MINUTES OF THE FINANCE COMMITTEE

TUESDAY, JULY 14, 2020, 4:30 PM

Special Telephonic Meeting of the Finance Committee
To listen to the meeting go to:
https://www.youtube.com/CityOfGreenBay
Public may join via Zoom

A. ZOOM MEETING INFORMATION.

1. This item contains documents which provide call in information and instructions for the Zoom Meeting.

B. ROLL CALL.

1. Members: Ald. Barbara Dorff, Ald. Veronica Corpus-Dax, Ald. Bill Galvin, Ald. Brian Johnson.

Present: Barbara Dorff, Bill Galvin, Brian Johnson, Excused: Veronica Corpus-Dax

Also present: Ald. Lynn Gerlach, John Mehan, Chief of Staff Celestine Jeffreys, City Clerk Kris Teske, City Assessor Russ Schwandt, Procurement Manager Calvin Winters, Police Chief Andrew Smith, Fire Chief David Litton, IT Director Mike Hronek, City Attorney Vanessa Chavez, Finance Director Diana Ellenbecker, Assistant Finance Director Pam Manley and others.

C. APPROVAL OF THE AGENDA.

Moved by Ald. Brian Johnson, seconded by Ald. Bill Galvin to approve. Motion carried.
Yes- Barbara Dorff, Bill Galvin, Brian Johnson

D. APPROVAL OF MINUTES.

1. Approval of the Finance Committee minutes from the June 16, 2020 meeting.

Moved by Ald. Brian Johnson, seconded by Ald. Bill Galvin to approve. Motion carried.
Yes- Barbara Dorff, Bill Galvin, Brian Johnson

E. REGULAR BUSINESS.

1. For consideration and possible action to payoff 2018 and 2019 Board of Commissioners of Public Lands state trust fund loan for a total of $3,000,000.

Moved by Ald. Brian Johnson, seconded by Ald. Bill Galvin to approve contingent on the approval of the next two items. Motion carried.
Yes- Barbara Dorff, Bill Galvin, Brian Johnson

2. For consideration and possible action of refunding $2,000,000 BCPL state trust fund loan for TID 22.

Moved by Ald. Brian Johnson, seconded by Ald. Bill Galvin to approve. Motion carried.
Yes- Barbara Dorff, Bill Galvin, Brian Johnson

3. For consideration and possible action of refunding taxable 2010 General Obligation purpose bonds (BABs).

Moved by Ald. Brian Johnson, seconded by Ald. Bill Galvin to approve. Motion carried.
Yes- Barbara Dorff, Bill Galvin, Brian Johnson

4. For consideration with possible action the acceptance of the Center for Tech & Civic Life grant for $1,093,400.

Moved by Ald. Brian Johnson, seconded by Ald. Bill Galvin to accept the grant as long as any clawback provision be brought back to the Common Council. Motion carried.
Yes- Barbara Dorff, Bill Galvin, Brian Johnson

5. Report out the acceptance of the WEC CARES subgrant for $57,535.30 with allowable uses to prevent, prepare for, and respond to coronavirus, domestically or internationally, for the 2020 Federal election cycle.

Moved by Ald. Brian Johnson, seconded by Ald. Bill Galvin to receive and place on file. Motion carried.
Yes- Barbara Dorff, Bill Galvin, Brian Johnson

6. Consideration with possible action on the results of a Request for Information for the Revaluation Assessment service.

Moved by Ald. Brian Johnson, seconded by Ald. Bill Galvin to approve Option #1 authorizing up to $50,000 from our 2020 contingency fund and spreading the balance of the contract over 2021-2022 under the direction of the Procurement Manager to negotiate that agreement with the expectation of the Revaluation Assessment service to be completed by 1/1/22 for the 2023 Budget. Motion carried.
Yes- Barbara Dorff, Bill Galvin, Brian Johnson

7. Review the City of Green Bay's 10-33 program inventory.

Moved by Ald. Bill Galvin, seconded by Ald. Brian Johnson to receive and place on file. Motion carried.
Yes- Barbara Dorff, Bill Galvin, Brian Johnson

8. Consideration with possible action on the purchase of Type I ambulance for GBMFD for the sum of $261,617 from Jefferson Fire & Safety, the lowest responsive, responsible bidder for RFQ #3266.

Moved by Ald. Bill Galvin, seconded by Ald. Brian Johnson to approve. Motion carried.
Yes- Barbara Dorff, Bill Galvin, Brian Johnson

9. Request approval for the purchase of Mitel Phone system from CCCP off the SourceWell group purchasing cooperative contract.

Moved by Ald. Brian Johnson, seconded by Ald. Bill Galvin to approve contingent on the supporting documentation being presented to Council. Motion carried.
Yes- Barbara Dorff, Bill Galvin, Brian Johnson

10. Request for approval of amendment to cell tower lease at Ted Fritsch Park.

Moved by Ald. Brian Johnson, seconded by Ald. Bill Galvin to send to Council with no recommendation and include the amendment and a summary of the impact of the change for the Council packet. Motion carried.
Yes- Barbara Dorff, Bill Galvin, Brian Johnson

11. Request for approval of amendment to cell tower lease at Fisk Park.

Moved by Ald. Brian Johnson, seconded by Ald. Bill Galvin to send to Council with no recommendation and include the amendment and a summary of the impact of the change for the Council packet. Motion carried.
Yes- Barbara Dorff, Bill Galvin, Brian Johnson

12. A request by Ald. Wery to the Finance committee which states: Offer a pay incentive/bonus for poll workers who have worked and will work this year during the Covid-19 situation. 2) Adopt a policy for future hazard pay situations. Referred to staff to research other hazard pay policies.

Moved by Ald. Brian Johnson, seconded by Ald. Bill Galvin to refer to staff and the Personnel Committee part 2) reevaluation of hazard pay across all departments. Motion carried.
Yes- Barbara Dorff, Bill Galvin, Brian Johnson

Moved by Ald. Bill Galvin, seconded by Ald. Brian Johnson to receive and place on file the pay incentive for poll workers. Motion carried.
Yes- Barbara Dorff, Bill Galvin, Brian Johnson

13. A request by Ald. Wery to the Finance committee which states: Update on lawsuit Zima v Schmitt, including city's role and why the city has agreed to indemnify the former mayor.

The Committee may convene in closed session pursuant to Section 19.85(1)(g), Wis. Stats., for the purpose of conferring with legal counsel for the governmental body who is rendering oral or written advice concerning strategy to be adopted by the body with respect to litigation in which it is or is likely to become involved. The Committee 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. Brian Johnson, seconded by Ald. Bill Galvin to receive and place on file. Motion carried.
Yes- Barbara Dorff, Bill Galvin, Brian Johnson

14. Report of the Claims Committee.

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

Moved by Ald. Bill Galvin, seconded by Ald. Brian Johnson to receive and place on file. Motion carried.
Yes- Barbara Dorff, Bill Galvin, Brian Johnson

F. INFORMATIONAL.

1. 2020 Contingency Account: $143,700.00

2. The next Finance Committee meeting will be held on Tuesday August 11, 2020 at 4:30 PM.

Next meeting will be moved to Tuesday, August 4 at 4:30 PM.

G. ADJOURNMENT.

Moved by Ald. Brian Johnson, seconded by Ald. Bill Galvin to adjourn. Motion carried.
Yes- Barbara Dorff, Bill Galvin, Brian Johnson

H. VERBATIM MINUTES.

- Finance committee meeting for 7/14/2020 to order and, computer just went blank. But do roll call. Here we go, okay. Alder Johnson.

- Here.

- Alder Galvin.

- Here.

- Buff is here. And Alder Corpus-Dax is excused. I will entertain a motion for the approval of the agenda.

- Approved.

- Second.

- Is there any discussion? Hearing none. All those in favor, say aye.

- [Group] Aye.

- Opposed? Motion carries, okay. Approval of minutes?

- Approved.

- Second.

- Move to approved by Alder Johnson, seconded by Alder Galvin. Any discussion? All those in favor, say aye.

- [Group] Aye.

- Motion carries. Regular business. One, for consideration and possible action, to pay off 2018 and 2019 board of commissioners of public lands, State Trust Fund loan, for a total of $3 million. Steff.

- Hello all, yes. What you have in front of you, there is in your packet included in letter that we would like to submit to the board of commissioners of public lands to pay off, actually it's two loans. A loan which we got in 2019 for a million dollars, that was for neighborhood enhancements. We also took out another loan for, in 2018 for $2 million, and that was for the Shipyard. Or whether it's because they were taxable, or because there was time constraints, we ended up taking our State Trust Fund loans. At, and at this time, I'm working with Baird and Associates. They were able to come back and saying, say that if we take the $2 million and refund it, we could save money for the TIF. And then the other one which is a neighborhood enhancement, we actually, between fund balance and premiums that we've received from going out to the, for our latest bonds, we would have enough money to pay this off, reduce our outstanding debt, and in the long run, save aside the interest. What we need to do though is, there's a timeline. We have till I think, I think toward the end of, I can't remember exact, to send this letter to the State Trust Fund loan, to the board of commissioners and let them know that we're interested in this, and then they could give us some exact information on when and how we could pay this off. On the line, we also have John Meehan, and, from Baird and Associates. And he could help explain if you have any more questions on this item, or the following two items, where it, one of the items that where we're gonna refund are refinance this $2 million loan that we're looking to pay off.

- Alders, do you have any questions?

- If it's appropriate I mean, I would just make a motion to approve this item contingent on the successful passage of the next two items.

- Yeah, that sounds good. All right, any other discussion? All those in favor, say aye.

- Aye.

- Aye.

- Opposed? Okay, most, all right. Number two, for consideration and possible action of refunding 2 million East BCPL State Trust Fund loan for TID 22.

- Okay I, in this case, I am going to turn it over to John Mehan. And to explain the $2 million item that we just had a State Trust Fund loan that we would like to now refinance. There is something in your packet, it's a refinancing proposal. And I am gonna let John talk to this item.

- That's great. Good afternoon, everybody. Diana, do you have the, so they all have the packet, which was, that I had sent through about eight pages or so?

- Correct. I can put it up in front of you, but there yes, the packet in front of them, at the number two is the $2 million refunding.

- Right.

- Super. Here, if you wouldn't mind, could we maybe walk through the, because I have it reverse audit. It's really to talk about item number three, and then to talk about item number two.

- [Woman] Should we,

- Oh, should we amend the agenda?

- I can just do it. I could just go it through. That's okay.

- All right, so go ahead.

- Yeah, if you go to, in the handout that we sent, page seven.

- It's gonna be framed in our packet, we separated it. So you're gonna,

- Okay.

- It's all the backup that we have supporting number two item.

- Okay, thank you. Intro page, it says refinancing and the 2018 state plus the loan?

- Yes.

- As a description of the current issue, as Diana was saying, it was for, I think initially for TID 5 now TID 22. It was in the amount of $2 million. It's considered to be taxable debt. So any refunding of it would be with a tax, a little debt issue. Now just, I think it was like two weeks ago, you conducted a sale, an issue oneself, some taxable notes. So we were very familiar with the bond market right now for taxable notes, very attractive. And what we're looking at doing is taking the maturities 21 through 28, which carry right now a 4.25% interest rate, and refunding those, and I'll get to the restructuring, because the call provision that Diana was referring to is the State Trust Fund. One of the attributes of the state plus fund is they allow you every year, a window to call debt payoff if you wish, as long as you give 30 days notice. And it's done prior, or on August 31st. So, what we're looking at, I'll get to a timeline, is by July 31st, a notice would go to, oh thank you, the notice would go to the State Trust Fund, saying on August 31st, we're going to pay your debt off. We're going to pay it off. So if you kick to the next page, what we're proposing to do is that, the amount of debt that's outstanding is about, it's $2 million in whatever interest costs. Until the proposed issue size is about 2,000,085, goes to interest costs, cost of issuance, et cetera. And have the structure set up so the repayments are from April 1, 24 through April 1 of 2038. So we're extending the debt. And we're doing that because this is TID 22 Shipyard debt. So we're trying to have the TIF match, the life of the TIF, match this debt. That's why we're gonna be extending it. And we're taking advantage of today's low interest rates by going from four to quarter percent interest, to an estimate of slightly over 2%.

