, Your Honor.
- Please rise for the Pledge of Allegiance. I got it.
- Okay.
- [Group] I pledge allegiance to the Flag of the United States of America, and to the Republic for which it stands, one Nation, under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all.
- Please remain standing for the invocation offered by the alder from the ninth.
- Thank you, Mayor. In lieu of an invocation, I guess I would encourage everyone to reflect in their own personal way as I know that you have opted to rotate amongst alders, I, personally, would encourage us to discontinue this process. And instead, I would just ask, again, that we do the moment of reflection, so that we can all make good decisions in our own reflective way this evening.
- All right, thank you alder. Approval of the minutes.
- [Man] Motion to approve.
- [Woman] Second.
- Motion made by alder from the seventh, seconded by alder from the sixth, to approve the minutes from October 15, 2019. All in favor, please signify by saying "aye."
- [Group] Aye.
- Those opposed, "nay." The ayes have it. The minutes have been approved. Approve the agenda.
- [Man] Motion to approve.
- [Woman] Second.

- Motion made by alder from the seventh, seconded by alder from the second. Any changes need to be made there? All right. All in favor, please signify by saying "aye."

- [Group] Aye.

- All opposed, "nay." Ayes have it. Agenda's been approved. On to the report of the mayor here. So, for this evening's report I just wanna offer a few comments on the budget that we have before you, as I've said before, I believe it to be a reasonable and responsible budget, focusing on the basic needs of this community while placing us on a sustainable fiscal path forward. And I believe it's worthy of your support tonight. Thanks, again, to the department heads and staff. Especially Director Ellenbecker, Ms. Manley, and the rest of the finance staff for all their hard work these past few months. To be clear, I'd rather we weren't increasing property taxes and stormwater rates, and I wish our police and fire departments had funding to fill out their organizational charts completely. I wish we had the resources to fulfill the requests of other departments, to add positions to better serve Green Bay residents. But we don't have a genie on payroll, and wishing won't make it so. Governing is hard, but it's your job and it's my job to do the hard work. We're here not just to keep time. We're here to make difficult choices needed to lead our city. So, I appreciate and value the role of Common Council in this process. If I didn't, I would have offered to meet with each and every one of you, and follow up by phone this past weekend. As a former legislator, I understand the position you hold, and I respect it. I look forward to tonight's discussion, which I'm sure will be fruitful. And I just ask that you make your decisions with an appreciation for their long term implications. As a person who has the legal responsibility of introducing the city's budget, and the one who can sign or veto items approved by this body, I'm calling on you to refrain from short term fixes and one time spending that has, and will have, a negative long term consequence for this city. Finally, I understand and appreciate the objections that some individuals in this room, and out in this community, have to the budget that's before you tonight. I really do. However, if the majority of the people of Green Bay wanted a mayor who would slash city government in order to keep taxes flat, they would not have elected me. I have no doubt that you all know your districts a lot better than I do, but I know this city, and I know its people. I'm very comfortable with the budget I've proposed, and I ask for your support tonight. So that concludes my report. On to announcements. Nothin', huh? Alder from the ninth.

- Thank you, Mayor. Just, kind of, a selfish plea. "On Broadway" is currently in the running again for the national grant with the Levitt Foundation. So I encourage everybody go to Levittamp.org and vote for Green Bay to help bring that National Grant Concert Series here to Green Bay for a second year. Thank you.

- [Mayor] Alder from the first.

- Thank you. I was asked by a school board member just to remind the elected officials that we're invited, there's a focus group meeting tomorrow at 10:00 am at the District Office in room 248 A and B. And it's a focus group on choosing the next superintendent and getting the elected officials input. I believe we all got an email to that effect. If you didn't get an email to that effect, you are invited to come to Central Office tomorrow and it is, again, 248 A and B, and it's at 10:00 am. And they are looking for elected officials input.

- [Mayor] Thank you. Alder from the 12th.

- Thank you, Mayor. I have an email from a constituent, she requested that I read it at the council meeting and enter it into public record. It regards the budget. Would you rather I do that now or wait till we get to the budget?

- [Mayor] You can wait for the budget.

- Okay, thank you.

- Any other announcements? All right. On to recognitions and awards. So, Nancy Quirk, 2019 Distinguished and Outstanding Alumni Award, University of Wisconsin Platteville. We are very lucky to have Nancy here in the city of Green Bay, doing amazing things for the Green Bay Water Utility. So I wanted to recognize her on that esteemed award. Well deserved. And I know that she had a few comments that she would like to offer the body.

- [Nancy] I was told to make it short. Is this on?

- [Mayor] It should be.

- Okay, sounds good. First of all, I'd like to thank the city of Green Bay for recognizing me for this award. I graduated from the University of Wisconsin Platteville in 1980, and there were very few women engineers at that time. I started my engineering career in structures, actually, in Seattle, Washington. And then I moved back to Wisconsin in 1987, where I got a job at the Madison Water Utility as a civil engineer. And I was the first female engineer there, at the city of water utility. I worked there for 15 and a half years. At that time I advanced to the technical services manager at Waukesha Water Utility, where I worked for nine and a half years as a civil engineer also. And then I began my career at the Green Bay Water Utility in 2012, as a general manager. I want to thank the city of Green Bay for believing in me, and allowing me to hone my management skills, and also participate in professional organizations that ensure that we are meeting the Water Utility's vision of being a leader in the nation for the drinking water industry. So, thank you for the city for recognizing me for this award.

- [Mayor] Absolutely. Congratulations.

- Thank you.

- [Mayor] Congratulations, again.

- Thank you.

- On to appointments. I have a motion. Motion to approve on the... One motion on the appointment and then one motion on the reappointments.

- [Man] I move to approve.

- [Woman] Second.

- Motion made by alder from the seventh, seconded by alder from the first, to confirm the new appointment of Cheryl Renier Wig to the Ethics Board. All in favor, please signify by saying "aye." Alder from the ninth.

- Press to speak. Just, if I could get maybe some perspective from you, Mayor. I've noticed, and I have a great deal of respect for Cheryl, however, I've noticed an increasing number of city employees being appointed to various boards and commissions. And, in this one in particular, I'm thinking about Ethics Board, where it puts a city staff person potentially--

- [Mayor] There's a requirement.

- That there be a city staff person? Okay. And, so then I'm just gonna maybe expand that. Is that a requirement with all of our boards and commissions, or the ones where we're seeing a number of city staff people appointed to them?

- [Mayor] No.

- Do you anticipate that to be a continued trend? Are we having trouble finding other candidates to fill those roles?
- [Mayor] I don't know what you're talking about.
- Economic Development Authority, Public Works Commission. We've got this one, we've got Green Bay Area Room Tax Commission. I'm just trying to get some perspective again on--
- [Mayor] Right.
- On your philosophy around appointments.
- It's not a change of course, at all.
- Okay.
- [Mayor] I'm not adding to the number of city employees who were previously appointed.
- Okay.
- [Mayor] Yeah.
- I guess that hasn't been the names that I've been seeing come before us. And that's why I'm asking. So this is a requirement? That we have have city staff person on this commission?
- It is.
- Okay. If that is a requirement, in the future, if that could just be a clarification that's put in front of council it would be much appreciated.
- [Mayor] Very good. Any other comments? All in favor, please signify by saying "aye."
- [Group] Aye.
- [Mayor] All opposed, "nay." They ayes have it. On to reappointments.
- [Man] Motion to approve.
- [Woman] Second.
- [Mayor] Motion made by alder from the seventh, seconded by alder from the fifth, to confirm the reappointments. All in favor, please signify by saying "aye."
- [Group] Aye.
- [Mayor] Those opposed, "nay." The ayes have it. Item has been approved. Now on to public hearings. So we have three items for public hearings. An ordinance amending a zoning ordinance, an ordinance rezoning property located in 154 Birger Street. But, most importantly, a public hearing of the 2020 proposed city budget. So, folks who are interested in offering public comments on the city budget, this would now be the opportunity to speak. That's public hearing. Is anyone here to speak on the city budget? Anyone here to speak on the city budget? Looks like we got one gentleman.

- [Man] Yes, sir.

- [Man] Citizen speak now?

- [Mayor] Yes. Absolutely. And just state your name and address, sir. We can go from there.

- Hi. My name is Eric Arneson. My address is 2732 East Carrera Court, in Green Bay. Thank you for the opportunity to address. I just wanna make a quick comment on the budget. And thank, and appreciate the idea of including a diversity officer on the team in Green Bay. I will say, I wanna speak for the, well I can't speak for the University, for me, my perspective on the University, I work as the vice chancellor of student affairs and campus climate at UW Green Bay. And I am the first chief diversity officer for the University. And I will have to say, from my experience, and from what Chancellor Miller, and now Chancellor Vangrunsman have told me, and what I see, is it has created a very different opportunity for us to really focus on serving all of our students. Really focus on creating an environment that is comfortable and supportive, and successful for our underrepresented students. We've made a pledge at the University that we wanna do a better job mirroring our community. And as you all know, our community is rapidly shifting and changing, which is exciting. And so, my job was created so that we can do a better job partnering with our community, and we can support our rapidly diversifying community. So, we have been able to create new policies, new procedures, strategic plans to be encompassing to all of our students. And we're seeing that pay off for us now, whereas, with our refocus on our community, which is, again, it's shifting quickly, to 25% of our freshmen class this year are students of color. Which is like double what it has been. And so, as a citizen of Green Bay, just, away from my position, I can see it as well as you can, that our city is rapidly diversifying. And if we don't prepare ourselves for that, in my mind as, again, just as a citizen, we have two forks. One is which we can include everybody and raise ourselves to a level that's really exciting, and leveraging all of these different ideas and thoughts. Or we can create a, if we don't do that, you can see, I'm not gonna name any cities, but there are cities that don't do that, and it's not going well for them. So I really applaud you for, to be intentional, and reaching out and creating a position and opportunity for everyone in this community to feel that they have someone here for them is on their side. So that's it. I just wanted to say that. Thank you, and I appreciate the effort.

- [Mayor] Thanks for your comments, sir. Any questions?

- Am I supposed to stay here?

- [Mayor] No, I don't think we have any questions from the alders. Thank you, sir. Appreciate it. Any further comments on any items in the city budget? Alder from the 12th.

- Thank you, Mayor. I'm assuming no other member of the public will step forward, so I think it might be a appropriate time to read the email from the constituent.

- [Mayor] Absolutely, go for it.

- "Mr. Brunette, I'm writing because I have concerns "about the proposed budget you'll be discussing tonight. "As a resident of Green Bay for 14 years, "I've always bragged about what a clean, safe, "and family friendly city it is. "I'm proud of our school system and the efforts made "to provide the very best education for all our students. "I love the improvements we've undertaken, "like the City Deck, and the Titledown District. "I understand that change is a crucial part "of keeping our community growing. "Some changes, though, seem like vanity projects "when they happen at the expense "of essential services like police and fire. "The proposed diversity coordinator sounds like "a gesture towards inclusivity, a nice, "but not entirely necessary gesture. "Certainly there are underfunded departments, "projects that could make good use of that salary. "I understand that the proposed budget allows "for the hiring of five new police officers, "but I question if that still leaves "the department understaffed. "It's my understanding that a current HR position "will morph into a

diversity coordinator "and potentially be paid at a rate "as much as \$33 per hour. "I believe that would be better spent on another officer. "I would hate to think that the budget "that passed through the Finance Personnel Committee, "without so much as a challenge, would also move "through City Council without real discussion. "A discussion that addresses the needs of the community "in terms of infrastructure repair and safety services. "Thank you for your time and attention." Just reading that per her request. Thank you.

- [Mayor] You wanna enter her name into the record?

- Anonymous.

- [Mayor] Okay. Thank you.

- For the record, Mayor. I did say that I could read it anonymous, or attach her name. I didn't hear back if she wanted her name, so I don't think she was hiding from that opinion. It's just I don't feel comfortable sharing that

- Sure.

- Until I have her confirmation, that's all.

- [Mayor] That's fine. Sir, did you have comments to offer?

- [Man] Yes sir, with all due respect.

- [Mayor] No, sir, if you'd like to make comments, please just offer your name and address.

- [Brian] My name is Brian .

- [Mayor] There we go.

- My name is Brian Higgin Bothem. Address 850 Newfeld Street. I did wanna step up and just make a comment regarding the diversity position. I do have a concern about that. I did not prepare a big lengthy report or anything, but, what I wanted to say is, deep down I would like us to focus on unity, and not diversity. There is a diversity of us all. And there is such a plethora of that. It would take us eons to really recognize every aspect of diversity of every human being on the planet. In regards to our city, our state, our nation, I'd like to see us just be focused that we're Americans. Focused on we're United States citizens. Focused on we have a fabric, a supreme law of the land, the United States Constitution. We have a state constitution. We have a state flag. We have a United States flag. So, I guess what I just really wanted to emphasize, or just speak my piece, was, I would not support, and I don't think we should support, a diversity position. I think we should really be focusing on unity. What makes us strong and unified as a city, state, and nation. And I wanna thank you for your time.

- [Mayor] Thank you, sir.

- My name is Andrea Haye. I live at 550 South Huron Road in Green Bay. I wasn't planning on talking today. I work at Green Bay Water Utility. As the communications director, and I also am a member and, well, not representing, but I am here as a member of YPAC, the Young Professionals Action Council. And we are here, some of us couldn't get here right on time, but I know they would want me to support in favor of this position. Our demographics in Green Bay are changing, and our workforce should reflect that. And right now it does not. And I will say, when you bring up the police force, the police force is the most diverse, I believe, department in the city of Green Bay. And we rely on them heavily for a Hmong speaker, for a Spanish speaker.

And when we sit around a table with Celistine, and the other department heads, we rely on them, and we really do need this position. And that's all I have to say.

- [Mayor] Thank you.

- My name is Stephanie Vanderzandin. And I'm at 400 North Washington. I represent Schreiber Foods. And I, as well, am director of diversity and inclusion, where that was the first position, at our organization, around diversity and inclusion, as well. We had efforts prior, but it was the first time we had a formal position at our organization. And a few things that I would like to share. I am very much in support of the new diversity coordinator position. When we look at trying to attract and retain top talent to this area, we have to be an inclusive as an organization, so Schreiber, and as a community, because our employees need to interact in the communities and they need to be supported in that. And diversity does not equal inclusion. So, while our workforce may be diversifying, and our country is diversifying, our goal, as well, is unity, but unity does not necessarily come by just saying, "Let's all get along." We all have to learn about each other. And these kind of positions really help to create cultural competence, awareness, also to help create measurements so it's visible if we have inequities within our workforce. So there's a lot of value and light that these kind of positions can bring about. When we look at other communities that have these type of positions, you can really see the impact that it's making. And for us, as an organization, and for me personally, this position is incredibly important to help keep us moving forward. And, as a large employer in the area, to be able to sustain a diverse workforce that also has the support within the communities where they reside. Thank you.

- [Mayor] Thank you so much for your comments. Alder from the first.

- Hi. I also have a email that I'd like to read from two of my constituents. They're very involved, and they often email me. "Hi Barb. "Two votes yes from us. "Stagnant tax rates for previous years "has done Green Bay no favors. "Everything costs more. "City services and overhead are no different. "Switch in what water bills encompass is good too. "I also feel any landlords on the council "should recuse themselves. "They're playing a far bigger dual role. "Tax rates basically affect their income "to the point they may vote what's good "for their own pockets, not the city, "or residents in the city." And that's Susan and David Parsons.

- [Mayor] Thanks, Alder. Any other comments from the public?

- [Renita] Renita Robinson.

- [Mayor] Sorry, go ahead.

- Good evening, Renita Robinson. My address is 1301 South Chestnut Avenue. And I'm also the CEO of the YWCA, and so thank you all so much for having the courage to be in a conversation about allowing for funds to create this diversity coordinator position. The YWCA actually celebrated 100 years in Green Bay this year, and I'm the first African American administrator at the institution. And so, I understand that there is a desire for unity, and unity won't come unless people who look different than the majority people are at the table and creating, just, visibility and a call for conversations that address things like implicit bias and all of the other things that are connected to issues around equity in schools, and access to a number of different things. And so, I just wanted to come as a member of the community to say that this position is necessary because as we change and the workforce diversifies, but also as the demographics of the community change, there is a need to have conversations, and someone representing the voice of the marginalized individuals in the community. And the diversity coordinator position would be that, is my understanding, in the way the position is being created, or structured. So, thank you so much.

- [Mayor] Thanks for your comments.

- Good evening. My name is Jeanine Calloway. I'm at 3084 Beck Drive. And I'm coming to speak for the position devoted to diversity and inclusion in Green Bay. I'm very passionate about this position. When my family and I moved here six years ago it was very obvious that there wasn't someone waking up everyday thinking about this topic. And so, as a wife of a African American husband who teaches in the school district, and we both have two African American sons, we have personally experienced why this community needs someone devoted to diversity and inclusion. In addition to coming to you as a mother and a wife of two individuals in the Green Bay school district, I also come to you as an employee of Schreiber Foods, where I am the director of talent. And so, my job is to find top talent, bring them into the organization, and help retain them. And I think that we can do as much as we can, but they have to go home. And what we don't have is a consistent partnership, within the community, devoted to making sure that those that come from other places outside of Green Bay feel welcome and included. And I was very excited to read this job description, to know that the city is thinking about this, and to help us to become more progressive in this space. So, it's not about bringin' different people to Green Bay, it's about retaining them. And so, having someone everyday waking up thinking about this will allow us to make more progress around this area, and allow this to be a place for, not just families to come, but also students and businesses. So that they can help Green Bay grow for the future. Thank you.

- [Mayor] Thank you so much for your comments. Any other comments from the public? Before we move on to the next item. Any other comments? All right. Thank you so much. We're on to ordinances, second reading for adoption.

- [Clerk] You may, under suspension of the rules, take up items one and two with a roll call vote.

- [Mayor] Motion made by alder from the seventh, seconded by alder from the third. Suspend the rules, take up these items with one roll call vote. All in favor that motion, please signify by saying "aye."

- [Group] Aye.

- [Mayor] Those opposed, "nay." The ayes have it, the rules are suspended. I entertain a motion to adopt items K1 and K2. Motion made by alder from the seventh, seconded by alder from the second. Please use the board. And those pass I I to one. Item L, report of the redevelopment authority, October 29, 2019. Your wishes regarding this report.

- [Woman] Second.

- Motion made by alder from the eighth, seconded by alder from the first, to approve report L, which is the report of the Redevelopment Authority from the meeting on October 29, 2019. Any items under this report you wish to handle separately? Number two. Item two will be handled separately. Hearing none others. All in favor of approving that report, please signify by saying "aye."

- [Group] Aye.

- Those opposed, "nay." And alder from the eighth. On item two.

- Thank you, Mr. Mayor. In the development agreement on page eight and nine, under roman numeral number four, obligations of the developer. Then C, and three under that. I would make a motion to delete that. This has to do with a line item of not less than 1% of the estimate aggregate assessed value of the property, which shall be used towards, dedicated towards, basically, public art. So, I make a motion to remove that requirement of requiring the developer to put money towards public art.

- [Mayor] Do we have a second?

- [Scannell] Point of clarification.

- [Mayor] Just one second, alder. We have a second. I'm gonna go to Director Vonck who might be able to talk about the discussion of this item between RDA and developer here.

- Sure. So, the reason for the inclusion of that line item, the percent for the art, follows a resolution that was passed by the Redevelopment Authority to insert this provision into the standard language for development agreements. And with that, what it allows to do it's described in there, the resolution described what public art is. I think it's pretty open and flexible, in terms of incorporating art into the project. I think later we're discussing, potentially, about public art. There's a whole litany of reasons why public art should be included. With that, it was done, by resolution, for the RDA and it can only be removed with the RDA's consent. I may defer to attorney, city Attorney Chavez, in terms of if the council were to remove this item from, because of the way it was done at RDA, the forward process. But it's likely that it would have to go back to RDA for their consent to also agree to remove it. But I guess I would defer to the city attorney in terms of the exact process for that.

- [Mayor] Before Attorney Chavez comments, I just wanted a point of clarification. This was a special meeting.

- Correct.

- [Mayor] Of the RDA because of the time sensitivity.

- Correct. So, the developer on TWG holdings out of Indianapolis, they're the ones who worked on the Broadway loft. Michael Taft, with the developer, is here today, if there's any questions for them. But part of this project involves opportunity zoned funds. And in order to reach the maximum benefit of those funds they needed to be invested by the end of the year. And so, yes, we did have a special RDA meeting because of the time sensitivity of this nature.

- [Mayor] Okay. Thank you, Director. Attorney Chavez.

- Yes, that is correct. So, this is essentially a three party agreement. So, because there are three parties to this, and the RDA has adopted, by resolution requirement that one percent be included by the developer. If the city does not agree, we're essentially sending these back for renegotiations. So, the agreement does not take effect until all three parties have agreed to it. But if one party does not agree to terms, it doesn't strike that term it just sends it back for everybody to, essentially as a renegotiation.

- [Mayor] Thank you. Alder from the seventh, did you?

- Oh, alder from the eighth.

- Thank you. Well, number one, and this comes up quite frequently in my, I'll do the Guizama thing, in my 20 years. We always get things at the last minute. You know, gosh darn it, it's gotta go through tonight because there's not time left. Well then get it to us earlier. I don't like that hammer hanging over us every time. We gotta pass it tonight, because it can't go back, we don't have enough time. Well, bologna. I don't think government should be imposing this type of requirement. I mean, we have an art czar, who supposedly is going out and getting grants and fundraising. Is that gonna remove all the requirements of that job position? I mean, that'd be fine with me, but this money that we're requiring them to put towards art they could use towards the project, or maybe need less of our TIF dollars, and then we can end that TIF sooner. I think there's other ways to get community art then requiring it of new developments. I'm all for the development, looks like a great development. It's just this particular item. And, per Attorney Chavez's recommendation, the council will actually be discussing, later in the report, under R, report of the Public Arts Commission, whether or not this council wants that to be included in any future RDA proposals. So that's under R, report of the Public Arts

Commission. So this, as a broad topic, will be brought up later. My motion would be, then, to refer this back to remove that item. If we can't just take it out right now. Is that what I'm hearing?

- [Mayor] Are you changing your motion?

- Well I would defer it to attorney. Or can I just remove it tonight, and if the other parties say fine then we just move on? Otherwise if they say no, then we have to renegotiate, but if we remove it tonight and the other two parties say, "Yeah, okay, that's fine." Then we're good to go.

- [Mayor] Okay. Director Vonck.

- Sure. So, if council were to remove this provision tonight, then it would go back to the next Redevelopment Authority meeting, which would be next Tuesday. If Redevelopment Authority accepted the changes, then the agreement would be done 'cause all three parties would be in agreement. If they did not, then it would come back here again for the next council meeting. And, basically, we're gonna play volleyball until one side decides to settle.

- [Wery] My motion would be to remove that.

- [Woman] I second it.

- [Mayor] Motion made to remove.

- Remove.

- [Mayor] The language from the development agreement.

- Right.

- [Mayor] Regarding 1% for the arts.

- Yes.

- [Mayor] I think that was already seconded by alder from the 12th. Further comments?

- [Man] Yes sir, how do you--

- It's not showing up?

- [Mayor] No. Alder from the ninth.

- Thank you, Mayor. I understand the alder's opposition to the art requirement, and I think there's a time and place for that philosophical debate. And that occurred at the RDA, where it was passed, and it is coming up again on the agenda later here. I think it's important to note the tied sensitivity of this development is because this is an opportunity zoned fund. Which means for the developer to maximize their investment through a federally mandated law, they need to have property control, site control, by the end of the year. That's why this is time sensitive. And it takes time for these things to unfold. And so, I think that's a really important observation, because for us to get into a debate to remove something that a developer has agreed to, and is willing to do, is completely reckless when it comes to the potential of derailing a development agreement that could bring a 21 million dollar assessed project to the city of Green Bay. I'm not interested in derailing a project because of a philosophical difference. And when we come to this issue later on, and if, depending on if the RDA resolution stays in place, are we gonna oppose every development agreement that comes before us

because we don't want to include that requirement? I don't think that is how good government should work. When the majority decides on something, we need to unify behind that and move on. And so, I think it's important, in the interest of protecting the developers timeline on this, to exercise the opportunity zone fund that they have, we need to approve this, get the deal done, and then we can have the philosophical debate about this requirement moving forward, afterwards.

- [Mayor] Thank you, Alder. And just a note for the alders, the list is not showing up for speakers, so just wave at me, please. Alder from the seventh.

- Correct me if I'm wrong, but is that, when I read through this RDA agreement, their initial time there, this is all dependent upon an agreement between the RDA and the developer. In other words, there is no requirement for the developer to do 1%, half percent, or anything, if they feel that their project would be inhibited by making this contribution. They can negotiate that right out of the contract to any degree, including completely. So I don't even know what's to discuss here. If a developer wants to contribute to the public arts, I think that's great. If they don't want to, don't think they can, they can negotiate with the RDA. I believe, if there's an issue then, that might be something to take up if the developer says we can't do it and the RD says, "You're gonna." Which I find that highly unlikely. But that would be an issue to take up. Here there's no issue. The RDA says public art plays an important role in a city's development, and we wanna help promote the arts and help promote developing our city. And if developers come in, and many of them have that same attitude, they agreed, they realize what this means to their development, and to the city. They wanna see the city grow, and public arts helps the city grow. So if a developer is willing to go along, I don't know why we would kick at it. The problem would be if a developer says no, and the RDA says yes. Then, yes, we have an issue to take up. Otherwise, I don't see where the issue is. I totally oppose this. Thank you.

- [Mayor] Thanks, Alder. Alder from the first.

- Thank you, Mayor. So I wanna speak in support of what Alder Johnson and Alder Scannell both have said. I believe both of them have been present in RDA meetings where we have discussed this at length. I am on the RDA. And this is something that RDA had rigorous discussion about. And the developer has agreed to do this. There's really no reason that we should be trying to amend this, and to take this out. So I would definitely be opposed to this amendment, and I think that RDA has a good understanding of what a good city looks like. And, I travel, I think a lot of us travel, you travel around to cities, about the same size as Green Bay, throughout the United States, and there is a lot more art and spectacular art in those cities. And I want Green Bay to have that too. So, I am very much in favor of having the one percent in these contracts, and I am opposed to the amendment. Thank you.

- [Mayor] Alder from the eighth.

- Thank you, Mr. Mayor. A few things to note. This isn't a debate on whether public art is good or not. Public art is great. It's whether or not we require it. Which, we do, alderman from the seventh. Section four is obligations of the developer. You will do this. The reason it's in there is because the RDA said, "Anybody who takes money from us must have it." So it's not like they came forward and said, "Yeah we kinda wanna do this." We told 'em, "You have to do it." So, let's not play that game. And as far as RDA met. Well, you know RDA meets at 8:00 am, 10:00 am during the week. Some of us work, you know, a lot of people in the public work. RDA should really meet in evenings, when the public can have a chance to attend and give their knowledge, instead of having it during the day when staff, and the only interested parties can attend, people who do that for a living. So, that's a little bit bogus there as well. So, I just wanted to point out, it's not something they offered up, they had to do it. And we could have the debate on, yes, Alderman Scannell, they had to do it.

