



AGENDA OF THE JOINT FINANCE/PERSONNEL COMMITTEE

**MONDAY, NOVEMBER 2, 2020, 3:00 PM
AMENDED**

Virtual Meeting. Public may join via Zoom.

A. ZOOM MEETING INFORMATION.

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

B. ROLL CALL.

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

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

Others Present: Mayor Eric Genrich, Ald. Craig Stevens, Ald. Lynn Gerlach, Ald. Randy Scannell, Ald. Mark Steuer, Ald. Jesse Brunette, Ald. John Vanderleest, Finance Director Diana Ellenbecker, Fire Chief David Litton, Police Chief Andrew Smith, Public Works Director Steve Grenier, Transit Director Patty Kiewiz, Water Utility General Manager Nancy Quirk, Information Technology Director Mike Hronek, Park Director Dan Ditscheit, Human Resources Director Joseph Faulds, Interim Community and Economic Development Director Cheryl Renier-Wigg, Chief of Staff Celestine Jeffreys, Asst. Finance Director Pam Manley, Asst. Fire Chief Rob Goplin, Asst. Fire Chief Ryan Gibbons, Police Commander Kevin Warych, Asst. Park Director James Andersen, City Assessor Russ Schwandt, Business Manager Rick Jurkanis, HR Operations Manager Melanie Falk and others.

C. APPROVAL OF THE AGENDA.

Moved by Ald. Veronica Corpus-Dax, seconded by Ald. Bill Galvin to approve the agenda. Motion

carried.

Yes- Veronica Corpus-Dax, Barbara Dorff, Bill Galvin, Brian Johnson, No- None, Abstain- None

D. APPROVAL OF MINUTES.

1. Approval of the Finance Committee minutes from the October 13, 2020 meeting.

Moved by Ald. Veronica Corpus-Dax, seconded by Ald. Brian Johnson to approve. Motion carried.

Yes- Veronica Corpus-Dax, Barbara Dorff, Bill Galvin, Brian Johnson, No- None, Abstain- None

2. Approval of the Personnel Committee minutes from the October 13, 2020 meeting.

Moved by Ald. Bill Galvin, seconded by Ald. Veronica Corpus-Dax to approve. Motion carried.

Yes- Veronica Corpus-Dax, Barbara Dorff, Bill Galvin, Brian Johnson, No- None, Abstain- None

E. REGULAR BUSINESS.

1. Consideration with possible action on the request to fill the following replacement positions and all subsequent vacancies resulting from internal transfers.

a. Engineering Aide

Moved by Ald. Bill Galvin, seconded by Ald. Barbara Dorff to approve. Motion carried.

Yes- Veronica Corpus-Dax, Barbara Dorff, Bill Galvin, Brian Johnson, No- None, Abstain- None

2. For consideration and possible actions the request from Green Bay Metro Fire Department to institute a rate increase for ambulance services.

Moved by Ald. Bill Galvin, seconded by Ald. Brian Johnson to approve. Motion carried.

Yes- Veronica Corpus-Dax, Barbara Dorff, Bill Galvin, Brian Johnson, No- None, Abstain- None

3. Report to committee an after the fact approval for emergency Pine St. Ramp Repairs for the sum of \$56,985. Sole Source Attached.

Moved by Ald. Brian Johnson, seconded by Ald. Veronica Corpus-Dax to approve. Motion carried.

Yes- Veronica Corpus-Dax, Barbara Dorff, Bill Galvin, Brian Johnson, No- None, Abstain- None

4. Approval for purchase of refuse truck from Envirotech Equipment for the sum of \$248,875 to replace equipment that is unrepairable. Sole Source attached.

Moved by Ald. Bill Galvin, seconded by Ald. Brian Johnson to approve. Motion carried.

Yes- Veronica Corpus-Dax, Barbara Dorff, Bill Galvin, Brian Johnson, No- None, Abstain- None

5. Approval for purchase of refuse truck from Fredrickson Supply for the sum of \$285,000 to replace equipment that is unrepairable. Sole Source Attached.

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

6. For consideration with possible action on a request to borrow \$340,000 from the State Trust fund loan for a five year term for Revaluation Assessment Service approved at the August 18, 2020 Common Council meeting.

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

7. Update with possible action on tax litigation matters pending before the Tax Appeals Commission and in Circuit Court.

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 will thereafter reconvene in open session pursuant to Section 19.85(2), Wis. Stats., to take action on items discussed in closed session, if appropriate, and to consider the remainder of the agenda.

Moved by Ald. Brian Johnson, seconded by Ald. Veronica Corpus-Dax to go into closed session. Motion carried.

Yes- Veronica Corpus-Dax, Barbara Dorff, Bill Galvin, Brian Johnson, No- None, Abstain- None

Moved by Ald. Brian Johnson, seconded by Ald. Veronica Corpus-Dax to return to regular order of business. Motion carried.

Yes- Veronica Corpus-Dax, Barbara Dorff, Bill Galvin, Brian Johnson, No- None, Abstain- None

Moved by Ald. Brian Johnson, seconded by Ald. Veronica Corpus-Dax to receive and place on file. Motion carried.

Yes- Veronica Corpus-Dax, Barbara Dorff, Bill Galvin, Brian Johnson, No- None, Abstain- None

8. Resolution authorizing 2020 transfer of \$45,000.00 from contingency for legal expenses related to Georgia Pacific tax appeal for real estate and personal property.

Moved by Ald. Brian Johnson, seconded by Ald. Bill Galvin to approve. Motion carried.

Yes- Veronica Corpus-Dax, Barbara Dorff, Bill Galvin, Brian Johnson, No- None, Abstain- None

9. 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. Veronica Corpus-Dax, seconded by Ald. Bill Galvin to receive and place on file.
Motion carried.

Yes- Veronica Corpus-Dax, Barbara Dorff, Bill Galvin, Brian Johnson, No- None, Abstain- None

10. A request by Ald. Wery to the Finance committee which states: Due to ongoing reasons of 'inadequate staffing' and 'prioritizing of tasks' in our Law Dept., I am requesting we hire City Ethics Inc, or a similar qualified party, to draft revisions to the city's Code of Ethics and Code of Conduct as recommended in their 2018 findings paid for by the City of Green Bay.