- [Woman] That's really good.

- So even though we're extending the debt, the rates are so low, that we're able to do that. And, because of the structuring, overall there's still is saving. So it's the advantage of that, it's a current refunding. You can do it as long as you give notice that you have a higher interest rate on it, four to quarter, which is about two, two times plus what the market is right now for tax court debt. We could give some cashflow relief to TID 22, which I think is important. And to still have the debt paid off with an overall 20 year life. Now as far as the wear interest rates are, inside of the next page, these are the U.S treasury rates. And I mentioned this only because tax solutions are priced against U.S treasuries. Someone who buys taxable bond says well, I could buy a U.S treasury and sleep well at night, so anything that I don't buy that's a treasure rate to it. So when you look at treasury rates, it's treasuries plus something. And they look at the plus saying, okay, is it a five-year maturity? Which are the purple bars. Is that a 10 year maturity? Which are those green bars. And there's also, I could have gone with the longer maturity too, but the idea is that right now, as you can see, treasury rates are pretty low. And that becomes the index that buyers look to. So, as that five and 10 year bounces around, so will the interest rates on the final sale. Okay, click the next page. Now we were mentioning about the structuring of the debt. If you look on the left side of the page, that's the good for refinancing. That's where you are right now. Now there's other TID 22, , mark the State Trust Fund loan. And that's, that four to quarter. And what we're doing is on the right side, we're saying, okay, we want to have cash flow relief. So we wanna reduce the annual payments, so we would go three years interest only, once again, because we wanted the TIF to start generating revenue, to cover debt service. And then extended out for an overall life, not to exceed 20 years from the start date, 2018. So in some cases, what happens is actually there's a savings in earlier, but that's only because you're pushing the debt from an early maturity to a later maturity. And once again, you know, we still generate on overall savings, but the reason we're doing this, this structure, cashflow relief for TIF 22.

- Can I just ask a question about on this page? I just wanna make sure that I'm reading this correctly. I'm looking at the gross savings or loss, and I'm seeing 86, 956. Is that the difference between the original deal and the refinanced deal?

- Yeah, that's really goes exactly. Looking at the original structure and taking it through a refinance structure and you say, well, you know, it really costs you $90,000 to do it, but because you get so much in savings upfront, the present value generates the overall map test of saying, well, there's really a savings on a present value basis. But you're absolutely right. The fact that you had debt that was being paid off now is being restructured over the 20 year it comes out to about a $90,000 debt.

- So the savings is the cashflow relief?

- Exactly.

- [Man] Okay so it's kind of, and the reason I bring that up is because we're really gonna to pay more for this, but we just have to make a determination if the cashflow relief is worth the $87,000.

- Exactly. And I think what it comes down to Alderman is that, it's a matter, if you do nothing, you know, you have to make the payments. And then it's the source of making the payments on the existing State Trust Fund. Do you take it? Well you don't have enough TIF for revenues from 22, so you really have to take it out of the general levy, of the general money to make the payments. And so by doing this, we're not taking on, we're not borrowing new money. We're not issuing new projects. We're saying we're structuring it so that the cashflow relief is to the levy, and that the TIF would support itself, that's the concept.

- Thank you.

- That was the very good explanation that I really appreciate that. So Alders, discussion.

- What a no brainer.

- [woman] Okay. Alder Johnson, do you have some concerns yet?

- [Johnson] No, I didn't have concerns.

- No, okay.

- I just thought that everybody was clear on what we are voting on, and that I mean this is going to cost us more in interest long term, but obviously the short term relief is what's really necessary in our fiscal position. So yes, I support this is. This is cash management 101.

- [woman] Great. Who would like to make a motion?

- [Man] I move to approve.

- Second.

- And, any further discussion? All those in favor, say aye.

- [Group] Aye.

- Opposed? Motion carries. So item number two has carried. Now back to my agenda, item number three, for consideration and possible action of refunding taxable 2010, General Obligation Purpose Bond. BABs.

- By way of an explanation in last year, we did the same step. Last year you had did that, which was issued in 2009 under what was then known as the American Resource Recovery Act. And communities, school districts, states, counties had the ability to issue, Build America Bonds, BABs. And, what a BAB is, it's debt that could have been issued tax exempt. But, since the fed was willing to give you some reimbursement on the debt service, if you issued taxable, because if they had taxable debt outstanding, that's less tax exempt debt that avoids paying tax on the treasury. So in 2010, similar to 2009, you issued at that time, it was financially beneficial to issue BABs and to take the subsidy. The remaining maturities, 'cause now we've hit a call date, it was a 20 year issue and we put the tenure point, you have a call. Your option is, you can leave it as is, as taxable debt and still get some subsidy, or you can convert it to tax exempt and take savings. The remaining debt are the years from now till 2030. And the interest rates on those bonds, because remember it was taxable back in 2010, the interest rates is 4.75 to 5.5%. And once again, we just had a sale just a few weeks ago, and we saw how the tax exempt bonds sold, so we are looking to say well, the redemption provisions here allow you to call these at any day with 30 day notice, slip to the next page Diana, please. And if we did that, we could issue two, just like we have steer refunding bonds, the approximate amount 7,615,000 it sounds sort of actual, but that's the approximate amount, their tax exempt, they're non-bank qualified, 'cause of the amount of debt you issue in a calendar year. The maturities don't extend past the original issue. That with original issue at a final payment, twenties, thirties structure, the true interest costs we have on there. The true interest cost is coming in at, it looks a little bit badly to see, but it's like amount of a 1.37%. So, that's why. And so our about 80,000 plus a year.

- And we're not paying it any longer. 15 long years. Wow, this is a good one.

- Yeah it's because we hit a call date now. And because we're going from comfortable, to tax exempt, which are allowed to do. Just like we did last year in 2019, so the savings is pretty significant.

- John, just one, can you just explain what the call date means? And somebody would say, why didn't we do this earlier?

- Oh, sure, sure. The call date is that, as of a certain date established at the time of issuance, and in this case, you know, the call date was set up for April 1, 2020, we tell bond holders, you're protected. Any bonds you hold they stay intact until that date, and then they may be taken away from you. They may be released, you know, maybe paid off, they may be refunded, whatever. Or they may stay outstanding 'cause they probably. You don't have to do anything. You can keep paying if you want to. But the bond holders know that it's likely to be taken away from them. And frankly, if they go into the secondary market to sell their bonds, I don't care if they are on the 2030, 2049, whatever year they old, it's priced as if it's gonna be, taken away from them. The expectation is, yeah, you've got to call date buy, buy these bonds from me, I may get paid off next week. So, the call date is if your option that is factored into the pricing.

- Okay, next page.

- Now as far as where interest rates are and I apologize, I know this is a really busy chart as things have bounced around. This is the tax example shot, as opposed to the treasury, when we looked at. And once again, you look low to the right side and you'd see how interests rate have come down. Now I don't feel bad at all about when we did this in 2019,. 'cause there would be pretty down low there. I'm glad we didn't try to do this in March of 20. You could look at that spike in the year. But where we are now, it's in the track to take these out. And once again, this is a, that's a five and a 10 year chart. You see, as opposed to the State Trust Fund loan, these are finance to their original maturity of 2030. You can look on the left side, which also takes into account, remember I mentioned that the BABs get a subsidy. So every April and October, you actually receive a payment from the Feds. And that deed area where it says bad subsidy, now it's a changing amount, but you give subsidy. And so the math is, given your existing debt service, given the reimbursement you get from the stack, from the state, where are you? And are you better off giving up the subsidy and reducing your interest cost? Which is that you move to the right side and you say, no more subsidy, no more taxable debt, now we have a tax exempt debt and based on that, after cost of issuance, where do we end up on the right side? And that's where we get those savings of 80,000 plus a year.

- [Woman] Okay.

- [Woman] One thing I wanna add to this, I don't have the breakdown, but it is, this will affect a couple of different funding sources. It would be both general fund, I think it's sanitary and storm, and there might be a TIF in there. So, this 80,000 for like 2021 budget, would be allocated through to over several different funding sources. But again, it's gonna help anyone who has this outstanding debt. It's going to reduce the amount that they owe in 2021 and future years.

- Alders, any questions?

- Yes, for sure. So you said it's going to affect us or to affect those three organizations for how long?

- Really we'll see savings starting in 2021, of a total of 80,000. It'll be split, but based on saw on call, once they have left is outstanding balance, and it'll go through 2030. So, over the next nine years, we'll, in total have about $859,000 for the saving, over those funding sources.

- And how will they make up that difference then?

- There's no difference. What it means is that when we have to pay an interest, we just have to, we will send less money in to pay these bonds off.

- [woman] So, we will have more money.

- [Man] Works better, yes.

- We'll have more money?

- Yes.

- It's the same.

- Yes. Good question.

- The last item Alder Galvin, I felt like had a choice. Meaning, do you wanna spend, you know, the $87,000 to keep the payments off the levy? That one had a choice. This one's need is an authentic. We move to approve this.

- [Man] I'll second that.

- All right, moved by Alder Johnson's, second by the Alder Galvin. Any further discussion? Hearing none. All those in favor, say aye

- [Group] Aye.

- Opposed? Motion carries. Fabulous. That mean that motion one, carry two right? 'Cause we now just carried the last two? Yes. All right.

- [woman] We are already done.

- Can I ask one other thing I know you wouldn't mind, Diana, could you go back to the timeline there? Just for the benefit of the committee. Just to roll through on, I'll do this very quickly, talk about it. The official statement is in really good shape 'cause we just did a financing. So we're updating the official statement. It's what I assume, it goes to common council as part of initial resolution on the 21st. Let's say yes, go ahead and get this done. By the end of the month, the notice goes from the city to the state correspond that says, okay July 31st, we're paying you off at August 31st. We're in. And then we move through that on the August 18th council meeting. We actually sell the bonds, close it on August 31st, and pay off the State Trust Fund, and have the money to pay off the 2010 debts. So the calendar does work. It just, there's a couple of involved council action.

- Okay. Thank you.

- [Woman] Thank you.

- Any questions Alders? No, okay. All right, item number four. Thank you so much Mr. Mehan, that was very interesting.

- Thank you, have a good night.

- [Group] Thank you, you too.

- For consideration with possible action, the acceptance of the centric for tech and civic life range for $1,093,400. Staff.

- All right, I will turn it over to chief of staff, Jeffreys. Very excited that we had some internal staff. The clerk and our chief of staff spend some quality time trying to put a grant together to get additional money for our elections, for the August and November election, and they were successful. And so what you have in front of you is a copy of the grant tracking form. It has a copy of what was submitted, and what the city is, has been offered. And so really in front of you is to accept this grant of $1,093,400 from the Center for Tech and Civic Life. So Celestine Jeffreys, chief of staff Jeffreys, are you on the line? Is there anything you'd like to add on this? I shouldn't ask questions from the Alders.