- Ask him.

- Alder.

- Okay .

- [Mayor] No crosstalk, come on.

- Thank you. So, I'm just saying, take this out, if they still wanna do it of their own accord, let's not tie their hands, we shouldn't be doing that. And then we can have the debate later, in general, we have an art czar now, who, supposedly, is getting all these grants and fundraising. That's where it should come naturally, some people in the community who wanna donate money towards the arts. When you go around in other cities, and I was just in St. Louis, you'll see little plaques of people who donated it. People are giving it because they want art, and that's the way it should come naturally, not forced. Thanks.

- [Mayor] Thank you. Alder from the 11th.

- My question is for Dr. Vonck. On this 1%, what is the actual dollar value the developer's actually gonna put forward on the 1% on this project?

- So, based on the assessed value, which we worked with our Assessor's Office to come up with an estimate of where it will be. We feel the project will be about 21 million dollars when assessed. So with that, the developer will be required to spend, or have a line item of \$210,000 towards public art. I think if you look in the definitions section, which is on page four, under sub M, I think we are pretty broad in how we describe public art. I think it's very important that public art is not just a statue, or a piece out in the yard. I think we're very deliberate and very liberal in our terms of explaining public art, and that can be incorporated into stand alone things that are in the public space. But in a lot of cases, that can also be integrated into the buildings. If the developer is working and there were some preliminary concept plans in there, would like to do some things, in terms of creative finishes, or elements, or parts of the building. Those things could be counted towards that public art. So they may serve a functional purpose, actually be part of the structure itself, but could also, then, be double counted towards the public art piece. Where this gets taken in, is when the developer, under their other obligations for submitting final concept plans, construction documents, in that, and then the budget. And that will be determined then, all right, these things are classified as public art. And then, that amount would be \$210,000, but some of that may be counted towards other things.

- [Mayor] Thank you, Alder. Any further comments? Alder from the seventh.

- Doc, if you could explain that agreement. How that works. Am I wrong, in that, it's not required that that's negotiated with the RDA?

- Sure. So, as you've seen, most development agreements we've come around a basic template that we use for negotiations. And I think it's language that's been worked on over time, counter it with our development team, that we really feel we have a good base from which to begin. There's some things that are in there that just are not negotiable when it comes to indemnity and liability, and things like that. As far as the public art requirement, how this was structured is generally when we work on a development agreement on provided authority to work with a developer and negotiate an agreement. And kind of negotiate the incentive, can negotiate other types of parts of the TIF incentive, other terms and conditions that are in there. What this did was remove my negotiating power, in terms of the public arts requirement, in saying that, "Look, we can negotiate things, "but if you want to remove the public art requirement, "you'll need to go to the RDA and ask specifically "to have it altered or removed." And so, that was the premise that, based on that resolution, felt that this particular thing was important enough that that's where it would be asked for relief, was from the redevelopment authority. And so with that, I think it's just important to note, again, those funds going towards public art on the building itself, or in coordination with the Public Arts Commission. And I think it's important to note that we have a public arts coordinator, and in terms of an individual, who I think, really makes our city awesome in terms of the public arts and what we do. It's very important that we continue to do that in our

community, again, for a number of reasons, and there's a public benefit to it, and that's why it was included, because TIF incentives are used, put forward to provide some public benefit. And in this case, we're calling out public arts as one of those public benefits.

- [Mayor] Thank you, Director. Alder from the seventh.

- Okay, so that can be negotiated, so both parties agreed to this, and so, there is no issue here now. And, also I would add that this type of thing is not a new invention. We are not inventing the wheel here, there are many municipalities that have this. It all depends on how you view the public art. Certainly, we have a public art coordinator, and a czar, to go fundraising. We'd like to do a lot with public art, and the more funds we can get for it the better. The better we can do, make our city more attractive, the more we'll retain the talent we have, the more we'll attract further development and population growth. So, this is an important piece to public growth, to our city growing, and... So we can have that philosophical debate later, though. For this agreement, there is no issue. Both sides agree to it. So, thank you.

- [Mayor] Thank you, Alder. Alder from the ninth.

- Thank you, Mayor Just one thing I forgot to mention before. This percent for the art is not supported by public dollars. It's not taxpayers that is paying this money. And the reason I wanna bring that up is part of this discussion is the Redevelopment Authority has agreed to this agreement, the developer has agreed to this agreement, and it would be foolish of us, I think, to send this back to RDA to reignite the negotiation process, because we don't want a developer to stick their own money into our community for a public good, which is the public art. They've already agreed to it. So, again, I think there's a time and a place to renegotiate that discussion, and that's later. I think for the purposes of this, and given the time sensitivity for the opportunity zone, we need to move this forward.

- [Mayor] Thank you, Alder. Any final comments? Before we vote on the motion. The motion before us-- The motion before us is to remove the provision in the development agreement that speaks to the 1% for the arts. We will use the board.

- [Man] Motion again, Mayor?

- To remove the 1% for the arts from the development agreement, before you. Oh yeah, we got it. Motion fails, nine, three. Entertain a motion to approve.

- [Woman] Move to approve.

- [Mayor] Motion made by alder from the ninth, seconded by alder from the first, to approve item two. All in favor, please signify by saying "aye."

- [Group] Aye.

- Those opposed, "nay."

- [Man] Nay.

- The ayes have it. The motion has been approved. On to item M, report of the Improvement and Services Committee.

- [Man] Motion to approve.

- [Woman] Second.

- Motion made by alder from the seventh, seconded by alder from the second, to approve report M, which is the report of the Improvement and Services Committee from the meeting on October 23, 2019. Any items under this report you wish to handle separately? Two, two. Item two. Any others? Item two will be handled separately, hearing none others, all in favor of approving the remainder of that report, please signify by saying "aye."

- [Group] Aye.

- Those opposed, "nay." The ayes have it, the report has been approved with the exception of item two. Item two was pulled by alder from the eighth. Light on the subject, here. Alder from the tenth.

- Thank you, Your Honor. At committee this week we had half the committee there, and it was two to one vote against the even odd parking. And after some discussion with another alder or two, I decided that I think it would be good to bring this back. So, I make a motion to bring this back to INS with the full committee, so that we can hash that out a lot better. Thank you.

- [Mayor] Motion made by alder from the tenth, seconded by alder from the third, to refer the item back to committee discussion. Alder from the sixth.

- I think we really have to look at this issue, because, in my district, we have a lot of older homes and they don't have the room, they have one stall garages, short driveways. It's fine for those alders who have in districts, or outside of the inner core of the city, basically. They have larger lots, they have room to park these vehicles. And a lot of families today, even their children, their teenagers have jobs, have to work. So they have a lot of cars, and it's becoming a burden on a lot of them. So, I support looking at some way of alleviating this situation. Thank you.

- [Mayor] Thank you, Alder. Alder from the ninth.

- Thank you, Mayor. I support referral as well. I think this is one of those issues that, at least I know that I'd requested at the last INS meeting, the one prior to where this decision was made, I requested to see what our neighboring communities were doing. And I didn't see that in the packet. And so, I would support referral, because I still wanna see that information. I wanna see De Pere, and Alloway, and Bellevue. I know we saw some other cities across the state, but I think what our neighbors are doing locally. I'm still struggling to determine, what is it that the city of Green Bay has figured out, or hasn't been able to figure out, that everybody else has, when it comes to this issue. And the other piece that I'd really like to see is financial impact. I think we've talked a lot, Alder Steuer, in particular, I know you've talked about this being a revenue generator. I'm not focused on this as a revenue generator, but I'm also very cognizant of the fact that there is a financial impact. And a financial impact, if this were to pass, we'd have to change signage, some services would have to be adjusted. We're gonna lose parking citation revenue. That has to be a conversation on the table. And so, I would ask that Public Works Department also come back, maybe, with some type of evaluation, or assessment, if this is successfully referred, on financial impact to the city, in terms of what it would take to do this. I do think it's time for us to give this a more serious look. Things have changed. I obviously have a very large chunk of my district, as well, that is negatively impacted by this ban. And I just wanna make sure that we're looking at the right information, the right data, when we're making a decision, before we completely reject this out of hand.

- [Mayor] Thanks, Alder. Alder from the tenth.

- Thank you, Your Honor. I entertain that, Alder Johnson. I think that it's important that we look at all factors here. The fact is that I grew up in Milwaukee and they've had it for many years. And I looked at 17 different cities, 10 of 'em were for it, seven were against. So, you're gonna get splits here. I feel that it is important. I

have a feeling, you know, we had push back from Public Works, and also police, on this. And I think one of the things that came forward was that, well you could have junk cars, you could have this that and the other thing laying around. My thought is that if you had a car, one vehicle, with, let's say, a permit. That would limit a lot of that. So the permit would be there. And some folks have talked about the fact that maybe a permit, maybe it should be free. Okay, well, we can talk about that as well. But I will say that if you pay one or two parking tickets, that would be the cost of a permit. So, there's a lot of scenarios here. I don't think we hit every one as much as we did. I did a lot of research on this, myself. And I might have been, along with Public Works, I think there was some differences as far as what I found and what they found. And I don't pretend to be a total expert on this issue, but I have a feeling that a lot of the things I didn't do research on were very good. So, I take pride in that. So I think, I agree that we should really bring it back, and I have a good feeling that we'll discuss it very well. Thank you.

- [Mayor] Any further discussion? Motion before us is referral back to committee on item two. All in favor, please signify by saying "aye."

- [Group] Aye.

- [Mayor] Those opposed, "nay." The ayes have it, the motion is, or the item has been referred back to committee. On to item N, report of the Protection and Policy Committee.

- [Man] Motion to approve.

- [Mayor] Motion made by alder from the seventh, seconded by alder from the fifth, to approve report O, which is the report of the Protection and Policy Committee on October 28th, 2019. All right. Item six will be held separately. Any other items?

- [Man] Number five.

- [Mayor] Five. Six. So items five and six will be handled separately. Hearing none others, all in favor of approving the remainder of that report, please signify by saying "aye."

- [Group] Aye.

- [Mayor] Those opposed, "nay." The ayes have it, the report has been approved with the exceptions of items five and six. What are your wishes regarding item five?

- [Man] Motion to approve.

- Second.

- [Mayor] Motion made by alder from the seventh, seconded by alder from the 10th. Item was pulled by alder from 12th. You have the floor.

- Yes, thank you, Mayor. I wanna make sure that the council knows what the recommendation of the committee was. It wasn't so much to create an ordinance, but I believe it was to refer to staff to look into it, and possibly to create an ordinance in golf carts, if you recall when I made the communication a few months ago, I think, perhaps it was a while back. I mentioned golf carts for lack of a better term, but this is actually low speed vehicles, and it could be a number of things. Current ordinance already allows certain low speed vehicles. So, as we refer to staff, they'll look into it, and I'm not saying I'm gonna fully endorse this, but I think there's enough there to look at a possibility to move forward. But the motion, as presented in the agenda pack, I don't think is a true representation of what was discussed at the council, what the intent of the motion, the communication was a few months back. Thank you.

- [Mayor] Would you like to make an alternate motion?
- Yeah, I think the motion should be to refer to staff to gather data to determine whether or not a ordinance should be created.
- [Man] Second.
- [Mayor] Motion made by alder from the 12th, seconded by alder from the sixth. Seeing no... Alder from the ninth.
- Thank you, Mayor. Attorney Chavez, there is, I currently have a communication submitted about creating an ordinance to allow for the use of scooters and other devices. Is it possible that this item could be included within that discussion? Or does it make sense to have those separate?
- Either way is appropriate to be. Ordinances are different because there is a possibility they would end up on sidewalks, but we could definitely consider both of them at the same time, and if it requires two separate ordinances we can draft those simultaneously.
- [Johnson] Okay, thank you.
- [Mayor] All right, motions been made by alder from the 12th, it was seconded by alder from the sixth, I believe. Any further comments? All in favor, please signify by saying "aye."
- [Group] Aye.
- Those opposed, "nay." The ayes have it, the item has been approved. On to item six. Was pulled by alder from the ninth. You have the floor.
- Thank you, Mayor. Just a question, 'cause as I was reading through the packet, it wasn't very transparent to me. Unless I was not picking up on the hints. And I assume this is to Celestine, right? Is she back there?
- [Mayor] Ms. Jefferies, yeah.
- Celestine, if you could just maybe talk a little bit about this proposal, what it means in terms of obligations by the city.
- [Mayor] Ms. Jefferies.
- Surely. Thank you, Mayor. Thank you, Alder Johnson. Sorry my computer's a little bit in the way. So, the Green Tier Legacy Community Charter, this is essentially a group of communities around Wisconsin that have signed onto this. They are, essentially, we get help in many, many areas. If you just give me a moment, I will pull up my notes. So, we get help with water resource management, with addressing watershed issues, drinking water, stormwater management. I know we do have Nancy Quirk, and her staff at the Water Utility, who are on top of our lead crisis. And Matt Higgen liable, and Ryan Pickler in the stormwater utility section, the utility manager of DPW on it. We can always learn more about best practices. We also get help preparing and implementing a sustainability plan. We can also, they will help us find funding from the state and the federal government. And, basically, comply with water regulations in a cost effective way. So, the number of communities in Wisconsin that are part of the Green Tier Legacy are numerous; Eau Claire, Fitchburg, La Crosse, Monona, Oshkosh, De Pere, Appleton, to name just a few. So, I think this is a real benefit. It basically gives us more than we have to obligate ourselves. That's how I read it.

- [Mayor] Alder from the ninth.

- Thanks. Thank you, Celestine. Just, maybe, is this kind of a scenario where they choose us as a community? 'Cause otherwise I look at it and I say, why wouldn't every community wanna be apart of this if it's, there's no commitment, there's no obligations, we'll help you do stuff. So, is this kind of like a competitive thing where they choose us?

- No. We had a presentation on sustainability, and we... We would, sorry, that was quite distracting.

- [Mayor] We're good.

- Okay. Sorry. So, your question, excuse me, alder, was why wouldn't everyone do it? If it's not big obligations on our part, why not? Well, I think there's a process for signing onto something. When we sign on to this, we're saying, "Yes, we really, "we would like to be a more sustainable, "more resilient community." I can't answer why all 72 counties in all of, I'm not sure how many municipalities there are in Wisconsin.

- 616.

- Thank you, Mayor.

- I think.

- Wouldn't sign on, but I think this is really a really great thing for us to do. And we are already making moves toward doing some of these things. We have a grant, we're pursuing another grant. So, yes, I think this would be a fantastic thing for us to do.

- [Johnson] Thank you.

- You're welcome.

- [Mayor] Thanks, Alder. Alder from the eighth.

- Thank you, Mr. Mayor. I know we discussed this briefly, two weeks ago, and then kind of cut it off because it was going to protection and policy. As I had brought up last time, the DNR set this up with some pretty clear goals of environmental improvement. And you can see in the resolution, number one is water resource management, and number two is sustainability practices. And those are spelled out pretty clearly. You can't really deny that those both need working on. But then it goes on further, they take it a step further than what the DNR set up, and include public health and social equity. And that's kind of the gray area, where you're not, well, does that really have anything to do with water resource management and sustainability? And when you look at some of the things, if you print off their information, their legacy community strategy options, their best practices, they go into healthy food access, physical activity, housing, crime prevention, climate change, noise. Does the council know that's what they're getting into when you're signing, and really to work on your environment. And, from what my reading of the resolution, it seems pretty clear, whereas by adopting this resolution, the city of Green Bay agrees to sign and hold to the Green Tier Charter. To sign and hold. And then further on, be it further resolved that the city of Green Bay staff, and members of the Sustainability Commission, are directed to assist with meeting the charter goals. That doesn't seem real ambiguous. That we can, or you might, or you may. It seems that we're saying that we will. I still think we should go back and be a tier one, or tier two member. If you had a chance in the last two weeks, I had mentioned that last time you could be a tier one or tier two member with the DNR to improve the main areas that we're lookin' at, water resource and sustainability. So, I'm gonna vote no against this. I don't like that third portion. I think we should take a different route, and just focus on the environmental part. Thanks.

- [Mayor] Alder from the seventh.

- Thank you. I'm on the Sustainability Commission, and one of the reasons we were very excited about this is this happened in last December, we had this discussion on this Green Tier, and had them come in and present. And at that time we were busy working on goals. And we decided, why should we reinvent the wheel, when we've got an organization out here who can lay it all out for us, not only goals, but matrices on meeting those goals. Whatever the language says, there is no commitment that we have, no one has any authority to make this city do anything. What are they, who's gonna do that? How? This is completely under our control. We wanna join Green Tier, for one, it saved us a lot of work at the commission from having to reinvent the wheel with coming up goals, and all that stuff, it's all laid out. It's providing us with plenty of resources and networking us with other municipalities, so we can see what they're doin', they can see what we're doin'. But no one has to do anything. We are not giving up any authority on this council. There is no one that can come and say, "You have to do this." How would they enforce it? It's just, no. I'm not exactly sure. What Green Tier is looking for is that we are committed to participating. And perhaps they don't have it worded as well as it should be, but there's absolutely no way the city is committed in doing anything it doesn't wanna do. No one has any kind of legal authority over us. This is a nonbinding resolution. It's just a statement of intent, statement of goals, a way to get there, and a way to network and get resources. It's all it is. There's parts of it that we may end up never even getting to. Or we may get to and amend, or completely redo, depending upon the environment of the time and how it fits for our city. We are not required to follow any guidelines that we don't want to, that we don't think work for us, or any goal that we don't think doesn't work for us. We can pick up any goal at any time and let the others lay a side that we want. This is a nonbinding resolution. It's just, I don't see it's worth picking over. For anything that there's anything objectionable in it. And, on the whole, it has been very helpful for the commission, in setting goals, setting matrices, networking, resources, the whole works. So, on the whole, it is definitely worth, I think, the city's time. Thank you.

- [Mayor] Alder from the first.

- Thank you, Mayor. So, I'm definitely in favor of supporting this resolution. I attended the Protection Policy Committee meeting, we had a great presentation. And, part of my understanding was that there could be grant funds available to us that might not otherwise be available if we don't sign on to this resolution. I'm also, generally, in support of goals relating to economic development, public health, and social equity. And so, I would think that that's a really good part of the resolution, in addition to the water resource management and sustainability practices. And I have no problem, whatsoever, supporting this resolution. Thank you very much.

- [Mayor] Thank you. I neglected to entertain a motion here, on this item.

- [Man] Motion to deny.

- [Man] Second.

- [Mayor] Motion made by alder from the third, seconded by alder from the eighth to--

- Can we have an affirmative motion so that we're not voting backwards? Like... I don't know. How does that work?

- [Mayor] Alder made the motion, so...

- [Man] It is right.

- Okay.

- [Mayor] It's on the table. So, we'll use the board on this. This motion is made, alder from the eighth.

- So could you clearly explain that, if you vote no, you're supporting the resolution.
- Alder from the eighth, just one second.
- Thank you, Mr. Mayor. I just wanted to point out that those grant funds are still available if you're tier one or tier two. That's the whole purpose of having this organization. Whether or not you're in the special one or not. And if you read in the Green Tier Charter, actually, into the Legacy Communities Charter, it clearly states if you're not following along, you can get kicked out. So, they could come back and say, "Hey you're not doing all "these things, we want you out." So, there are repercussions, you can't just do each one. Thanks.
- [Mayor] Thank you. So, alder from the third made a motion, seconded by alder from the eighth, to reject this item. So, if you vote in favor of that motion, you'd be rejecting the item. We're gonna use the board. Sorry. Motion fails, nine, three. Motion made by alder from the ninth.
- [Scannell] Second.
- [Mayor] Seconded by alder from the seventh, to approve. All in favor of the motion, please signify by saying "aye."
- [Group] Aye.
- [Mayor] Those opposed, "nay."
- [Man] Nay.
- [Mayor] The ayes have it. Motion has been approved. On to item O, report of the Protection Policy Committee granting operating licenses.
- [Scannell] Motion to approve.
- [Man] Second.
- Motion made by alder from the seventh, seconded by alder from the third, to approve report O, which is the report of the Protection and Policy Committee granting operator licenses.
- [Galvin] I need to abstain on one person.
- Very good.
- Alder from the fourth.
- Thank you, Your Honor. I need to abstain on one of the applicants, Jacqueline Lifeger.
- [Mayor] I'm sorry.
- Jacqueline Lifeger, I need to abstain from voting on her.
- [Mayor] All right, that's been recorded. Any others? Any names that you wish to handle separately? Hearing none, all in favor of the report, please signify by saying "aye."
- [Group] Aye.

- [Mayor] Those opposed, "nay." The ayes have it. The report has been approved. Noting the abstention. On to P, report of the Plan Commission.
- [Scannell] Motion to approve.
- [Mayor] Motion made by alder from the seventh.
- [Woman] Second.
- [Mayor] Seconded by alder from the second, to approved report P, which is the report of the Plan Commission from the meeting on October 21, 2019. Any items under this report you wish to handle separately? Alder?
- Just a clarification point, that I'm not going to abstain in the Broadway Business Plan. And I wanna clarify, it's because I am not, I do not report to that separate board of directors, so a conflict does not exist. And I just want that to be stated for the record.
- [Mayor] Noted. All right, any items to be held separately? Hearing none, all in favor of that report, please signify by saying "aye."
- [Group] Aye.
- [Mayor] Those opposed, "nay." They ayes have it. Report has been approved. On to Q, report of the Park Committee.
- [Man] Motion to approve.
- [Woman] Second.
- [Mayor] Motion made by alder from the seventh, seconded by alder of the fifth, to approve report Q, which is a report of the Parks Committee from the meeting on October 23, 2019. Any items to be handled separately? Hearing none. All in favor of that report, please signify by saying "aye."
- [Group] Aye.
- [Mayor] Those opposed, "nay." The ayes have it, the report has been approved. The report of public arts.
- [Man] Motion to approve.
- [Mayor] Motion made by alder from the seventh,
- [Man] Second.
- [Mayor] Seconded by alder from the third, to approve a report R, which is the report of the Public Arts Commission from the meeting of October 23, 2019. Any items you wish to handle separately?
- [Man] Number one.
- [Mayor] Number one. Item one will be handled separately. Hearing none others, all in favor of approving the remainder of that report, please signify by saying "aye."

- [Group] Aye.
- [Mayor] Those opposed, "nay." The ayes have it, the item has been approved with the exception of item one. Your wishes regarding item one.
- [Man] Motion to approve.
- [Mayor] Motion made by alder from the seventh, seconded by alder from the first. Alder from the eighth, pull the item, you have the floor.
- Thank you, Mr. Mayor. We already had some extensive discussion on this earlier. I'm just going to amend it to say to deny the RDAs resolution 1903, regarding percent for art. Would that work, Attorney Chavez? I mean, we can just vote no, but... I prefer to say deny.
- [Mayor] Attorney Chavez.
- So, to clarify, this has no affect, so if you deny it, it's basically the city saying that that's not a standard they're adopting, but it has no affect on what the RDA does, because they are a separate body and have adopted, by resolution. It is just stating the intention of the body.
- [Wery] Things that are timely. All right, thank you.
- [Mayor] So, there's a motion to deny the RDAs decision.
- That's correct.
- [Mayor] To adopt resolution 1903, regarding percent for the art.
- I don't think we should be forcing this on developers, because, I think, if you're forcing a developer to pay 200 grand, 300 grand, whatever it is. If you have some huge development, they're gonna find a way to work that into their other expenses and get more TIF out of it. So I don't care what you say, it's really not comin' out of their pocket. I really think we need to get those TIF closed earlier, give out less. You know, they're gonna find a way to get this back from us. So we're really just paying it to ourself. Thanks.
- [Mayor] Thanks, Alder. Do we have a second on the motion?
- [Man] Second.
- [Mayor] Seconded by alder from the 12th. Discussion. Further. Alder from the seventh.
- Well, I just disagree that this is gonna come out of our TIF. There's no evidence for that. And, like I said, this has been adopted in other cities. I see no reason why we wanna deny the RSAs opportunity, everything is negotiable. I think if we start coming into a scenario, where we have a developer saying this is an issue, then we could maybe take up their cause with the RDA. But, as far as I can tell, most developers agree with the RDA, agree with promoting public art. They recognize the value of it. Not only to their own development, but to the city, and to the further development of the city. So, I would just say that until we got a flowing development, I don't know why we wouldn't go forward with this. Thank you.
- [Mayor] Thank you, Alder. Alder from the 10th.
- Thank you, Your Honor. Well, Alder Scannell and Alder Johnson, I just, when you were talking about this over at RDA, what research did you do on other communities that may do something like this? Did you find

any other communities that had this, or was this something that just came forward? Could you clarify that a little bit?

- [Mayor] Alder from the ninth.

- Thank you, Mayor. Yeah, there are a lot of communities that do this. Particularly those that are growing, that are successful, that have strong economic conditions. There's a strong case to be made for public art in a community. And I think we can have that discussion, we can have that debate, it's already occurred at the RDA. But I think the bigger issue, here, really is how we interact with developers. And I think that there's this fear that developers will no longer come to the city of Green Bay, and yet, nothing has proved to be more untrue with that particular fear. So, to answer your question directly, yes, while Green Bay is the first city to make this particular policy active, the city of Madison has adopted something that will take effect, I believe in January. There are many other cities across the country that do something quite similar. In fact, some of them, many of them do 2%, 1.4%. State of Wisconsin even had a similar policy. I think it really boils down to how it applies to different situations. In our case, we're only applying it to TIF funded projects. The state of Wisconsin did, I think it was 0.2%. Even the mayor might have more knowledge of that. No, I think you weren't in the legislature yet, then. But, it's, and in the case of Madison, they only do on public buildings. So, there's definitely a wide variety of options. This was the particular path that the Redevelopment Authority chose. We require investments, a lot of investments, when TIF funding is supported. We require people to put in trees, to put in roads, to put in certain ascetics in a building. Heck, not long ago, we were here debating whether or not someone should put balconies into a TIF funded project. We do that all the time, already. We're just, basically, we're sending the message here that public art should take a priority in this, as a public good, as a public impression that is valuable to our community.

- [Mayor] Thank you. Alder from the 10th has the floor.

- Those are good comments. I'm just wondering when this came forward, as far as developers coming in and talking to the RDA about this, I wasn't at the meeting either. But, was there a cooperation between developers and the RDA on this point, as far as, it's not required that they do it? I mean, I guess I'm just trying to understand it a little bit better. It sounds to me like public art it's important, a lot of folks are looking at that, but I'm just wondering if... If this was mandatory for these developers when they came in to include that in their project, or is this something where they could defer out if they'd like?

- [Mayor] I'll allow Director Vonck to chime in here. Just on the process.