Moved by Ald. Bill Galvin, seconded by Ald. Veronica Corpus-Dax to hold until the next Finance Committee meeting. Motion carried.

Yes- Veronica Corpus-Dax, Barbara Dorff, Bill Galvin, Brian Johnson, No- None, Abstain- None

F. REVIEW AND APPROVAL OF THE MAYOR'S RECOMMENDED 2021 BUDGET INCLUDING OUT-OF-STATE TRAVEL REQUESTS...

Moved by Ald. Brian Johnson, seconded by Ald. Veronica Corpus-Dax to open the floor for interested parties to speak. Motion carried.

Yes- Veronica Corpus-Dax, Barbara Dorff, Bill Galvin, Brian Johnson, No- None, Abstain- None

One citizen spoke.

Moved by Ald. Bill Galvin, seconded by Ald. Veronica Corpus-Dax to close the floor for discussion. Motion carried.

Yes- Veronica Corpus-Dax, Barbara Dorff, Bill Galvin, Brian Johnson, No- None, Abstain- None

Mayor Genrich presented an overview of his recommended budget.

1. Common Council (page 15).

Moved by Ald. Brian Johnson, seconded by Ald. Bill Galvin to approve. Motion carried.

Yes- Veronica Corpus-Dax, Barbara Dorff, Bill Galvin, Brian Johnson, No- None, Abstain- None

2. Mayor's Office (pages 19-20).

Moved by Ald. Bill Galvin, seconded by Ald. Barbara Dorff to approve. Motion carried.

Yes- Veronica Corpus-Dax, Barbara Dorff, Bill Galvin, Brian Johnson, No- None, Abstain- None

3. Administrative Services (pages 29-30).

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

4. Information Technology and Equipment Replacement (pages 39-42).

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

5. Law (page 49).

Moved by Ald. Brian Johnson, seconded by Ald. Barbara Dorff to amend budget line item #53021 by increasing it by \$220,000 for a total of \$257,500. Motion carried.

Yes- Veronica Corpus-Dax, Barbara Dorff, Bill Galvin, Brian Johnson, No- None, Abstain- None

Moved by Ald. Bill Galvin, seconded by Ald. Brian Johnson to approve as amended. Motion carried.

Yes- Veronica Corpus-Dax, Barbara Dorff, Bill Galvin, Brian Johnson, No- None, Abstain- None

6. Municipal Court (pages 54-55).

Moved by Ald. Brian Johnson, seconded by Ald. Barbara Dorff to approve. Motion carried.

Yes- Veronica Corpus-Dax, Barbara Dorff, Bill Galvin, Brian Johnson, No- None, Abstain- None

7. Human Resources (pages 62-63).

Moved by Ald. Veronica Corpus-Dax, seconded by Ald. Bill Galvin to approve. Motion carried.

Yes- Veronica Corpus-Dax, Barbara Dorff, Bill Galvin, Brian Johnson, No- None, Abstain- None

8. Community & Economic Development (pages 75-76).

Moved by Ald. Bill Galvin, seconded by Ald. Barbara Dorff to amend budget line item #59940 by increasing it by \$50 for a total of \$59,481.

Motion carried.

Yes- Veronica Corpus-Dax, Barbara Dorff, Bill Galvin, Brian Johnson, No- None, Abstain- None

Moved by Ald. Veronica Corpus-Dax, seconded by Ald. Barbara Dorff to approve as amended.

Motion carried.

Yes- Veronica Corpus-Dax, Barbara Dorff, Bill Galvin, Brian Johnson, No- None, Abstain- None

9. Police Department (pages 84-86).

Moved by Ald. Bill Galvin, seconded by Ald. Barbara Dorff to approve. Motion carried.

Yes- Veronica Corpus-Dax, Barbara Dorff, Bill Galvin, Brian Johnson, No- None, Abstain- None

10. Fire Department (pages 95-97).

Moved by Ald. Bill Galvin, seconded by Ald. Veronica Corpus-Dax to approve. Motion carried.

Yes- Veronica Corpus-Dax, Barbara Dorff, Bill Galvin, Brian Johnson, No- None, Abstain- None

11. Public Works includes Engineering, Operations, Traffic and Equipment replacement (pages 105-112).

Motion by Ald. Brian Johnson to add \$200,000 by increasing budget line item #54061 to \$141,000 and increasing budget line item #54064 to \$90,000. Motion failed.

Moved by Ald. Barbara Dorff, seconded by Ald. Bill Galvin to approve. Motion carried.

Yes- Veronica Corpus-Dax, Barbara Dorff, Bill Galvin, Brian Johnson, No- None, Abstain- None

12. Parks, Recreation & Forestry and Equipment Replacement (pages 125-128).

Moved by Ald. Veronica Corpus-Dax, seconded by Ald. Bill Galvin to amend budget line item #54003 by decreasing it by \$3,000 for a total of \$20,000.

Motion carried.

Yes- Veronica Corpus-Dax, Barbara Dorff, Bill Galvin, Brian Johnson, No- None, Abstain- None

Moved by Ald. Bill Galvin, seconded by Ald. Veronica Corpus-Dax to approve as amended. Motion carried.

Yes- Veronica Corpus-Dax, Barbara Dorff, Bill Galvin, Brian Johnson, No- None, Abstain- None

13. Miscellaneous (page 133).

Moved by Ald. Brian Johnson, seconded by Ald. Bill Galvin to approve. Motion carried.

Yes- Veronica Corpus-Dax, Barbara Dorff, Bill Galvin, Brian Johnson, No- None, Abstain- None

14. Sanitary Sewer (pages 143-145).

Moved by Ald. Brian Johnson, seconded by Ald. Barbara Dorff to approve. Motion carried.