- [Jeffreys] Yes. Well, I think, you know, let's just start off with some questions. You know, obviously we're very excited about this opportunity. And it's a great opportunity to not only meet some of our financial challenges with holding two elections in the middle of a pandemic, but also a great opportunity for the clerk's office to upgrade some of their equipment. And for us to really conduct some excellent voter outreach. So that's really the gist of it. But you may have some questions, I will say at the outset as well, that we will have our first internal staff kickoff meeting with our technical advisor, from the Center for Tech and Civic Life that will occur next week. Alder Weary at the ad hoc committee on elections had asked a question of, you know, in what way does the grant obligate us financially? It does not obligate us financially, obviously this is all about staff time. But you know, this is for staff that are already salaried. And many staff would be engaged in some of this work. Obviously clerk's office, and then myself in the mayor's office, and we'll probably tap some other people from other internal teams that we have, who can really lend a helping hand, as well as some excellent thoughts. But as I said, we do have a technical advisor from the Center for Tech and civic life and we will have our first meeting next week. So, that's where we are. Any questions?

- I dealt with this at the elections meeting last Thursday so I'm pretty familiar. So do you guys have any questions, Alders?

- Yes I have a few.

- Sure.

- Okay. First off Celestine, I mean, congratulations this is obviously a big win for the city of Green Bay. I do have a few questions that I'd like to maybe just maybe have some information clarified. And I wanna clear from the onset by no means questions just that I'm questioned on whether or not we should accept the grant, because everything that I write here, I wholeheartedly support. And I think you guys did a fantastic job with, securing this for our community. So you had kind of alluded to it with Alder Weary indicating, you know, financially, are there any obligations, what I'd be curious to know 'cause I didn't really see it in the information that was provided to us, are there any metrics or outcomes that we are expected to achieve? And if we don't achieve them, is there a penalty?

- [Jeffreys] Excellent question. As the grant was presented to us, that we were not presented with, you must expand and vote by X percent, you must have X absentee ballots back. We were not given any of those metrics. But what our technical advisor will do is to provide us with best practices. So that we are the, so that our plans that we have put forward yield the most success. I will have more of an understanding of what that really looks like after our kickoff meeting next week.

- Okay, so in the contract agreement that I presume we'll need to sign once this secures approval, is there any risk of us having to repay any of these funds if we don't meet goals?

- [Jeffreys] I do not believe so. But obviously, when we get that contract in, if that's any, if let's put it this way, if there's any kind of payback that we would have to give, if we don't meet our obligations, that would be something very serious that the council, and quite frankly, the staff would need to consider. I mean, as you know, there is no such thing as a free lunch, right?

- Well, that's why grants exists, right? I mean,

- [Jeffreys] Yes, that's right yes. 'Cause there are parameters. So, my, you know, all of all the information that I have right now, all they're Johnson is that, that that would not be a claw back provision. There would not be monies that we would need to pay in order to match a grant, there's no matching requirement, obviously staff time, but that, that goes with all grants pretty much. But certainly, if I had any indication after kickoff meeting next week, that there is some sort of claw back provision, that is something I will make aware to, our senior staff and then right away to council.

- Okay. And then,

- [Jeffreys] But I do not anticipate that.

- Okay and I appreciate, you know, the fact that obviously staff will look at that. Lemme see, there, sorry, there were just a couple of other questions I had written down that I had answered as I was going, reading through the application. But one thing I noticed is that proportionately speaking, we were investing quite a bit less on absentee voting, compared to the other communities. And quite a bit more on expanding outreach, with the exception of receiving perhaps. Could you maybe just elaborate on that? Because from the outside looking in, the suggestion might be, that we're putting more fuel on the fire, as opposed to kind of controlling the fire first. And so, I'm just looking for some perspective on that.

- [Jeffreys] So I think, you know, certainly when we submitted what we thought would be best, we submitted it not knowing what the other communities were going to do. And I also saw that the proportions were different. This is what I imagine we will tackle in our conversation with our technical advisor, as to where should we actually put our best efforts. As I said the, what was approved in the grant was what we asked for. We wanted to do that outreach. We wanted to make sure, 'cause like I said it, you see in the grant, there's a voter universe of a dozen, we have about 52,000 registered voters. And so, we felt that that was important additionally, you know, we have quite a bit in equipment. I know one community, there are definitely differences. And I'm actually looking forward to seeing, what our technical advisor advises us to do, you know, whether or not there'll be, okay, great city of Green Bay, you're gonna do, you know, five out of the seven things, but I think what you should do is maybe look at another community's plan and, and copy that. I really don't know. Like I said, we gave our, what we thought was best, especially for our community, and each community is different. And so, yeah, I look forward to what that conversation's gonna look like. I mean, we've already invested some money. We did $10,000 in terms of a planning grant from this whole endeavor, which was essentially to put everything together. And we've already, you know, from our finance committee meeting, maybe two meeting ago, the purchase of a ballot folder, and without folder and the, there was another piece of equipment,

- Good job,

- [Jeffreys] Thank you, thank you. And the drop boxes, thank you. So, you know, when, so we took some of that money and that initial $10,000 and immediately bought equipment. We've also taken some money. And we immediately sent out a, forgive me everyone, I'm a little tired from last night. Sorry. We immediately, you know, I've put out a piece of mail for everyone to get everyone, knowing hey, you're polling location may have changed. Encouraging absentee voting. Encouraging registration online. So, we also put quite a bit of money into, into advertising. So long story short Alder, is that I will see what happens with the technical advisor. Those updates will happen at the ad hoc committee 'cause that's the best place for them. And then the ad hoc committee report goes to the city council, as to what is actually happening and what the plans are. And what's the best practices are that are tech,

- Yeah and I fully expect obviously that every community has different challenges and needs. And so I think, you know, your initial comment about how you didn't necessarily do this benchmarking and comparing to every community, really kind of helps answer that question.

- [Jeffreys] Okay.

- You know, which kind of goes into, you had mentioned that we had a lot of equipment purchases. And originally one of my questions was looking how on election day I received very high, and then I looked into the detail and saw that a big part of that was because of the equipment purchases. So, it was actually really happy to see that. On page 11, this is really more of just a question. There was a, it's talking about the processing of ballots. And I noticed that Milwaukee and Green Bay are gonna spend about the same amount of money, $145,000. One thing though that I noticed was that we are spending 140 of that I believe, on labor for this year. Whereas Milwaukee is spending that money on equipment to fully automate their process, which I presume is equipment that you can use then, year over year, into the future. Is that something that we had considered? And if not, is that of viable adjustment that we could make? Does that make sense?

- [Jeffreys] So, I would say that, you know, without getting into the details of Milwaukee's plan, 'cause what we put is a little bit more in my head. We actually put in for electronic poll books, which are rather costly. That's not gonna be something that we can actually put in place for this election cycle. So I'm not sure if that's gonna go forward. We also put in for like, so we already bought the ballot folder. We will buy that very quickly. But then the D S 450 tabulator, which is a $60,000 piece of equipment, which helps it process very quickly. We do actually need labor in order to really make this election work both ahead of election day, on election day, and then after election day. I also noticed that one of the communities is going to pay their venues more money. That was not something that we put in. You know, every once again, every community is different, but we did put in more money to pay our poll work there's money. So, you know, hopefully I'm addressing some of your observations.

- Maybe more, it's, I guess I pose it as a question, but it could perhaps be issued really more as a statement, that if that is, you know, I don't know if that totally eliminates or, you know, virtually, I mean reduces Milwaukee's labor costs to the point where they're not existent, but I do think that that was an interesting comparison. And if that is something that we can achieve at the same price, I think it would certainly be something worthwhile to consider. And then the last question that I had was on the item related to poll workers, and they brought this up at a previous committee meeting. And it's recognizing the amount of time and effort that is, authentically necessary to recruit poll workers. You know, social media posts and appeals and requests, all you want. But at the end what gets you to a yes is when there's, a personal invitation. A personal ask, a personal request to serve as a poll worker. And so I don't know if we've considered trying to reduce some of that burden from our existing staff by hiring an essence of poll worker recruiter, but I still think that's a worthwhile item to consider. And so, when you're working with the staff from the grant, the granting organization, I would still urge us to, see if that is a viable solution. And it's not to try to override or overstep anything at the ad hoc committee’s very wonderful work. But it's just coming from my personal experience of recognizing that we still need a lot of poll workers and that is a ton of work to get. Having a dedicated person in charge of that would be very useful.

- I like to call out, I need to call on Kris Teske because she was raising her hand in at the last content, and I just couldn't break in fast enough. So Kris, I don't wanna get too far away from the last comment. And then we'll go back to Celestine, okay?

- [Kris] Thank you, thank you. First of all, thank you for again, for recognizing the amount of time it takes and the paperwork for poll workers. But my comment was, I ran where Milwaukee is, was going to assist them where the labels would be slapped on the envelopes and things like that, it would be automated which wow, I'm sure that's gonna cost a pretty penny. But I wish I could call Neil. Neil Albrecht was the head of the commission and he just retired, I think last week. And I've been following, they were having a hard time appointing someone. It was very controversial, and I guess they just did that. So I didn't want to interrupt just getting into things. But I thought that was really interesting, what Milwaukee was, you know, looking into.

- Well, they're pretty penny, Kris, it's $145,000. The same amount that we've outlined for labor. So that's why that contrast really kind of just drew a flag for me, to see if that was something that was worthwhile to pursue. But I'll leave that to you guys to figure out.

- And now back to Celestine to answer the question she was about to answer and sorry, I interrupted, chief of staff, Celestine Jeffreys.

- [Jeffreys] So now you have to tell me the question again.

- Exactly hiring a poll workers recruiter.

- [Jeffreys] Oh, poll workers recruiter, right? So we did actually, you know, I recognize that that sometimes it does take people, so we do have some voter navigators in there, as positions. And so, you know, I, that's a question about the poll worker recruiter. It's very hard, it's hard to keep them as well. And part of keeping people is making the work situation palatable to them. It's a long day, it's not a lot of amount of money, which is why we increased the salary. So I think all that goes into keeping, getting and keeping co-workers, and I agree with you Alder, that that's something we are gonna need to chat with our grant agency about looking at some best practices from other parts of the state of Wisconsin, as well as our round the con, so I agree.

- Okay, that's all I have, thank you.

- Sure.

- Yeah and Alder Galvin.

- [Galvin] Thank you. And Brian you brought up some very good points. My concern going forward is, is we've got this grant that's gonna cover a lot of things that fire the X grant being given to us, we weren't going to be able to do. But, two years from now, four years from now, if we're spending $145,000 on additional staff and that 'cause who knows what the future holds. Is this gonna be causing, I mean, a lot of budget issues I would think down the road? Where, you know, we're spending this kind of money later on, you know, for staffing and salaries and everything else like that. I mean, these kind of things add up. And I'm just, I'm wondering are we kinda getting ourselves into a situation where in the future it's gonna cost us a lot more to run a re-election? What Brian talks about, some of this equipment, could actually probably save us on staffing in the future if we're able to purchase it. Obviously I think it's too late for us to be purchasing some of it. Those are just comments, questions I have.

- So, let's talk about, let's pick these, you know, just toxic, 'cause there's gonna be too many of them. But, you know, and I know that, let's hit, let's address your question on paying the poll worker. This is an emergency hazard pay. We're not gonna be doing this. Is that correct Diana or Kris?

- All I can tell you, for this time, at this point, it is suggested that we were gonna give it an increase to the poll workers for these next two elections. We're not calling it hazard pay, it's just an increase in the wage.

- Well funded, yeah.

- Yes. But if I'm corrected it, it really is for this, just this year, because we would not expect to be able to put that amount in our problem future budgets.

- Okay.