- Sure. So, as for the process, Alder Johnson is correct in that we looked at a number of other communities who had done this. One of the ways we looked at approaching this, after discussing a number of ways, was to look at this for publicly, or when projects involved public financing through tax increment financing. We felt, just given in terms of where things were at for our budget, for the city, to go like the Madison approach, or the state approach, and requiring it of, actually, public projects. So, if we were to build a new police and fire, public safety building, part of that then, okay, we'd require a percentage to go to the public arts. That is not the case here, because that would actually require then, that would have a big impact on levy dollars. And then that would impact your tax bill. In this case, we looked at doing TIF supported projects. When there is an agreement between a developer, the Redevelopment Authority, and the city, they have to meet a but-for test. And in but-for, this project, you know, but-for public assistance, we can't do this project. And so, when we look at doing a TIF incentive, it is very important for us that the dollars that we are putting into the project, or what we're asking for, that money goes first into public improvements, then it goes into environmental remediation, asbestos removal, those types of things. And then, anything else that the RDA would specify before you get into the private improvements. And the big reason for that is if a development goes sideways, there's at least some tangible benefit to the public. And, again, many cases you need to provide a public benefit when you're investing tax increment dollars. Yes, even though they're really the developer dollars, right? Because they're the ones creating the increment. The RDA was very specific that we fail, okay, in addition to

the infrastructure that's important, right? The streets, roads, pipes, things like that, which we're paying for with TIF dollars in these projects. Public art is also a vital component. And, in terms of what that means, there's these policies all over the country. And in terms of how it's had an impact, I think Alder Johnson was very clear in saying, "Look, this wasn't gonna be retroactive, "or anything we hadn't already been negotiating." They were exempt, right? Because you didn't want a 11th hour surprise. But with ones that we were starting new and working on, it was to be included. And I think the way that the policy was adopted, it provides a lot of flexibility for these developers. And, so they are able to integrate it in a lot of ways. If they wanna integrate it and do something really awesome in their building, in terms of putting a mural on the side, or adding some really great architectural details, those things count. And guess what, if the project changes over time, those things are still visible to the public. There's still a public benefit to it. And so, I think just given how we've done it, and seeing that since we've done it. A few weeks ago we approved one Ester, tonight we approve the TWG Apartments. And we're continuing to work on other agreements, and that's a part of it, and we haven't gotten kickback.

- [Mayor] Alder from the 10th.

- May be a silly question, but as far as the art that comes forward, is this something that the Sustainability Commission will look at, or the Arts Commission, would look at, as far as deciding what's appropriate, what isn't? Or art is for the sake of art. Who decides that?

- Ultimately, it will be decided, the avenue we anticipate it being decided by is the Redevelopment Authority, in terms of when they are submitting plans they are required to submit plans and specifications. So that if you say you're gonna build something, you need to build it. And those plans need to get approved by the Redevelopment Authority. Now, in that, they will have to identify, both on the plans, and in the budget, what's public art. And does it fit the definitions. And we'll work with our public arts coordinator to make sure that it fits those definitions. There's also an avenue for the developer to contribute money in lieu of doing it in the project. And that will be, that money would go to the Public Arts Commission, to decide on how to use the public art.

- [Steuer] Thank you.

- [Mayor] Thank you, Alder. Further comments? Alder from the eighth.

- Thank you, Mr. Mayor. I just wanted to make sure we were clear again, we're not really debating public art, 'cause it can be a great amenity to a city. It's not a debate over public art, it's just a debate on how we're forcing it to be funded here. I think, we do, I don't think, I know we now have a Public Arts Commission and a public art czar. And we said, right from the beginning, their role was to, not only approve art, but fundraise, and to go get grants. And that's how we were gonna fund it. People who are interested in the arts and donating into it, that's how you would go get it, not force it. So I'm philosophically opposed to this. And number two, I really think if you have any clever developer, which, I think they all are, they'll find a way to get their dollars back in the TIF, one way or another, they're gonna get it back. They're just not gonna fork over \$200,000 for the heck of it. There's gonna be a way they're gettin' it back. So, for those two reasons, I think we should deny it. Thanks.

- [Mayor] Thank you, Alder. Alder from the seventh.

- Well, I'd just like to clarify that the Public Arts Commission has been brought into this, and really, they may not benefit at all from this. They may not be apart of this at all, perhaps. It depends on how the developer goes, and so on. They may decide to make a contribution to the public arts and let us go from there, but this is basically the developers decision, and, as Dr. Vonck mentioned, they can do this in so many different ways, with architecturally, whatever they decide to do that's acceptable for public art. So, this may not have anything to do with the Public Arts Commission, or its czar. What it is, is it's stating the city, the RDA, that public art is

important, and we wanna pursue it in every avenue possible, not just through our Public Arts Commission, not just through our czar. And, again, the developers, these are the ones we've been working with, they're smart people, they realize the importance of art, they're not trying to scam their way through this. If there's a problem for him, he'll bring it up as a problem. It's not a problem. This adds value to their project. This is smart business. So, I see no reason to inhibit our growth, as a city, with promoting public art in as many ways as we possibly can. Thank you.

- [Mayor] Thank you, Alder. Any further comments? The motion before us is to not deny the adoption of resolution 1903, regarding percent for the art. We're gonna use the board here.

- No denies the denial?

- [Mayor] The motion is to deny the adoption of 1% for the art.

- So no, you wanna deny it?

- Mm-hmm.

- Okay. Didn't look right.

- No. Did I vote wrong?

- Do you support denying it?

- Yeah, 'cause this motion

- [Mayor] The motion fails, seven, five. Entertain a motion.

- [Man] Motion to approve.

- Second.

- Motion made by alder from the ninth, seconded by alder from the seventh, to approve item one. All in favor, please signify by saying "aye."

- [Group] Aye.

- Those opposed, "nay." The ayes have it.

- Nay.

- Item has been approved. Report of the traffic, bicycle, and pedestrian commission.

- [Man] Motion to approve.

- [Woman] Second.

- Motion made by alder from the seventh, seconded by alder from the first, to approve report S, which is the report of the traffic, bicycle, and pedestrian commission from the meeting on October 21, 2019. Any items to handle separately? Any items? Hearing none, all in favor of approving that report, please signify by saying "aye."

- [Group] Aye.

- Those opposed, "nay." The ayes have it. The report has been approved. On to report of the ethics. Ethic board.
- [Man] Motion to approve.
- [Woman] Second.
- Motion made by alder from the seventh, seconded by alder from the first, entertaining a motion to, see the place on file?
- Okay. Motion to approve was made by alder from the seventh, seconded by alder from the first. The discussion? Alder from the sixth.
- I believe I have to abstain from that voting.
- [Attorney Chavez] Not at this point.
- It's okay? All right, just wanna make sure.
- [Mayor] Thank you, Alder. Alder from the fourth.
- Thank you, Your Honor. On that motion, there's a second sentence, almost near the end, complaint should, instead, be investigated, that's incorrect. All staff is doing is checking to see if a complaint has been filed. Correct? We're not checking to see if it should be, a complaint should be filed.
- [Mayor] Got it. Attorney Chavez.
- We can correct that. That was the understanding we received, was whether it should be investigated at that level, instead of at the Ethics Board level. But whether one is being reviewed is something we can look into instead.
- [Mayor] Do we need a different motion?
- Yeah, it would just be to amend it.
- [Mayor] Okay. Motion made by alder of the fourth to amend the motion.
- [Man] Second.
- [Mayor] Seconded by alder from the seventh. And the intent here is to discover whether or not a complaint is being investigated at--
- That's all the chairman was concerned that if we moved forward with a complaint while an investigation was already taking place, it could harm that investigation. He merely wanted to see if it was or wasn't. If it wasn't, then we were gonna proceed.
- [Mayor] Very good. Thanks, Alder. Any need for abstentions here? Okay. Motion has been made and seconded. All in favor, please signify by saying "aye."
- [Group] Aye.

- Those opposed, "nay." The ayes have it, the items been approved. Do we need item one passed as well? Okay. On to U, report of the Joint Finance Personnel Committee meeting. Sure. Alder has requested a seven minute break here. Without objection? We're in recess.

- Call us back to order here. We are on U, report of the Joint Finance Personnel Committee. We will entertain a motion. Although, we won't vote right away, I promise. Motion made by alder from the first, seconded by alder from the fifth. Go to alder from the first, here, as the chair of the Joint Finance and Personnel Committee meeting, to make some opening remarks. After she's concluded her thoughts, feel free to make some opening comments as well. Alder from the first.

- Thank you. After we met last Tuesday, at the end of the meeting I felt confused because it seemed like we were being questioned as to why we didn't make any motions to change the budget that we presented. And, as I reflected on this, I realized that while Alder Galvin, and Alder Corpus-Dax, and Alder Lefebvre, and I have been working on this budget for months, not all of you may know that. Not all the alders are able to come to all of the meetings. And so, I did some serious thinking and writing over the weekend, because I wanted to explain, to you all, what we've been engaged in doing, and how much we had already cut before we even came to that meeting last week. So, significant cuts have already been made. And I think it's important that we recognize that our city has very limited funding resources, other than the property tax, and some federal and state funding, which has been cut a great deal over the last few years. And, as we've said for many years, this council and the Mayor, chose not to raise the mill rate very much, if at all. And, instead, we used one time money, such as the Packers sales tax refund, we removed annual equipment replacement, put into bonding, the general fund balance, we took money from there. Those were all one time fixes. And the consequences of reducing our general fund balance, number one, our Moody's rating was lowered. And so, now we will probably be paying more interest when we do bond. So, taking money from that general fund balance isn't a very good idea, it's pretty low right now. Also, when you use the one time funding sources, the state does not allow you to go back and make up those mill rates. You can't turn the clock back. You can only move forward from now. So we're in a bit of a pickle. We are at a place where we have used one time funding, and that's not available anymore. And now we've gotten ourselves into a hole. So, I wanna talk to you a minute about the amount of the original budget requests that were eliminated from the budget before you even saw it last week. \$4,582,100 was taken out of the budget from the first request that we received on finance, okay? That's a pretty big number. Over four million dollars down from the original request. Just a few things that were completely removed by the department heads and the Mayor, jointly. And I wanna emphasize the process was collaborative. The Mayor worked with his department heads. The department heads agreed to look at the budget to see what could we take out, what moneys can we possibly take out. And they came up with some money that we could take out this year. So, some of the significant cuts, 1.2 million from DPW, transferring out equipment, fire, \$131,800 for equipment, police, \$989,000, sworn being down to 185, instead of at 194, although, in the table of organization, it still is at that level. This year it was agreed that they would go to 185. Remember last year we had them at 180. And they didn't quite get there, but it's still an increase from last year. Fire overtime down \$100,000. And the general fund, this one is kind of sad, but we had to reduce from 2% to 1%, our cost of living raises for the general employees that are not represented by associations by unions. So, we don't have that half cent sales tax that the county has. So we looked at other possible ways to increase the revenue without raising the mill rate even further. Number one, let's talk about the wheel tax revenues. That was the topic that came up last Tuesday. Taking \$231,000 from wheel tax revenues to fix roads, that's exactly how that money should be used. Assessments have been eliminated. That was the number one reason that we wanted to have that wheel tax, was to eliminate those assessments, those hardships on people. And that's been done. And now there's some money left. Without taking the 231,000 from the wheel tax, using it towards sealant and blacktop materials, the projects can't be done, 'cause there just isn't any other money available to do those projects. I did find the 2017 memo that was talked about. I know some people had questions on that. Alders probably found that for themselves, I guess. But, it is a legal use, and it is a very acceptable and credible use of wheel tax money, to use it for the blacktop materials and the sealant. And number two, many cities in Wisconsin are funding the forestry departments from their stormwater funds. And, we can take the funds from our water bills, and that's a way to keep those services, and allow the money we

collect to be used toward other, we collect from the mill rate, to be used toward other city services. So, yes, yep, there's gonna be a raise on the water bills, about \$6 every quarter. And in doing so, then our citizens will be able to retain some of the services that they expect, and that they need to have. Please know, fellow alders, that I believe that this budget has been trimmed of all the fat. We need to move forward from the practices of the past years, of using one time moneys of no, or minimal mill rate increases, and get ourselves out of the hole we've dug. As the chair of the Finance Committee, I'm asking you to support this budget as close to what is currently being asked for as possible. Thank you, Mr. Mayor, for letting me make these comments.

- [Mayor] Thank you, Alder. Other general comments on the budget before we get into the weeds of it? All right. Item one, to improve the report of the purchase of 22 vehicles for various city departments off of the 2019 state of Wisconsin VendorNet contract for \$700,232.

- [Man] Motion to approve.

- [Woman] Second.

- Motion made by alder from the seventh, seconded by alder from the fifth. All in favor, please signify by saying "aye."

- [Group] Aye.

- Those opposed, "nay." They ayes have it. Item two, to approve the purchase of new cars and light trucks that have been approved in the 2020 city budget through the state of Wisconsin VendorNet contract, and report the results back to the Finance Committee after the purchases have been made.

- [Man] Approve.

- Motion made by alder from the seventh,

- [Man] Second.

- Seconded by alder from the fourth. All in favor, please signify by saying "aye."

- [Group] Aye.

- Those opposed, "nay." The item has been approved. Item three, to approve the requests by Department of Public Works to amend parking lot lease between Georgia Pacific and city of Green Bay for property adjacent to West Side Garage.

- [Man] Motion to approve.

- [Woman] Second.

- Motion made by alder from the seventh, seconded by alder from the first. All in favor, please signify by saying "aye." Alder from the ninth.

- Thank you. I watched this one on video. Steve, Director Grenier, just a question. If Georgia Pacific needs to exercise their right to terminate this agreement, which would be converted to a month to month agreement, do we have an alternative backup for that equipment storage?

- [Mayor] Director Grenier.

- They've already terminated the original agreement. What they're asking to do now is just convert the termination language from a six month out to a one month out. But they've already served notice on the original agreement. I headed that six month out clause. An answer to your question, at this point, no, we don't have a fall back position for that equipment. We are actively working with, both, Georgia Pacific, and the realty company that they are working with, with that Bay West facility. And some potential plans, one of the things that we're looking at is whether they would be interested in a certified survey map, a CSM, that we would fund to split that piece off, and potentially buy that, because it's directly contiguous to our West Side Garage, and could easily be attached to our parcel. It would be irregularly shaped, but not flag shaped, so we believe that it would be compliant with the zoning ordinance. And just pick that small piece up. But we've been renting that from them, for a nominal sum, for a great many years.

- [Mayor] Alder from the ninth.

- Okay, so when you say that they've already terminated that agreement, meaning that they've put into action the six month notice, and if the council agrees to this modification, that six month would then be converted to a month to month?

- [Grenier] You are correct.

- Okay. And I guess my biggest thing is we're kind of voluntarily giving that up. I just want to ensure that staff is confident that if they find a buyer and we need to be out within 30 days, or a month, that we can do that.

- [Mayor] Director.

- The termination provision gets us the existing call that they've invoked gets us to April, which gets us through the winter, which is the biggest problem that I see. And, if any time after April, when we would go to month to month, to be able to vacate that property in 30 days or less, then that becomes not a problem for us. We would have room on the opposite side of Oneita Street. So, going through the summers I'm not concerned, and then we will be spending some time here over the next couple of months working with the operations director to come up with a new plan, potentially, to CSM, and acquire that piece of property, or finding other locations for that equipment. So, at this point, we don't see any problems with it.

- [Mayor] Alder from the ninth.

- Thank you for the clarification.

- [Mayor] Thank you. Alder from the third.

- Is my light on? Okay. Can I speak after this motion on this subject, here?

- [Mayor] On what item, Alder?

- Basically the whole budget. I was trying to hit my button to talk, but, for some reason, it wasn't.

- [Mayor] Right. Yeah, we'll dispense with this item, and then I can go back to you.

- [Mayor] We have a motion on item three here. Motion to approve was made by alder from the tenth.

- [Mayor] Seconded by alder from the eighth. All in favor, please signify by saying "aye."

- [Group] Aye.

- [Mayor] All opposed, "nay." The ayes have it, the item has been approved. Alder from the third for some general comments.
- Thank you, Mayor. With this budget, what is the increase on our tax bill?
- [Mayor] In the mill rate?
- What's the increase? Three point something, four point?
- [Mayor] What's your question, specifically?
- On our tax bill, if we receive our tax bill, if this budget is passed as is, what is gonna be on the city?
- [Mayor] Okay. Director Ellenbecker.
- Is it three something?
- Yeah, so the proposed budget is a 29 cent increase from \$9.16 to \$9.45 and it is 3.2% increase on the mill rate, for the city's portion.
- Okay, 3.2. So, Mayor, what I'd like to do, send the budget back to your office with a 1.5% increase on the mill rate.
- [Mayor] Okay, is that a motion that you're making?
- That's a motion. Yes.
- [Mayor] Okay. Is there a second on that motion?
- [Man] Second.
- [Mayor] Seconded by alder from the eighth. Any discussion? Alder from the seventh.
- Sure. Just out of curiosity, Mr. Mayor, what would you do with this budget if we made that request of you?
- [Mayor] I would not submit it in that form.
- That's my thought. It's... We're just spinning wheels. Let's get to work. Thank you.
- [Mayor] Further comments? Alder from the 12th.
- Yeah, thank you, Mayor. Now, I've really struggled with this budget. I've been involved in a legislative capacity, this is, I guess now, is my eighth budget four in the county board, four, now, in the city of Green Bay. And, I really struggle with this budget, because I think the narrative out there is that we can't do anything other than ask the state of Wisconsin to allow us access to a sales tax, or try to find clever gimmicks to go around the ERP, the Expenditure Restraint Program, that, whether we like it or not, it's something that the state of Wisconsin has imposed on municipalities. I think you could argue, for good reasons, in a lot of situations, because if municipalities are given the right to tax their constituency, their homeowners and property owners, not all, I'm not saying that that's what we would do in the city of Green Bay, but many municipalities would do that. And I also--
- [Mayor] We do have a motion on the floor, Alder.

- It's to the motion.

- [Mayor] Okay.

- So, we also have this, also this discussion that somehow past budgets of the City Council have doomed the city of Green Bay now, and into the future unless we take this rather drastic action. And, I don't know about you, but Green Bay exists. I mean, we're doin' just fine. There are a lot of issues within the city budget process, but there are different things that I certainly would do. And I don't mean to question the Mayor's, what he has done, and how he has cut, because he's made difficult decisions, but I have a whole list of ideas that could have been done to limit the rate of tax increase, limit, or remove transferring to the stormwater utility fee, limit transferring, what, historically, have been tax levy supported pot hole and other maintenance to the wheel tax, which I agree. Alder Dorff, I did look at that 2017 memo, and, we can discuss that if we get to that point, but, there are a lot of things about that maneuver that I think the person who voted for a wheel tax should be very concerned about. So, I do support the motion to refer back to the Mayor's Office, not to be difficult, but, this budget, as presented, in all my eight years on the, in elected government is the most troublesome. And I have been serving in some of the worst of times, financial times. When I was on the county board, we were in the middle of a recession, and we had to make some very tough decisions. So, there are things that could be done that are not being touched in this budget, as presented. And I can go through those, if you want, or we can wait till if this motion fails, we can kind of chip away at those issues, but--

- [Mayor] It'd be appropriate to wait.

- Okay, we'll wait. I am in favor of the motion. Thank you.

- [Mayor] Alder from the first.

- Thank you. I'm not in favor of the motion. Everyone was not able to attend the joint personnel and finance budget hearing, where we had some very rich discussion. And so, tonight is the night that we can all be together, and we can all be discussing. I believe that's the purpose. We shouldn't just throw this budget back at the Mayor. We need to spend some valuable time here tonight talking about items. I'm interested from the alder from the 12's ideas. Maybe he does have some ideas, but I wanna hear what those are. I don't want, this shouldn't just go back to the Mayor's Office. We're here to work tonight, Alders. And I think we really need to do the work that we have been elected to do. And part of that work is to have a discussion about each of these budget items. And we need to do that tonight. Thank you.

- [Mayor] Thank you, Alder. Alder from the 10th.

- Thank you, Your Honor. As one of the 12 alders, I'm sure, I mean, we've all put a lot of time into this. I've put a lot of time in it as well. Reading, studying, talking to all the department heads, talking to a lot of people, so, I think we've all done due diligence. I would be interested, also, to hear, go through it line by line, if need be. We need to, not just throw it back, because if you throw it back, it's like, what are the alternatives? I mean, you can talk about cutting staff, cutting services, finding alternative funding sources. I think these are all discussions that need to be held. I think we all need to hear that. Does that mean the meeting's gonna go longer? Yes. But, that's what we're here for. So, I do not support that. Thank you.

- [Mayor] Thank you, Alder. Further comments on the motion? All right. We're gonna use the board.

- [Scannell] Yes supports the motion is open.

- [Mayor] Correct. Motion fails eight, four. We are on item four, to approve the request to fill the following replacement position and all subsequent vacancies resulting from internal transfers.

- [Man] Motion to approve.
- [Woman] Second.
- Motion made by alder from the seventh, seconded by alder from the first. All in favor, please signify by saying--
- [Man] I have a question.
- Alder from the 12th.
- Thank you, Mayor. This is one strategy that we can use going forward in this budget here. And I know this is to fill the position now, but question for Director Ditscheit, I reviewed the table of organization and you have a few administrative clerks in that department. Could you speak to the duties of this position, and to why it's needed to be filled at this time, given the budget situation we find ourselves in.
- [Mayor] Director Ditscheit.
- So, over the years we have actually reduced the amount of administrative clerks up in the Parks Department. This is a necessary position in order to, basically, take reservations, answer phone calls, answer questions from the general public. It would be very difficult to operate efficiently without that position. And we've already reduced the number of administrative clerks throughout the years.
- [Mayor] Alder.
- Okay. You have, it looks like this is the office position, is that correct?
- [Ditscheit] That's correct.
- You have three administrative clerks, administrative support, executive secretary, financial supervisor, and a pending change, in your office, of the assistant director. Could the workflow be evenly distributed amongst all those employees in the office, or hire an intern, or do some recruiting at the technical college, or UWGB, for a young person who is interested in getting into this field?
- This position is kind of the first person that somebody would talk to when they first come to the office to ask questions, to reserve shelters, to enroll in programs, so it's the person sitting at the front desk who answers the questions. We do, currently, have two summer SME positions in addition to the fall time. We used to actually have three positions. That was actually reduced down to two positions last year. So, we are at our, kind of, our low end of staffing here, as far as how low we can take it without it affecting services.
- Okay. This is a strategy we have to think serious about, and that is reducing our staff through attrition, at least to get through this budget year. So, I know the motion is to approve. Would it be appropriate, or possible, to make a motion to not approve the position, not fill the position until September 1st, 2020? That would be a motion, if it's a valid motion, considering there's already one on the table.
- [Mayor] Motion to amend.
- Yeah, a motion to amend. I'd like to approve the request to fill, but not until September 1st, 2020.
- [Mayor] Have a second?

- [Woman] Second.

- [Mayor] Seconded by alder from the sixth. Alder from the fourth.

- Thank you, Your Honor. I appreciate everyone trying to take a look at this and come up with ideas. But, I think to sit here and try and pick apart, and this is what's gonna happen tonight, we're gonna try and pick apart department by department. Alderman Wery doesn't like having things happen at the last second, and here we are at the very last second. We haven't met with the staff or anything to ask if these things could have been done before, months before. And I've seen when we've cut clerical positions, \$16, \$15 an hour positions. It's happened at the police department. And then we end up with people, supervisors, who start doing clerical work, who aren't able to do their work. And I think at this point, after the last few years, all these departments have made those cuts that people call fat. And I think we've hit that point where these positions are not fat anymore, they're muscle and bone. And if you delay this position till September, that means someone else is gonna have to pick up that workload, which means they're not gonna be able to do their job. And I don't think any department head here has any staff in any position that's expendable, without affecting other people's workloads, and their ability to do a good job for this community. I just have to say that if we're gonna sit there and try and amend, or delay filling positions and that, it's the same thing as not having it. If he doesn't need it till September, he doesn't need it at all. And I can't support going through this budget this year, again, looking to pull positions one at a time, or reduce positions, or delay positions. It's not doing this community any good. If that person's not there, then who's going to do it? And then who's going to do their job? And we've already got enough complaints from citizens about the delays that it takes to get processes, to get permits, to get things done within this city building. And, to me, we're just gonna make it worse by pulling these positions, or delaying these positions. I'm sorry, I can't support it. Thank you.

- [Mayor] Thank you, Alder. Further comments? Alder from the seventh.

- Yes, Your Honor. This is my fifth budget, and, in years past we've tend to go pickin' through. And, I think last years in particular was a, I saw it as a fruitless exercise. We just ended up with a little bit of change, and we really didn't make any difference. I think if we're gonna make a serious change to this budget to really lower our levy, we're gonna really be cutting some big services. We're gonna be really hamstringing ourselves. I believe our department heads, especially having gone through last year where they all took a 4% cut, pretty much. They understand what they need. And I'm willing to go with the budget that they and the Mayor and the Finance Committee have hammered through. So, I'm not really in favor of monkeying around line by line, unless there's somethin' that should jump out. I just don't see how this, we're gonna get anywhere financially, or we're gonna really hamstring ourselves. So, I don't support this. Thank you.

- [Mayor] Thanks, Alder. Alder from the 12th.

- First of all, let me explain what I'm doing. I'm in administrative work myself. My profession is administrative work. I know how hard folks in clerical positions work. That's not the dispute, I understand that wholly. And I, as a manager, support employees. I know that when I have vacancies in my workplace, that as a manager I tend to pick up the slack. So, the reason I'm doing this and making these cuts is not to be harsh, not to second guess our department heads, not to do any of those things. We are in a situation where our levy, our mill rate is being increased to the maximum of what is allowed by state law, biggest hike in the last decade, or longer. And, what I am trying to do is come up with ways to find in this budget about one, or 1.3, or 1.4 million to reverse two things. And we'll get to those things, but I want it to be known now why I'm doing this. It's not to cut positions, but the strategy is to make up money through attrition. As we have positions that are open, we can close the budget gap. There are two things of this budget, aside from the increase of the tax rate to the highest that it can go, that are really troubling to me. One would be the stormwater utility transfer. We'll discuss that later. That's 1.2 million, roughly. And the other is using wheel tax revenue, \$231,000, to cover what historically had been used through tax levy. Now, those are my justifications. So, we made a motion, Alder Nicholson made a motion to return to the Mayor's Office. Didn't pass, not a big deal, but Alder Dorff,

and I think a few others said, "Let's get to work. "Roll up our sleeves, we're here now, "let's have the discussion." That's what I'm doing. We need to find ways to pull back on what is being spent in this budget, staff attrition is one of them. So, any city employee, any member of the public that's watching this, it's not my intent to villainize, or to blame staff for the position that we are in. We all take responsibility one way or the other. What I'm trying to do is close a budget gap so that we can put something to the taxpayers, and the property owners, and investors, and business owners, and everyone else who visits this community that's responsible and respectable. And that's what I'm workin' hard to do. So, with that, I'm support of the motion to hold hire until September, not to penalize the department, not to question their judgment, but to start chipping away at this rather precarious budget that we find ourselves in. Thank you.

- [Mayor] Alder from the first.

- Thank you, Mayor. So, holding it until September 1st will put us right back in the same position for the next year's budget, because then that position is on board, and then how do we fund it in the next year? So I'm very against holding it. I'm against not filling it at all. We need to fill this position. I know that those clerks help us in making reservations for the shelters, which is a revenue generating item that we have coming out of parks. Is that right, Director Ditscheit?

- [Ditscheit] Can you repeat the question please?