Yes- Veronica Corpus-Dax, Barbara Dorff, Bill Galvin, Brian Johnson, No- None, Abstain- None

15. Parking Division (pages 147-149).

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

16. Storm Sewer (pages 151-155).

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

17. Transit (pages 160-161).

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

18. Bay Beach (pages 168-171).

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

19. Debt Service (pages 173-174).

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

20. Neighborhood Enhancement (pages 176-177).

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

21. Workers Compensation (page 179).

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

22. General Liability (page 180).

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

23. Health Insurance Escrow (page 181).

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

24. Revenue - General Fund (pages 183-193).

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

25. Revenue - Sanitary Sewer (page 194).

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

26. Revenue-Parking Division (page 195).

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

27. Revenue - DPW Equipment Replacement (page 196).

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

28. Revenue - Storm Sewer (page 197).

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

29. Revenue - Transit (pages 198-199)

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

30. Revenue - Bay Beach (page 200).

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

31. Revenue - Debt Service (pages 201-202).

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

32. Revenue - Equipment Replacement Funds (pages 203-208).

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

33. Revenue - Neighborhood Enhancement (page 209).

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

34. Revenue - Workers Compensation (page 210).

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

35. Revenue - General Liability (page 211).

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

36. Revenue - Health Insurance Escrow (page 212).

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

G. INFORMATIONAL.

1. The next Finance Committee meeting will be held on Tuesday November 17, 2020 at 4:30 PM.

2. The next Personnel Committee meeting will be held on Tuesday November 17, 2020 at 4:30 PM.

3. 2020 Contingency Account \$93,322.00.

H. ADJOURNMENT.

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

I. VERBATIM MINUTES.

- Diana and Pam, you guys ready?
- Diana is muted so...
- I'm sorry, what was the question?
- Ready to rock and roll? We got a lot to go on.
- Yap.
- All right. Then I see the committee members are here. Oh, where's Alder Galvin... Oh, there he is. I couldn't see him behind his glass of milk, I didn't know it's him. Okay, all right. I'd like to call the meeting, the direct personnel and finance committee meeting for November 2nd, 2020 to order. This is a zoom meeting, so roll call Alder Dorff here. Alder Corpus Stacks.
- Here.
- Alder Bill Galvin.
- Here.
- And Alder Brian Johnson.
- Here. Okay. At this time I would entertain a motion for approval of the agenda. So moved by Alder Corpus-Dax, second by Alder Galvin, all those in favor say aye.
- Aye.
- Oppose no. Motion carries, the agenda is approved. We have two sets of minutes to approve. So the first set, is approval of the finance committee minutes from October 13th, 2020.
- There was arms.
- I'm sorry. I couldn't hear what... Oh, they're both the same. Oh, I see. One is the Finance, one is Personnel, okay. So first up, in the minutes from October 13th, Corpus-Dax, seconded by Alder Johnson, all those in favor say aye.

- Aye.

- Oppose no, motion carries. Okay, now the approval of the personnel committee minutes from October 13th, 2020, motion to approve by Alder Galvin, seconded by Alder Corpus-Dux, all those in favor, say aye.

- Aye.

- Oppose no. Motion carries of the minutes are approved. Regular business, item one. Consideration with possible action on the request to fill the following replacement positions and all subsequent vacancies resulting from internal transfer, engineering aide. Staff.

- [Joe] So you do have the records to fill in your packets. So there's any questions, I can answer them or director can answer them.

- Okay, are there any questions from the committee? No.

- Motion to approve.

- Motion to approve the Alder Galvin.

- I'll second it. Seconded by Alder Dorff. All those in favor, say aye.

- Aye.

- Oppose say no. Motion carries. Thank you. Report for consideration and possible actions, the request from the Green Bay Metro Fire Department, to institute a rate increase for ambulance services. I'll ask the committee first. Are there questions on this from any member of the committee or other alders?

- Yeah. Alder Dalvin.

- Thank you. I guess one, looking at what we currently charge, looking at the company we contract with, is proposing the charge, are those fees equal to, less than, or more than what it actually costs us on these various runs, understanding that there is some variances, you know, depending on what has to happen.

- Yeah, I'm going to defer that right over to chief Litton.

- Alder Galvin, the fees listed there typically they're set at a rate that maximizes both our Medicare and Medicaid reimbursement from the federal government, federal and state governments. They in no way reflect the actual costs of doing business. You know, we generate about a \$3.1 million in revenues, on ambulance calls, in our personnel budget for, you know, a firefighter slash paramedics, all of them are cross or up into \$15 million. So this is a way to, you know, that we've had in place for a long time to generate revenue, to help pay for the services, by no means does it pay for it all. I mean, it's taxpayer supported obviously, and this is a way of recouping some of that in revenue.

- All right, and then in the letter, I think it's the titled... The one that was sent to Allouez Bellevue from assistant chief Ryan Givens. It talks about transports, where we're transporting between say medical facilities. And that's a, it says that's something that we haven't done normally, we're just doing it more and more. And it says that each municipality would have the benefit of a conservative estimate is 6,000 annually to the city of Green Bay based upon patient air mix. So what Allouez and Bellevue also be gaining money from this? Or is it just Green Bay?

- Well it's both. So I think what he's referencing there, so there's two different topics there. So the first one being, it's going to generate roughly 6,000 more dollars in their rate increase, it will also generate additional revenues, it's called the set rate, which is typically like where we would pick somebody up from, let's just say, Bellin Hospital, and they're going to be flown out via a medical airplane. So we would pick them up at Bellin, transport them out to Austin Straubel, make the transfer there to the medical team on the plane, and the reimbursement for that is not something that we currently can bill for because we don't allow it by ordinance. It's something that we are doing more of and we can do more of, so it will generate some additional revenue. I cannot give you, I don't know exactly what that's gonna look like. Year in and year out, that's really up to the, you know, the facilities and how much of that they have going on. I would speculate that maybe it's going to add another five or \$6,000 in revenue. It could be higher, could be a little bit lower than that. The other issue that you ask about Bellevue and merger with Bellevue, and when we do start providing medical transport, or medical services for them, and that won't be, you know, under the merger agreement, which is still a confidential document, that'll be at some point down the road here so I'll just leave it like that. But yes, the payer mix, when we... In the end, the payer mix is when we bill for ambulance service in Allouez and, or Bellevue, those respective villages keep 15%, and we get 85% of the billing.