- And then, I think back to clerk Teske, she has pulled together a list of equipment that you think would help make this, these two elections and future elections more efficient. And that goes back to as chief Jeffreys says, you know, a high-speed tabulator. We talked about some additional Dropbox's, these electronic poll books, if possible, if we could get them this year, we don't believe they'll be able to be installed and implemented for this election. But if those could be purchased with this money, that will help us in future elections. There was other suggestions of more expressible equipment, which we just purchased last year. Get enough for if we have more locations, some additional storage carriage cages for equipment. So, there has certainly been some discussion on the equipment that we potentially could buy with this grant that will help us in the long-term to, you know, to really to make hopefully make it more efficient going forward.

- Okay. And then I guess also we had already allocated money by the Dropbox and some other equipment, so that obviously this will be a savings center contingency fund.

- It was, it wasn't from contingency, it was from a grant, right? The $10,000 grant, right we didn't take anything from contingency?

- Okay then I guess I misremembered it. I thought we were taking some money from contingency for some of this equipment that we were purchasing. Now, I may have misheard it or misremember it wrong.

- Diana?

- Correct. The way the motion was approved is that we were going to pay for the ballot folder, I don't know, somewhere around 4,500, $5,000, And these two drop boxes out of the $10,000 grant, which was really, as they developed this grant, and we got $10,000 to participate in this. And I, there was a better term for that. But that is the money we're gonna use. If for some reason that grant didn't come through, we were gonna fall back and use contingency. However, we have received a tech, we have received a $10,000 check. It's in house, it's in the bank. And we received this additional money.

- Okay.

- So,

- But you were right Alder Galvin, you were right. You don't hear that at your house very much. But you right, so very well.

- [Jeffreys] Well, I also just wanna say Alders, and clerk Teske can, also jump in and, you know, correct if hedges, I want you to understand exactly how labor intensive of an election is. And some of the things that clerk Teske has asked for will make that faster, right? But there's a lot of checks and balances that require a human eye, brain, and hand, in order to do. And so, we are up to, clerk Teske can absolutely correct me, I'm not sure we can fully automate ourselves out of this, unless some, there are some other changes in state law. People is what I'm saying.

- True, true.

- All right. Any other questions on this, the grant? I move forward. Do I have a motion to accept the grant?

- If I can just make one final comment. And I appreciate chief of staff Jeffreys come in about how we can't fully automate ourselves out of this, and I understand that fully. But grants like this don't come around very often, so as much as we can automate ourselves out of it, I think would be great looking long term because I think, you know, I'm highly suspecting another opportunity like this would come around the next election cycle. So with that I would move that we accept the grant, however I'd like to add a contingency, that if there is a claw back provision within the contract that, that be brought. I'd like to see that maybe brought back to council just for a full in being a part of it.

- Yes. Because if there's a call back, we have to, we have to be aware of that, if we have to pay something back, right?

- Right.

- Okay. That makes sense, I'll second that.

- Okay. Motion made by Alder Johnson, seconded by Alder Galvin. Any further discussion? Hearing none, all those in favor, say aye.

- Aye.

- Aye.

- Motion carries, great. Number five, report out the acceptance of the, WEC CARES Subgrant for 57,535,000, no wait, no no. Okay, $57,535 and 30 cents. The 30 cents threw me. With allowable uses to prevent, prepare for, respond to Coronavirus domestically or internationally for the 2020 federal election cycle. More money for elections

- Correct I will just start on this one. This is a WEC CARES Grant Subgrant that the check is in the mail. I mean, it's in our bank. We have already received the 57,000. So at this point, it's really, we want to report all of the acceptance of the grant through our grant policy, we would say any grant before you accept it, should have gone through committee. However, this was one that really just came to us. And I mean, it came through, it was offered to us. It was signed. And we have now accepted the grant, so we wanted to report it back out to you. Again, this money is meant to be used for elections.

- We need to take action on it then.

- This is probably receiving place and file.

- Okay, so move and second. Okay oh Kris, I mean clerk Teske.

- [Kris] It's okay, it's okay. I'm sorry, I just have a question because the deals is 450 is what we really, really, really want. And we'd like it for November, if we could get it. But I don't know when am I gonna have the okay to see if there's any left? I don't think, I don't know if there is or not. They were holding one for us and then I was told we couldn't. So,

- No, I don't want you to miss out either. Why would we wait? Diana or Celestine, why would we wait?

- If there's no money.

- Yeah, but now there is money.

- There is money yes, there is no reason to wait. And as soon as this has been accepted, as of tonight, that money isn't in hold as soon as long as internally between chief Jeffreys and where we're helping, and you help put the grant together, as long as it's included in there, you have the permission to move forward with it.

- Right, okay. So we're gonna to vote,

- Can I clarify? I mean, can I ask? So that cost around $61,000?

- Correct.

- There are going to be maintenance fees yearly in the future.

- Okay.

- So for my calculation right now, we only have about $67,000.

- We have $1.1 million

- That came in already.

- Well, it's coming.

- Well, I was told I couldn't spend anything until,

- Okay, let’s start with a new thing. Let's say we have $67,000 for sure, which we do, which we do. And I think that we would be very justified in not losing that essential piece of equipment. And so, I don't know if we need a motion on that, or if we're allowed to have a motion on that. But please help me staff, because I think it gets chief of staff Jeffreys, or finance director Alder Ellenbecker.

- From what I understand from listening to the ad hoc committee the other night, and what's included in the packet, I would say that the DS 450 the tabulator had estimated costs around 62,000, would be included in this grant, and that we should move forward with at least putting the requisition in, working with our purchasing department, verifying, working with the vendor, seeing if one's available. And to moving down that line to get that a piece of equipment as soon as possible.

- Great. For public record no, right? So go forth and do that.

- [Woman] Okay, then, than you.

- [Jeffreys] And I would agree that I think it's really important for us to get this piece of equipment. I just wanna make sure that everybody understands so it seems like we spent money, double money twice, 'cause the $10,000 grant was supposed to be spent for, part of that was supposed to be spent for the ballot folder. And the, so I just wanna be sure.

- Yeah part of it was. But we have enough left.

- I just, so like, I just purchased the ballot folder and the envelope opener today.

- [Jeffreys] Okay, okay.

- I didn't do drop boxes yet because Celestine, you made the comment that you wanted to do more than two. So I thought maybe if we ordered more, we'd get a better deal, maybe.

- Sure, yeah.

- So I held off on that. But I got the go ahead with the folder and the opener, so, you know, and that's $4,300. And then with the 61 or 62,

- It's perfect. Right 'cause we have 57 plus the leftover of the 10,000.

- Okay. But then we don't have any for drop boxes until we get more money.

- Yeah, you'll get some. We'll just take one thing at a time. All right let's have a vote on this motion. All those in favor?

- [Group] Aye.

- Opposed? Motion carries. Great. Kris, go forth in order. I wanted you to order that for months.

Okay. I knew you couldn't. All right. Next, number, what am I on? No. Number six, consideration with possible action on the results of a request for information for the reevaluation assessment service.

- Okay, this is to start the conversation of a reevaluation for the city of Green Bay. On the line we have our assessor Russ Schwandt, and we also have our procurement manager, Calvin Winters. And they help work on this reevaluation RFI, which means a request for information. So it was put out to the community, trying to get vendors, to see if they were interested in working on, in assisting the city with this reevaluation assessment. At high level we, it was put out new vendors that two vendors submitted responses and one vendor was recommended. So again, this is just a start the conversation, looking for feedback, direction from the committee. I don't need to go through the memo exactly, but I want to let you know, I'm gonna just kind of dig these are some bullet points that came out of the request for information that was submitted. It was sent out on June 10th, it is for commercial and residential properties within the city of Green Bay. Their RFI, request for information was it was to assist the city in its financial and time planning for this project. The result of the request of the information could result in a contract award in the future, because this is a service that this is going to be acceptable. We would not have to go out for a full RFQ or RFP on this request. And then the vendors were just submit their most accurate information again a real quick recap the city of Green Bay last conducted it, reassessment on properties, of properties in 2004. And then also due to the recent market change, changes in the city we are out of compliance and now the state is going to require a state statute. Says we are required to form re perform a reassessment. So it's something we need to move forward with at this point. It's been on the, something we've been wanting to do for a very long time, but now we are required to do. We have a few years to make this happen. And so of course the city of Green Bay assessor staff would currently would they continue to do the perform, the maintenance and the annual updates that they're currently doing. But we would need additional staff to either internal staff hired, or we would go out for this assess for an outside service to complete this assessment. In total we have about 33, 397 parcels. I'm gonna stop there for a moment. We have below on the memo, we talked about an estimated timeline. We talked about what the cost was from this vendor who submitted. But I'm gonna actually stop and see if Galvin Winters, our procurement manager or our assessor Russ Schwandt, wants to add anything, or if there's questions right now from the Alders to just again, this is a discussion to move this forward.

- Right, Alders, do you have questions or should we Schwandt speak first?

- [Man] I have no questions right now.

- Alder Johnson?

- I guess I can make one comment. As far as the deadline goes, we have to have 23 to complete the reassessment. That's our drop dead date. And after that point, the department of revenue will actually hire an outside firm and build the city to have it done. This is not for a door to door reassessment, this is actually for us statistical reassessments. So that means that we'll be taking the sales and reviewing members our assessments, and doing a drive by basically reassessment. We'll still be maintaining our current values up until that point. And then switching over to the new numbers all at one time. And while we're doing our current maintenance, we are still going into properties, when that's allowed. And redoing knowledge as possible. So when we do our permit work, we're still looking at the entire property, not just that particular piece. So we have been over the past number of years, been able to look at the properties and see them from a maintenance standpoint. So that's one of the reasons why we haven't had to do a reevaluation in such a long time. Our staff has been able to keep up and keep on top of things. And the market has been helpful to us in that regard too. But at this point now with the low rates and the way things are getting out of hand, I don't know if anybody's even looked, but anytime there's a house on the market, it sells within a week or two. So it's just amazing with what's going on.

- So really no one is gonna go into every single home and look inside every single home in Green Bay for the assessment, is that what you're saying?

- No, we're not, we're not doing it, nowhere to turn off.

- You want to just, okay. I mean, we have to do it. We have to get this done. So Galvin, do you have something?

- No, not unless anybody has any questions about the process that we use for this, or wording without going out for a subsequent RFP.

- Okay. Alder Galvin, do you have any questions?

- I remember the last assessment that occurred and I had a situation where they came through the subdivision I was in, reassessed all the houses doing, I believe, the same system you're talking about merely go drive by. The valuations went up through the roof, at least in my subdivision. And when I compared it to homes that were built, same square footage, same timeframe but on the East side, in a similar subdivision, the evaluations were a lot different. And when I called the city, I didn't get much of an explanation. When I asked if I could have my house reevaluated, two people from the city showed up. They walked in my garage, through my kitchen, living room and out the front door and dropped the value of $40,000. So, just these drive by evaluations, I understand we have to do it. It just seems kind of, do we base it on looking at the house? Do we base it on the sale values, or what we see as we drive by?

- [Russ] Well we're what we're basing it on is the information we have in our files currently as being accurate. And that's why when we do go out in the field, we're looking at constantly at what we have in our files versus what's in the field. So, and that's what those people that went through y your property should have done when they went through it. Make sure that what we had in our files is accurate versus what you have there. If they didn't do it, I apologize. They should have done it at that point, 'cause that's their job. What we're doing, and this is where every community is going, just because of the timeframe, and because of the cost involved, is reviewing sales versus what is out in the actual field. And because of the fact that we don't have the money to do the door to door and go through each individual house. When you do have a sale property, you make an attempt to go through the individual sale properties and review that versus what you have in your files to make sure that you have a good base to compare other properties to. And you have to make certain assumptions that people do take out building permits for the work that's done on properties. And then if they don't, that sometimes gets caught up in, when people get their notices and they say, well, my neighbors got this, this and that in their basement, and you look at it and then there's no permits for that work. So, some people will get away with certain amount of work that hasn't been permitted, but generally we will find out about it in the process. We do review the sales like I said, and we do have access to MLS records. And pictures do tell us an awful lot, because they post a lot of pictures, whether it's for sale by owner or by the MLS. And we keep copies of those pictures. And when we review, you can tell when somebody has gone from the laminate flooring to, you know, tile floors are hardwood, and replace their regular countertops with a branded or siltstone, or something like that, , excuse me. And it's those type of things that we've done over the past number of years that has helped us to keep our values kind of in line. So when you get the market going the way it's gone, it's just hard to keep up.