- That part of what those clerks do is help reserve the shelters, which can be a revenue generating item for parks. Is that correct?

- [Ditscheit] That's correct. So, they bring in revenue by taking those reservations for the shelters, for the field rentals, for all of our programs. The one thing I do wanna mention is currently we have two clerks who are sitting at the front staff that manage that, that take all of the calls, that do all of the reservations. If you eliminate one of them through this process, there'll only be one clerk up front, and in the summer months it would be very, very difficult, or nearly impossible to keep up with the workload.

- And I know the Redsmith Shelter just had the ribbon cutting yesterday, and already people are inquiring about renting that shelter. So, it's going to become increasingly busier, and we need to be responsive to the public when they call. Because if they don't get an answer from us, well, let's go, and maybe we'll rent the church. Or let's rent the community hall over in some other jurisdiction, not in the city of Green Bay. So, I think it's important that we're responsible to the public, and I don't think that cutting out this clerk position is a good idea. Thank you.

- [Mayor] Thanks, Alder. Alder from the eighth.

- Thank you, Mr. Mayor. Since we're talking about number of budgets, this is my 60th, so I've been through many. We've had a couple go till 1:00, 2:00 am in the morning back in the day. So, I don't think any of us mind going through it line by line. Last year, I believe I suggested a couple hundred thousand dollars worth of cuts. So it's definitely worth trying. Not many of them were accepted, but there are things there that we could do. I worked for a company that went through several financial problems. They had three, four years in a row, no raises, no 401K match, started layin' off people. My team had to absorb so much work it was crazy, but you got it done. You complained about it, but you got it done, you found a way to do it. We're in a tough position. I know you, yourself, said this is not a good budget, and you were handed it, you were handed a tough hand right out of the chute.

- [Mayor] I don't think I said it was not a good budget. That might be a paraphrase.

- I paraphrased, okay. It was a budget you didn't prefer. How is that? If this is one way we can start workin' on it, then I think it's something we should look at. But then we shouldn't just, like Alder Galvin said, pick on

parks when we go through each department it has to be spread evenly. Maybe other departments have some extra time, can they come down and help? And I'm not sure how the intermechanics work, but that's how it works in the real world. You go and you help other departments. I work at Schneider, and if I have extra time, I go and help a different team. You pull in, you just don't get to sit around. So, and we have really hard working employees here. We really do, but we're askin' a lot of the citizens. We did some not recommended things the last couple years. I haven't voted for a budget for three years because of those. We used a lot of one time money, that is definitely correct. I was not for that. And it got us to this point, but there's some ways that we can work through it, and I think we're trying to. So, I'm in favor. Thanks.

- [Mayor] Thank you. Alder from the fourth.

- Thank you, Your Honor. I wasn't trying to imply that, Alder Brunette, that you're picking on parks, it's just, it's, like Alder Wery just said, a million dollars stadium tax money. We use that to offset the budget, because we did not raise the levy to cover that. That means that next year we have to, not only cover that million dollars, but the increase to any of those salaries or those projects. Then next year \$800,000. We are 1.8 million in the hole, going back three years, minimum, 1.8 million in the hole. We took a 4% cut. Not one department that took that 4% cut has gotten that 4% back. So, again, we're in the hole. Because what we're doing is we're not hiring policemen. We're not fixing buildings. The roofs are leaking, the foundations are crumbling. We are taking out a 10 year loan to buy cars that last four years. We are hurting the citizens of this community when we make decisions not to spend the money when it needs to be spent. We're not doing them a favor when we didn't raise the levy those last three years. We hurt them. They may have been happy that their taxes didn't go up a few more dollars per thousand, but, in essence, we hurt them. And we're havin' to make it up now. And if we can't, and I've said this before, and the chief's gonna kill me, but if you wanna make a meaningful cut to this budget, you have to cut a portion of some department, and it goes away. You can't not, kind of, cut it for a little while. You have to get rid of it. You have to get rid of your drug unit. You have to get rid of your rescue squads. You have to close down your park shelters in the summer. That's how we're gonna balance this without raising the levy. And I just want everyone to keep that in mind. Do we do more harm by trying to save the tax dollars a few bucks? Or do we do more harm by raising the taxes when we should? And I just want everyone to keep that in their mind. I'm willing to listen to your ideas. We've got a lot of people here who have looked at, like you said, you've worked on a lot more budgets than I have, and I'm willing to look at everything, but we have to keep in mind, it sounds great to say, "Hey, the Mayor wanted a 3.2%, "we got it down to one and a half, yay for us." But how does that affect our community down the road? And we have to start thinking five, 10, 15, 20 years down the road, not budget by crisis from year to year. We're trying to do that with our bonding. We're trying to limit the amount of bonding, and we're trying to have the department heads come up with bonding requests going down five years. I'd like to see our budget proposals start to look down five years or more. Where do we wanna be in that amount of time? So, we start having an idea of what we have to do to raise our money. And, so, I'm done. Thank you.

- [Mayor] Thank you, Alder. Alder from the ninth.

- Thank you, Mayor. Look, I agree that we're hurting taxpayers near term when we're holding increases to a minimum. And one of the things I don't necessarily agree with is like, "Hey, we're gonna do 1%, "just because it seems like a nice number." And I think, when we don't have alternative sources of revenue, it does force us to look at the expense side of things. And one of the things that I appreciate, that Alder Brunette did here, is he answered a question that was asked last year, which is what is your end game? What are you trying to get to? And if there is one reservation that I do have with this budget, as well, it is the transfer the forestry department, and it is the use of the wheel tax dollars. Those were my two primary things that I wrote down, as well. And I'm gonna have a really hard time supporting a budget that requires a future action by this council that is not guaranteed. And that future action is that we are going to approve the stormwater management fee increase. That's not guaranteed. So if we walk out of here today with that expectation, and we don't approve that stormwater fee, we're stuck in a very difficult position. And I know that we talked about not using one term fixes, and while certainly to transfer to the stormwater fee is not a one term fix, you can do that

permanently, and it's allowed, but let's call it what that is. That's also an increase. And if we approve that stormwater fee, and if my math is right, we're literally looking at almost a 6% increase. That's a big number. And I think Alder Brunette, his approach here is one worth talking about, and I'm gonna bring it back to the motion, and that's, attrition is one of the easiest ways for us to target cuts that aren't necessarily intended to be punitive in nature. And so, I wanna maybe ask a question of Director Ditscheit, rather than saying do you need this position, because I think we all know how you'll answer that question. I would too, if I were in your position. I think the question is, if this position is not authorized to be filled until September one, how would you backfill that service?

- [Mayor] Director.

- [Ditscheit] The reality of it is we just need the bodies up there to handle the calls. So, if the decision is to hold on the filling of the position until then, we would almost need to have SMEs to cover it, or seasonal staff to cover it, 'cause we need the bodies. Not only does this position take the reservations, they take all of the forestry complaints. If a limb is down they'll field those calls and direct it accordingly. Just one person up front cannot field all of those calls.

- So, one of the other proposals that I'm seeing in the budget is the creation of this IT department, which I don't oppose the creation of the department. I actually think it makes a lot of sense. But I think, with that, is we're also creating a director, as well as an assistant director role. Both of which also come with salary increases, and for those increases I would expect that we are going to get additional services. Otherwise, if it's just we're maintaining the same level of service, I don't see why we'd increase the salary. The reason it ties back into this, Director Ditscheit, is that it seems like this particular position is doing a lot of manual receiving of things that could potentially be done online. Do we foresee this IT department being able to automate some of these requests? For example, booking reservations online. Do we allow that right now? Do we need a human person to do that?

- [Ditscheit] We already do allow that online. So we offer that service. And people are able to place complaints through the IT department online, also. But we just get a lot of calls in addition to that.

- So, instead of just maybe taking the calls and then manually processing that, do we currently do anything maybe to refer those citizens to those platforms to help reduce the burden on actual staff time?

- [Ditscheit] As far as promoting that service? Is that what you're referring to?

- Correct.

- [Ditscheit] It would all be done on the city website is how that would be done.

- Right, but when somebody calls in, and wants to manually place a reservation, do we still take the time to process and honor that request, or do we say, "You can do that online at," You know, "here."

- [Ditscheit] A lot of the things that we field are people actually coming into City Hall to actually physically do it here. So, the calls are a portion of it, but we do get a lot of pop in visits also.

- Okay, so right now, then, if, again, per alder Brunette's motion, if we do not fill this position until September one, your solution to that would be to hire short term labor.

- [Ditscheit] That would be my recommendation.

- Okay. Thank you.

- [Mayor] Alder from the seventh.

- Thank you, Your Honor. I also wanna make clear that I support, and I certainly applaud any effort to save the city money. And I am not disparaging anybody from going through this exercise. I just, my statement was meant that having gone through this, having talked to staff, having gone through, I expect this to be a fairly, as it was last year, a well intentioned, but fruitless exercise. And certainly have no problem sitting through that, I'm not saying we shouldn't do that, but I agree with Alder Galvin, that if we're gonna make a difference, it's gonna hurt. If we're gonna really get down to saving the levy, which, by the way, to look at it from the standpoint that this is the greatest increase in 10 years, well, in 10 years it should of gone, that's a false image, 'cause in 10 years it should of gone up when it didn't. So, you can't really look at it that way. That's a skewed perspective. I think we're behind the eight ball. We gotta play a little bit of robbin' from Peter to pay Paul, a little bit. Shifting some things around to keep the services. And certainly for the wheel tax going for fixing roads, which is what it's supposed to do. So, I have no problem taking some of that excess money to clear up some of those potholes for our fellow citizens and myself. I got a vehicle. Well, anyway, we can talk about the other stuff when we get there. But I don't disparage those who wish to lower the levy. I applaud that effort. I don't disparage going through this line by line if that's what people wanna do. I'm just saying, from my perspective, everything I know about this, and I could be surprised, perhaps, but it would be a surprise, that I expect this budget to pretty much go through the way it is, that's, I support. So, thank you.

- [Mayor] Thank you, Alder. Alder from the tenth.

- Thank you, Your Honor. I had a chance to visit in parks, as a number of you folks have, and Nina, I might ask you to chime in a little bit here. I had a good conversation with Nina, up in the Parks Department. And I think one of the things we need to look at when you look at this budget is that a lot of citizens in the city of Green Bay are used to the services they have, the garbage pickup, and the snowplowing, and all sorts of things, different things with parks. I've heard people say it's like a Cadillac of services, that we expect it. And we're used to it. So if you take anything away, people are gonna start complaining about that. So, part of this might be a paradigm shift as far as how we move forward. And, Nina, when I talked to you, you were talking about that you've lived in different areas of the country where services you had to pay for. And could you just clarify some of that? I hate to put you on the spot, but I think this is important. Just as far as us living in Green Bay and what we expect, what we're used to, and we take it for granted a lot of times. We have fantastic services. And, when you live in another community, what is it like? So, if you could just mention some of that, I'd appreciate it.

- Thank you. I worked for the military for almost 30 years. I lived on the West Coast, the East Coast, I lived down South. I lived in a lot of really bad communities, and I lived in some great communities. And, when I moved back here, to Wisconsin, I moved back here, it'll be five years this month, as soon as I could buy a house in Green Bay, I moved to Green Bay. And I looked at all the amenities, how you pick up my trash, how you take the recycling, how you come to my house and you pick up the leaves. You're plowin' my snow, I tell deputy, or Director Grenier all the time, you just keep doin' what you're doin', 'cause I appreciate it. But I gave you an example. I lived outside of Boston. I lived in a small community right outside of Boston. And I was telling you that I even had to send toilet tissue into the school with my child, because they didn't have the money to pay for these things for our kids at that school. Every time they picked up my trash it was on my water bill. Every time they, if I wanted my leaves picked up, I paid a charge for that. I am so grateful for everything that you do in the city of Green Bay. I love this community. And I've lived, like I said, for 30 years I transferred around with the Marine Corp as a civil servant, so I was involved with government on the federal side, as well. And when I look at, even just at the Park Department, the fact that we have 63 parks here in the city of Green Bay. And the things that we're able to do. I can appreciate, you know, we have this one clerk and stuff up in our office. And I don't make light of anybody's positions or what they're doing tonight, but I would like to remind everybody that we hire over a thousand seasonal employees every summer. And these are the guys that are out there cutting the grass in the parks. These are the guys that are out there pickin' up trash in the parks. And it's more than that. These are every person that works out at Bay Beach, every person that is

staffing the playground programs in all these parks. And we're doing the administrative support for that, including doing the hiring for all of those that we offset the executive secretaries position with. So, and with the shelters and stuff, when you talk about the shelters, I would love to go online, but, unfortunately, right now we have to stagger the openings on the east and the west side. Which, that means we hire seasonal that physically goes over to the shelters and opens up those shelters for the tenant, and goes back at night and locks them up. We are the ones that set up all those times for the opening and the closing and everything. But yes, this is a great community, and the amenities, wow, it's the best I've lived in.

- [Steuer] Right.

- [Mayor] Thank you.

- Thank you, Nina, for that. And I wanted everybody else to hear that as well because, you know what, if we're gonna start cutting, in the city, we're gonna have to do that. We'll have to pay for garbage pickup, pay for recycling, pay for leaf pickup. These are the things that we're talking about. So, if the citizens of Green Bay want their services, you know. If this budget has to go up a little bit. I'm partly to blame for this as well. I've been on this council for eight years now. And we did very, very little as far as raising the mill rate. We went along with it. And we had the one time moneys. Well now we're stuck. So, we can either move forward, try to do this budget the way it is. Or, start gettin' rid of core services. That's their choice. If citizens wanna do that, then fine, let's do it. But, you know what, I looked at this budget over and over again, and I really tried to look at cuts too. And I understand the whole dynamic with, we'll get to the stormwater thing eventually, we can talk about that then. But as far as this position goes, one thing with the Park Department, they bring in revenues. That's one thing that I've always argued about that, this city needs more opportunities to bring revenues in here. And how do we do that? A lot of it through the Parks Department, Bay Beach. There was a period of time where the moneys that came into Bay Beach were thrown back into the general fund. And that didn't do the Parks Department any good. So now, you have a segregated fund that is working very, very well. And you're bringing moneys in. That's what I wanna see. I wanna see revenues. If this council and other people can do anything, we gotta look at ways to increase our revenues. Otherwise, we're gonna have to cut services, and you have to cut jobs. Period. So, I'm gonna keep fightin' for it. I don't approve taking that position out. Thank you.

- [Mayor] Thanks, Alder. Alder from the 12th.

- I could probably talk for a hour about it, but I'll just hold off for now. Thank you.

- [Mayor] Thank you. Appreciate that.

- Yeah, no problem. I'll save it till the next.

- [Mayor] All right. The motion before us is to delay the hiring of this clerk position until September 2020. We will use the board on that. Motion fails, seven, five. Entertain a motion. Motion made by alder from the first, seconded by alder from the sixth. What was that? Fifth. To approve, all in favor, please signify by saying "aye."

- [Group] Aye.

- Those opposed, "nay."

- [Man] Nay.

- The ayes have it. Item is approved. On to item five, to approve the request for 2020 reclassifications during the individual departments 2020 budget approval. Just wanted to make a note here that you will all have the

opportunity to weigh in on the individual reclassifications as we move through. So, I would entertain a motion to approve at this point.

- [Man] Motion to approve.

- [Woman] Second.

- Motion made by alder from the seventh, seconded by alder from the first, to approve the item. Please signify by saying "aye."

- [Group] Aye.

- Those opposed, "nay."

- [Man] No.

- The ayes have it. The motion has been approved. We will use the board. I'm voting in favor to break the tie. Motion is approved. On to item seven. Approve the Mayor's Office 2020 budget.

- [Man] Motion to approve.

- [Mayor] Motion made by alder from the seventh.

- [Woman] Second.

- Seconded by alder from the first. All in favor, please signify by saying "aye."

- [Group] Aye.

- Those opposed, "nay." The ayes have it, the motion is approved. On to... That was actually seven, goin' back to six here. Apologies for that. Approve the Common Council 2020 budget.

- [Man] Motion to approve.

- [Woman] Second.

- Motion made by alder from the seventh, seconded by alder from the first. All in favor, please signify by saying "aye."

- [Group] Aye.

- Those opposed, "nay." The ayes have it. Item is approved. On to item eight, to approve the administrative services, including finance, clerk assessor, purchasing, election board of review, and document center 2020 budget.

- [Man] Motion to approve.

- [Woman] Second.

- Motion made by alder from the seventh, seconded by alder from the fifth, to approve. Alder from the eighth.

- Thank you, Mr. Mayor. My question would be on page 28, the training and travel. Just wondering the difference between 2018, actual, 14,610, to this years 17,540, or \$3,000 difference. Is it because of election, more training and travel, or...

- [Mayor] Director Ellenbecker.

- This is administration.

- [Ellenbecker] I just need a minute to look it up.

- [Mayor] Yeah, sure, go ahead.

- Randy will sing while we wait.

- [Mayor] We need order, alders.

- [Scannell] I could read a poem.

- Spur of the moment.

- [Mayor] No, that's good.

- Okay, so, the increase, I will give you by department, by division. The finance division went up \$500. Clerks went up \$100.

- Purchasing.

- Purchasing what. Purchasing went down \$250.

- And, correct, elections went up \$890. That would be the larger portion of that. And that is based on pole worker training, because of four elections, versus two.

- All right, I appreciate it, thanks. That's kind of what I thought, I just wanted to verify that. On page 31. And this is something that I had suggested last year and it didn't pass, but I'll try it again here, again. The welcome center aids, the two positions, I would move to eliminate those.

- [Mayor] Second on the motion?

- [Man] Second.

- [Mayor] Motion made by alder from the eighth, seconded by alder from the third, to eliminate welcome center positions. Alder from the ninth on this item.

- No.

- [Mayor] Alder from the fourth.

- Thank you, Your Honor. Thank you. I've had the opportunity to make a lot of calls to City Hall, not always knowing who I'm going to be talking to, or who I need to talk to. When those two people aren't there, I get diverted to the city clerk's office. And I'm taking a clerks time up, to listen to my question, figure out where to transfer my phone call. And I think about that position, we're looking at \$15,000 here. And then, how many people are out there, like me, who don't always know who to call, who are gonna be calling that clerk's office.

And is essence taking a clerk's time from other duties, again, that they should be doing. I think what we get for this \$15,000 is very well worth it. We've got two individuals that contribute a lot to our city, to our City Hall. And I think that, to take them away, and then put, again, that workload onto the clerk's office, is unnecessary, and I think all we're doing is just tying up another person, who's not gonna be able to do their job. Thank you.

- [Mayor] Thank you, Alder. Alder from the first.

- So I would just like to speak in support of these positions, because when I come into City Hall, and am waiting for the elevator at times, I see how they're working to help direct people on where to go. I think it adds to a certain level of security of the building, because we have those eyes out in the hallway there. I think it gives us that customer service that our citizens should be accustomed to, and have grown accustomed to. And it's a very small amount in the budget to provide for that extra customer service that people get. So, I would not be in support of eliminating those positions.

- [Mayor] Thank you, Alder. Alder from the 10th.

- Thank you, Your Honor. I might, Kris, if I could talk to you a little bit? With those two positions, I guess I'd like to know some of the dynamics of those two positions. I realize, I think that they're hired, they work for the city, but there's also another organization that's involved as well. Could you fill us in on that?

- That was through a Spherion, and, from my understanding, with their supervisor, that that is no longer the case. They are city employees now. Marissa, her last day was Monday. She got a full-time job, so I'm very happy for her. We will miss her. She answered the phones in the morning, and directed people. Trevor doesn't do the phones. We do the phones in the afternoon. But he is excellent at directing people. And he just has a personality that's wonderful. So...

- [Steuer] Okay.

- That's the extent of it.

- All right. Well, I've had the privilege, over the last 12 years, to work with special needs clients. I learn more from them than they learn from me. It's amazing. So, I think it's an opportunity for folks. There have been many, many cutbacks in that area as well. For folks, they're often berated, as far as working in the community full-time and that. And they don't have, maybe, the skillsets, or such, to do that. But they are often required to be compared to citizens that are just working. So, that's difficult. That's very difficult. And that's a whole nother conversation. And, like I said, I know we're gonna go line item by line item, and I'm hopin' I can get to someone, or some spot where I can say, "Yeah, I agree with that, "I think we should bring that down." But, I think in this case, I think because of my background working with special needs clients, and just seeing the benefit to the community and to them, I can't support it. Thank you.

- [Mayor] Thank you, Alder. Alder from the 12th.

- Yes, thank you, Mayor. I remember Alder Wery made this motion last year, and I didn't support it. And I think the reason I gave was that, because it was a Spherion, that the folks who had been doing the work were very good employees. And I think my word was, "There's a million reasons not "to make the cut." Which is nonsense, because I can't think of a million reasons to do anything. But the intent is there to value these individuals who are providing a service to the city, but this is actually a rather good opportunity, in that, the absolute worst thing for me, as a council member, is to make votes to reduce, or to eliminate positions of people who are currently hired and working the job. That's just a absolute last resort, and a terrible thing to do. But this is a particular situation, if I hear the city clerk clearly, is that there was one person who has left the position, so I would ask Alder Wery, or I can make the motion to keep the current position but not fill the other position, now that it's open.

- [Wery] That's agreeable.

- So I'll make a motion to eliminate the one position, and keep the one that is currently full for the 2020 year. Does that make sense? Do you kinda get what I'm getting at?

- [Mayor] Yes, Alder. Second?

- [Man] Second.

- Seconded by alder from the eighth. Alder from the ninth.

- Thank you, Mayor. I was actually going to make that exact same motion. And I think Alder Brunette is spot on that cutting staff is a very difficult thing to do. And so, I know in this particular case it's good to want to have that bleeding heart sentiment to do something really good, but I think what we're trying to do here is accomplish something that's really great for our community as well. I know there are other programs. And, Kris, I would maybe suggest that there is a DVR program out there that actually will pay for people. And you could, potentially, replace this role with somebody, without any expense to the taxpayer, through that program. I'm happy to talk to you about it outside of this meeting. But for that reason, that's why I am going to support this motion to retain one role, but to eliminate the other.

- [Mayor] Alder from the seventh.

- Yep. Kris, as Alder Galvin had brought up, if you don't fill that role, what does that do to your department? You're looking forward to filling that role, I'm assuming. It's in the budget. How much time are we tying up in the morning with your other staff without this position filled?

- Well, we do it in the afternoon, so, we can manage. I mean, we just do what we have to do. Is how we look at it. So, we'll manage.

- [Scannell] Wow. Again, I just don't see how this is gonna make a significant difference. Whereas, it might make a significant difference for an employee of special needs. And still, a position that benefits the city. I just don't see how eliminating this is gonna reduce our mill rate. So, I'm not going to support it. Thank you.

- [Mayor] Thank you, Alder. We've got a few alders with buttons pressed over here. Alder from the ninth. No? Alder from the 10th.

- Thank you, Your Honor. At first blush it seems like this would be a good route to go to disown that position. Like I said, I'm goin' back to my previous statement about that, I'm intrigued by the DVR that you were talking about, that that might be another opportunity. I still think it's important that we have people up front there. But, I don't know. I'm havin' a hard time with this one, 'cause I have a background with special needs clients, and I think it's important that they're included, but if we can do something differently, if you feel confident enough in that, Alder Johnson, I would like to entertain looking at that. So, with that being the case, I might go along. Thank you.

- [Mayor] Alder from the sixth.

- I agree with Alder Johnson. If that's available, I would definitely support eliminating this program, position, now, but then looking into finding the funding for it. Because, yes, I've enjoyed both of them coming in and talking to them, and they're very pleasant. And I think they're a value to the city. But, yes, I would support it if we're pretty confident we can eventually replace 'em. Thank you.

- [Mayor] Any further comments? Alder from the eighth.

- Thank you, Mr. Mayor. For most of the years I was on council we didn't have that welcome center. I remember that was a big deal to put that in. We had to knock out a big area and everything. So, most of the things did run through the clerk's office. I know, and it's a good thing to have when you can afford it. And we have a spot now where we are gonna have an opening. And it sounds like we might have an avenue to fill it, not funded by us. So I think we take this opportunity to keep who we have, just not fill the other one, and explore. Maybe we'll be able to fill both positions in the future. If there is that program available. So... They may be little cuts and little pieces, but they add up, it's like a puzzle. If you look at one of 'em it's pretty tiny, but you start piecing them together, and all of a sudden you might have a sizable amount. And you can lower your mill rate, or, maybe, move back some of the money from the wheel tax, which is also one of my concerns, because I think the people who voted for it wanted to do more roads. Get more roads done. And I think we've all pounded on that over, and over, and over. We want 2% of roads, on 2.5, 3%. Let's be aggressive on this. And if we're siphoning off little pieces of that for different things, we're gonna do the same amount of roads every year. This is one little piece of the puzzle, let's try it. Thanks.

- [Mayor] Thanks, Alder. Any additional comments? Alder from the seventh.

- Just one quick one. I'm not confident that that funding is there. So, I'm still going to oppose this, 'cause I still don't think it's gonna matter, come up to a hill a beans. Perhaps, if we look into it and it is there, and I'm wrong, that could be taken into account for next years budget or somethin', but for now, I'm still going to oppose it. Thank you.

- [Mayor] Thank you, Alder. Motion on the floor is to eliminate one of the welcome center positions. Motion has been seconded. We'll use the board on it.

- Motion passes, eight, four. Motion to... Motion to approve item eight.

- [Man] Motion to approve.

- Made by alder from the seventh. Alder from the ninth.

- Thank you. Diana, I'm gonna maybe put you on the spot here, but, more so, because it's something that I've noticed throughout the budget, but because you're the first one, I guess, the question will be directed at you. But I know that we were holding salary increases to 1% in your department. Has there been turnover or additions that has led to a \$51,000 increase in regular salaries, or am I just not connecting the dots on something here?

- There were no new positions in this budget. We actually had one purchasing manager that we are expected to fill at a lower rate. That 3.8% increase is step increases and a 1% increase starting in October 1st of 2020. So those are just steps and 1% increase.

- [Johnson] Can you explain what a step increase is.

- A step increase would be an employee, who, when they slotted, when, through the new pay plan, they were slotted into a grade and they were slotted in anywhere between a step one, up to a step seven. And the step seven, I believe, Director Faulds can correct me if I'm wrong, step seven would be what is a control point, or the middle of the market. And so, in some cases when they went to Carlson Dettman, and they considered each job description, and they may have said that this position was not up at control point. So, when they put the pay plan together, about three or four years ago, they might of slotted somebody in at a grade step one. So, every year, as long as they perform, and get a performance review, an acceptable performance review, they will go to a next step. And a step is about a 2.5% increase, and the whole pay plan was to get somebody up to

the control point in up to about seven years. So, there are several positions that were in administrative services that were considered to be either lower than the control point. So we had many positions that were started in a grade and step one. So we're probably goin' into year four, about. So, they're still moving up to, probably, from step four up to a five, three to four. And so, that is why you're seeing quite a few of our administrative people are moving up, probably, a step of 2.5%, and then, again, you have eight, nine months worth of a 2% increase that got effective October of this year. Your over year. And then next year you'll see the 1% effective in October.