- Okay. And you said, according to ordinance, so we're conducting these transports, but by ordinance, we cannot charge for them. Am I understanding that correctly?

- Yeah, we had a special case the other day, where the private ambulance was unavailable and that's becoming more and more of an issue for us here in our region. And so they had a critical need, and so we filled that need for them out of, because, you know, the courtesy of our, our citizens, our residents, but, you know, going forward, if we pass this, especially the set rates for that, we'll be able to actually bill for it collect on it. And that rates at a higher level as well.

- Okay. I guess the one question I have is you say Bellevue, when the contract is signed in Allouez currently on these kinds of transport, they get 15%. Are there other grants or other actions that the Metro Fire Department takes at the bill for that Allouez and Bellevue will be getting a percentage of what we will bill for?

- No, that's all... The revenue sharing is stipulated in the contract between the city and the village of Allouez currently, and it will be so stipulated the same in Bellevue.

- And just for my curiosity, and if it's something you'd rather answer another time personally, between you and me, that's fine. But why did we come up with an agreement where they get 15% of that?

- Well, it was part of the... You know, I wasn't here for that negotiation with Allouez, but my understanding is you know, at the time Allouez had their own ambulance service and so they were generating revenues and the original split was 50/50, when the agreement first began in 2009.
- Okay.
- Or 2012, I'm sorry. And it's weaned down to 85/15, and that's what it is for the perpetuity of the agreement, which we've been doing it with LOE now for 8 years, so there's 7 more years left on that agreement.
- Okay, all right. Thank you very much, chief. I appreciate the information.
- Sure.
- All right, any other questions? I'll entertain a motion to approve.
- Motion approved.
- Motion approved by Alder Galvin. Is there a second?
- Second. Second by Alder Johnson. Hearing no other discussion, all those in favor, say aye.
- Aye.
- Oppose no. Motion carries. All right. Number 3, report to the committee in after a fact approval for emergency pine street ramp repairs for the summer of \$56,985 sole source attached. So I assume we'd read through this. Are there any questions on this? Are there any questions? Nope. Okay.
- Just one Alder Dorff
- Yes, Alder Johnson.
- Director Grenier, I presume that this is coming out of the parking utility budget.
- If funded by the annual parking ramp repairs, contract bid items. So the money that we had set aside for parking ramp repairs is sufficient to handle these as well.
- Okay, thank you.
- Great. There's no further discussion. I'll entertain a motion.
- Moved.
- Moved by Alder Johnson, second by Alder Corpus-Dax. All those in favor, say aye.
- Aye.

- Oppose no. Motion carries. Item number 4, approval for purchase of refuse truck from viral tech equipment for the sum of \$248,875 to replace equipment that is unrepairable sole source attached. Are there any questions on this item?

- Alder Dorff

- Yes, Alder Johnson.

- Director Grenier, and I'm going to maybe bleed this over into the next item as well. I noticed that we have two trucks that have died of engine failure. Is that correct?

- That is correct.

- And neither one of them is repairable. And are these... I mean, what was the lifespan on these vehicles? Did we anticipate, I mean, having to replace these anytime soon?

- These both vehicles were scheduled for replacement. One of them is a 2004, the other is a 2007. Refuse trucks have an 8 year life expectancy to them, so they're well beyond their service life. These were at least one of them was new, but in gently used condition, we bought that from another municipality and retrofitted it when we went to automated collection to try to build in some planned replacement within the schedule, rather than buying 16 brand new frontline trucks and having them all come up at once, we retrofitted some of our existing fleet and then purchased some different vintage from neighboring municipalities. And we have been periodically replacing those over time now. 2 years ago, we did have a situation where the equipment replacement was in the budget, it was pulled from the budget sent to the bonding. And for one reason or another DPW was not part of that bond request. So there was 1 year, I think it was 2 years ago that we simply went without. So that got us 1 year behind in our equipment replacement. And every year... Again, it's an eight year lifespan on a garbage truck. We have 16 frontline trucks that makes real easy math. Every year where we request two of them to be replaced. And these two were among two that got caught in that, that one year shuffle back.

- Okay, thank you for that explanation.

- A further discussion. Hearing none I'll entertain a motion.

- Motion to approved.

- Motion approved by Alder Galvin.

- Second.

- Second by Alder Johnson. All those in favor, say aye.

- Aye.

- Oppose no. Motion carries. Number 6. I'm sorry, number 5. For approval for purchase of reference truck from Fredrickson Supply for the sum of \$285,000 to replace equipment that is unrepairable sole source attached. Any further discussion on this item?

- Move to approve.
- Move to approve Alder Johnson, second by to Corpus-Dax. Any further discussion, hearing none all those in favor say aye.
- Aye.
- Oppose no. Motion carries. Number 6. For consideration with possible action on the request to borrow 340... That may stay in this right turn at \$40,000, right from the state trust fund loan for 5-year term, for re-evaluation assessment service approved at the August 18th, 2020 common council meeting. So this is we're coming with the request to borrow the money that we approved back in August. Okay. Any discussion or questions on this item? Alder Johnson.
- Thank you, Director Diana Ellenbecker, if you could just confirm, because we had made that first installment, we paid for that out of contingency. I mean, is this something that normally you would borrow for? I mean, as opposed to just budgeting is particularly since the agreement is a multi-year agreement.
- It can be done either way. It certainly can be borrowed, or if there was room in your budget, that would be the preferred option. What happened is there is over \$200,000 that is owed up in the contract in 2021, and not being able, not wanting to increase the mill rate anymore. We do not include that 200,000 into the 2021 budget. And so at this point it was... What I'm putting in front of you is a 5-year borrowing request for \$340,000 to pay for this. Again, the benefit, we'll start seeing the benefit of the rebill, or the change from the rebill starting in the 2023 budget.
- So how does the installment repayment work on this? I mean, is this kicking payment down another year as well? Or does it start immediately? How does that work?
- The installment payments are, gosh, I don't, I think the numbers are in the book, it's about 280 if I remember 200 and some thousand for 2021 in the remaining balances in 2022.
- No, I'm sorry. I meant the loan repayment.
- At this point that isn't... We can have it straight line, we can have it heavy on the end, we can have it heavy upfront. That's a request that can be sent to the state trust fund loan, state trust fund. At this point first there's two times as the council will see it firsthand, just get permission to apply. So then in this case, this is just an application to apply for the \$340,000. At that point, we have the option to ask what kind of timing we want to pay this. We could put it a very small payment in the first 1 or 2 years, knowing that this will have a bigger impact in the 2023 budget. Again can be straight line, we can be half back-ended or front-ended. However, if the committee has a choice or a recommendation on that, and we can take, take that forward to the... When we put the request in.
- Does the interest rate change on that depending on the repayment schedule?
- It does not.
- And the interest rate on that was 2 and a half percent?