- Okay, so when you say files, you're talking about you look to see a building permits were pulled and things like that, or the house was sold and there's you know some data that you collected from that.

- [Russ] Correct.

- Okay, all right, thank you very much. And you don't need to apologize I mean, it all worked out in the end. It's just my personal experience here at the time

- [Russ] You know there's a certain way of procedure they're supposed to file and if they don't, I need to hear about it. And then that's something we learned from, and I hopefully this next time around with this outside help, those things are very helpful in instructing outside staff to do. I mean, if I hear they're things, that's something that I will pass on anybody that's working for us.

- Alright, thank you so much.

- [Russ] You're welcome.

- So in the packet, I did that include the whole RFI that was submitted, you know, there was a lot of detail on how this vendor felt they were going to be able to accomplish one of two things. They gave us two estimated timelines with one with a goal of having assessments done one, one of 22 which would mean it would affect be in effect for 23 budget or a year later. One, one of 23 and effective for our 24 budget. And in both cases that would meet our state timeline. So what I put in front of you was the more aggressive timeline. The funding options, lemme, I'm just looking through the estimated, the funding options I actually, I'm going to jump down below that the estimated pricing for option one was $388,900. And that did matter if we ended up having a one, one 22 or one, one 23 assessment. It's still all the same work, it's just how fast we want to get it done, or if we stretch it out a year, as COVID year. If that's going to, if the assessors may be concerned that maybe this is gonna affect some of the pricing. But, so either way, the pricing for option number one is 388,900. Option two is included more services. However, I believe the assessor believes that their team can pick up the additional work that there are some sketches and some other work. So, I guess I would be looking for the assessor to admit to comment on that item. They had an option one and an option two.

- [Russ] Yeah.

- Okay.

- [Russ] Option one, option two, basically we have a digital sketching that stamps has been working on mainly during our, home work from home stuff. And as we've been doing new homes, so on sketching, and you may have noticed some of those online as you look at our website, those have been coming on more readily. So that additional monies between apps and one and two is for the outside vendor to take over that work and actually put all the patches in themselves without our staff doing it. I don't think that's necessary. I think we could save them money internally and do that continuing to that ourselves. Even if that work isn't completed, we still have the statistics, as far as the square footage of the buildings and the outbuildings and the attachments that will allow us to price of the properties without even having the sketches there. So I guess it's not a necessary thing that we have to have. It's something that would be nice to have, but it's not something that I think that's required at this point. As far as the timing of it, like Dan has said, they do offer a three year outside option, and I think the one thing that I see with that as being an advantage to the city is the fact that with, through your option they bill it monthly. So they'll be billing instead of 24 months, they'd be billing at 36 months, or it'd be saving the city, the payments are over that period of time, that wouldn't cost any more there's no interest on it obviously, so. And then in the interest of the market itself, the longer you go as far as pushing it out, the more you have as far as the sales that are facing your values are. So, what I'm looking at is setting it up for an early 2023 valuation timeline. And then giving us enough time so that if we are completed in 2022, that we can pull the trigger and send values out in the fall of 2022. But if something happens where we get, there's a cure for COVID or something like that happens and the market kind of settles out, or the interest rates go up or something, you know, and this falls down a little bit, I would hate to have to do a revaluation and then see the market take off or flatten out, where all of a sudden we're going from a hundred percent of market value, and then we're going to 110%, because everything dies off. I want to give us the option of that extra year so that we can see where we're falling off in the market. And we don't have to use the extra year, it doesn't cost us anything. The deadline is still at that end, but it's there in case it's necessary just to see where we're at. I guess that's my thoughts on it.

- So you're in favor of doing it over three years then? Is that what you're saying here, three,

- [Russ] Three years would be my, yeah, it would be a cost savings to the city as far as not spending the money all in two years. And then also give us time to look at where the market's gonna be after this whole crisis is over with.

- Alders, any other questions?

- I Just have one, Alder Dorff.

- Yes, Alder Johnson.

- I'm just, I'm looking at the $22 would be the installment for this year, was that budgeted?

- No, at this point there's no money set aside in 2020 for this project. So, at this point there is again, there is no money set aside. It certainly could be set aside in 2021 into the budgets or in 22 and future budgets, future borrowing. But at this point there was no money set aside in the 2020 budget. The only reason why I put it out there, the way it is if we want to try to meet the goal of the deadline of one, one of 22, which means would be effective in our 2023 budget, the vendor had asked that we really get started this fall, and be able to sign a contract and get started by August, or you know by this fall. That would say that they were gonna bill us on an equal, equally split it into monthly payments. That would be four to five months of monthly payments, and that would be about 81,000/. That's when I, that's where I, why earlier in the memo, I have funding options right now. Money is snap and set aside. We would have to either do contingency, decide if we wanted to move it back just a little bit back, which means it would go into the following year, the 2024 budget. And then we that would allow us to put it either in the 21, 22 and 23 budgets or bar.

- It's better to get this done so we get the taxes in 23, rather than waiting until 24, right? Isn't that what we're thinking that valuation would be?

- Correct. Overall an assessment shouldn't, wouldn't, isn't necessarily going to bring in more tax dollars. It should just read even out the assessment. So, if you're anybody who gets their tax bill and their tax bill, their assessment goes up, that doesn't mean again more dollars. It just means that their mill rate is going to be lower and at some point it, if their hoses hasn't changed much, they may actually have the same tax bill. It could go up a little, it could go down a little, but it's really not meant to generate more taxes. But you're right it's been 2004, since we have done a reassessment and,

- So why are we in a hurry? I mean, why then would we not wait till we have the money to do this? If it's not gonna, what difference does it make then? Other than,

- Other than, I just know that it's been there for many, many years. We've outlined it all there's asking about reassessments.

- Yes we have, absolutely.

- So when it came to the 2020 budget I promise you, and we went through the capital improvement plan that I would, we would bring something back to you this summer, this fall, to have set up have ready one, just to find out we, you know, we did not know what the cost would be if we went for an outside service to, last two years, we tried to put additional staff into the assessor's budget that was pulled back out. They, if they had two additional people for the last two years, this could have been, probably could have happened around the same timeline and they could have done it internally. We couldn't have, we didn't have to put the employees in, so at this point we would said we would come back and see what would be the cost, if we were to get an outside service, to help us do this assessment. And so, the vendor has given us the option of either having it done for the 2023 budget or 2024. We wanna do it for the 23 budget. That's when there's a little bit more of a rush. They really wanna get started this fall. And then they think in that year and a half, they can complete this project. If we want to go to at least the processes in place, the cost is not there. The vendor did not increase the cost. If they went over another year, same work is gonna be done. And, but the payments split out over probably would be split out, probably potentially it can, I mean, we wouldn't have any expense and tweak. We could get that contract signed as a one to one 2021 and get started, and then we would be able to put some in our budgets or viral for it in the future.

- Alders it's up to you.

- I feel comfortable with that, which is why he asked the question. Because I think this is a really difficult year for us, to try to find the $81,000. I mean with you know some of the other assessments, that we've been making on, potential shortfalls or increased expenses. The other piece of this that I do have a question on, and we're talking about roughly a $400,000 expense here, do we have a policy that dictates when an item must go out to bid?

- So the general policy with the procurement manual that was passed last common council, anything over $25,000 typically would have to go out for some sort of competitive pro whether that be a bid or an RFP. Except in the case of professional services, which this would be deemed professional service. So, medical, consulting, financial, those types of services are exempt from the process. It doesn't mean we shouldn't go out and do that, but it does also doesn't, there's not a requirement for it. That's why we did a request for information. Not knowing what was out there, we wanted to get a feel for what the market looked like. We got back two responses, which is, you know, not as many as we would like to see, but in talking with the assessor, we agreed that these may be the only two that would respond anyways, given the scope of the project. So, I feel comfortable that we have a good feel for what the market is. We got, you know, more than one response, and so I would feel comfortable suggesting that we can move forward based on the results of the RFI.

- And this RFI with these numbers stand if we chose not to execute the contract until 2021?

- Yeah, that's what you said Diana, right?

- So that would be, that would be on the vendor. So there is no, unlike a bid or an RFP where vendors are bound by submitting a proposal or submitting a bid they're bound for, whether it's 60 or 90 days, how would we have it written they're bound to hold their pricing for that long. The RFI does not have that stipulation in it at all, so the vendor could change their pricing. I'm not saying they will, but they are not bound or held to the pricing that they presented in the RFI.

- So if we did, I mean if we said, hey we're not gonna, we're not gonna execute a contract at 2021 that gives you a little bit of time to do an RFP hypothetically. But my fear at this point and in your experience as a purchasing manager, I want you to maybe walk me through this, my fear at this point is we've now publicly published the prices from the RFI, how does that potentially affect a fair bidding process?

- That could have some effect. You know, I don't know, you know, in talking with the assessor and Diana, we agreed that these may be the only companies that we're gonna submit proposals in the first place. I think Russ, if you can talk a little bit to kind of the scope here of how big this is and the companies around our area that are able to do it, so yeah there is a little bit of a, I don't wanna say conflict of interest, but there is a little bit of an issue with having the pricing out there. But at the same time, if this is something that we're gonna move forward with just awarding on a professional services contract, there's really not a problem there.

- [Russ] Yes, okay Calvin. And I appreciate the work that Calvin and Diane have done to move this forward. It's been a lot of work just trying to get this going where it is because it's been so long since we've done this. But, I know all the firms that are in the state that do this type of work. And the ones that I've talked to, and I've talked to quite a few of them just to gauge their level of interest, generally what they have is their contracts go out several years now. The state does change it so that they're able to have contracts that run for five years for their maintenance. And generally a lot of those are inclusive of a reevaluation of whether it be for townships, smaller cities, villages, or whatever. So a city the size of Green Bay is kind of a one shot deal for a lot of these companies. And they are the lead time in order for them to adjust their other schedules, to meet this type of a deadline. And a three year deadline in 99% of the cases for these other vendors was just too short of a timeline for them to be available, to work with us. And that's why we got such a small response for this type of work. I've talked to a lot of them, I begged them to jolt them to try to at least give us, a few more bids, just to see what's out there, and there was no way that they were able to give us, anything, just the mere fact that they wouldn't be able to do the work even if they were awarded the bid, because it just wasn't enough time for them to do the work and readjust their schedules for the other communities, that they serve currently. So what we have now honestly, it'd be the people that we're talking with already worked with the city of Green Bay, they are in house with staff, and they do some other communities also. So we're comfortable with the ones that we have and they're familiar with the community and that's why they're, they felt comfortable with making the answering the question. So I don't feel that there'd be the ones that would be changing their numbers if we were to push this off until next year. I don't think if we were to put out a RFP, would it bring out any additional thoughts from interested parties, other than those that are unqualified, or just gonna take a flyer at something and throw something really cheap out there and waste a lot of time. And that's the one thing that we don't have a lot of, is the time to get this going. Starting at such a late date is one of the reasons, like I said, that a lot of these people aren't bidding. So if we're pushing this back three months now just by going into the first week of next year, we're gonna be cutting off a lot of other, well, we're cutting off maybe the option of having anybody do the work. But I think since this company that we're currently working with has expressed an interest in doing this, that they would be more than willing to do that, , excuse me, work with us to start after the first year. And I'm sure Galvin could talk to them and make sure that's an option. That they're not having a problem. If that answers your question.