- Okay, so that is, I guess, what I understood step increases to be, but I wanted to get that explanation from you, because, so while we, in the budget proposal, we've only laid out a 1% increase, there is a significant number of staff, if they haven't reached that maximum ceiling, that would see that step increase as well.

- Correct. And if they have reached the step seven, after that there is a performance range. And at that point they have the option, again, it depends upon how they are rated. They still can get a one, or 1.5% performance, and they could still also get that 1%.

- [Johnson] Okay.

- [Mayor] Alder from the 10th.

- Thank you, Your Honor. Even though these positions aren't in the budget this year, I need to make a statement about our assessor's office. I had a chance to talk to Rod Schwant about a number of things, and I think this is important moving forward. There were a couple of positions that were not put in the budget for appraiser one and appraiser three positions. And we have not done a city reevaluation since 2004, which is, I think, harming us, greatly. I'm just, Diana answered me, and I just asked, she answered me and she said, "The city of Green Bay "is committed to find a way to do a reevaluation. "I think it is necessary and very overdue. "The basis for budget is the assessment, "so this needs to be updated. "At this time, there is a very good chance "that we have nonuniform assessments "and are potentially leaving some value unaccounted for. "However, we are not able to put an estimate "on how much this could change our assessed rate. "We also are not aware of how much "a reevaluation would cost, but in 2020, "we'd like to get an estimate if we are not able "to fill the two appraiser positions. "If we are out of compliance too long, "the state will order a reevaluation of the city "if the city hasn't started one already." So, this is something that we have to look for in the future as well. Normally a reevaluation you might do every seven or eight years, we haven't done it since 2004. I think we're crippling ourselves by not having this. So, these two positions aren't even in the budget. And I'm all in favor of that. I thank Russ for giving me a lot of information on this. If you want more, we can talk about that, but these aren't in the budget. We're just approving the administrative services portion of the budget. But what I wanna see approved is not even in it. So, we'll have to save that for another rainy day. Thank you.

- [Mayor] Further comments? All right, all in favor of approving item eight, please signify by saying "aye."

- [Group] Aye.

- [Mayor] Those opposed, "nay." The ayes have it, the item is approved. On to nine, to approve the information, technology, and equipment replacement in 2020 budget.

- [Woman] Second.

- [Mayor] Motion made by alder from the seventh, seconded by alder from the first. All in favor, please signify by saying "aye."

- [Woman] Aye.

- [Mayor] Those opposed, "nay." The ayes have it, the item has been approved. On to item 10, to approve the law 2020 budget. Motion made by alder from the first, seconded by alder from the seventh. Alder from the 12th.

- Thank you, Mayor. My question is for Attorney Chavez. I remember my first time on the council, that we had, if I recall, a city attorney, and I think we had two other attorneys in the office. Do you know, is that true, first of all, and then second of all, do you know when the other, the fourth attorney was added in your department?

- [Mayor] Attorney Chavez.

- I can get you all that information, just give me one second. So, as for your question as to when the fourth attorney was adopted, yes, I believe it happened about 20, oh, I wanna say it was about 2012. Somewhere around there is when they added the, well, no, 2016, or '15, is when they added the fourth attorney. However, in 2008, or somewhere in the early 2000s, they actually had four attorneys and then dropped it down to three. I'm not sure why, I wasn't here. But they did have one person that went from an assistant city attorney to a deputy. And then they never filled that assistant city position, assistant city attorney position. So, while we have had four attorneys for the recent past, it looks like we've actually had four attorneys since about the '80s, with the exception of the gap that occurred in the early 2000s for about 10 years.

- [Brunette] Okay, thank you.

- [Mayor] Thank you, Alder. Other questions or comments? All in favor of the motion, please signify by saying "aye."

- [Group] Aye.

- [Mayor] Those opposed, "nay." The ayes have it, the motion has been approved. On to item 11, to approve the municipal court 2020 budget.

- [Man] Motion to approve.

- [Woman] Second.

- [Mayor] Motion made by alder from the seventh, seconded by alder from the first. All in favor of the motion, please signify by saying "aye."

- [Group] Aye.

- [Mayor] Those opposed, "nay." The ayes have it. The item has been approved. On to 12, to approve the human resources 2020 budget.

- [Man] Motion to approve.

- [Woman] Second.

- [Mayor] Motion made by alder from the seventh, seconded by alder from the second. Alder from the eighth.

- Thank you, Mr. Mayor. Keeping in line with what we've been trying to do, at least some of us, is not fill open positions. There is an unfilled position, human resource assistant one. I would make a motion to not fill that position.

- [Mayor] Director Faulds. You wanna comment on the status of that position, and the proposal in the budget?

- Sure, so the HR department has two HR assistants, one would be for risk, and one would be for our HR general to help out. And we have reclassified one of those positions to a diversity and inclusion coordinator. And I really commend all the people that came here tonight and spoke about it. They did a very good job of explaining the benefits of having a diversity and inclusion coordinator. And, I think the Mayor, and myself, we believe that moving forward with this position, that would really benefit the city, improving the diversity for the city, the organization itself, and also for the community. So, we've asked to fill that position, around May or June, to offset what the cost would be to hire if it was an HR assistant, starting January 1st. So that's why there would be no impact on the budget with hiring the diversity and inclusion coordinator. And that's the proposal we have right now.

- [Mayor] Thank you, Director. Alder.

- [Wery] Thank you, Mr. Mayor. I would ask the finance director, if this position were not filled, with salary and benefits, what would we not have to pay? What would be the savings?

- [Ellenbecker] And you were asking in the 2020 budget?

- [Wery] Yes, next year. Thank you.

- I had it out.

- [Wery] While you're looking that up we can debate the value of the position, or we can simply look at it, that it's a want versus a need. And, obviously, this budget is excruciating for everybody. And this is really more of a want. I don't care how you debate it. It's not a need, especially when we're lookin' at not filling all our police, not filling all our fire. This is more of a want. So, let's, if there's nobody in that position, let's look at not filling it. Maybe down the line we can discuss the merits of it. Did I buy you enough time?

- You're talking, I wanna verify, it's diversion and inclusion coordinator in the HR department?

- [Man] Well we haven't officially classified it yet, so it was the old, yeah, human resource assistant.

- Okay.

- The total budget is 65,869.

- [Wery] Okay, so my motion is not to fill that position. And the dollar value would be 65,869.

- [Mayor] Alder from the 12th.

- Thank you. Question for Director Faulds, or perhaps Diana, I noticed on the agenda for the information provided with the agenda for the joint finance, the category for the salary on that position, and the workup that HR provides, the category's at \$58,094. And then if you look at the budget book, the position pays \$33.68. And just, the math doesn't, to me, come up right. Because the category, was that for this budget year? Because we would be hiring it later, or was that for the entire budget year?

- [Ellenbecker] There has been a correction in the book since this was printed. When we put the book together in early October, that position had not, the information had not come back from Carlson Dettmann. At that point it had not been ranked to see what salary, or what level, or what grade it should be put in. So there was an assumption made. At that point the assumption was made, it was at \$33.68. Since that

classification has come back, it is now at \$28.98, so it came back at a lower rank. So what's in the book is no longer what would of been presented last week by personnel.

- So, 28.90 would be the--

- [Ellenbecker] That would be the hourly rate.

- Hourly rate.

- [Ellenbecker] Correct. And then, of course, you have all your benefits to go with that position.

- Yeah. Thank you. I support the motion, not because I'm not in favor of diversity and inclusion, I think that there are many ways that we can accomplish that. And one idea that I would, assuming, hoping that this motion fails, one idea that I have is to create a community committee made up of an alder community member, or city staff, and we can talk about diversity and inclusion efforts, not just within the city of Green Bay, but also, the greater community. Those meetings would then be open to the public. We could draw a much wider net in how do we have these community conversations. Furthermore, I would say that, not that I wanna age myself, but I think I'm the youngest person here, in this elected city government. I think I'm just a few months younger than you, Mayor. One thing that I have noticed, living in Green Bay my entire life, and one thing that I'm very proud of is being a member of this community, is that the community is changing, organically. Many of my friends growing up, and now, many of the constituents who I represent, as I go door to door, I do not see the tensions that we see in a lot of larger communities. I think, overall, the city of Green Bay is a very diverse and inclusive community already. Now, we can work on improving that, and we can do it through a city committee, and having a very good discussion. But just going to school in the Green Bay school district and being involved in the community, we do get along, and we could work on some things, and perhaps a committee would address some of those concerns, but at least then the committee would be out in the open, and we can draw in as many opinions as possible and necessary. And I think that the reason why we're a very welcoming and inclusive community, in my opinion, from where I sit and who I am as a person, is because we're a very faith driven community in the city of Green Bay. I don't hide the fact that I'm Christian. I'm very proud as I look at people, and as I communicate with people, and I work alongside people, and as I listen to people. I never once think of a person as the group that they belong to. I think cultural identity, and all the other things that make a person unique, is very important. I don't see how a person should treat someone poor because of their element that makes them diverse than that person. And so, when I see conversations goin' door to door down in the community, it's because we're a very faith driven community. It's very much in our DNA, as a community, from the very beginning. And so, again, it's not, my vote against filling this position is not because I'm against diversity and inclusion. I don't think a very compelling case has been made that, given all the other issues we have within our community, and all the other pressing needs, that that position isn't needed as part of a city staff. Like, government doesn't need to fix everything. A lot of the things, and you've seen the speakers come up and speak, they're parts of corporations, and school districts, and technical college. A lot of these positions exist already. Whether Green Bay should adopt that position as part of our table of organization, I simply say, "Not now." Not this year. Not with our tremendous budget. So, Mayor, if you're interested, if this motion passes, and you're interested in drawing a community effort together to address diversity and inclusion and look at it from a different way, rather than filling up a city position, I'd be the first to volunteer to help you with that. But I'm in favor of the motion to exclude it at this moment. And future years, when things are a little better, we can look at it a little differently. Thank you.

- [Mayor] Thanks, Alder. Alder from the first.

- Thank you. I would say that this position, that we're clearly talking about, is the diversity inclusion coordinator, not the human resources assistant position. And, I would say, it's a need. It's not a want, it's a need. I think we've heard from entrusted members of the public, who didn't even intend to speak, from a lot of influential people out there in the audience, and some of them may have left, that this is a position that is

needed, and that it is important to the citizens of this community. I think there is a lot of white privilege sitting at this table. And I think, perhaps, we all could benefit from a little cultural diversity training. I know I have been through much, because I was in education, and that's just a natural part of education. But to not see it, I don't understand how it can not be seen as a need. Just as some of my fellow elders don't understand why I think it is a need, they think it's just a want. So, I will definitely be supporting having this diversity position. And I will be voting against this motion. Thank you.

- [Mayor] Thanks, Alder. Alder from the ninth.

- Thank you, Mayor. I actually agree with Alder Brunette on one thing. I disagree with him on another. One is, that I do think the creation of a commission, committee, or something, could actually be a very effective strategy. I think the piece that I do, maybe, disagree with a little bit, is that I do think that there is a problem in our community. Things aren't going as well as sometimes it may appear on the surface. And I do think this is an issue that needs to be addressed. I think what's at heart of the discussion, though, is what is the most effective way to do that. And is it through this position, or is there an alternative way to do that? And so, I would, maybe kick this back to Director Faulds with a question. Because if I recall correct, when I was reading the position description, when you see these positions created in other private organizations, they make these business cases for why it's important to their organization, and their impact to the staff. I just wanna make sure we're not crossing, or confusing two different issues here. And, if I recall correctly, the impact to the community was a secondary, if not, tertiary objective. The primary objective was, as it relates to city staff.

- That's correct, and that's what I said. I think that the primary objective is to help recruit and attract candidates for the city. And I think that's gonna help us result in more creative and innovative workforce. I think the individual from Schreiber, talked about how we're all fighting for talent right now. And we're gonna have to do that through looking for diverse candidates. And then I think just a byproduct of that is gonna be reaching out to the community and working on the community relations between the city and community members. So I think it's gonna work hand in hand. But initially, we're gonna focus on recruiting for the city, but it's gonna be reaching out to the community groups as well.

- Okay. So, when we're looking at this human resources position right now, it's my understanding then, since we're able to reclassify it and give it different responsibilities, that that is a position through improved deficiencies that is no longer needed in your department. Would that be accurate?

- Yeah. I think you talked about how, with our IT department, there's been automation through other departments, and we've noticed that some of the responsibilities for our HR assistant have been picked up by automation. But we do see that there's a big need for diversity and inclusion at this city, so we wanna reclassify that position to meet that need.

- Okay. So, I wanna actually follow that up, Director Faulds, with a thank you. And a congratulations for recognizing an opportunity to improve inefficiencies, 'cause I don't think staff gets acknowledged enough for that. When it comes to the diversity inclusion piece, though, do you feel that right now our department has an ability to recruit candidates of diverse background? I mean, are we challenged with doing that?

- So I think, right now, the city of Green Bay is, we're checking the boxes. We're doin', probably, the bare minimum. And I think this position's gonna help us get over the top to actually get out and make intentional recruitments to diverse candidates. That's what I think this position's gonna help us do.

- Okay, given the challenging budget situation that we're in, do you feel that the city would be disadvantaged or not, if we were to hold off on the creation of this position for one more year?

- I think we would be. I think saying that it's a tough budget now, I think that speaks a lot about our organization Diversity and inclusion, it's important whether it's a tough budget, or not a tough budget. I think

it's an everyday thing and it's very common for every organization. So, to hold off one year, it will affect the city.

- On an annual basis, how many positions become available within the city of Green Bay that you are required to fill?

- I think Nina talked about how there's a thousand seasonal positions filled every year. And then, I think we have about let's see, I think it's in the accomplishments here. It's usually about 100 vacancies, give or take. Between 90 to maybe 125 a year.

- Okay. Thank you. Chief Smith. It was noted earlier that you probably, that you probably have the most diverse department here within the city of Green Bay. Could you please describe to us, maybe, your process, your strategy, with how you fill a number of those positions without a diversity inclusion coordinator. Well we try really hard, but we're not meeting the goals that we have to fill all those diverse positions. We send our recruiters out across the state, and I told them I'd be willing to scour the earth to find the right candidate, that high quality candidate, that can help us with our diversity. But we're not doing it, we're not able to get those people from other areas to wanna come to Green Bay, here. It's a struggle for us. It's a struggle for us, 'cause we're competing with all the other police agencies throughout the state, and even the region, that are trying to get those high quality candidates that would help us balance the diversity that we have in our department with the diversity of the city of Green Bay.

- Do those other cities, to your knowledge, have a position like this that would put the city of Green Bay at an unfair disadvantage with being attractive to those candidates?

- [Smith] I don't know if any other cities have a diversity coordinator or not.

- Okay. Mayor, since this was in your proposed budget, I am curious to, maybe, hear your thoughts on, again, when we think about the objectives, or the outcomes goals that we want from this position, serving, I guess city staff, right? Recruiting of city staff, maybe other needs within the organization versus trying to influence or impact the community as a whole.

- [Mayor] Yeah, so as the chair of this meeting, I don't engage in debate. I will just say this is a really important position from my perspective, something that I've talked about very publicly for a long time. I think it'd be a huge benefit to us as an organization to have this position, and, as Director Faulds said, this person would have a secondary, but important role in the community, connecting with other community leaders and community organizations. This is something that we've lacked for a long time. You asked about other communities. Appleton's had one for 22 years. 22 years they've had this position. And I think it's not the end all be all, certainly. But it's a big part of the puzzle and it's a reason that I think that Appleton is viewed as a community that is more open and welcoming than the city of Green Bay.

- Okay. And I appreciate your comment, Mayor, about not debating, and that's simply why I was looking for, maybe, an explanation, which you offered. Helping city staff versus the community. So, thank you.

- [Mayor] Alder from the fourth.

- Thank you, Your Honor. Director Faulds. This position is to help recruit. Is it also, so, when we're recruiting, we're recruiting, say, police department. What we're recruiting are officers that are diverse, but also accepting of diversity. So, having those kind of individuals working for our department is a positive, not only for the department, but also a preventative.

- [Faulds] Yeah, I think when you have a diverse workforce for the city, we're able to then meet the needs of the diverse community that we have. I think that's what you're asking. And I do think the police departments

do an outstanding job of going out and targeting diverse candidates. And I think where we're lacking is we don't have the capacity in HR to have a person to do that for every single department. They have their own police officers who can actually recruit on their own. We need a position to recruit for all of our other departments in that manner.

- And also, I guess what I'm making a point is the officers we have, all of 'em, would be accepting of everybody else's differences. And I would, and I hate bringing this up, chief, but shortly after you took over the police department there was a large investigation that took place, in which, officers were harassing other officers on the department. And it ended up costing the city how much money?

- Well we lost a number of officers through the discipline process who were removed from the department, but I think the settlement was in the ballpark of \$120,000.

- [Galvin] Okay. And then, so your recruitment. How many times a year do you send out recruiters?

- [Smith] Just about every week. We recruit everywhere we can, and as I mentioned in the Joint Finance Committee meeting, we recruited a young man, who's Jamaican, we've got people from Texas, we've got people from California. We've reached out across the world, really, to try and find those quality candidates.

- So every week we're sending officers out to recruit, and how many officers do we send out usually?

- [Smith] Usually two. Just a couple of lieutenants.

- So that's two officers gone every week, times 52 weeks, are gone for a day?

- [Smith] Usually it's a one day trip. We try to make it a one day trip.

- All right. If we had this position filled, Director Faulds, would that person be able to assist the police department? Could it possibly reduce having to send out as many officers as often as we are?

- Yeah, I think that's what the hope would be. I think the position would be taking targeted efforts locally, and state, and perhaps even nationally, to try and recruit candidates, but the position would work closely with the police department to create efficiencies in recruitment.

- [Galvin] And this would be for the fire department, the department of public works, everywhere.

- [Faulds] Yeah, it'd be for every department.

- And they could all potentially save effort by sending their own staff out looking.

- That's exactly what we hope the position would do. I think really what we're doin' is we're taking our HR assistant, and we're reclassifying that to a position that will help our recruiting needs. And that's specifically focused on diverse candidates.

- So, one, we save staff time, which would let them do the job they were actually hired to do. Two, we're potentially preventing complaints, lawsuits, and things like that, that could harm the city and cost it money down the road.

- Yeah. I think you've talked about something I didn't touch on, is providing the training and the resources for the employees that we have as well. So, not only is it training our employees that we have, but also helping retain employees when we do get them in the door.

- [Galvin] All right, thank you very much.

- [Mayor] Alder from the eighth.

- Thank you, Mr. Mayor. Well that was a lot of ifs, and buts, and maybes, so... I'll just bring it back to we've been tasked with keeping the city safe. We're not filling all our firemen. We're not filling our policemen. I couldn't make the meeting, but I did, I drove my kids down to St. Louis to look at a college, and I made them listen to two and a half hours of personnel and finance. And boy they .

- [Mayor] Child abuse.

- I think my son fell asleep . It was exciting. So I heard all of the discussions, you know. The chief, you do an amazing job at recruiting, and if our HR department needs to sit in with you maybe. Maybe that's what we need to do to take that mindset and spread it to the rest of the city. I heard Alder Galvin, you talkin' about traffic officers. And I wholeheartedly agree, I bet ya that's number two, next to roads of complaints, is speeding. Holy moly, and I always tell people, the older people, oh, we always jockey for the limited traffic officers we have, we're always jockeying for them to be set up, 'cause we probably all have 50 different streets that they could be put on, easily. So, I would rather have another traffic officer on staff than this position that may or may not help. We don't know that. We, like I said before, we could debate the merits of the position, but right now we're dealing with wants and needs. We need some more traffic officers. We're telling people that we're raising your taxes to the max. We're gonna give you this extra hidden fee that you'll see in a couple months, and then come back and call us and say, "What the heck is this?" Hold off on this. We can have this debate next year or the year after, when we can afford it. I don't see it as imperative that we have to have this over police or fire, or any of those other things. We can have that discussion on the merits of it, but I don't think we have to do that right now because we're not in the position to even, to hire this position. So, I'm firm in believing that we not hire it. Thanks.

- [Mayor] Thanks, Alder. Alder from the second.

- I support this position. I've lived here 41 years, and to this day I still get treated as an outsider. So, it is a need in our community. It's easy to say that it's not when you're not on the other side. So, I absolutely 100% support this position. I hope you guys do as well. If it wasn't a need, we wouldn't of had people come forward and speak. I mean, quite honestly, we wouldn't of had multiple people of color, come here and speak and say how this is a need in our community. Like I said, I've lived here 41 years, I still get asked where am I from. I have the same yoooper accent as pretty much everyone else here. Say "fir," and "ya know," and all those other things. I still get asked where I'm from. I'm from Green Bay, Wisconsin, born and raised here. As far as not seeing that issue in schools. That issue was in schools. When I was in high school, back in the '90s, we had an influx of the Hispanic community, and it was not handled well by the city. And, I don't even think it has really been addressed yet. I mean, it was very interesting, and being someone who was born and raised here, all of my friends being white, the only other Hispanic people that I knew were my family. To have this influx of Hispanic kids, and, people are lookin' at me saying, "Why are they acting like this?" "What's going on here?" It was a very interesting position to be in. That the school district, and, I mean, just the city didn't ever really address. Going to school, again, there really weren't many other African Americans, there really weren't that many other Asian Americans in our school district. So, yes the city has become more diversified over the years living here, but you don't see that as much in city staff, you certainly don't see that in City Council. So, I really do think that this type of position is needed. We need to do more outreach, as a city, to reach out to those minorities.

- [Mayor] Thank you, Alder. Alder from the seventh.

- Yeah, thank you, Your Honor. I would disagree vehemently that this is a want. This is a need, and it's been a need that's been overlooked a long time, and it's 'bout time we addressed it. And now is a perfect time to

address it, when we have this opportunity where it's not gonna affect the levy. Everybody says, "Let's put this off next year, "the year after that." Well, we're gonna put it off till the cows come home over the rainbow. 'Cause if you don't think next year is not gonna be a knuckle cruncher budget, I think you're very much mistaken. And I'd like to speak a little bit more about, you know, I did a little research between Appleton and Green Bay. And for me, this position isn't a wishful position, it's a need. As a city, we wanna grow. We wanna grow with development, economic development. We wanna grow in population. And if you look at Appleton. In 2000 their population grew .65%, ours grew .59. Then from 2010, on till this year, they have yearly statistics, and I won't go through every year, but if you add it up, Appleton grew by 2.57%, we grew by 1.02%. And in that time we had three years of negative growth. So, I see this as a position where it will help the city grow. It's a practical position. And in helping the city grow, that's gonna help our future budgets. So I think now is a perfect time to address this need that's long overdue. I think it will have a practical effect. This isn't just a pie in the sky hopin' for, I mean, there's other communities that have these positions, we can look at them, I did, and they make a difference. I'm sure there's other factors, but, certainly, that is one. And so, I have had nothing but positive communications from my constituency, and heard nothing but positive from the community, except for the one gentleman. So I believe that it's long overdue to fill this. Now is a perfect time to do it. If we put this off, I just don't see it's gonna happen. And the idea of a commission is an interesting idea, but again, I don't think it's gonna have the same, you're not gonna have that expertise that someone who's in this position's going to have. And certainly since this is levy neutral, perhaps we could take a year and look at, maybe, whooping that into some kind of committee or somethin'. But in the meantime we got a year where this isn't gonna affect the levy at all, and so I fully support moving forward now. I think now is the time. Thank you.

- [Mayor] Thank you, Alder. Alder from the eighth.

- Oh, one more thing. I'm sorry, one more thing.

- [Mayor] Alder from the seventh.

- And we talk about the police positions. I did a little research there too. Thank you, Commander Wark for your help on this. In 2014, we had 191 officers. '15, 189. '16 188. '17, 180. And then '18 is 178. So we've been movin' steadily down. And I think this budget starts puttin' us in the right direction. We're movin' up to 185. And with his retirements and everything, I think that's an ambitious goal to get those positions filled. I think we're... What I liked about this budget from that standpoint, personnel standpoint, is that we're gonna be adding this position that doesn't affect the levy, that I think will have a practical affect on improving our population in the city, and we are turning that trend around on the police. We are lookin' to get more boots on the ground. So, I think next year, hopefully, we can do a little more. But again, we gotta go year by year. You gotta take it what's before us. And I think, to put this off with wishful thinking that we can, maybe, do this next year, I think it's gonna be tougher, much tougher next year to do something like this. So, thank you.

- [Mayor] Thank you. Alder from the 12th.

- Yes, thank you, Mayor. Alder Scannell, you keep stating that it's levy neutral, I don't believe that to be true. If we don't fill the position, meaning if we don't fill this one or reclassify it to this, if we simply don't fill that existing HR position then it's not levy neutral, we actually have a cost savings because we're not filling any position in HR. So, because it's an open, it's an open position, but that's my point, we keep stating it's levy neutral. Perhaps this year, if we were to also fill that human resource assistant instead of this one, but because, potentially, we don't fill either, it's not levy neutral, we actually save. And the second point that I wanna clarify, Alder Johnson. I might of misspoke, I didn't want to suggest that I don't think that racial tensions exist, even in Green Bay or any other community, 'cause I know that to be the case. I've witnessed racial tension quite a bit throughout my life, within my neighborhood, community members have told me, but the value of being involved in the community and the wonderful thing of living in a free society is that we can discuss these things openly, amongst each other, that we look beyond the thing that makes us different from each other, and we have conversations that make people understand their unique perspective. And I think that's the greatest thing,

for me, of living in a diverse and inclusive community. I don't think I would do well in a community that was not diverse and inclusive. That wouldn't connect to who I am as a person. It's a wonderful thing, as our community expands and we incorporate more cultures within the Green Bay area. So, I don't want it to come off that I don't think that that effort is not valid. My main argument is, right now, given all of the tremendous needs we have throughout the city, to add a position within the city of Green Bay there needs to be much more information that I receive, other than anecdotal information. Like, I need to know how this will improve the situation in a way that we couldn't do in a different method. And what I mean by that is discussions within our existing staff, HR making this apart of their focus, how do recruit diverse and how do we make things more inclusive? There are a lot of ways to do this. And I'd be interested to see how other communities do this. But I don't want it to come across that I don't think that racial tensions do not exist, or any other differences that people have. I know that, even within the faith community, there is tensions throughout Green Bay, and throughout other communities. What I'm suggesting is, if you look at it more of, we are all individuals with a lot of different things that differentiate us from other people. And you look beyond things that make each other different. And we really get to know people and have conversations and welcome them to our community. That we invite them to a function on our street, and we reach out to them. When we campaign we go door to door. We engage with all of the people throughout the community. That's what I have always done. That's one of the wonderful things about living in Green Bay. I'm suggesting that what I have witnessed through the years is that the younger generation that is being educated throughout the community, and is engaging throughout the community, and is engaging with other people on the playground. I see so much more promise in the future generations that, perhaps, other generations have maybe messed up. And I'm not looking to throw past generations under the bus, but I think we have to be very, very, very deliberate about what we do, given this situation we are in budget-wise. We can accomplish what we're looking to do, just a different way. And that's why I'm against filling this position at the time. And I would go as far as to say that human resource assistant, that we don't fill that position if this reclassification doesn't go through. So, thank you.