- Two point... Correct. It's actually located on page 2 of the document from the state of Wisconsin. It says 2.5.

- Okay. And so right now we're just authorizing you to apply for it, but we would actually have to accept later whether or not we want to do that. Do you know when that would occur?

- Yes. Well, it takes anywhere from 2 to 4 weeks to turn it around. So again, I wouldn't be able to submit it until of course, council meeting on November 10th, it gets submitted back to them, it would probably roughly, it's going to be 2 to 4 weeks after I submit our approvals, council approval. So I would expect it to P December, when we'd probably have that final paperwork.

- So essentially authorizing this today, though we're pretty much consenting that this is not going to be in 2021's budget. So, I mean, what is that? Is that also with the presumption that we're not doing any debt service on this in 2021?

- I see what you're saying, because then that would say there should be a payment in 2021.

- Right. And I understand it won't show up as an expense, but I'm curious if we've accounted for any debt service on that in 20...

- Well tell you every year I take into consideration and expectation on what their debt service is going to be for the following year. And again, this is another year where we are expecting to, we would like to take funding through much earlier in the year. And if we take the funding through early in the year, then we do have a first year of debt service payment, and instrument on anything we borrow in 2022. So there is an assumption of 2020, I'm sorry, 2021 borrowing. There is an assumption that I will have extra debt service due in our second payment of the year for that. So what I would say is, there's an estimate out there right now, I can't say I specifically took the debt of interest payment that would be due for this one fifth of the 340,000, it would be relatively small, but that's iteration, but there is an estimate and for, to include interest for anything that's about in 2021. So I'm just being honest. I did not interpret, particularly take this one into consideration, but there is an estimate for 2021 borrowing built in. So I know every debt schedule that we have. I know how much I owe for everything that's already been borrowed and then we make an assumption into our debt service due in 2021.

- Okay. I'm going to support this today reluctantly, only because, it's one of those things where I think it's... We're kicking the can down the road on this again. And I understand why it's being proposed this way, but if I could maybe make one request, and that is when this goes on, the council meeting, when we're looking at the order of the agenda, perhaps this item could go after we have the budget discussion.

- Any further questions? Any other discussion? Hearing none I'll entertain a motion.

- Motion approved.

- Motion approved by Alder Corpus-Dax.

- Second.

- Second by Alder Galvin. All those in favor, say aye.
- Aye.
- Oppose. Motion carries. Okay, good. Update with possible action on tax litigation matters pending before the tax appeals commission and in circuit court, legal, is this something where we need to go into close session?
- [Attorney] Yes, I would recommend that this is something we go into closed session for, if there are questions regarding these items.
- Okay. So first I will ask, are there any questions regarding these items?
- Let me go into closed session.
- Okay, so motion by alder Johnson. Is there a second?
- Second.
- Second by Alder carpus-Dax. Alder Johnson, would you read the language?
- The committee may convene a closed session pursuant to section 19.85 subsection I, subsection G Wisconsin statutes for the purpose of confirming legal counsel for governmental body who is rendering oral or written advice concerning strategy would be to be adopted by the body with respect to litigation, which it is or likely to become involved with the committee will thereafter reconvene an open session pursuant to section 19.85 sub section 2 Wisconsin statutes to take action on items discussed in closed session, if appropriate and to consider the remainder of the agenda.
- Okay, all those in favor of going into closed session, say aye.
- Aye.
- Opposed. All right, we will go into closed session. So we'll wait and all alders may stay on, but whoever's running. The meeting needs to put people into the waiting room then. Director Dorff, are you taking care of moving them in, or...
- Just give us the signal when we can do this.
- So we're meeting people in right now, and we are recording.
- Move that we returned back to regular business.
- Motion by Alder Johnson to return to regular order of business. Is there a second?
- Second.
- Second by Alder Galvin. All those in favor, say aye.

- Aye.
- Oppose no. Motion carries. I'll entertain a motion on what we discussed, Alder Johnson.
- Motion to receive a place in file.
- Okay, motion received a place in five Alder Johnson, second by Alder Corpus-Dax. Any further discussion? All those in favor, say aye.
- Aye.
- Opposed no. Motion carries. Back to the agenda item, number 8. A resolution authorizing 2020 transfer of \$45,000 from contingency for legal expenses related to Georgia specific, tax appeal for real estate, and personal property.
- Move to approve.
- Move to approve by Alder Johnson.
- Second.
- Second by Alder Galvin. Discussion? Hearing none. All those in favor, say aye.
- Aye.
- Oppose no. Motion carries. All right. Item 9. Reported the claims committee. There was one item on claims, are there any questions? Nope. What do I need to do? Receive and place on file or proof?
- Motion to receive and place on file.
- Okay. Is there a second?
- Second.
- Second by Alder Galvin, all those in favor, say aye.
- Aye.
- Oppose no. Motion carries. Item 10. A request by Alder Wery to the finance committee, which States, due to the ongoing reasons of inadequate staffing, and prioritized enough tasks in our law department, I'm requesting we hire a city ethics incorporated, or similar qualified party, to draft revisions to the city's code of ethics and code of conduct as recommended in the 2018 findings paid for by the city of Green Bay. And I need to read from a request from Alder weary, who could not be here. When we first implemented the new ethics policy and revised ethics ordinance, we knew there would be changes to help avoid unintended situations or misuses. The city council hired and paid for these revisions over two years ago, Alder Wery goes on and says, I feel it's very important to make these changes in order to get a clear, fair policy ordinance in place. Although Wery he also says, it is

time to put the resources into making these changes or suspend the entire ordinance policy. It is complete, and he concludes by saying the process is broken and has great potential to be abused. So that is the statement from Alder Wery. All right. So let's talk about hiring someone, doesn't sound like we have a lot of money, but okay. Any discussion on this?