- It does, thank you. I think with that I mean I would offer up a motion that, we engage in the contracts with option one, starting one, one 21. And I would just reiterate that the reason I'm making my motion that way is because I don't know where we're gonna find $81,000 in this year's budget without taking it from contingency funds. But I would also offer up to our assessor that, or to a purchasing manager that is you work with this vendor if for any reason the pricing changes on that, I want you to feel comfortable bringing this back to finance committee so that we can potentially engage in a conversation about utilizing the contingency fund this year, if it does save us money long-term.

- Absolutely. And the advantage we have with, you know, doing a direct professional services contract here is, we have the ability to negotiate, where if we did a bid, we have no, we have to take the lowest bidder. We have the ability to do some negotiating here. So, and if we can get a signed contract in place with that pricing, that would hold them to that at that point, even if it isn't starting until one, one of 21.

- Okay. Diana Ellenbecker?

- The only thing, a couple of things I just wanted to add, and I know you're, I just wanna just add a few more things I wanted to comment on, yes of course if we just wait another year or two, 1/1/2022, 1/1/2023, which is the 2024 budget, it's just one more year later where you, your mill rate is just going to be much higher than comparable surrounding municipalities. That's just something to keep in mind. Remember right now we're at $9.45, over the next couple of years, I'm sure it'll go to $9.60, $9.80. Attention Alders, this would be just one year. If we were to complete it one year earlier, we would have that on or overall mill rate would drop. So you would see that drop, and of course, that has been what many older persons have been asking, for a long period of time when we were comparing to our surrounding municipalities. You know the other way,

- Can I just stop you there? But Diana, where can we get this $80,000 then?

- Because that would certainly make me walk back my emotion.

- Yeah. I think it's really, you know, 'cause things don't seem quite as desperate with all these grants that we've gotten. And we can cover elections now. You know, we just, things seem a little better for us right now. Alders I don't know if you agree, but they're not quite as, we're not quite as desperate straits. So maybe we need to stretch and try to start this.

- Thing kind of like gunning for that contingency fund yet for the balance of the year, anything that you can predict that might come before us that would require the use of that fund?

- We're currently sitting at $143,000. We so far agreed to pay for those sandbags, which was a couple hundred dollars. And the other item is any items that were for litigation for GP and maybe Green Bay packaging. At this point we've been taking the legal fees out of that contingency. I do not have an estimate on that, estimate. But, you know, if that is, I'm not, I don't have an estimate. I think last year we ended up taking somewhere under $10,000 of legal fees. So the contingency is certainly an option, whether or not there's an option to go out for bond or another borrowing this year, bonding is allowable source for something, even though it says this a really tangible, it's a long year impact on this, that would be allowable. And again, there was other options we were hoping that we had some unbudgeted revenue maybe coming in from a service agreement that has gotten been assigned. That was something that we were hoping that would have been signed, and that we could have tried to use that money toward this expenditure. So again, 2020, right now the money is not set aside, but again, contingency, bonding are probably your two sources at this point, if you want to get this started and try to move it along in the shorter time period.

- I think I'm comfortable with contingency. Does anyone feel the same? That would wanna make that motion we started?

- Maybe if I would, so one thing I would just clarify that I'm not comfortable with bonding. I personally think bonding should be an option that's off the table. But if we were to use the contingency fund, maybe I would rather than trying to use up more than half of it to allow us to do this, I would ask a purchasing manager, do you think that we could negotiate with the vendor here to reduce the $81,000 that's required in 2020? If he could bring that down to say maybe $50K and then allocate that other $30K over the next two years, so that way we don't have to use too much of our contingency fund.

- Sure, that's absolutely something we can bring to the table to them. I think given what we've had and just based on their response, I think they would like to get going sooner than later so I have a feeling they probably would work with us, to do that.

- That's a great idea.

- So, we could go back to them and negotiate.

- All right, so make that motion Brian Johnson.

- In an agreement with option one authorizing up to $50,000 from our 2020 contingency fund in spreading the balance of the contract over 2021 and 2022, under the direction of the purchasing manager to negotiate that agreement.

- And he's writing and she's continues to write.

- I like the motion it's fantastic. I do, there's one more item I want to discuss, and it doesn't have anything to do with the pricing or timeline, it is the very last item discussion of a communication strategy. And I think that is very, very important. I think that's a critical step in this process. It doesn't cost us anything. We just, I want to understand and we have to discuss internally through Alders, through Chief Jeffreys, how do we get the communication out to our constituents that a reassessment doesn't necessarily mean their bill is going up. So, unfortunately we opened up the can of worms by putting this on our agenda. So don't be surprised. There's a chance an Alder is gonna get a phone call in the next couple of days, in the next week that they're talking reassessment and they might be concerned they're built and their assessment is going to go up. And again, we have to start talking a strategy. I know a chief of staff Jeffreys had put it on her list of things to do, is talk about a communication strategy. But if you have suggestions, recommendations, we certainly want to put it in a simple form so people can understand that. But that is just something that as Alders, you're the ones potentially getting, going to be getting phone calls, including from city staff. And we certainly need to start thinking about how we would move forward and try to make this clear. And that it's really meant to equalize everyone out, everyone. And it doesn't necessarily mean their text will go up.

- Can we put this on our agenda next time to think about strategies? I think that might be a good idea. And I think about this, Alders?

- I don't know if that's necessarily a finance committee role. I think that's probably a staff responsibility.

- Okay.

- There's media releases and other things that can be done. Things that could be posted to the, in fact, they'd probably be better if they posted gave us something that we could just post on our social media platforms.

- Yeah, that's true.

- So it's the same message in the same way from up down.

- Okay, so again really what, why I wanted to mention that it's just truly to know that we know what's important. And the more, hopefully the more information we can give and communication we can give out there ahead of time, hopefully will stop some of those phone calls and people that I'm the hopefully we can give them more information so be aren't so panicked by it that it.

- Right.

- And again, some people were still gonna be worried about it, but maybe we can try to relieve some of that panic. So, I'm going to put Russ the assessor on the spot. I know he had some point, he has some concerns about this timeline, he thinks it's pretty tight if we were to try to move forward with this. I guess I would like to Russ any other county at this point on timeline.

- No, I guess if the concern is to get the mill rate lower for 2023, I understand that. I just, I want the best product for the city as possible, and giving us an extra year, depending upon what happens in the market. And that's, that's my main concern. I mean, if we were to all of a sudden you to take, the rates were to go up and everything wants to stop, that would change the market dramatically, and I don't see that happening. But I don't profess to have a magic wand or a crystal ball to see what's going to happen. So, I'll do whatever the council wants me to do. And I think just the possibility of doing this has got me excited. But what I can do for you as on the communication side, I will have a staff and myself we'll put together kind of a type of a press release that we will give to all the Alderman, so that you will be speaking with a unified tongue as far as what we will be talking about when we get calls. And then when you get a call, if you're not comfortable with answering questions they have, we can always direct them back to my office. But some of the general questions they will have will be in that type of press release, and then you'll be able to refer to it and answer whatever questions. Then if it gets too difficult for what they have, just send them back to us, and we'll be happy to answer those questions. But as far as the timeline goes that's definitely up to you. My preference would be longer because of the way the market is kind of fluctuating. But if that's not something that is in the cards, that's something that the firm is willing to do on a shorter period of time, that's fine with me.

- Okay. So with a motion on the floor is there still more you must tell us Diana?

- Nope. I was gonna thank Russ, and I was just gonna say, thanks Russ, but I would think, and we get it, even if we got it started and in a year and a half from now let's say our appraiser, our assessor, and our evaluation team says, you know what, we would have better results if we waited another year, it's not gonna cost us more. And we could actually potentially delay, the delay which assessment role we go on. But if we don't start now, there's no way we'll be able to do the one, one of 22. So I think you still have the option of, if Russ at some point, or the assessor is concerned about how the numbers are shaking out or the market or the, how things are the number again, what the market is showing, we could still bring it back and discuss, you know, maybe delaying it a year. But we can't do that if we don't start.

- Okay.

- Yeah, and I think in my motion, I would want it. I would want it to state that it's expected that the work be completed 2022, anticipating at 2023, is when this goes online. And understanding again that staff, if they hit a roadblock that they can come back to us. But I think I want my motion to state, that sort of the, the expectation of the contract.

- Are we ready to vote?

- All right, all those in favor of, oh, is there a second, did you second it all together?

- [Russ] Yes.

- You did? Okay all those in favor, say aye.

- Aye.

- Aye.

- Opposed? Motion carries.

- I would like to come up with dirty dishes, Alder Galvin had on his kitchen sink to get us assessment reduced by 40,000.

- It was the four girls running around.

- All Right. Review the, number seven item seven, review the city of green bay, 1033 Program from inventory. This looks like an exciting agenda item.

- Yes. I actually don't know a lot about this one, but I believe Commander Warych hopefully is on the line. And this is something that the mayor has asked that an inventory was brought to the Finance Committee, and that if any new items were ever purchased for the 1033 Program that it would be brought to the attention of the Finance, which would also be to the Council. So Commander Warych are you on the phone, on the line? I don't think he is, but I'm here.

- Oh, Smith is here, yeah.

- Tell us all about the 1033 Program.

- Okay so in a nutshell, the 1033 Program is where we get evidence. Our items from the department of defense that they no longer need. And these items can be things like scopes, or they can be weapons, or they can be vehicles. In the past, we've got a forklift, got a pickup trucks, we've got an ice maker, we've got an elliptical machine. We've got camelback hydration systems for officers of long underwear to wear underneath their dive suits. All kinds of things that they'd get.

- That's pretty exciting. And what brings us to this today? Is it the night vision goggles?

- Controversial, Alder Dorff, that people will get things like armored personnel carriers, systems that are controversial. They'll get other things like this that don't really fit in with what we're doing here in Green Bay. I'm pretty careful about the things I get. We get a lot of guys that wanna get some really cool stuff. And several times in the past I've said you know what, that's really not something we need here in the city of Green Bay, let's find something else. So the mayor would like us to do two things. One, have you review the 1033 lists quarterly, which you have in front of you. Those are the items that we have. And if we get any new items before we take full acceptance of those, he wants me to run them by the committee here and make sure that you don't have any problem with the things that we're getting.

- Why I asked that question was, I thought the stuff in yellow was the new stuff. I thought that's why you were bringing us some new stuff. Do you know what the highlighted stuff is?

- Yeah the highlighted stuff is stuff we're sending back, 'cause it wasn't as advertised. It's a lot of night vision things, but the key component of it was missing. That was be the liquid tubes that are inside that would allow people to work. But we basically have here just to show, so that's all getting sent back.

- Oh, okay, that helps explain that. All right, Alders.

- I was going to say that

- Yeah, go ahead.

- Oh, okay Alder Johnson.

- All right beauty before age, got it. Chief I'm looking at this, and I'd just like you to confirm. Because I feel like, you know, the description, in a lot of these are fairly obvious. But when I'm looking at this, what I am seeing is a Green Bay police department that is not militarized. Would you agree with that characterization?

- I would completely agree with that. Yes, sir. We have, we we've really tried to not militarize ourselves. And we get things like, you know, the Camelbacks or whatever. That's certainly something that you can buy anything on here that we have for the most part can be bought at Nelson tactical or at Cabela's.

- Okay, thank you.

- Okay. Alder Galvin.