- [Mayor] Thank you. Alder from the ninth.

- Thank you, Mayor. I just, after listening to the discussion, I kind of wanted to weigh in. I am gonna support the motion not to fill the HR assistant position. And I wanna, maybe, provide some clarity on why. It does boil down to timing. And timing is a very significant discussion in this. And, while we see a number of private sector employers that fill these positions, I doubt that any of them would fill that role if they were looking at a budget where they were going to lose money. And I think it goes back to timing and priorities and what those needs are. I think in the case of the discussion around the diversity and inclusion coordinator, I do fully support the concept. And I do want to see the city of Green Bay address that in the future, if it does not pass in this budget cycle. I do wanna see it come back next year. I think sometimes there's the convenience, right, of saying this is my one issue that I'm very passionate about in this budget, and I really wanna see it passed. Unfortunately, we have 110 million issues that we are looking at in our budget. And, boy, we gotta find a way to cut. We kinda, we went through this last year. And it was very easy, right, like, Alder Wery, I know, had provided a number of places, \$50 here, \$100 dollars there. I might be slimming those numbers down a little bit, but, and I remember you making the comment we gotta say yes to some things. Meaning we gotta say yes to cutting some things. But I don't think we have to say yes to tabling the concept. And the concept being, that I think Alder Brunette offered a very reasonable alternative, which was the creation of some sort of commission, or task force. And I think we oughta take immediate steps on that, right after this meeting. Perhaps that can be a late communication. We should do that. And I think the city could be a leader in that capacity, that would provide us a year to determine where our true pain points are, as a community, and if it makes sense for the city to be the convener around that discussion, because there are a number of organizations in our community that currently do very, very important work around that arena. But that's not what this position was, and that was corroborated for us by both the mayor and our human resources director.

- [Mayor] That's not accurate.

- Well, what I heard is that the primary responsibility of this position is recruiting candidates of diverse background to the city. And that is a very important, noble objective. Is that the most important thing that we need to do right now?

- [Mayor] Alder from the first.

- Thank you, Mayor. So, I'm a little surprised that we just get to keep talking, and talking, and talking, and talking. A lot of times, in the past, we've been limited to maybe twice, but, I guess, if we're gonna keep talkin', I'll keep talkin' too. I think that the human resources department, Alder Johnson, already did that research. And, I really would like a clarification from the Mayor, or from the human resources on the point that Alder Johnson made, that wasn't agreed with. Could I please have that clarification?

- [Mayor] Like I said, the primary purpose of the role is organizational. They're gonna be doin' a lot of work on this organization, as Director Faulds has said, to recruit diverse candidates to work in the city of Green Bay, but as it's laid out, in the job description, there's also a very prominent responsibility for this person to be out in the community, meeting with community leaders and other community organizations, again, to send that message that Green Bay is open, and inclusive, and interested in diversity, and embracing the changes that we've seen over the years. Not just accidentally, but very intentionally embracing what's happening in this community. So, you can try to say that you support this concept, but if you vote against this position tonight, it's very clear that you do not.

- [Man] Are we debating?

- Okay. Well, I guess I have the floor.

- [Mayor] You invited me into the conversation.

- Excuse me I have the floor right now. Okay. I don't need your support, Alder. I can handle it myself, thank you so much.

- [Man] Then do it.

- And I am doing it.

- [Man] Well, we need help from our chair.

- Alder.

- [Mayor] Alder from the first has the floor.

- Thank you.

- Thank you.

- So, let's see, another point that was made by Alder Johnson, I think was something about how will this help in the budget, how will it help increase the budget? I think Alder Scannell made some good reasoning around that, because of the way Appleton has seen growth within their city, and the way Green Bay has not seen growth within our city, not as much as Appleton. So, I think that's a way that we could probably look at how our budget could be supported by growing our city. And a final thing I wanna say is, I'm starting to get a little worried about this council, because it seems that there is a pattern, that anytime anything is mentioned about diversity, it's always, "Oh, let's just wait. "There just might be a better way to do that." This isn't the first meeting this has happened at. This has been a pattern if you look back at meetings. Why? Why are we so

reluctant, as a city council, to address this now? To acknowledge that this is a need now. I really feel that we should be a council that does embrace diversity, and that helps our city grow, and that helps the whole unity. Someone out in the audience had talked about unity. I don't know that you can get to unity, unless you first address diversity. So, I hope, alders, that you will look in your hearts and come to an understanding that this really is a need for the city. This is a need. It's 2019, almost 2020. We need to have this position, and we need to be able to address diversity and inclusion in the city of Green Bay. And that needs to be supported by our City Council. Thank you.

- [Mayor] Thank you, Alder. Alder from the 10th. And, just before you begin, alder, alder from the first made a good point about a number of comments being made, so... We should try to bring this to a close here.

- All right. Thank you, Your Honor. Well, I was digging through some of my files recently. We all have files at home. And I found a commercial that I had put together for my oral campaign, which, anyway. I'm gonna read it. And I was contemplating whether I should read it or not. And, I think I should. And it's a commercial that I did, and it's called "Diversity." And I just wrote, "Over the past number of decades immigrants from Somalia, Laos, and other areas of Southeast Asia and Mexico have found their way to the Green Bay area. Before the arrival of the French in the mid 1600s, native peoples populated the shores of the Fox River in Green Bay, namely, the Menominee, the Ojibwe, Pottawatomie, and Ho-Chunk, followed by the French, English, and early Americans. The oldest piece of property in the state of Wisconsin lies in the west side of the Fox River, where Fort Howard was instituted in 1916. Successive influxes of Belgian, Italian, German, Scandinavian, Irish, and other peoples, helped to build Green Bay into the dynamic city that it is today. The recent immigrants stand to make the city even stronger." You know, this is kind of a looking at it from the head or the heart. I grew up in Milwaukee. I grew up when we had race riots, martial law. I'm a freshman in high school and I'm riding on a city bus, and all the windows were broken all the way down Lincoln Avenue. One of our brothers is black, at the catholic school I went to. He was standing on a lawn and somebody said, "Hey you." You know, with the word. "Get off my lawn." He turned around, "Oh brother Nole, I didn't know it was you. Go ahead, you can stay there." There's a thousand little stories. I drove integration bus routes as a teenager, well, 19, 20 year old. I don't know how to really put it. Milwaukee's a very segregated city. They have a lot of problems and a lot of issues. I think Green Bay has some opportunities here. We had, when I first campaigned for alder, in 2012, I had one of my citizens call and say, "What are you gonna do about the Somali situation?" And I said, "Hm, interesting. What do you want me to do?" So I started talking to her. And my thought was, you know what, what would happen if my son, who is now 26, he was 14 years old, if he was in Mogadishu in a half track with a AK-47? I don't think, as parents, we would of liked that at all. So I think what we need to do, sometimes we have to kind of look beyond some of the minutiae here. I think we have to start really looking at what our community is. What do we want for this city? It's a tough budget, I agree. But, like I said, we delayed things for 10 years. I've had a number of citizens actually talk to me and say, "You know what, I think we should go with the budget as much as you can." Because we've delayed things for so long. Well with that delay, there are still some very urgent special needs. And, I don't know. This one I'm goin' from the heart rather than the head. I think it's important that we look at the budget, but, you know what, Green Bay... I think we're behind the eight ball a little bit. We need to get with it. And I speak only from my own personal experience, growing up in a large metropolitan city and seeing the things that I did as a youth. And I just think that it's not a good feeling. I think we really need to look at opportunities here, and I think this is one way to do it. Thank you.

- [Mayor] Thank you, Alder. Alder from the eighth.

- Thank you, Mr. Mayor. I really was looking at this from the financial point and didn't wanna get into the merits of it. Every city has its challenges, I don't care where you go. I've experienced Green Bay being a very welcoming place, and I can speak for my district. Whoever moves in, they are welcome by all the neighbors around, doesn't matter who you are. That's been my experience. I referee high school soccer in middle school. I see people runnin' around havin' a good time, getting along. My kids both go to West High School, probably the most diverse school in the city, the high school. They love it. I love it. It's a great school, great kids. And

there are quite a bit. They have friends across the spectrum. I think this is happening naturally in our city. And there's almost like some kind of guilt trip that if you don't do this, oh, what's wrong with you? It's like, that's not it at all. We're lookin' at this as a budget, is it something that we can explore in different ways to get to the same ends, then let's do that. But I also see it happening naturally with our young folk. It's amazing, and it's great. But we can look at it another way, and look at our budget and say, "We are in really tough times." That we went through and everybody seems to be just ignoring it. I guess we can accomplish the same goal, and have a little better budget. So, thanks.

- [Mayor] So the motion before us is to leave the HR assistant position unfilled, which would prevent the hiring and diversity and inclusion coordinator. We're gonna use the board.

- Did she cut you off?

- No.

- [Man] A yes is...

- A yes is to leave the position unfilled.

- [Woman] Say it one more time, just one. That one was backwards .

- [Man] Yeah, say--

- So, the motion is to leave the HR assistant position unfilled.

- [Scannell] Which, a yes unfills it.

- Which would prohibit.

- [Woman] It's one of those backwards motions again. So to vote no, we keep the diversity coordinator position.

- Right, correct.

- [Woman] If you vote no, you keep the diversity coordinator.

- [Wery] Yes leaves the position open, correct? Mr. Mayor?

- Yes.

- [Wery] Yes leaves the position open.

- No is in favor of the diversity and inclusion coordinator.

- [Man] Mayor, Alder Vanderlese is offline here. You might wanna...

- You're a no, I think you said that you're against leaving the HR position unfilled.

- [Man] Stuff in the face yesterday. I'm talking about, it's horrible.

- Wanna vote verbally?

- [Man] It's comin' up right now.
- All right. So, you wanna vote verbally, alderman? What's your vote, Alder?
- [Man] Yes.
- Yes. Motion fails, seven, five. Motion on the floor is to approve HR budget. All in favor, please signify by saying "aye."
- [Group] Aye.
- Those opposed, "nay."
- Nay.
- No.
- The ayes have it.
- [Man] No.
- On to I3, to approve the community and economic development equipment replacement 2020 budget.
- [Man] Motion to approve.
- Second.
- Second.
- Motion made by alder from the seventh, seconded by alder from the fourth, to approve. All in favor, please signify by saying "aye."
- [Group] Aye.
- Those opposed, "nay." The ayes have it, the motion is approved. On to I4, to approve the police and equipment replacement 2020 budget.
- [Man] Motion to approve.
- Motion made by alder from the first, seconded by alder from the fifth, to approve. All in favor, please signify by saying "aye."
- [Group] Aye.
- Those opposed, "nay." The ayes have it. The item is approved. I5, to approve the fire and equipment replacement 2020 budget.
- [Man] Motion to approve.
- [Man] Second.

- Motion made by alder from the seventh, seconded by alder from the fourth, to approve. All in favor, please signify by saying "aye."
- [Group] Aye.
- Oppose, "nay." The ayes have it. Item 16, to approve the public works, including engineering, operations, traffic and equipment replacement 2020 budget.
- [Man] Motion to approve.
- [Man] Second.
- Motion made by alder from the fourth, seconded by alder from the seventh. All in favor?
- [Brunette] Question, Mayor.
- Alder from the 12th.
- Thank you.
- I guess I'm confused by the way it's listed on the agenda. Public Works, including engineering, operations, traffic and equipment replacement. That includes the Public Works budget in addition to, is that correct? 'Cause I don't see, maybe I'm overlooking it. I don't see where the Public Works budget is included in this agenda. It looks to me.
- [Mayor] This would be the appropriate time to debate the budget.
- Okay. So, if I could, Mayor?
- [Mayor] Yes.
- I'm opposed to the budget as presented. A couple different things that were sticking out to me, one would be the diverting what historically had been levy supported blacktop mat to wheel end joint sealing. And, I guess my question to Director Grenier is, how much, in the past have we budgeted, historically, on this item? And, has that always been levy supported? And, do you have a budget for the wheel tax for 2020? A lot of questions, I apologize.
- [Mayor] Director Grenier.
- Going back to 2018, or 2018 actuals for joint sealing was 121,451. And change. And blacktop materials was \$89,883 and change. Last year we took a significant reduction in order to make the budget. Joint sealing materials went down to \$70,900, and blacktop materials went down to \$46,000. And this year we are proposed to be funded from the wheel tax. Blacktop materials in the amount of \$104,000, and joint sealing materials in the amount of \$127,000.
- [Brunette] Okay. And, do you have anything budgeted for those items from levy supported dollars?
- I do not.
- [Brunette] So, the entire blacktop material, joint sealing material, is from the wheel tax.
- That is correct.

- [Brunette] How much do you anticipate the wheel tax will generate in revenue for 2020?
- Based on current projections, we're looking at somewhere in the neighborhood of about 1.5 to 1.7 million.
- [Brunette] When we passed this, last year I believe it was, the memo dated 2017, we were projecting 2.1 million. Obviously, we aren't gonna make that this year. And then, for next year we're also not going to make that, according to what you just said, 1.6, 1.5 to 1.6 million.
- That is correct. I have multiple times advised the committee and hopefully that message, going through the minutes, comes to this council. And I think I may have made a mention to the council, as a matter of fact, once, that when we did the original projections in 2017, that was based off of the numbers that were reported to us by DMV for vehicles subject to vehicle registration fee, registered within Green Bay. But our correspondence with other jurisdictions, who had passed a vehicle registration fee, indicated that the numbers provided by DMV have been shown to be about 30% high. So we have revised those numbers when we've advised the committee.
- [Brunette] Sure. I'm not disputing that, Director Grenier. You have filled us in along the way, and I appreciate that. I guess what my question, what I'm getting to, primarily, is that 1.5 to 1.6 million, do you have a budget for the wheel tax with that smaller amount, versus what you prepared in 2018, 19, for the 2.1 million? So, right now we have 1.5 to 1.6 to work with for 2020. What is the budget for the wheel tax next year?
- We have not prepared that. That would be brought forward as part of the 2020 capital improvement program.
- [Brunette] Okay. I'm a little perplexed by that because we're at a budget meeting, and the diverting of \$231,000 from what historically had been part of your department budget, now will be, we're now asking the wheel tax to cover that, which then means that they'll be less money for some of the other things that this council voted on. So, I guess I'm very uncomfortable with approving \$231,000 of wheel tax revenue for, basically, pothole patching, if you will, without having a better idea how that will affect all the other things that we were told the wheel tax would cover. Do you see where I'm going with this?
- I don't, because the memo that was prepared in 2017, and the action that was taken by this council, in, I believe it was August of 2018, very clearly indicated that these maintenance type activities were definitely anticipated, and that the annual distribution of funds was subject to go up or down from the numbers that were provided in the memo. Those were, they were definitely not intended to be hard and fast numbers. They would be adjusted as needs were identified.
- [Brunette] Okay, so the 2017 memo that you prepared, you prepared on June 14th, 2017. That's what we approved at the Improve and Services Committee, and then the full council. And I believe you mention scenario two. And, of course, we are working on, first of all, first can you agree that you were presenting scenario two. That's what the council approved.
- I believe that to be the case. I don't have the memo in front of me.
- [Brunette] Okay. Scenario two, for those who don't have the memo in front of them, the revenue generated was 2.1 million, which, of course, we know is reduced. And the uses of that 2.1 million, elimination of residential special assessments was 750,000, reduction of nonresidential special assessments, 175,000, alley reconstruction resurfacing, quarter million, budget maintenance, a quarter million, maintenance programming, 100,000, rail crossing repairs, 150,000, program expansion reduction and borrowing, \$425,000. So, right there, I take maintenance programming to be what you're doing now, \$231,000. So, this memo of 2.1 million, 100,000 of that was for maintenance programming. And now that jumps to 231,000. That's an increase of a heck of a

lot of money. So, how are we going to make sure that all those other things that this council voted for, with the wheel tax, will get done if we're using so much of that? 231,000 of 1.5 or 1.6 million is a rather large percentage. 100,000 of a 2.1 million dollar budget is, what, 5%? I mean, it's a pretty substantial change. So, how do you reconcile that for those who voted for the wheel tax thinking we were gonna do more roads and more street maintenance, or the major things like bridge and alley, that we otherwise don't have resources for. And now we're doing something that historically had been levy supported. What's the rationale? How do we reconcile that with the constituents who are asking?

- In my mind, it's very easy. You follow down to the paragraph, following the, what you just read, because the next two sentences says, "Each of the uses would be reviewed annually "as part of the development of "the capital improvement program. "Based upon program needs for the coming year, "allocations to each of these uses "would be adjusted and presented to "the Improvement Service Committee "as part of the CIP financial analysis." That was anticipated when we prepared the memo.

- [Brunette] Right. Did someone just give you this, or?

- Yes, Alder Dorff provided me a copy of the memo while we were talking.

- [Brunette] Okay. I didn't know that, so. I'm not trying to be a wise guy, I just didn't. 'Cause you said you didn't have it, and then you read it. I guess what the main question though is, is we are at a budget meeting. We have a very stretched budget. And, what we pass as a council was to remove special assessments, primarily. And, I know what you're stating, that you don't have a capital improvement plan, but there's got to be some framework. I mean, this is the budget meeting. This is what we're discussing. So if you're going to ask me or the Mayor, through his budget's going to ask the council to be okay with using 231,000 for potholes, basically, essentially, for lack of a better term, then, how are we going to spend the other money to accomplish what this council wanted to accomplish?

- We'll bring the rest of that financial analysis when we bring forward the CIP, just like we said in the memo.

- [Brunette] Okay. Ballpark, though. Is there anything you can provide the council? Because I'm looking at a memo where there was a \$2.1 million estimate, and we are short like quarter of that. That's a pretty... If I knew that we were gonna fall so short, and, again, I'm not placing it, entirely, on you, 'cause I know how things happen, but we can't fix that issue, but what we can do is look forward. And if we're gonna try to divert money to the wheel tax, or from the wheel tax, I need to know what exactly we're going to do. Otherwise, we should remove the wheel tax to the bare minimum to avoid special assessments.

- That's your prerogative.

- [Brunette] Of course it is. I'm not disputing that. But what I'm wondering though, is you don't, at a budget meeting, you don't have some general framework? You know what sorts of projects are on the table that you are considering.

- Of course we don't have it at a budget meeting. That's not part of the budget, that's part of the capital improvement program, which comes later in the year, it's not tied to the budget. The only tie between the two of them is when we do bond for money, that becomes debt service, which is later on in the budget hearing. But that's years down the road, it's not in the same program year.

- [Brunette] If we use 231,000 for maintenance programming, we will have less for alley reconstruction, bridge maintenance, program expansion, reduction and borrowing. Is that correct?

- That's the adjustment that we talked about at the end of the memo. Based on the program needs for any given year. And if next year we have money that can be taken where the wheel tax doesn't have to cover the

maintenance programming to the same level, then the levels will be reflected back downward consistent with what they were in 2019. That's an annual adjustment. That is exactly what we described in the memo.

- [Brunette] Okay. This is why I'm against this particular budget item, is because what the public expected with the wheel tax is not what is being delivered. That's my personal opinion. Alders can differ if they want, but we are basically charging a fee for people which we greatly underestimated how much we would generate. So, now as a proportion of the wheel tax, much of that will go to just simply patching potholes, a short-term fix until we work on a major overhaul, how we do streets. So, I'll make a motion to remove the \$231,000 from the wheel tax revenue and put that as part of the Public Works budget fully understanding that we need to find \$231,000 from the Public Works budget.

- [Mayor] Motion has been made and seconded. Alder from the eighth.

- Thank you, Mr. Mayor. Flashing back to when we discussed the wheel tax. I made it very clear that it was not only to eliminate assessments, it was to do more roadwork. And this council agreed with that, and especially my committee, the Improvement Service Committee, I think in unanimous, have pounded it over, and over, and over, and over, we want more roadwork done, stop the excuses, 'cause we keep getting a lot of excuses why it can't be done. And we've offered all kinds of support. Tell us what you need and we'll get it done. And I think the rest of the committee will attest to that. We've always said, "We need more roadwork done." 1.5% of our roads is disgustingly small. And you hear it all the time. That's the number one thing we hear is the condition of our roads, then traffic. It might be a close second, but... So, to hear that 231,000 is now being shifted into that fund, that hampers the efforts, dramatically, to do more roadwork, dramatically. We're already starting next year in a massive loss. Director Grenier, I know you've heard us tell you over, and over, and over to do more roadwork. And I don't want excuses, but I want to hear, what would you change? What would you do differently if this money were put back in your budget? What's your plan B, or plan C? What would you do?

- [Mayor] Director.

- You're asking a hypothetical question. What would I do?

- [Wery] Yes.

- If you're asking me to say I'm gonna increase the amount of roads that I'm gonna do, that's not the answer that I'm gonna give you.

- [Wery] No, my question would be, if this passes and we put the \$231,000 back on your budget, and you had to find a cut to that amount, or a lessening of something, where would you shift things around?

- I wouldn't. I've prepared the budget that I feel comfortable with. Any reduction in other funding within my budget is gonna result in a reduction in service. So, you asked the mayor earlier tonight if his budget was to be returned back to him, what would he give you? In essence that was the question that was asked. And he said he would give you back exactly what you got tonight. If you make an adjustment and put that money back in and tell me that I've gotta find a corresponding \$231,000 in cuts in my budget, I don't have it.

- What would you cut,

- I simply don't.

- [Wery] Or change?

- What would I change in my budget?

- [Wery] Yes.
- I wouldn't.
- [Wery] You have \$231,000, potentially.
- [Wery] Would you knock it off? Every time I talk.
- Alders.
- [Mayor] Alder from the seventh is trying to.
- [Scannell] I've got a point of order.
- Point of order, Alder.
- You always do.
- Well, it's a point of order.
- [Mayor] Alder from the seventh.
- Better be a good one.
- Legally, I don't think we can take the wheel tax and put it into his budget, that's one thing we can't do.
- He's proposing to move it out. We're just putting it back. Follow along.
- [Mayor] Alder from the eighth.
- All right, thank you. See, I told you it was pointless. All right, so Director Grenier, this money's back in your budget, if it passes. How would you change it? You now have to change it. I'm asking you directly. Not, you're not gonna do it, what would you do? You've been tasked with that, what would you do?
- [Grenier] I have prepared the budget and the numbers that I am comfortable with. I would not make the adjustment.
- I understand you wouldn't, but you have to. How would you do it?
- [Grenier] I'm gonna leave it in your hands to make those adjustments.
- All right, well you're doin' wonderful job. Thanks.
- [Mayor] Alder from the first.
- Okay. So, let me clarify something, Director Grenier. Is it important to fix potholes? Does that help roads if you fix the potholes?
- [Grenier] Yes.

- It does. Okay. And so, we get a lot of complaints about roads. We get a lot of complaints about potholes. We have an item, maintenance programming, which we've projected to be 100,000. So I don't know why we're even talking about eliminating 231,000. We already projected that, initially, to be 100,000. And then, of course, that last paragraph, which I had read, each of these uses would be reviewed annually as part of the development of the capital improvement program. So, how does filling potholes and the sealant materials, does it prolong the life of roads?

- [Grenier] That's exactly what it does.

- It does. And then it makes it easier for citizens to drive on those roads, you get less complaints about potholes ruining tires and things like that, if the potholes are fixed.

- [Grenier] Correct. We call that increased ride quality.

- Increased ride quality, that's a good term. So, I think that having that \$231,000, from the wheel tax, is exactly what the wheel tax is meant for. I don't see how you can possibly take anything more out of the budget that you've prepared, and that you've given to us. And that, if you didn't have the \$231,000, I guess we just wouldn't have potholes being fixed. And I don't think that's what we want. I don't think that's what our citizens want. I think they want, what is it? Good riding quality? Is that what--

- [Grenier] Increased ride quality.

- Increased ride quality. So, I would not be in favor of moving this money out of the wheel tax. I'm sorry, the use of this money should stay with the wheel tax. Thank you.

- Thank you.

- [Mayor] Thank you, Alder. Alder from the fourth.

- I'm sorry.

- [Mayor] That's right. Alder from the ninth.

- Thank you, Mayor. I just wanna be very clear about something. We're not saying that potholes aren't going to be filled. What the question is, is what is the best way to fund it? And I think when we're taking something that has historically been funded by the levy, and we're shifting it to a new fee that was created, it is legal. I wanna be clear about that. That is a legal move that can be done. But there's the law, and then there's the spirit of the law. And the spirit of the law, that was discussed when we passed the wheel tax, was more funds, so much in fact, to the extent that when a proposal was made to us, earlier this year, to use the wheel tax to reduce debt, we actually created a segregated account to keep that money and hold that money for future repairs.

- [Wery] No, no, no, no, no, no.

- My recollection is that passed, right? So, my point is, is that we did that because we wanted to create, I guess, the ability for the city to fix more roads. And through a proposal like this, my understanding would be that we're just going to maintain the same amount, but fund it differently, which means that it would impede the ability of the wheel tax to do more. So, it's for that reason that I am gonna support the motion, and I think we need to then have that discussion. And I don't think, to be fair, I don't think the burden should be placed entirely on Public Works to determine how to recover that funding. If the motion is successful, and passing, I'm open to having that discussion with all of the other accounts that exist in the city budget, where that can be recaptured.

- [Mayor] I think Director Grenier had a point of clarification.

- My point of clarification is simply that the vehicle registration fees were always, from the point of inception of the first report that went out, there was always the intent to add that into a segregated account. And that's something that my department, and I, personally, insisted upon for transparency of those accounts. So, to imply, or state anything otherwise, would be inaccurate.

- [Mayor] Thank you. Alder from the 10th.

- Thank you, Your Honor. Well, I'll tell you a couple things here. I spent a couple of months trying to get the PACER report from Public Works, and it took a while. And I finally got it, and it's more or less the conditions of the roads. And I, while you guys are watchin' your TV shows, I don't want a pat on the back for it, but I have been sitting there looking at this PACER report, it's a huge report, and it shows all the road segments, and all the problems that there are, as far as rating. So, what I've taken upon myself is to look at this PACER report, and I've added another field, aldermanic district. I'm thankful that I was a cartographer because that helps a little bit. But I'm looking through all the 1,400 segments of roads that need fixing, and this is from zero, one, two, three, and four. It's big. And I wanted to have this for tonight, but I just ran out of time. But I wanna share that with the council when I get that all finished. I'm gonna give each alder their own copy of the roads that need fixing, or repair, or whatever. More or less, zero, one, two, three, and four. I don't know how that'll help this particular budget talk, but, you know... The intent of the law was to move forward and get our roads fixed. We each represent 8,700 citizens, and it's either speeding, traffic, or it's roads. Period. Get 'em done. I don't know what it's gonna take. And I, I've heard a lot of interesting things, even from Public Works, I think what, the problem I have is that we're not experts, but we try to be. We're tryin' to learn as much as we can, and I think sometimes we just feel like we're handcuffed. I'm really getting tired of, just, all the dialogue that comes forward. I want to see action. And I'm working on this diligently. I wanna share that. And I'm hoping that we, as alders, can look at this, each of these documents, and say, "Okay, yep, we need some help here." I don't know how that translates, and I'm gonna leave it to each one of you. I'm gonna give it to you. You can use it, or throw it away. But, I want our roads fixed. And I will support your motion. Thank you.