- So this is the Attorney Chavez. I did doubt you a couple of firms provide assistance in drafting ordinances, in order to determine whether or not there was well availability, but then more importantly, the costs. And the estimates that I received were between 10,000 and 20,000 for drafting of an ordinance, depending on the amount of work that's required, as far as attending meetings, receiving input to do revisions and what.

- Alder Galvin.

- All right, thank you, chair. I will have to say I sit on that committee, and right now we're having a hearing on a complaint, and we are finding that in this hearing, in some of the areas that we're looking at, the current document we have is out of date and we're having some difficulty with that. And I will have to say I've been on this committee since I became an Alder. And there's been a couple instances in the past where these documents have made it very difficult for complaints to be filed, put through the the litigation process to see if it actually there was a violation or not. At the same time, I also understand that our legal department is, in my opinion, overwhelmed. There's many ordinances, not just this one that have been languishing on the shelf waiting to get done for years. And I understand that everyone in the law department is working to the utmost of their abilities. There's just not enough bodies. And I'm not sure though, if starting to piecemeal out all our ordinances that have been waiting in this manner is really cost effective. Or if we're better off looking for a more permanent solution by hiring, you know, full-time or part-time staff, to accomplish this. With our budget right now, I'm just not sure if this is the way to go at it, or if staff in a lot department can give us some insurances or some kind of a timeline that they maybe think that these ordinances could be addressed, and fixed, and then put into effect.

- That is difficult to assess just because the needs of the department change on a regular basis. So we were originally hoping to have the ethics ordinance finalized and brought to the board in September. And then with all of the litigation that has come up because of the election, that has severely knocked our timeframes back. In addition with the new things that are coming through, as far as litigation goes at poles. It affects staffing in a sense that it holds me from it, and then it pulls our paralegal from it as well. And then when there's a significant briefing required, our legislative attorney, unfortunately, is one of our better writers. And so she gets pulled into litigation whenever we have to conduct something in-house as well that requires a brief. So all that to say, I wish I could tell you that we will have this done by January, we'll have the sign ordinance done by February, we'll have the chapter 33 done by March, but what ultimately happens is the needs of the city undertaking priority over things that we're drafting. And that just means keeping things running on a day-to-day basis. I have one person who's dedicated to primarily records, requests and contracts. You will see it in our budget comments that the records requests were exponential this year. They were just astronomical. So the amount of time that was required to be placed on that, which is mandated by law, just kind of be clips to everything else. And then contracts, if we don't have somebody dedicated to making sure that contracts happen, then the activities of the city falter, because we are holding things up. So those take priority. And then of course, I have a city prosecutor who is dedicated first and foremost to handling things within municipal court. So she accepts additional work as she's able to, but, you know, the municipal court keeps her very, very busy. So with those, I would say that, you know, we try to

reprioritize as we're able to, when we are making determinations, as far as what's getting done first, our analysis is always based on what's going to create the most liability for the city, or what has the deadline. And unfortunately this year, we've just been hit by a lot of deadlines. And then you add in time off, either due to family needs, or, you know, COVID concerns. And it just means that, we've gotten pushed behind. So I don't have a solid timeframe for you, I would not provide you with a solid timeframe either, just because I think that there are too many factors that affect it. But other than to say that, you know, we share your concerns about making sure that things get fixed. Like, I don't like our ethics ordinance, I feel like there's a lot of places where we can improve things. And then we also wanted to do it comprehensively. So not just doing the ethics ordinance and the code of conduct, but also looking at, you know, the process that's in place, should there ever be another efficiency to remove somebody that needs to be clarified as well. And then also the procedures that should be followed. We have a lot of ambiguity as far as the procedures themselves. So, you know, we share the same concerns. It's just, we don't always have the bodies available to draft.

- I just need to ask the host, Attorney Bungert, is trying to get in, has been trying for a while, she's calling from a number 6158068 So she's texted me and she has said she's in, does anybody see her out there? So I will suggest to her that she tries to go into the zoom meeting again and do it again, Okay. Okay. Who was next? Alder Scannell.

- Thank you, Ms. Chair. This is for our attorney. Do you feel that not only with these items, but with all your work in general, that you are understaffed? That you need another full-time or part-time employee? And 2-part question. If we looked at these ordinances, and prioritize them, which one would you recommend we look at to farm out if we need to do that? We decided to do that, whatever.

- So I think like every department we have gotten to the point where we are no longer able to keep up with the demands of the city. And so, yes, I mean, we could always use more bodies. I've actually said that we've probably used 7 attorneys and we certainly have 4, just based on the number of, you know, what we've done as far as research goes. But, you know, we make do with what we have. Now, as far as the prioritization. So like I said, kind of changes based on what is happening. So for a while, I would have set some top priority was going to be ethics. As we have started into election seasons, we're really up to date, there've been some challenges with the inspections this year, we found a workable solution, but it is something that we really want to get completed before the next election cycle, which could be as early as February. And so that one, I think is trumping the ethics at this point. And then chapter 33 really needs to be revamped before we start getting into the renewals for next year. And then on top of that, I think everything kind of gets pushed down because we have building and inspection codes, building and housing inspection codes, I believe it is. That we need to demonstrate to the state that we are bringing our code into compliance. So I would say that right now, our top priority is getting that one completed. And then I would probably say it would be fine. And then a tossup between ethics and chapter 33. Whereas 3 months ago it would have been ethics, then probably signs, and then 33.