- And I would have to, just to point back in on that, there's a lot of misconception out in the public media. You know, when someone says a police department have tanks, they don't have tanks, what they have are armored carriers, which allow you to drive into a scene that survived having someone firing armor piercing rounds at your person. There's no cannons, there's no mounted armaments on it, other than stuff that will stop bullets. Although we did get one years ago that turned out it wasn't bullet proof, but I mean, you live and learn. But we've gotten a lot of useful equipment. If you look at this, this is all stuff that we would have purchased for the department. It has saved the city taxpayers an unbelievable amount of money. And yes, you can see though, this is not brand new equipment by any means. The stuff we get is sometimes pretty dated. And it's not always functional. And so here we are sending a lot of it back because it doesn't work. So, I understand people's concerns, but I would have to agree this has been nothing but a board for the city, and for the department. And it's not militarized. These are weapons and things that the department would have purchased regardless. So, that's just,

- [Dorff] Thank you. All right. So, what kind of emotion do we need on this? 'Cause like receiving place on file?

- Yes.

- Okay.

- I'll make that motion.

- Motioned made by Alder Galvin.

- Second.

- Seconded by Alder Johnson. Any further discussion? Hearing none, all those in favor to receive and place on file, say aye.

- Aye.

- Aye.

- Opposed? Motion carries. Thank you, Chief.

- Thank you, Chief.

- Next Chief is up. The other chief. Consideration with possible action the purchase of type one ambulance for the Green Bay Metro fire department for the sum of $261,617 from Jefferson Fire and Safety. The lowest response, responsible bidder for RFQ 32 66, chief Litton.

- Oh, yeah. I guess I would defer it to the Emergency Manager. They run the bid on the,

- Okay.

- But, the ambulance is replacing the ambulance at station two, which is one of the old Ford van chasses. We've moved to all the smaller truck chasses now with a four wheel drive for getting around the city in all the wonderful weather we have. So this bid is just a little bit higher than last year's bid, which we were pretty surprised about. So we're happy with working with them.

- Alders, do you have any questions on this?

- I would make a motion to approve.

- Okay, motion made by Alders Galvin to approve.

- Second.

- Yes, Calvin?

- So I just wanna add in one thing, you will see, so the way we bid this out, we bid this out as a three year contract. By no means, are you awarding a three year contract here with this. But we asked for the vendors to provide us pricing based on a percentage increase from the previous year, for the subsequent years. So, just so you know, if this does come back next year or the following year, it will be again to Jefferson Fire and Safety based on the percentage increase that they provided. Which seems to be in line with what we're seeing for typical increases on an annual basis.

- Okay.

- Alder Dorff, just one question.

- Yes.

- Calvin, when we're looking at this, how many responses did you get to the RFP?

- This one, we only had one response that came in. There was another response that was started, but it was not completed. I'm not quite sure that the vendor that was in there did not provide any contact information. With the recent call that we've asked, we've switched to a system where we receive our bids electronically. There was one vendor that had started a bid, but did not complete it. We didn't have any way of contacting them. So Jefferson Fire and Safety historically for the last two years now has been the only one that has submitted a bid on this.

- Okay the reason I asked is because under normal circumstances, if we had multiple bids, you would provide those bids for us to review, correct?

- Correct, yes. I would provide you, the full bid summary with all the vendors.

- Okay and I just wasn't sure if we were only getting the winning bid put in front of us and that's why I asked the question in recognizing that chief had indicated that this price is in alignment with the last purchase, I'm comfortable with it, so, and the motion, I don't know if you caught that, Alder Dorff?

- Oh no, I didn't. Okay, so Alder Galvin moved by Alder Galvin, second by Alder Johnson. Further discussion? Hearing none. All those in favor, say aye.

- Aye.

- Opposed? Motion carries. All right, item nine. Request approval for the purchase of my telephone system from CCCP off the source, Well group purchasing cooperative contract. Staff?

- Okay in your packet there was nothing included. 'Cause we were trying to get the most up to date quote and information for this polling system. We just recently borrowed $250,000 in the 2020 borrowing for this phone system, Director Hronek is on the phone. We did get a quote for 178,000 for this phone system. However that does not include install. And there's a few other add ons that still need to be included. But I'm actually gonna turn it over to the director, and if you have any questions on this quote.

- Director Hronek?

- Do you have any questions?

- That's about $80,000, less than what we bonded, which coincidentally is what we needed for the,

- We were waiting for that question.

- As director Ellenbecker said, we're also gonna need to purchase some add on new suits call handler and this is primarily for the police department. And then also a Mitel revolution, it's like a messaging alerting service that have stood in the building. Somebody could just type the numbers in a phone and a prerecorded message could come through everybody's phones or speakers in the ceilings in conference rooms.

- I heard that.

- What I would like to add and I know I'm mom, I'm a director can I add to it, some of the things that, what's gonna be good about the system is, you know, as we move forward if we get approval to move forward with this, you know, maybe up to the 250,000 that we borrowed, this new phone system, the director things we can have in prior to the elections. And a huge advantage to that is that's gonna have some kind of like center likely which would, which would help funnel phone calls to take some phone calls away from the clerk's office.

- Oh, good.

- It's on, it did talk about better recording and transcription. It would allow us to do a more work from home where the calls can be forwarded from home. So, there are a lot advantages to this system. So those are there you know again once the court is in, plus the install and these couple other upgrades that we need and that's because system work really well. That we'll follow up you know fall closer to our $250,000, that was borrowed.

- I knew you'd spend it. All right, any other discussion?

- We approve what the contingency that the supporting documentation be included in the-.

- True, true, I'll second that.

- Okay. Any further discussion? All those in favor, say aye.

- Aye.

- Opposed? Motion carries.

- Thank you.

- Thank you. 10 requests for the approval of amendment to the cell tower lease at the Ted Bridge Park.

- I am going to turn that right on to our procurement manager.

- Okay.

- So this is, the next two here are both cell tower lease items. From time to time, these companies will come to us and ask for amendments to their original leases. So with this one at Ten Fridge park, this is one that it's an AT and T tower. The rental tower which is American tower came to us, and basically the way it was explained as AT and T is kind of a bully when it comes to its cell towers. And basically if they don't get the terms that they want, they will pull their dishes and pull their equipment off of a tower and find a tower that will be suitable to them. So, American tower came to us, asked us if we would modify this lease to make them more competitive within the market. So we did look at that. We agreed with that. The law department went through these, these amendments or these addendums. And we did come up with an agreement. So the reason that we did decide to do this, we have 30 year leases, but those leases are in kind of five year increments. So next year is an option year, so that would be the opportunity for the company to just drop police altogether, at which point we would lose all revenue for that. So we decided this was a good decision to go forward with granting the amendment to the tower lease for this one.

- Is there time sensitivity on this?

- Yes. So-

- Lemme tell you why I'm asking the question. I personally feel very uncomfortable passing any type of an amendment to a contract without any type of supporting paperwork.

- There's nothing here.

- Okay so what exactly do they want the amendment to be? Just, can you restate that?

- Yeah, let me, let me pull up the full document here.

- I mean and so when I say time sensitivity, it has to be done at this meeting or can it wait until the next Finance Committee meeting when we have time to get the paperwork support that requests?

- But then it's another whole month to the city council meeting, I mean.

- To do that.

- So they, I mean these companies are preferred to have that you know at times has it, 'cause this has been going on we've been working on, these for almost two months now, going back and forth between the legal departments with, the tower companies and the City.

- What if you just had the paperwork in per council, like Alder Johnson asked the last time?

- We can absolutely, I can absolutely include, would you prefer that the full amendment be included or would summary of what is changing?

- I'd like a summary. I have no idea what we're giving up here.

- Okay.

- We're giving up anything or we're gonna be losing on this or anything else, so I mean hard for me to vote on something, I mean I trust you, I know you're doing a good job and everything, but if someone asked me, well what were the changes? I have to be able to tell them. It should be open to public record as to what & why.

- And I can absolutely work up some sort of summary document for the council meeting.

- So, to even as it relates to today I just, again, I still feel uncomfortable voting on something with zero idea on what I'm voting on. So I'm wondering, given the time sensitivity of this, this could be placed as a committee at the whole, without any recommendation from finance committee. I don't know how we'd make it recommend there's something we don't know what we're doing.

- Two things. First of all, we can send it to council with no recommendation. And then council we don't need to do committee of the whole, I mean does it have to be it can just be bloods pull me item, you know. So, can you explain a little more what we're agreeing to?

- Yeah I'm pulling up the documentation for it now. I'm just trying to pull up the law departments. I wanna use the law department's explanation, just because they are the ones who went through everything. So let me pull that documentation quick.

- I do see that Attorney Chavez is on the online however, I know whenever her assistant are the ones who worked on the cell tower agreements. I'm not sure if Vanessa, you have any comments on these cell tower changes?

- Attorney Chavez, are you there?

- Sorry, I was on mute.

- Oh, okay. So I don't, I'm not actually familiar with these. Joanne is very thorough when she does her contract. So I do agree that the contract needs to be provided to you, so that you are voting on. I have asked Attorney Joanne she is available to hop on the call to provide you guys with an update as to what changes she made. So I don't know if you want to put this one on hold and we'll come back to it.

- Would that be the same for the next one, for the Fisk Park lease too?

- Oh, the Fisk Park lease that is.

- You have to talk to it, let's don't talk about, but yes or no, do we need to wait on that?

- The Fisk park lease says a little bit different situation than the lease, than this amendment, they're two different situations. This one as being kind of driven by the providers, whereas getting the one is, yeah, it's a little different.

- Since we did not provide the backup at all I mean even if we discussed it, would you prefer us just to get, put a summary together of the changes for each one of the amendments, and then we can also include a full copy of the agreement the rather lawn, but we certainly can include them in you didn't pack it.

- Can you include it, can it be something as simple as a red line agreement?

- So that there, this is a full amendment. A full new amendment there's multiple amendments. This is amendment number two to this lease, so it's a full new amendment so there's, nothing that was necessarily red line it's a full new to the agreement.

- Okay that sounds like a good idea. Why don't we just why don't we just I don't know, what should we do send to council without recommendation?

- Yeah, I think if we do that and then in the council packet, if we can include the actual verbiage of the amendment and maybe a summary of the impact of the change.

- Yeah, that's right. That sounds good.

- Yep, we can do that.

- All right, so let's have a motion to that effect.

- Alder Johnson.

- That is my motion-

- Yeah, thank you

- And I'll second it.

- So the motion is to send this to a council without a recommendation. All those in favor say aye.

- Aye.

- Opposed? Nay. And then if that if the summaries are in there we'll talk about it in the council, right? Alright and okay so now item 11, request for the disapproval of members, is there more information on that or do we need to do the same thing?

- I wouldn't suggest you do the same thing. I can give you a kind of a rundown of why this one's different, so this one, the provider that was on the Lea, or on the tower pulled their equipment off the tower so this one is really, the leasing company, the American tower coming to us, and asking for us to essentially reduce their rent payments until they are able to get a new tenant on the tower. It is a revenue sharing situation. So, it's not a situation where American tower is just trying to reduce the rent. They're getting monies and they're getting profit from somebody being on the tower, so they're actively looking for a new tenant for the tower as well, so this change was more driven by you know, they don't have any way that they're generating money right now so they requested a reduction in rent. Once a new tenant goes back on the tower everything would revert back to where it was.

- Then what would be the impact in our budget for not getting this revenue?

- I would have to, I mean we had a breakdown, yeah.

- We could include that in the summary of changes that is for the council packet.

- All right, let's do that.

- I have to identify a source for that then.

- Right?

- We would miss we're using that money you know which we probably were using that money for something.