- [Mayor] Alder from the 12th.

- [Brunette] If you could read back the motion, I wanna make sure it was the intent of what I was hoping to do.

- [Mayor] So, I think that the intent of the motion was to eliminate the use of wheel tax for joint sealing and blacktop.

- For the amount of \$231,000. You know, obviously I know that that's going to require us to make a cut in the Public Works Department, somehow, some way. And, I guess, my question to, it's related to the motion, so give me a little leeway here. Diana, there are two positions currently open in Public Works. One is an electrician, the other is a mechanic. There are five electricians, according to what I see, in the Public Works Department, and nine mechanics. Obviously those positions are important, but what I'm wondering, is if those positions are not filled, right now they're on the cities website, so I'm assuming we haven't extended an offer today to anybody that it's been expected. How much would it be if we did not fill those two positions for 2020?

- [Ellenbecker] If you look on page 116, I can see that a electrician will go anywhere around 62,000 to 71,000, for salaries. Plus then you would have benefits. And then a mechanic, I'm not sure which positions are open. Which position is open.

- It just says mechanics in Public Works on the city's website. So, I guess what I'd like, as you look for that, Diana, I don't wanna be Machiavellian in how I do this, but, I understand some wheel tax should go for the

pothole, and whatever, the joint sealant and blacktop, however it's worded. So, what I would submit is that whatever cost saving we have by not hiring the electrician and the mechanic, that we would then offset that from levy dollars, and still use some of the wheel tax for those things, because we approved up to \$100,000 on the interoffice memo, dated 2017. So, I think we could make this neutral if we allow the excess of not filling those two positions to go to wheel tax. Hoping that you all know what I'm getting at.

- [Ellenbecker] Can I ask a quick question?

- Sure.

- [Ellenbecker] I don't know which positions those are. I'm not sure if they're all levy supported positions. They could be could be sanitary--

- Look on the city website. We might have to take a five minute break if we can't gather, I mean--

- [Mayor] Oh no.

- But that's your call, Mayor, but.

- [Mayor] We're goin' through. Director Grenier. Can you speak to what those positions are, and their value?

- I don't know what the individual value with salary and fringe would be, but both positions are 100% levy supported. I can verify that.

- [Mayor] And then, just in terms of departmental value, what they're doing for you everyday in the department.

- Well, 2019, we did not get any dollars, not budget, not bonding, for equipment maintenance. So, I had three major pieces of equipment fail, requiring engine replacement at \$70,000 per. Those were done by my in-house mechanics. The electricians, this is the sixth budget in a row that I've approached the Mayor's office, and asked for another electrician to be added to my table organization. Because the existing electricians can't keep up with the demand. And I understand, because of tight budgeting, why you've elected not to fund the position that I've asked for. So, a further reduction in another electrician just means more work's not gonna get done. Pretty easy.

- [Mayor] Thank you, Director. Alder, you still have the--

- [Brunette] No, that's fine. Before I make a motion, a different motion, I need to hear from Diana what the--

- [Mayor] We can come back.

- [Brunette] Okay, thank you.

- [Mayor] Alder from the fourth.

- Thank you, Your Honor. So, Jesse, you're proposing, and I'm just, I'm trying to understand this, instead of \$230,000 going from the wheel tax, to do road maintenance, you wanna offset some of that, and then not hire a mechanic and electrician? And, so you wanna transfer, say the mechanic and that electrician come out to \$150,000. You wanna transfer that money back to DPW to do more roads?

- Okay, Director Grenier, if you had \$150,000 to do more roads, how much more money would you need, because, if I understand things correctly, the wheel tax offsets about one third of the total cost of a road. So would you need to bond more money? Find more money?

- [Grenier] That's kind of an oversimplification.

- Well, then understand who you're talkin' to here. We're not real deep into how you do your jobs.

- [Grenier] You understand a lot more of what I tell you than you're letting on, so... Again, I'm not gonna get too deep into it, because I've heard, repeatedly, nobody wants to hear Steve's excuses anymore. So, the problem that we have is either this council needs to take a fundamental change in how roadwork is done, and the change that you're going to have to embrace, and, let me be very clear about this, that will be this council that's making that change. You folks are gonna have to vote to change how we do roads, and you are going to have to be willing to pave over utilities that we have no guarantee on.

- Well, and that's what I'm asking, Steve. Because, as you've explained at the last finance meeting,

- [Grenier] Water utility has about a one million dollar budget that they have to put towards water infrastructure needs in an annually, at a given year. And then the sanitary utility, when we get to sanitary, you're going to see their debt service, and when we get to storm, you're going to see their debt service.

- So, when you--

- [Grenier] Both of those utilities are 100% self-funded. So, whatever we borrow for infrastructure upgrades have to be able to be supported by the user fees for the sanitary and the stormwater.

- And that's what I'm trying to make a point here, is that, replacing a road is not simply getting some asphalt, or some cement, tearing up the old one and laying it down. It's looking at the infrastructure underneath, because if you don't repair that infrastructure, you hear that complaint like everyone, "Oh, they just put that cement down two years ago. "Now they're tearin' the darn stuff up and doin' repairs underneath."

- [Grenier] You're correct.

- So, you have to coordinate with these other organizations. They have to have the money in their budget to do those roads.

- [Grenier] Yes.

- In addition, you also, the city has to find other moneys, usually through bonding, to do those roads, do they not? I mean, the wheel tax

- Yes.

- doesn't cover everything.

- [Grenier] No. Right now the wheel tax, this year the wheel tax covered resurfacing on one small project.

- Okay. So, simply to say, "Here's \$150,000, do something with it." You really can't do more roads without a lot more planning, and coordination, and money within all these other organizations. So, the money would then be used to what? Railroad crossings, bridge repairs, alleyways?

- [Grenier] Possibly.

- Okay. And that's what he was... It's taken me a little while to grasp all the variables that go into this, but that's my understanding. So, we can't simply say, "Here's a quarter "of a million dollars, here's a million dollars, "go replace 10 miles of road." It's, if the water utility doesn't have money to do it, then we have to find a road that doesn't need water utility replacement. But it makes no sense to be replacing some of that roadway, then, if it's gonna have to be repaired 10 years down the road. Down the way. So, what I'm asking you is, you're telling him, "Here, take this money, and use it for something else." But where is he, still, gonna get the money for the road repairs that need to be done? Where does that money come from? He's budgeted \$230,000 to fill the potholes. So, where does he get the money that he needs to do that? Okay, so we got \$150,000, maybe. But, how do we come up with the rest of it?

- Okay, so what we're doing again, though, by not hiring this mechanic, who you said you think is an important position, this electrician, who you said you think is an important position. He says he doesn't have enough to begin with. We're kickin' the can down the road again. And next year we're gonna have to find the money to fund those two positions. I mean, again, we're passin' a buck. We're hurtin' our constituents. We're hurtin' this community. I just don't see the sense of it. I'm sorry. I can't support it. Thank you.

- [Mayor] Thank you, Alder. Alder from the seventh.

- Thank you, Your Alder. I think maybe, hopefully, the light bulb's gone on a little bit, and I'm finally getting a grasp of what some alders are concerned with. It's that, this is the first year of the wheel tax, and money that was in the levy, in the past, to do patchwork, is now coming from the wheel tax. Which is what the wheel tax was meant to do. As I understand it, the wheel tax, first and foremost, goes to replace roads. And that's what Director Grenier looks at. He looks at how many roads can get done. He puts that in. Then, what's left? He looks at that and says, "Well, "maybe this bridge crossing, "maybe so much for pots, "potholes." That's the way the wheel tax is supposed to work. I don't understand, I didn't understand that the big concern was that it used to be in the levy, and now it's not in the levy. Well... And it should be in the levy. No, it shouldn't be in the levy. He's not gonna be able to use the wheel tax, to do every dollar of the wheel tax, to do nothin' but roads. Replace roads. And it was never thought that the wheel tax would do nothing but replace roads. There's gonna be money left over, and that money should go for roadwork. Whether it's a railroad crossing, an alley, or pots, potholes. So... The wheel tax is working the way I thought it was supposed to work. And if, let's say, he gets to do more roads. So, hopefully . We're all hopin' he gets to. And there's less money for potholes. Well, hopefully there'll be less need for potholes, but if there is, then he might have to dip into the levy. That's gonna be a decision we're gonna have to make down the road. But for now, I don't see how that's a decision we need to make. He's doing all the roads that can get done. There are no special assessments. And we're way behind, as far as our infrastructure needs. And, to put a bandaid on it, with filling some potholes, I think is a good use of that wheel tax money for now. As long as you can't do more roads. If you can do more roads, let's do more roads, but I think he would a done that. He can't. So, let's make the best use of what's left with that wheel tax, and fill some potholes, so we don't have people filing claims that their car is all beat up from goin' through a pothole. So, just because this used to be in the levy, I mean, we used to do special assessments. All this has changed with the wheel tax. The wheel tax should be to do our roads and nothin' else. I thought, before, what Alder Wery was talkin' about, was tryin' to put wheel tax money into the Public Works budget, which is what it shouldn't do. But now I get what... So, the light bulb came on. But, I think other light bulbs need to go on, in that, this is what the wheel tax is for. We dip into the levy if we need to dip into the levy, and we borrow more if we need to borrow more, but for this year's budget, we got the roads done, we're gonna get done, nothin' else is gonna get done with roadwork. Let's put the rest of the wheel tax to good work. I think filling potholes is pretty good work. If I'm correct. I believe I've got the picture correctly now, and I hope that helps everybody, it certainly helped me. Thank you.

- [Mayor] Thanks, Alder. Director Ellenbecker. Do you have the numbers yet?

- It is estimated at about 149,000. So, I just wanna make the point the 2019 budget did have 116,904 blacktop materials and joint sealing. And you're looking at 231, so it would be an increase of 114,100. So, there was a increase over last years budget. Not sure if that's a compromise, where you could just restore last year's number. They had the other portion offset by the wheel tax, which is around the hundred thousand that was in the original memo.

- [Mayor] But then, the number that's in this budget, matches the 2018 number, roughly. Correct?

- Correct. The '18 number was 211,000 in the 2018.

- The motion that I made is fine. At least I'm trying, let it stand where it is. So, I don't wanna make any amendments to the motion I made already. I just want it known that there is a possibility to offset that with some cuts to the Public Works Department, if needed.

- [Mayor] Can you reiterate you motion. Is--

- I think the motion I made was to restore the \$231,000 from the wheel tax revenue source and transfer that to the tax levy. That's a clinky way of stating my intention. It's just that, the money that we are gonna use from the wheel tax, I want that to come from the levy, the \$231,000.

- [Mayor] Okay. So, just to be clear, this is creating a \$231,000 hole in the DPW budget.

- Right.

- [Mayor] Alder from the seventh.

- I just wanna make sure I understand this right. So, what we're really talkin' about, we're not talkin' about wheel tax at all. We're talkin' about, we have... 231, is that the, 231 that was levied, and we wanna keep levying. Why? Why do we wanna keep levying that when we passed a wheel tax to cover that same thing, if we don't need the levy to cover what we want the wheel tax to cover? I don't understand why we would put money back into the wheel tax that's gonna sit there and not be used. When we could put it to good practical use. Just because this used to be in the levy, I don't know why we have to... Before the wheel tax, there was a lot of use tos. The wheel tax changed all that. I don't quite follow under why we're doin' this. Thank you.

- [Mayor] Thanks, Alder. Alder from the 12th.

- [Brunette] Nope, that's fine.

- [Mayor] Okay, alder from the eighth.

- Thank you, Mr. Mayor. Going off Alder Scannell, I would just comment that we don't know how much money we need yet because, we just heard, we don't have any idea of what we wanna do. So, why not have the money ready to go. And there are plenty of streets that just need to be repaved. That don't need the deeper work done. So, I have no doubt that we can use this money. We heard we needed another engineer, that's why we couldn't do more work. And we suggested, well, tell us how you can get around that. Maybe we need to contract it out. Maybe we need to change some priorities. I chatted with somebody in the water department, they said, if approached, they would look at giving more money to do those projects. But I haven't heard that we've had these conversations. So, I think we should put this back, leave our road money ready to roll, and really push ahead with what we wanted, is more road work. I don't know how De Pere, and Ashwaubenon, and all these other communities, can do more roads than we can. I don't understand that. And we just need to keep pushing, and pushing. This is what people want, more roads done. Thanks.

- [Mayor] Thank you. Alder from the seventh, for the final time, maybe.

- Yes, I think so. Well, instead of putting this of taking... The levy, putting this back into the levy, the filling potholes. Can we just leave that out of the levy, wait, if you wanted to wait until figurin' out how many roads we're getting done, figure out what's left, and use that left over for potholes. As I understand, that's what the wheel tax should of done. So, we maybe end up doing a little less for potholes, but if we're doin' more roads, maybe we don't need to fill as many potholes. But it seems to me, we don't wanna put this back into the levy, because the wheel tax was designed to work on it. We wanna do as many roads as we possibly can. What's left should go for other work, roadwork. So, I don't know that we need to put roadwork into the levy, into the budget. Maybe that should be taken out and done with a... Does that... Make sense from an engineering perspective? That's up to us, huh? So, I would recommend that we do not expect the levy to fill potholes. That we expect the wheel tax to do it, and if we need to wait and see how much we put into it, I guess, that makes sense to me at least. I don't know why we'd put this into the levy. Thanks.

- [Mayor] Thank you, Alder. Alder from the ninth.

- Thank you, Mayor. Director Grenier, first off, previously when you commented that the Public Works intent was always to keep it a segregated fund, I understand that, and I just wanna make sure that we're talking about the same topic here. When you had proposed your capital improvement plan, I believe a portion of that wheel tax, and I don't recall the specific amount offhand, at the time, was proposed to offset new borrowing. And that was when we made the motion to create the segregated fund. And we said, "No, we wanna borrow the full amount." And whatever money was, kind of, left over, would be put into the segregated account with the intent to be used for additional roadwork. Do you know, offhand, how much money was set aside?

- [Grenier] No I don't, because the segregated account was set up, back, last December when Diana put the account together, well before I ever brought anything to the committee.

- Okay. Director Ellenbeck, do you know what that amount is?

- [Grenier] We don't know that at this point because we haven't received all the money for 2019. We're still receiving the receipts for October, November, and December, obviously.

- Okay. Do you know, by chance, even if it's a ballpark, year-to-date, how much has been taken in and how much has been expensed?

- [Ellenbecker] We just looked it up. To date we have about 1.4 million dollars in the account, and that is about nine months worth of payments from the state. And to date, the only expense that has, there has really has been no expenses taken out of that account, except there is expected special assessments as they fully bill out those special assessments.

- [Grenier] And the \$100,000 of road maintenance funding.

- [Ellenbecker] Oh yeah. Okay, how much? And \$93,000 of road maintenance for 2019. That has been taken out of that account.

- [Grenier] Because we haven't finished the 2019 construction, we haven't issued the invoices for what would have otherwise been assessed.

- [Ellenbecker] Correct, to date--

- [Grenier] But that estimate was provided to the committee earlier this summer.

- Okay. So, just 1.4 million, Diana, is the number that you said? Sorry, did I mishear that?
- [Ellenbecker] Correct. For nine months, that's, to date, actually it's 1,479,529, but that was some early payments. So, yes, that is what has truly been brought in, but that really is for nine months worth of receipts.
- Right, okay. And so, 93,000 has been taken out of it so far. And you don't happen to know what the amount of the special assessments is yet? That hasn't been calculated yet?
- [Ellenbecker] That is correct. Until the final payments are made and the council approves the special assessments, and we would move the dollars. We would not have that figure. I believe it's been estimated for \$900,000 for this year, but I think that was an estimate.
- Okay. And that's kind of what I'm getting at. So we could make some reasonable guestimates for the point of this exercise here. Of 900,000. My point is that it would still leave us with several hundred thousand dollars in that account that was intended to be, again, separated with the intent to do road repair. And, while I do support what Alder Brunette is attempting to do here, I also recognize, again, the tightness of the budget and the need for us to really make the math work on this at the end of the day. I'm definitely very hesitant on holding off on the hiring of those two positions. I don't think that that is a good response right now. And so, ultimately what I'm getting at is we could potentially, in the 2020 budget, restore funding for that sealant, that serves that purpose, while looking at this isolated fund and acknowledging that there should be several hundred thousand dollars left in that, yet, that could potentially be used to plug the hole for this year. It's a one time fix. I know we don't like it, but it's what the wheel tax was intended to do. Does that, potentially, make everybody happy? I mean, it fixes our potholes. It gets us through this next year. Until, as Director Grenier had alluded to, we can come up with a more comprehensive, alternative approach to the way that we fund roadwork.
- [Man] I guess Diana's call makes sense.
- [Mayor] Do you have a motion, Alder?
- [Scannell] Well we have a motion, don't we?
- We have a motion on the floor. I guess if it... To restore it. I mean, this could be a rider on that motion, but it could be a separate motion, too. So, I say, why don't we let Alder Brunette's motion work its way out, and then maybe--
- [Man] If his motion fails, yours still apply? If my understanding is correct.
- [Mayor] We'd have to make a new motion. So, I'm gonna admit, I'm a novice in this department. I'm gonna look at Diana for some help, because we're dealing with dollars that are not part of this particular fiscal years budget. I don't know how to make that motion.
- [Mayor] Director Ellenbecker.
- [Ellenbecker] Correct. At this point, \$231,000, that you are talking about, is not in this budget book. It's just another funding source, like other sources we have. At this point, that 231 is not in here. If you want it back in here, you can approve to put it back in here, that adds about four cents to your levy, takes your increase up to about 3.6% at this point.
- So it'd fix the levy.
- [Mayor] Further comments?

- Mayor, Steve.
- Steve.
- [Mayor] Director Grenier.
- If I'm understanding Alder Johnson correctly, what you're saying is for 2019 we have already received approximately 1.5 million, and we have expenditures, or encumbrances 900,000 to a million, somewhere in that neighborhood.
- [Johnson] Correct.
- So, there's somewhere between 500 and 600,000 dollars in that wheel tax fund unallocated right now.
- [Johnson] Correct.
- And what you're suggesting is if Alder Brunette's amendment does not go through, that there's capacity to do what the Mayor has suggested with the 231,000 against the wheel tax fund having no impact on our ability to do anything in 2020s anticipated wheel tax revenues.
- [Johnson] Correct.
- Does that make everything a little bit more clear?
- Yep.
- Yes.
- [Johnson] But what I'm also hearing, though, is that if we put that 231 back in, that it affects the mill rate, and now we're exceeding the levy limit.
- Yes.
- [Johnson] So it really doesn't solve anything. Sorry guys, I tried.
- [Man] Well, unless we just do your portion and not Jesse's. If we just do your motion and not Jesse's then it doesn't affect the levy.
- [Johnson] Well, Jesse's motion has the floor, so.
- [Man] Correct, absolutely.
- [Mayor] Any further comments on alder's motion? Apologies.
- [Man] Thank you, Mayor.
- [Mayor] Alder from the 11th.
- What we're talkin' about here is we wanna fix roads, we wanna fix potholes. I'm not in favor of raising the levy to transfer money from one pocket to the other. I think that we should just leave the wheel tax money, use it as we're using it, and if we don't have to add to the levy, use that money. It's gonna help us in the long

run. Use the money as we see. And I understand what Director Grenier is talkin' about, as far as the infrastructure, the water and the sewer, and all the rest of that goes into it. His hands are tied in that department, same way with the water department. In other words, when the money's not there to do it, they're not doin' it. So, he's gotta kinda work around their system. We're kinda in a jam. I know there's some roads that we could resurface and we're talkin' about that money, that we have extra there, maybe they can find some roads that we can resurface and do that. And when my district, they're gonna resurface a few roads, this year. And, I don't think they have to do major work in 'em, but they're gonna resurface 'em. So, I think that we're just tryin' to thread a needle here pretty fine. I think that if we don't have to put it on the levy, and the wheel tax is meant to do its job, I guess I'd say just leave as is. Thank you.

- [Mayor] Very good. Thanks, Alder. Any final comments here? All right. We shall vote. We'll use the board. Motion before us is to end, to remove the transfer, or, to prevent the use of wheel tax revenue to fund joint sealing and blacktop.

- [Brunette] So, I'll withdraw my, Alder Johnson's motion is good. I'll withdraw my motion if Alder Johnson.

- [Mayor] Alder from the ninth.

- My motion would be to use the unallocated wheel tax funding from 2019 to fund blacktop material and joint sealing, joint sealant for 2020, in the amount of, whatever it was, 211,000 and change. That'd be the appropriate motion?

- [Mayor] I mean, is a motion necessary?

- I don't believe so, because that's the way the budget is currently crafted.

- [Mayor] Correct.

- [Johnson] Except that it's pulling it from the unallocated amount, and it leaves available the wheel tax funding to be used in 2020. Right? It's kind of a... It's one account to the next.

- I think it's, from a practical standpoint, it doesn't matter. From a, I see what you're trying to do, and I think by discussing it here, there's now a written and verbal record of it. So, from our accounting standpoint, we can make, the transfer of money is not going to happen until after January 1st, but, with the journal entry that's completed within the financial software, we can make a note on that, making it very clear that this transfer, this journal entry, is from the unallocated 2019 funds, not the 2020 funds. It really is a paper exercise, but I understand why it's an important paper exercise.

- [Mayor] Alder from the ninth.

- I think at the end of the day we all want the same thing, right? Which is more roads to be repaired and fixed, and, if it's a paper exercise that gets us there, I'm all right with that.

- [Mayor] So...

- That's the motion, right?

- [Man] Second.

- [Mayor] Okay, repeat your motion, alder.

- To use unallocated 2019 wheel tax funds, that were put into that segregated account for 2020 blacktop material and joint sealant.

- Very good.

- In the amount of that, whatever it was, 211,000.

- 231. Motion was made by alder from the ninth, seconded by alder from the seventh. All in favor, please signify by saying "aye."

- [Group] Aye.

- [Mayor] All opposed, "no."

- [Man] Nay.

- [Mayor] The ayes have it. We are on to approve the Public Works budget in its entirety.

- [Man] Motion to approve.

- [Mayor] Motion made by alder from the seventh. Seconded by alder from the fifth. All in favor? All oppose, "nay." Oh, alder from the sixth. The ayes have it, the item has been approved.

- Now we're finishing the budget?

- [Mayor] No, that was the DPW budget.

- Okay, okay. I wanted to make a comment after all this.

- [Mayor] Very good. On to item 17, to approve the parks, rec, and forestry, including admin, City Hall, Triangle Hill, parks, recreation, pools, forestry, wildlife sanctuary, and equipment replacement 2020 budget.

- [Man] Motion to approve.

- [Mayor] Motion made by alder from the seventh, seconded by alder from the first. Alder from the sixth.

- I do have a question. I just want a clarification on page one--

- [Mayor] Your mic.

- On page 127, from the parks director, please.

- [Mayor] Okay. State your question.

- It is 55101, equipment repair, it went up 868.6%. I just want a clarification on this.

- [Mayor] Director Ditscheit.

- [Ellenbecker] I can answer that available, and then you can ask him more questions if necessary. It truly is an accounting change. It's to make it more transparent on what expenses we are using. What happens is if, if you look in the middle column, the second last line, you have the 59920. Do you see that account on page 127? The middle column, or I'm sorry... What's that? Yep, the 319,750, 319,750 in the past we have budgeted for

that. We are no longer using this transfer account anymore. And now there's three line items within the budget that are now bein' used. So, if you look up, back to the 54010, the 5411, and the 55101, the three of those together basically offset what we used to show as a transfer out. We used to transfer out money into another separate account, and that's where we were expending the money for fuel, oil, propane, and equipment repairs. And you weren't seeing that in the actual line item detail in this book. And that they've been historically doing that. So we stopped doing the transfer out, and showing the actual expenses in this budget. So those three accounts, as you can see there was no budgets in previous years. Those three come out to roughly the same amount as what we used to do and transfer out in previous years.

- [Woman] All right, thanks. Oh, I'm sorry.

- [Mayor] Alder.

- [Woman] Thank you. I just wanted to under stand that. Thank you.

- [Mayor] Okay. Very good. Other comments? Alder from the 12th.

- Thank you, Mayor. We'll discuss this a little more under storm, sewer, I know, but I want a clarification from whoever, whether it be Public Works, or Director Ditscheit, regarding the forestry budget to stormwater, who would then manage the forestry staff if that goes through?

- [Mayor] Director Ditscheit.

- That would still remain under parks, recreation, and forestry. This is just a budgetary, or a financial change. It's not a change to the structure of the division.

- [Brunette] Okay, so your staff would still... You would direct your staff, through your subordinates, if you will, the staff of that department, ultimately. That doesn't change?

- Nothing would change. They would still operate out of the park shop.

- [Brunette] Okay. Thank you.

- [Mayor] Other comments, questions? All right, seeing none. We've made the motion, all in favor, signify by saying "aye."

- [Group] Aye.

- [Mayor] All opposed, "nay." The ayes have it. On to 18, to approve miscellaneous 2020 budget.

- [Mayor] Motion made by alder from the seventh, seconded by alder from the first. Any discussion? All in favor, please signify by saying "aye."

- [Group] Aye.

- [Mayor] Those opposed, "nay." The ayes have it. Item's been approved. On to 19, sanitary sewer 2020 budget.

- [Scannell] Motion to approve.

- [Mayor] Motion made by alder from the seventh.

- [Woman] Second.
- [Mayor] Seconded by alder from the first, to approve. All in favor, please signify by saying "aye."
- [Group] Aye.
- [Mayor] Opposed, "nay." Ayes have it. On to item 20, to approve parking utility 2020 budget.
- [Man] Motion to approve.
- [Woman] Second.
- [Mayor] Motion made by alder from the seventh, seconded by alder from the fifth. All in favor, please signify by saying "aye."
- [Man] Aye.
- [Mayor] Opposed, "nay." Ayes have it. Item is approved. On to item 21, approve the storm sewer 2020 budget.
- [Man] Motion to approve.
- [Mayor] Motion made by alder from the seventh.
- [Woman] Second.
- [Mayor] Seconded by alder from the first. Alder from the 12th.
- Yes, thank you, Mayor. I am most certainly against this idea of transferring the cost of the forestry department to the stormwater utility. That, for me, is the biggest sticking point for this budget. I did quite a bit of research on this subject, and the stormwater management ordinance, if you will, chapter 30, I pulled this from the city of Green Bay website, and I reviewed it, it's 33 pages and a lot of very dry reading, unless you're a city attorney. I have a hard time following everything as presented, but one thing I did notice, the entire rationale is that trees, trees help with stormwater retention. In other words, the root system for trees would absorb water, and that helps, but when you review this document, which, by the way, if I have the most up to date copy, it was amended 12/16, which I believe to be December 2016. If you read the entire document, which I did, and skimmed it, the trees are never mentioned in this entire document. Trees, the word trees, unless my eyes deceive me, are not listed at all. Page eight, the word forest is mentioned. Pervious surface means an area that releases, as runoff, a small portion of the precipitation that falls on it; lawns, gardens, parks, forests, or other similar vegetated areas are examples of surfaces that typically are pervious. And then, also, on page 16, I believe. Also, for highly susceptible wetlands, 75 feet, highly susceptible wetlands include the following types; ferns, sedge meadows, bogs, low prairies, conifer swamps, shrub swamps. Other forested wetlands; fresh wet meadows, shallow marshes, deep marshes, and seasonally flooded basins. So, again, the word forested are mentioned, but not trees, so please, any council member who did review this, if I missed anywhere in here, this entire 33 page document, that there is any reference to trees, please correct me, because that's the large assumption that we're going on. That trees affect stormwater to that level. And then, as I looked into this a little deeper, the proposal that we're transferring 1,189,853, the expense for forestry through stormwater utility bills. You're doing so on the understanding that that rate then gets put to stormwater utility bills. And what Director Grenier mentioned, at joint finance and personnel, that the average quarterly cost to a bill would be \$6.32, something close to that, for effective \$25 per year. Keep in mind that that is average. That doesn't mean that's the case for all properties. And how you determine what amount gets put on stormwater utility bills, that's based on pervious and non-pervious area. So, for example, many of your

constituents, if you have large areas of driveway, large roof structures, sheds, walkways, anything that prevents water from going directly into the ground, and causes runoff, the more structures you have, the more your stormwater utility bill will go up. And so, my question, and this is what I'm really struggling with, is if that is true, then, in order to believe, suspend belief and think that trees affect stormwater to this level, then for our constituents and property owners who have trees on their property, which would absorb stormwater through their roots, they should be getting a credit on their stormwater utility bills. The entire ordinance is two references to forest had nothing to do with trees, and I guess my question, at this point, to the city attorney, Vanessa, was this reviewed? Should this be revised, this ordinance before we entertain any thought of adding to the stormwater utility rates?