- Okay. So let's just focus then on, the request is that we hire a qualified party to draft revisions, and that would cost, you said between \$10,000 and \$20,000.

- Correct.

- But it is something that our law department can handle, given time. And we can't say exactly how much time, so that is correct as well, right?

- Correct.

- Okay. Committee or other alders, any thoughts on that specifically? I would personally not be comfortable in spending another 10 to \$20,000 on legal. We just talked about other things, and we are going to be needing other monies when we get to the budget. And I would not be in favor of doing that. I think we just need to wait, see if our legal department can get this done. And I agree that it needs to get done. Anyone else. First Alder Johnson then Alder Steuer.

- I think there's a second piece to that communication with which at least we ought to approach, which is if it's not done, should we suspend the actual ordinance? I don't know if we can actually do that. I mean, the attorney Chavez, could you comment on that piece of it.

- So it's a little bit unusual because, that is something that what we will... No, what I would actually recommend at that point is we just repeal until we get it revised. And that would go to probably the ethics board for them to review. Yeah. I believe it would go to the ethics board to basically repeal it until, we have something to replace it with. You know, we have ability to not enforce necessarily, but not in the case where we have a due process hearing involved. So either we have it in place, or we need to take it off the book.

- Ready? Alder Steuer did you still the comment?

- Yeah, it might be. Thank you chair. This might be a little bigger picture, look at it. I think one of the issues of, you know, all their worry and maybe some of the other Alders have, like when we bring communications in and we're looking at doing ordinances, you know, we're thinking that they might be done in a timely fashion, but according to the attorney Chavez, it looks like we're up against, with a number of things. So I don't know if there's some way, for sake of transparency, if there was a way to look at what we have in the pipeline, as far as the different ordinances... I mean, we're going to be looking at housing next year, you know, amongst others. And I just would like to know, do we need to hold back, and not ask for things? Or do we need to at least see where we're at? Are we halfway through one ordinance? Are we two thirds of the way through another ordinance? I think for us alders we need that information, so that we can move forward and try to make some decent decisions.

- Let's stay focused on this.

- I know you're focusing on that, but that's kind of, that's gotta be thought of too.

- I have a suggestion, Alder Wery he was not able to make it. This was Alder Wery's... I really think he, this has gotten to be a much bigger discussion. I wonder if we might be able to hold this when we don't have a budget to look at afterwards. If we could just hold this till the next meeting, would the committee be all right with that.

- I would be okay with that. That's a good motion.

- Okay. Motion by Alder Galvin then, to hold till our next finance meeting. Is there a second?

- Second.

- Second by Alder Corpus-Dax, discussion on holding. In that case, all those in favor, say aye.

- Aye. Oppose no. Okay, motion carries. We'll hold this till our next meeting. All right, here we are, the reason for the meeting, the review and approval of the Mayor's recommended 2021 budget, including out of State travel requests. So this is how I think we are going to do this, this evening. I will have the Mayor do an intro, we will probably take in an hour to 2 hours. I'll see how things are going, but we can't all be sitting here. We've already put in, over an hour for this first part of the meeting. And we will run it as a regular meeting. Let's have some discussion, before we begin though, this portion it was brought up. Should we allow members of the public to speak? Who would like to speak on that? Alder Galvin.

- Well, it would be nice to have the public speak before, I think. What we're going to be doing here is actually flushing out the proposed budget and coming up with what we feel is going to be the permanent budget. And, you know, I just wonder if that might be better save for the actual council meeting, where that will be done formally. It seems to me that in the past, we haven't done it, one because this could be hours upon hours long. And two, the comments they make could end up being a moot point in the end.

- And 3, because they have had an opportunity in the public meeting to speak if they wanted to. I think we have to also remember that, that they got an opportunity to speak.

- I haven't allowed it at this time, for those very facts, and I think I haven't heard any complaints from any of my constituents during any budget process, because they weren't allowed to speak at this portion of the process. So, I would... My recommendation would be that we do it as status quo and we save the comments for the actual council meeting.

- Okay. Alder Johnson, Alder Corpus-Dax. Alder Corpus-Dax.

- I see this as a regular personnel finance meeting, and we've never not allowed public to speak at those meetings. So I'm fine with having the public here, speaking. I don't think we have a whole lot of public here, so I don't believe it's going to take very long, if we do allow them to speak. I think that we should allow them to have, the time to speak in the beginning of the meeting, and then we can move on from there. I'd hate to have to wait until the end, wait until we get through all of this, and then just allow them the chance to speak at that point.

- Thank you Alder Corpus-Dax. Alder Johnson.

- Is that a motion? No, well, I'm asking if you have any comments, we're having some discussion.

- I think what I would prefer to see is have the Mayor maybe give us this overview, assuming that that's the intent. And then I would like to at least allow members of the public to speak if there are any in the call that would like to do that. To Alder Corpus-Dax's point, I don't think there's a ton of time on the call.