- Yeah, I know it's not, we're not talking tens of thousands of dollars, but it is a reduction. And what could easily happen, you could pass this, and in that time they could find a new tenant, and the amendment would be, but regardless, we need to make sure that we move forward. So yeah we can definitely provide that information in our summary to the council.

- Okay.

- But what I do want to add though Calvin is, are two of the Alders is the original agreement, we had with them said, if there is no revenue coming in, it wasn't revenue to share it. This amendment isn't saying that they can pay us less, it was just updating our documents, getting them up to date and there are some other tweaks to it, no matter what that revenue potentially was going to be less because of there was not somebody bringing in the revenue. So this is not to just to accept a lower rent payment this is there were other changes and this was inevitable and was going to happen through discussions that says, they, I think they brought this to us in December or January and we have been working on this. So we've actually delayed the reduction for a period of time already.

- Okay.

- I would just replicate my motion I would move that we refer this to full council without a recommendation contingent upon staff, providing documentation of the exact verbiage of the amendment in a summary.

- I would second that, but I would have one quick question. Is this normal nation in time for our committee meetings? Or was there just something that you just couldn't get?

- Well, I'm sorry that you broke up a little bit there.

- Okay I guess my concern here is we have two items which we added on and it, and like Alder Johnson said, it's very difficult for us to make any decisions. It's even harder for us when we can't even review it in advance of the meeting and I'm just wondering if this is, is something that normally goes on. I mean I don't remember experiencing this before, or there was some kind of a paper shuffle mistake here.

- So we had discussed me and director Ellenbecker had discussed, you know, what kind of documentation we want to do include. Including, we decided not to include the full amendment, given the length of them. It's something that you want. I see it's absolutely something we will provide. But yet these cell tower companies they do approach us often from what I can understand. And a lot of times they're unfound. But given that these two are in renewal years next year, and they could drop the lease altogether, which would be a complete loss of the revenue, we thought it would be prudent to, to make sure we basically hedge our risk, and at least continue to get revenue on the, on the towers.

- Okay, I think it's clear that in the, can we need information, right and thank you and we'll get that right. Did we already vote?

- No.

- All right, all those in favor say aye.

- Aye.

- Aye.

- Opposed? No, motion carries. All right I mean I wasn't high. Okay, all right the next item, the next two items all right I think we can talk about this first item without Alder Bill being here, 'cause he and I already talked about this. And so, oh come on, agenda, he had request by Alder Bill for the finance committee, which States offer Penn center voters for poll workers who have worked in woodwork this year during the COVID-19 situation. Okay we talked about that, and that's happening already because of the grant. So there's no we don't really need to do anything with that we'll do that under the grant. The second part adopt a policy for future hazard pay stuff situations referred to, he would like that refer just staff to research other hazard pay policies if this would occur in the future. So that part of it is what we really need to discuss if we wanna refer that to staff.

- Just an update, that is actually what Alder Galvin recommended last meeting was to refer to staff to, hazard pay stuff situation this is the second time it's come around. So yes, the first item number, one correct. Based on what I also heard of the ad hoc committee, I think Alder Weary understands that at least for this year, we would be looking at using some grant money to help pay for additional money. Before this, this incentive number two, Clerk Teske actually went out and she tried to find some additional hazard pays. I also went online and trying to find some examples of existing. And I was not able to find any at the time when I'm forecasting, he did a research in four city. I believe they're all within the state of Wisconsin, she did not get any response back. And I come back my clerk Teske talk and she would like, but at this point I do not have one, to bring to you an example from other municipalities. So if it's something we need to try to create, we can move forward with that. We can work with our attorneys we can try to arrive at HR policy but in our limited time we. And kind of trying to see what happened at the ad hoc and with the whole, the incentive and bonus. We do not at this point, have any hazard to bring to you.

- And yes, let's go up with Alder Galvin first this time.

- I just think that a basic level here, the first part of his item had to receive replacement file in the second time since we've already addressed this for the upcoming election we have time we can table it until he can come and give us some parameters of what he's looking for or staff wants to make a proposal for a future hazard pay situation, it could be next time.

- Alder Johnson

- And I don't mean to split hairs on this, but what would the topic of hazard paid be more appropriately situated with personnel?

- Yes. Could be.

- In which case, then I have no problem with us like exploring future hazard pay policies. I just think that that perhaps that should go to Joe or Director Faults as opposed to Director Ellenbecker. So my question is can we, as a finance committee, refer that to staff and then have director Faults, bring it back up, bring it back to personnel can we do that?

- Or can we just repeat the word?

- Yeah the short answer is yes, you can do that. So you're essentially be redirecting it to a different committee, but you're sending it back before that. So there's no issue with that.

- Okay I just don't want to send it like to refer it's a personality and then it gets to like marks right. In which case, then I would make a motion that we refer this to staff and staff being a human resources and then have them bring back a proposal to the Personnel Committee.

- I'll second that.

- Okay, so that's for part two.

- It's for hazard pay policy.

- Okay, so that's for purchase, so let's we'll deal with death first then. So any further discussion on adopted policy for future hazard pay situations have been referred to staff?

- I would just expand on that a little bit, Alder Dorff meaning that I think it should be a complete reevaluation of hazard pay. I mean because I'm sure he's, I mean that's pretty broad right I mean, hazard pay could be impacted by a lot of different things. right like elections, so to me it's just a reevaluation pastured pay across our different or different departments just to make sure that they're brought up to speed.

- Okay Alder Galvin, where you're raising your hands?

- I was just stretching my fingers.

- Don't want you to do that 'cause then I think you're raising your hand okay, okay so that's the motion and you seconded it Alder Galvin?

- Okay, all those in favor.

- Aye.

- Opposed? All right, motion carries. And then the first part was received in place on file.

- Correct. Okay. Made by Alder Galvin.

- Second.

- Second by Alder Johnson further discussion hearing none all those in favor aye. Opposed motion carries alright now this next one, I don't know how we could do this without Alder Wery here.

- Well, I guess my question on this would be, do we need them here to have an explanation from, and I would imagine it's gonna be a lot apartment giving us update on why the city has agreed to indemnify the former mayor. And I don't see why that can't be in the public record, you know, because the explanation, it's just the explanation of why has the city agreed to do it? I don't see why I would have to have a pretty compelling reason to go into court.

- Attorney Chavez?

- I see no issue. No, it's just the, take me a little bit. My phone is dying, it takes longer to light that up to unmute it that's all that's happening. So I don't see any issue with us discussing the reason we've already taken certain actions in the case in open session, because those are decisions that have already been made and they're just applications of law. If we start talking about an actual update on the case of strategy and stuff, that's my recommend we go into session.

- Including the city's role, which she, okay so he wants update on this unknown lawsuit include the city's role and why the city has agreed to indemnify the former mayor so of that in open session, we could probably do why the city has agreed to indemnify the former mayor, but not everything.

- Well to me, isn't it I mean, I thought it was pretty well stated through the media not too long ago that be the case has been delayed until next year. And the reasons were given in the media. Unless something has changed since then. Again, I don't think we need to go into closed session that's all pretty much made public

- Okay so what I'll do where he is requesting this so what questions just the committee had then.

- We received an update from staff, the confidential update and that we received your email and then so I feel like that kind of meets that request, but then the question of why the City's agreed to indemnify the former mayor I can't imagine a scenario where any government entity would not indemnify it's leaders and not just government I mean, it's in the private sector too I mean I you know, we do that even with our board of directors, we buy insurance student and fire board members I mean, that's a very common practice

- So Attorney Chavez do you have anything to like to add to that you can say it in open session?

- Yeah so if you guys refer back to the email that I sent you guys on closed session, and we can have an explanation outside counsel finding what the allegations are. But for me to just give you a brief update and based on the fact that the actions that he stood for were taken in his official capacity as mayor. And so anytime a person take action within the scope of their duty or under the official property, I should say, then they are entitled to a defense by law. And so, it's not that we have chosen to identify him. We're actually providing a dispatch or the former mayor.

- Okay, because you have to we have to, by law. Okay, good.

- And I will second that

- Okay move to listen file by Alder Johnson second by Alder Galvin, further discussion, all those in favor say aye.

- Aye.

- Opposed? Motion carries. And last week you reported the claims committee.

- I have no questions on the claims.

- I have no questions, Alder Johnson?

- I am working on that. Sorry, 'cause it wasn't in the packet I wasn't logged in and I didn't see it.

- Okay, that's okay, it is a lot.

- That I've got no conflicts here.

- Yeah just okay yep, we'll give you a minute.

- And then I'll be sure to review the details before the council meeting. Okay, I'm good.

- Okay, motion to.

- Receive a place on file.

- All right bid by Alder Galvin second by. Second Alder Johnson discussion hearing none all those in favor say aye.

- Aye.

- Opposed? Motion carries. Informational, here we go. We have the contingency account is $143,700, but it'll soon be less than that when we get what we agreed to do earlier in the meeting. And then the next finance committee meeting will be held on Tuesday August 11, 2020 which is actually election day at 4:30 PM.

- I have a question and Brian same thing I'm now gonna be a poll worker along with my wife, and Brian also.

- Yeah, I think we better not have it on that day.

- Should we move it to Monday or Tuesday? I mean, Wednesday.

- I can't put it on top of another committee. Key director Ellenbecker and you're muted, so I don't know what you're saying.

- Potentially like you said, the problem is if we do Monday or Wednesday, like you said, we do end up being over the top of other meetings and that, you know, sometimes you're restricted by the zoom account.

- I've got Shelby here and she says we can overlap. so I think we'd be all right, as long as Alderman don't have a conflict.

- What depends on overlap with what but how about, should we if we couldn't move it to the fourth.

- We could overlap. But yeah, it would be better not to have the meeting on the second. Monday there are a lot of meetings on the second Monday, and then of course Wednesday, it- and cut out the week before so that everyone can attend I think that would be best.

- I think August 4th.

- Yep.

- August 4th, we're doing with the polling locations.

- What did you say, so what about 10 o'clock when we're done with the polling locations?

- Yeah you'll be really energized at that point all right.

- The jokes fall flat when nobody reacts the first time.

- We were just stunned we were just too stunned at what you said. All right 4:30 on the fourth finance and personnel probably,

- But we'll let, I will elect director Faults know

- Okay.

- Alright. Anything else? I will entertain a motion to adjourn.

- Can I just quick question Alder Dorff I don't know if this would be for you Alder Dorff for director Ellenbecker, but one of the things I noticed, and this has been on other committees that I've served on too sometimes we have individuals who are on the phone, you know, where they have one item they need to attend to I didn't make two hours of conversation to hit their five minute item and I always kind of feel bad about that when we consider sort of the order of the agenda is it random or do we consider that at all?

- I can tell you this one, we moved around several times so I grew up the first three because we had an outside vendor we had someone from Baird and put those three together then the next two, they could have probably been pushed down farther than the next three and three next, there were a couple items for yes Galvin, our procurement manager so he had five items together so I kind of grouped them that way and so I there was, there was some thought and put into them. I weighed him at some point I put the two together and then I on top of it try to group the one that yeah, so there is some thought to it but anyone in we do, I do try to move them around I try to consider yes unfortunately, I'm not sure who wouldn't particularly you're talking about but I did try to Kris Teske I tried to have hers, the Clerk Teske together so I did try to move around and try to so again, people off the phone as soon as possible.

- Yeah it's not a specific request necessarily about tonight it's a general statement I've seen this in other committees and so I'm just trying to obviously be as courteous as possible to all of our staff as well, who have families they'd love to get to in the night as well and so I'm happy to hear that you put thought into it that's good enough for me thank you.

- Okay thanks.

- Can we adjourn already no.

- Move to adjourn.

- Alright.

- Second.

- All those in favor aye.

- Aye.

- We're adjourned. Peace everybody. bye.