- [Mayor] Attorney Chavez.

- I can't actually answer that for you. I am not the person who has reviewed this. And so, I would be speaking on behalf of another person who's not here. As far as whether or not stormwater is something that is affected by trees, I don't think there's any doubt about that. And so, as far as it falling under the ordinance, I don't think there's an issue with that portion of it. It is a recognized control.

- So, I understand this was needed to balance the budget, but my concern is that this is a major policy shift. This is not something to take lightly. This should be discussed at Improvement and Services Committee, perhaps discussions with the water utility. More public notice, because once you add things to a utility bill, in this case, a stormwater utility bill, it gets much easier, in the future, to keep adding cost to a stormwater utility. And, I'll be honest, if I did not bring this up at joint finance and personnel, I don't know if many people in the community and the public would be aware of this. Luckily the media ran stories on it. And I'm not trying to pat myself on the back, but this is a rather significant change. And it's not something this council should take lightly. Now, the rationale used, and, Mayor, your assistant was great in gathering this information for me, but the argument that other municipalities are doing it, the only two that I'm aware of that I researched on my own, and then Mayor's community relations assistant shared with me, is Kenosha and Racine. Those are the only two communities that have actually done this. I don't know if there had been others, but one thing to keep in mind about Racine, they had, and I reviewed their budget, I reviewed our budget and their budget, and one thing I noticed about the city of Racine, they implemented this change in 2019 for their budget. In 2020, in order to balance their budget for this year, I feel like I'm in Congress shuffling papers, testifying, one thing I noticed about the city of Racine for their 2020 budget is that in order to balance their budget this year, they sure enough have added additional costs to their stormwater utility bills, or at least they had proposed from their 2020 operating budget overview there's language that says, "In allocating more cost to fee based systems, including fire protection, recycling, and stormwater." On the same page, they add, fire protection cost on water bill to the tune of 1.8 million dollars. And they added additional forestry, and curb and gutter moved to stormwater fee, the tune of \$225,000 under other financing sources this category includes the pilot payment from the water department. The pilot revenue has been reclassified to the general fund, which increased the category by 1.8 million, because it no longer must be used to pay for prior fire protection. And, sure enough, under significant revenue changes for 2020, they put the fire protection to water bill at 1.8 million. My reason for stating this is that we should adopt practices of municipalities that are ran well. And that we adopt good things for our community. Racine, the city of Racine, their 2019 tax levy rate, it was at \$16.09, through the roof. Ours had proposed, if this budget passes, as \$9.45, theirs is \$16.09. 2020 estimate is \$14.92. Once we start adding things to stormwater utility rates, it gets easier and easier to do it. And I'm all for it if the rationale makes sense, but it's not obvious to me that this change, this tree, surface trees, terrace trees, whatever you wanna call 'em, has that level of affect on stormwater utility. We should be discussing this at the committee level. We should have more data. We should have professional presentations. I probably spent five or six hours on this particular item alone. And the more I learned about it, the more disturbed I am. We are the city of Green Bay, although other municipalities are doing it, the city of Racine and Kenosha have done it out of necessity, their finances, to my estimation, without being an expert on their government, not in very good position. So, please, of all things in this budget, this thing should be sent back and done the proper way, not some budgeting gimmick, that's the way it feels to me. And the public has every right to be outraged by this,

and I hope they are, because there is a lot of this that really does not pass the smell test. So, with that I'll make a motion to make a motion to refer this to the Improvement and Services Committee, and restore the 1.189, whatever it is, to the tax levy so that we can try to figure out how we're gonna reduce the tax levy by that amount. Thank you.

- [Mayor] Thank you, Alder. Just a quick note, Director Ellenbecker shared with a few alders, a number of other municipalities that are using this, Alder Steuer just shared the email that she sent to him. So, they include Milwaukee, Madison, Menasha, and Stevens Point, at the very least, but obviously, it could be others. Thanks, Alder. Alder from the first.

- Thank you, Mayor. So, yeah, I was looking for more information. To me, this makes perfect sense, and I don't think it's anything that was hidden. I think it was there in plain sight, and it was certainly talked about, to shift the forestry services over to the stormwater management. So, who would be the person in the room that could give us a little bit more information on why this is an appropriate use.

- [Mayor] I think Director Ditscheit could speak to the value of street trees, certainly.

- Yeah, so the value of street trees it's not just, I mean, part of it is stormwater management, but there's also a lot of other value. So, they do reduce the stormwater runoff by infiltration through the ground surface through the roots, but it also has a lot of other aspects to it, lowers the air temperatures, reduces air pollution, reduces heating and cooling costs. So there's a lot of other bullet points that go along with it, but when you take a look at just the stormwater runoff reduction, the DNR does have a calculation that they use to calculate out the value of the stormwater management on a yearly basis. And based on that calculation, and the number of street trees we have, it's a pretty significant dollar amount, it's about 1.16 million, based on the DNR's calculations. That's an annual benefit to stormwater management. So that's as it relates to stormwater management, but then it also does increase property value, air quality improvement, energy savings, all of the above.

- [Mayor] Thank you, Director. Alder?

- So, our city, too, is in a bit of a budget crisis, it's not just we're seeing it in Kenosha. This seems to be a very sensible way for us to ensure that the forestry department can still continue to do its work, and that, we don't have to raise the led anymore. I don't know where we'd get 1.2 million at. I don't think we even need to look for where we'd get 1.2 million. We have the answer. We've come up with the answer. I believe that this is a good use of stormwater management money. Thank you.

- [Mayor] Thanks, Alder. Alder from the 10th.

- Thank you, Your Honor. Actually, Director Ditscheit did hand me a sheet. I kinda wished everybody woulda got a copy of this to look at. But I'll just read a couple of things from it. Talking about street tree benefits. And I, I've talked to Alder Brunette on this issue as well, a couple of times. I think, at first blush, I was thinking, "Really, we're gonna transfer that money "from forestry over?" It just didn't seem to make sense. But then, as time went on, we have a 1.2 million dollar hole here to fill, and I don't know how we're gonna fill that. So, I'm just gonna read a couple things here. When you look at trees, there is that and they reduce pollution and all that kind of stuff, but what Director Ditscheit mentioned is that trees reduce stormwater runoff and improve water quality. Trees reduce peak stormwater runoff, and associated pollutants, entering local water bodies. Trees reduce stormwater volumes by intercepting a portion of rainfall, which evaporates and never reaches the ground. Tree roots also increase rainfall infiltration and storage in the soil. And tree canopies reduce soil erosion by diminishing the impact of raindrops on baron surfaces. Now, this is from the DNR. I'll pass it around. You can take a look at it, but it has a list of all the elements that trees do. But we're looking at it specifically for this particular topic. And we could talk about the science about this until we're blue in the face. But, right now we're looking at what are we gonna do with this 1.2 million. And, I'm not fully in favor of

transferring things over, because, in a sense, you have another bill, another tax. You're kind of goin' from one to another. My concern was the fact that, and I asked Director Ellenbecker about this, that this is a yearly thing. I thought if it was a one shot deal, I think I would be a lot more comfortable with it. But it sounds like this is gonna be going on for some time. But I'm also torn by the fact that we have 1.2 million to deal with. We'd be here till four in the morning trying to figure that out. I'm not prepared to do that. So, I'm gonna support this, and let the chips fall where they may. Thank you.

- Thanks, Alder. Alder from the 11th.

- Most of the people I've talked to, in my district, they're not in support of adding another \$25 to their yearly bill. And the businesses are definitely against it. Most of your businesses, they look at this as, like, here's our water bill. And they look at the storm runoff. They're already payin' a large sum. Most people are payin' a large sum if they have a business, they have a lot of property. It's not a real popular topic, I'll guarantee you, and most of the people I've talked to are dead against it. And that's where I'm standing on this, as far as, I can't support that. Thank you.

- [Mayor] Thanks, Alder. Alder from the seventh.

- Thank you, Your Honor. We have to get creative. I mean, we're behind the eight ball, and we gotta get creative, and this is how we're gonna get creative. The way I look at this is, there's no way to pull it anywhere else out of the budget, so do we value this item, or do we start making cuts on this item. I don't wanna make cuts on this item. And if I could put it on the levy, I'd put it on the levy. Doesn't matter. You're right, we're gonna be paying for this one way or the other, either Paul pays for it or Peter pays for it. I value the service. I think it's what we wanna do. I don't think we can cut that any. And so, if we can be creative and figure out another way to pay for it, then we need to be creative and pay for it. And I think that's the problem we've had in the past is, we got creative on how not to pay. And that's why we're where we are. We need to be a little creative on how to pay, and hopefully we can start digging ourselves out of this hole. And if I'm not mistaken, some of this also, 25% of the salary for the Sustainability Commission comes from this. So, I've had nothin' but support for that. And I think that's very practical for our community to have a sustainability coordinator. So... Yeah, it's creative. And I can see and appreciate how that makes you feel uncomfortable, but I believe in being fiscally responsible. I believe in all those services we're providing. And so, how are we gonna pay for 'em? Well, we can't put 'em on the levy. It just ain't gonna work. So, if we can figure out another way, and we have. Thank goodness we found another way to do it. So, I support this, and I've had nothin' but support. People have told me 25 a year, as an average, maybe somebody's gonna pay 30, or 35, and someone's gonna pay 10, you know. I don't think the range is that wild, but, let's say it is. People see a lot of value in a sustainability coordinator, with the problems we've had the past couple of years. There is big support for that. So, I appreciate being creative and paying for something, instead of being creative in how we're not gonna pay for somethin'. And, all the service is there, I don't wanna cut any of 'em. So, I support this. Thank you.

- [Mayor] Thanks, Alder. So the motion on the floor is to end, or eliminate, the funding of our forestry budget, 88% of our forestry budget, with stormwater utility rates. We will use the board.

- Yes vote puts it into the budget.

- [Mayor] And creates a 1.2 million dollar hole.

- [Woman] And a no vote keeps it where it is?

- [Mayor] Correct.

- [Woman] Okay.

- [Woman] How are we goin' to get that? We've been trying. We're almost done here.
- Did you get one?
- [Woman] Yes.
- Jeese.
- It never showed up. It doesn't like me. What'd I push?
- You're on Tetris.
- Did you know there was one thing, when I scrolled it was Chinese, and then it went to English.
- [Woman] Mine was that the whole time.
- That's weird.
- [Woman] Mine's Chinese and now it's English.
- How'd I get out of the meeting? What am I doin'?
- You're just goin' back to it's gonna stay.
- [Mayor] What's up?
- [Man] He left the meeting, so he's gonna have to do verbal .
- I'm not used to a touch thing here, it's touchy.
- [Mayor] So, verbal vote.
- Verbal vote?
- [Mayor] For you.
- Yes denies it, correct?
- [Mayor] No.
- [Woman] No.
- No denies it.
- You wanna keep it in there.
- No, no.
- [Mayor] Opposed to Alder Brunette's motion.
- Right, right. Yes would support this motion, no, no, no, no.

- Alder,
- Only one.
- [Mayor] An aye?
- [Man] Yes, yes, yes.
- [Mayor] The motion fails, seven to five. So, the motion before us is the approval of the stormwater, or storm sewer 2020 budget. All in favor, please signify by saying "aye."
- [Group] Aye.
- Those opposed, "nay."
- Nay.
- No.
- The ayes have it. At this point, I just wanna pause and see if there are items that folks wanna discuss in the remainder of the items here. If we know...
- [Scannell] Can we take 'em all together?
- That's a good question.
- [Woman] We will give rest to the budget.
- Correct. Well, we have a vote on the budget, itself, under resolutions. But I just wanna see if we can dispense with some of these other items with unanimous consent. Alder from the 10th. Director Ellenbecker? Director Ellenbecker? Alder from the 10th has a question about employee compensation, and under which item that would be appropriate to discuss.
- [Ellenbecker] Which department would it be?
- Or which...
- It's general fund, item 29.
- [Woman] 28.
- [Ellenbecker] Would've been included in number seven, all the way through...
- You can address it in your final comments
- 217 for sure.
- Though, if you want. Do you wanna make a motion on that?
- Okay, alder from the 10th.

- All right, thank you, Your Honor. Diana, just checking, we're looking at this 2%, down to 1%, savings of what, 57,000? Is that it for the employees?

- [Ellenbecker] Correct, that was the estimated amount.

- I guess, I'm having a hard time understanding why the first year would be only 57, but the second year would be, you're saying that it would be a lot more significant. And I just need an explanation why.

- [Ellenbecker] Sure, because this year's 2% was effective October 1st of 2019, so this increase goes to, really, September 30th of next year. So, next year the 2% would've only been built in for October, November, and December of 2020. So, we took the 2% for those three months, down to 1%, and that came out to be about 57,000. What I said to you, the following year, you would have a bigger impact, because you would now be taking that increase, of 2%, down to 1%, for at least nine months. And so that--

- So it's prorated.

- [Ellenbecker] Correct, there would be more months in the following year that you would have a reduction from two to one.

- Now, is this a one time reduction? Or is this gonna be...

- [Ellenbecker] I think, annually, that 2% is voted on each year.

- It's negotiable.

- So that is absolutely

- It's negotiable.

- [Ellenbecker] Something that the council can choose the percentage each year.

- But I've been getting some pushback from some of the employees and that on this. I realize that there are unions, and there are some that are not union. And it just... I don't know, I have a hard time trying to fix budgets on the backs of the employees. I don't know if anybody else can chime in on that, but I'm havin' a hard time with this one. And if anybody else cares to chime in, I'd like to hear it. Thank you. I don't really have a motion. I just needed to hear that.

- [Mayor] Sure. Alder from the sixth.

- [Woman] This also concerns me, 'cause we had five managers, they got a big step, plus they're getting the 1%. Now we're asking the regular employees to take just a 1%. And we're also increasing their medical and their dental. I have a problem with that. I'm sorry, I don't think that's fair that we give... It seems like the management always seems to get a better pay scale, or whatever, than our regular employees. Maybe that's why, sometimes, people leave.

- [Mayor] Yeah. Director Faulds, maybe you can talk to our compensation plan in its totality?

- Sure. I'm not sure if I'm following with certain employees not getting the 1%, or the step, all employees will be getting step increases if they have the performance evaluation that meets expectations, or above, if they're in the steps. And then, I do think it's a difficult discussion for our employees. I think it is tough for them to take a 1% increase, but we understand it is a tough budget, and there is gonna be a little bit of pushback, but I think the employees... You know, it is a difficult conversation, but I think, explain to them the situation we're in. I

think they'll understand it. It's difficult, but I'm hopeful that next year we can talk about 2% again. But it's not an easy decision to make, but I think it is helpful, that will help the budget for, not next year, but the year following after that. But it would be for all general employees would have 1% increase above their step increase.

- Can I ask?

- Thank you, Director. Yeah. Alder from the 10th.

- What will that change the mill rate? If we put that back. In.

- [Ellenbecker] It would be right around a penny. For every about

- Just a penny.

- [Ellenbecker] 59,000 then, increase in expenses, it would be about a penny. I guess I wanna clarify, also, I'm not sure what Alder Lefebvre was sayin', but, when Director Faulds is saying all general employees, that is all management and employees. So, there is no difference between, it would be protected versus non-protected, or representative versus non-representative position. So, all management would also only be gettin' 1%.

- [Mayor] Further comments?

- I'd like to, I don't know how we're gonna do it, but I'd like to see it go back up to 2%. I'll make that motion.

- [Mayor] We have a second for the motion? Seconded by alder from the sixth. We'll use the board. Oh, sorry. Alder from the eighth.

- Thank you, Mr. Mayor. Director Ellenbecker, the cost is about \$50,000 to have a 2%, instead of 1%? Did I follow along right?

- [Mayor] Well it's 57, it's prorated.

- Right, right. There's a relatively easy place where you could find about \$50,000 to give employees the 2% raise. And it's not creating a new position. If this doesn't go through, and employees get a 1% raise, you can pat 'em on the back and say, "Hey, suck it up, at least we "got this new inclusion position."

- [Mayor] Alder from the first.

- So, Director Ellenbecker, if this motion passes, and that means the mill rate would raise by one penny, do we lose money by doing that? Are we at the top of where we can be? Are we risking anything?

- [Ellenbecker] No, we would be able to work within the parameters of the expenditure restraint program. And the reason, let me explain why that is. But, yes, if we woulda added that 57,000 back in, less than \$7,600 adjustment we've made, it would go up to 946. So it would really be a, less than 1%, less than one cent change, it would go up to 3.3%. What we would do is, we have the option of taking out some Packer overtime, and it's an accounting change, but we are taking some Packer overtime and Packer revenue, which are, they offset each other 100%. So, if we took out expenditures of \$57,000 and \$57,000 worth of revenue, that would free up this 57 to put that expenses in, and take out Packer overtime revenues, out of the budget. It's just an accounting change, and it would allow us to stay within expenditure restraint.

- So it's like .8 of a penny.

- [Ellenbecker] Correct. Yep, this change, if you add it back in, would go up to 9.46, and it would be a 3.3% increase with these two changes.
- Okay, thank you.
- [Mayor] Alder from the fourth.
- [Man] I still make that motion.
- [Mayor] Alder from the eighth. No? A lot of people on the list here. Alder from the ninth? Yes, no? Okay. Alder from the third.
- [Man] Thank you, Mayor. Now, is this a 1% with all employees?
- [Mayor] Non-represented.
- [Man] Non-representative. So, are we talkin' management? So this is 1% for management.
- [Mayor] Director Faulds.
- Right now we're talkin' about 1% for all of our general municipal employees, which that means is, 1% for every single employee, except for the employees that work for transit, police, and fire. So, the 2% will be for every employee, outside of transit, police, and fire.
- [Man] And that's everyone.
- That's everyone.
- [Man] That's management with line.
- It's management, yep, employee, all staff, except for police, fire, and transit.
- [Man] Okay, well...
- Who are in represented unions in police, fire, and transit.
- [Man] Right, those are excluded.
- Yep, they have their own bargaining rights and their own contracts.
- [Man] Okay, so you're part of that then. I mean, management. All the directors, all the supervisors, all the line.
- Yes.
- [Man] Excluding the three parties.
- Yeah, that's correct.
- [Man] Okay, well Alder Lefebvre, I thought she stated that, okay, when you have management making over 100,000, and they're getting a one or 2%, that's a little bit more than someone making \$12 and hour, isn't it? How is that fair?

- Are you asking me?
- [Mayor] Is that a question for somebody in particular?
- [Man] Mayor?
- [Mayor] Well, it's a percent, so it's equal in that way.
- [Man] But I guess I don't agree with that. I don't mind giving line a 2%, but also management? They're already making, what? 90, 100, 126,000 retirement? Doesn't make sense to me. Who made the motion? Alderman Steuer?
- [Steuer] I did.
- [Man] Why don't you exclude management, and just the line.
- [Steuer] I don't know if you can do that.
- [Man] We've done it in the past.
- [Mayor] So, any further comments? So, the motion before us is to restore 2% increase for general employees. Any further discussion? We had a motion and a second. We're gonna use the board. Jesse.
- [Brunette] Came off, but I don't know.
- [Mayor] Okay. Brunette's a no.
- [Brunette] We've had enough.
- [Mayor] Never. Brunette's a no. Yeah, no. Motion passes, seven, five. All right. Any items left here that we wanna discuss? Anything at all? Alder from the ninth.
- Thank you, Mayor. Just a question for clarity's sake, before we, I guess, adopt the rest of this. And I don't know if this would be considered out of order. I apologize, I missed it in the expediency with which we dispensed some of the earlier items, but the resiliency coordinator, I noticed that it had, just, to be determined in there. So my question is, it's just really more procedural understanding of how it works. And so, whether it's you that answers it, or if it's somebody else. I think that, that position, correct me if I'm wrong, was contingent upon us receiving a grant. Okay. And then, I think your, the estimate. I don't know if that was an exact number, 25% comes through stormwater, 75 through the grant. Would that come before INS and council later to get that stormwater funding? Or is that automatically implicit in the budget?
- [Mayor] That's a good question. Director Faulds.
- That would be automatically put in. What we've done, I think, the past two years, I've explained to the personnel is that when a position is passed in the budget, that I'll bring an informational item to personnel to let them know that we're filling that position. So right now it's been passed for the 25% out of stormwater, and 75% out of grant.
- [Johnson] So that comes, though, with a future expectation that this council would approve an increase in stormwater fees to cover that? Correct? Or is there already cushion in there that would absorb that?

- We would have to adjust the stormwater budget. So, I think based on that, I think what we can do is, I think we can bring this position back to see how it affects it. Because usually what we do, is we do a budget for that in the budget, but since we have that in the situation, I think it would be a good decision to bring it back to committee before we approve it.
- Typically we would do a .
- [Mayor] Director Grenier.
- I'm gonna look to Director Ellenbecker. Typically, something like this would be a budget amendment, which would be handled through finance committee, correct?
- [Ellenbecker] Yes, if you were gonna... Yes.
- So, I just wanna make sure we're looking in the right spot. Typically this wouldn't come back through INS, it would come back through finance, a budget amendment to the 2020 budget.
- [Johnson] Okay, and the reason I was maybe questioning if it would go through INS, is if it would require INS to take action on increasing the stormwater management rate.
- And again... Given that this is an off-levy, I don't know if that makes a difference or not, but, historically, because we would be amending the approved budget, regardless of where the revenue source came from, because you're making the budget amendment, historically those have been handled at finance committee.
- [Johnson] Okay. So, either way, that position addition would require a budget amendment.
- Yes.
- Okay. And again, I'm generally supportive of the position, particularly if it's going to address funding, I just wanna make sure that everybody here understands the process with how we'll, in terms of how we'll get there.
- Yep.
- [Johnson] Thank you.
- [Mayor] Thanks, Alder. We have a few folks in the queue here. They all legitimately in the queue? Alder from the fourth. You in there? No. Anybody else wanna talk here? No. All right. Are we prepared to take the remainder of the items by unanimous consent? Motion to suspend the rules.
- [Mayor] Just, by unanimous consent. And as long as we don't have any objections. We'll be able to take 'em up by unanimous consent.
- Second that.
- [Mayor] And then, we...
- [Mayor] Okay. So, without objection, we're gonna adopt the remainder of the items here, 22 through 40. Without objection those have been adopted. On to resolutions. Motion to adopt the remainder of the items. Okay. So, we need a motion to adopt the remainder of the items here. So, again, that was 22 through 40, is what I have?

- [Chavez] Yes.
- Motion made by alder from the first, seconded by alder from the fifth. All in favor, please signify by saying "aye."
- [Group] Aye.
- Opposed, "nay." The ayes have it. On to resolutions.
- [Woman] You may, under suspension of the rules, adopt resolutions one through five together with one roll call vote, and we'll take up six separate.
- So, I'm takin' up one through five, with the motion made by alder from the seventh, seconded by alder from the first, with one roll call vote. All in favor of that motion, please signify by saying "aye."
- [Group] Aye.
- Those opposed, "nay." The ayes have it, the rules are suspended. Entertaining a motion to adopt resolutions one through five.
- [Woman] Move to approve.
- Motion made by alder from the eighth, seconded by alder from the first, to adopt resolutions one through five. Please use the board. That's yes. Look at that, unanimous. Bravo, way to go, guys.
- [Ellenbecker] Mayor, I have the rundown with the final resolutions.
- [Mayor] Okay.
- [Ellenbecker] I should have had that in front of you before you voted on it.
- Oh, that's okay. Oh, we didn't vote on it.
- [Scannell] One through five.
- [Ellenbecker] Got it.
- Okay. Do we need five minutes?
- [Ellenbecker] Yeah, three minutes.
- Three minute recess.
- [Woman] Thank you so much.
- We're almost there, Randy. Just leave it alone.
- [Man] Like I said, it wasn't perfect, but you know what...
- [Woman] Oh, sorry.
- Yeah. Oh, okay, I like that idea. Okay.

- Just a thought.
- Yes.
- So, on any complex motion, they just have to write it down and panel it in?
- [Woman] In some .
- Okay.
- [Woman] Do it word for word, 'cause sometimes .
- Yeah.
- [Woman] You know?
- Right. You can't even comprehend what they're saying. Yeah.
- [Woman] So, just a thought.
- No, I totally agree. Call the meeting back to order here. So, we are on item six, under resolutions.
- [Woman] Move to approve.
- Motion made by alder from the first,
- [Scannell] Second.
- Seconded by alder from the seventh, to approve. We'll use the board. Are you sure? You positive?
- [Man] Actually, I'll put down two or three notes.
- That's kind. Budget passes, seven, five. On to ordinances, first reading.
- [Woman] You may, under suspension of the rules, advance ordinances one through three to a second reading.
- [Woman] Second.
- Motion made by alder from the seventh, seconded by alder from the second, to suspend the rules, take up these items with one roll call vote. All in favor of the motion, please signify by saying "aye."
- [Group] Aye.
- Those opposed, "nay." The ayes have it, the rules are suspended.
- [Scannell] Motion to advance.
- Motion made by alder from the seventh.
- [Woman] Second.

- Seconded by alder from the second, to advance items one through three. All in favor of the motion, please signify by saying "aye."
- [Group] Aye.
- Those opposed, "nay." They ayes have it, the item has been advanced to the final reading. On to referrals and petitions, referral of petitions and communications. Anybody?
- [Man] Motion to adjourn.
- Motion to adjourn, made by alder from the third.
- [Man] Second.
- Seconded by alder from the 10th. All in favor, signify by saying "aye."
- [Group] Aye.
- Opposed? Ayes have it, we're adjourned.