- I would like to do it this way, I would like to do it at the beginning before the meeting starts to allow members of the public, if they wish to speak and to give them 3 minutes, and to have that be the time that they can speak. Because again, there was a time that was set aside for them to speak, and they will be speaking again, if they want to at the city council meeting. So I would like to do before we even started to the budget. I think it will break it up too much, if we let the Mayor start, and then we'll let the public go. But I wonder if the Mayor has any comments, or if anyone else has any comments?
- No, I don't have any comments, perfectly happy to have the public make some comments right now if that's what you as chair would prefer. So whatever the committee decides fine by me.
- I make a motion to open the floor for interested parties.
- Second. The motion's been made and seconded to open the floor for interested parties to speak on the budget. You'll be given 3 minutes to speak. All those in favor, say aye.
- Aye.
- Opposed. Motion carries. Is there anyone from the public who wishes to speak?
- We have Michael Shea. Well, did he raise his hand? I didn't see him raise his hand. If you wish to speak, please raise your hand. Okay, Michael Shea is raising his hand. Celestine, do you have a timer that we could put up, please?
- [Celestine] I am actually not running this meeting, I'm attending, not running.
- All right. Who could be our timer for us?
- [Joe] What I can do is, I can just keep track of 3 minutes, and I can let the person know when 3 minutes is on. Thank you. Okay, Director Faulds Will keep track. Okay, Mr. Shea, proceed. And please state your name and address for the record. You need to unmute yourself.
- Mike Shea 275 I Woodstock Court. First off, I just want to say, as far as raising your hand goes, there's a lot of people without cameras, and I did raise my hand in the function on zoom. I don't think that a lot of people that can do what I just did, just so you know, public wants to speak, you'll have to find a different way. But to my statement, when we need to increase the bottom line, you have two options, you can increase revenue, which in this case is raise taxes, or you can cut costs. Last week when the Mayor presented his proposed budget, I asked what areas were found to cut costs. Mayor pointed out cost savings, and travel, and training was quite proud of that. After digging into the budget, I found that the answer seemed a bit disingenuous, because if you look on page 28 of the proposed budget, the Mayor explains it travel and training, as well as the department administration have cut costs, not by choice, but because of the environmental factors outside the control of the city. So what this means is having less elections next year, and COVID changing the landscape of how we travel in train, those two areas automatically went down. There was no look and see, how we can reduce costs. You just kind of took the low hanging fruit and said, "Hey, great. We're cutting costs." So my challenge would be, for this committee and the city council at large is to look for ways to cut costs, not just have things that happened because of outside environmental factors. If outside

environmental factors can cause positive change like that, then I would suspect that incite factors, could find greater ways to cut costs and waste. So, thank you very much for letting me speak.

- Thank you, Mr. Shea. If there's anyone else from the public would like to speak, please call out to me, and identify yourself. Just unmute yourself, say that you'd like to speak. Is there anyone else who wishes to speak? Last call. Is there anyone else who wishes to speak? Okay. This time I'll entertain a motion to close the floor.

- Motion to close the floor.

- Motion to close the floor by Alder Galvin, second by Alder Corpus-Dax. Discussion? Hearing none, all those in favor, say aye,

- Aye.

- Oppose no. The floor is now closed. All right, so we'll go back to the meeting. I first would like to preface by, thanking director Ellenbecker and assistant director Manley, for the hard work that they have done to put this budget together. I would also like to recognize the efforts of all of the directors in paring down as much as they could. We have lost a great deal of revenue this year. So we really are coming in with a, what I believe to be a reasonable budget. I like to think all of the alders that are attending tonight, which are Alder Corpus-Dax, Alder Gerlach, Alder Galvin, Alder Stevens, Alder Scannell, Alder Johnson, Alder Vander Leest, Alder Steuer, and Alder Burnette. Alder Lefebvre called, and she is ill, and has asked me to make some comments on her behalf at the appropriate times. Alder Wiry had another commitment, and he has also asked me to make a comment at the appropriate time, which I will do. And finally, I would like to thank Mayor Genrich, for bringing this budget forward to us, and that we have 213 pages. So Mayor Genrich, take it away.

- Thank you, chair Dorff, for those comments, I would echo all of them, especially the ones thanking Director Ellenbecker, and Pam Manley, and all of our department heads and staff who played a role in an enormous undertaking on their parts. So very appreciative of all the effort devoted to it. I'll dispense with some of my introductory comments that I offer at the public meeting that we had last week. And just kind of jump right into 2021. Pam Manley if you or Director Ellenbecker are able to allow me to share my screen, I can just share that presentation.

- All right.

- Yes, Alder Galvin, go ahead.

- And this happens every year, we have the actual hard copy budget book, and then we have several computer models of the budget, and as when Mr. O'Shea was making his comments, he referenced the page, and when I looked it up, it's something totally different than what he was referring to. Because I'm trying to do this off my laptop, can we use the paper copy or can at least try and make a reference for those of us using the paper copy, what page we need to go to. So we're all looking at the same animal, at the same time.

- Yes, we'll be able to give you what that electronic document page number is, and then we'll also tell you the page number in the book. So that whichever one you're following, we'll try to end every time we'll try and give you that reference.

- Thanks so much. I just, I hate feeling lost.

- Great point, great point alder Galvin. Thank you.

- Okay.

- All right, with that, we'll jump in. I'm just noting budget highlights. This is a pretty basic budget. So it's a, you know, it's a short list you're really prioritizing public safety, making sure that we're not using one-time budget fixes, which is, you know, sort of add to the structural problems that we've faced previously and would again, if we were to use one time funding. And then just continues to put the city on a sustainable fiscal path. This 3% request to increase in the mill rate, is not a request that I take lightly, but I think it is necessary in order to maintain those essential public services, including most importantly, public safety. So with regard to public safety, you know, coming into office, I think, all of you know that the prior budget took the number of funded police officers from 194 down to 180 in the budget that was approved for the current year we went to 185 by mid-year, and this proposed budget takes us up to 187. The highlight with that, in the addition of those 2 positions would enable us to create another team of Behavioral Health Officers to work directly with County clinical social workers kind of doubles our capacity in that regard. Thankfully, the County board did last week. And so if we were to add these 2 positions to the police department, we would be able to add that additional crisis intervention team, which I think has been very successful in addressing these crisis situations, which can be some of the most dangerous and violent for both our citizens, and our officers to face. And so I think based on the positive experience with this team, the need for us to do more in that area, we would love to expand upon that work and make that possible. Additionally, we have suggested adding another firefighter position back. This was held open last year for the reason that the Chief didn't feel, it made a whole lot of sense to run an entire recruitment class just for one position. So that position is being added back proposed to be at the 2021 budget. This just makes the point that, these are the only three positions that are being added, being funded in addition to what's being done in the 2020 budget. So no other positions for 2021. This peaks to, you know, what we're facing as a result of COVID in terms of revenue losses. So hotel and room tax, pretty significant, 190,000 proposed, drop there in 2021 investment income, 470,000, suspected that that will drop off, you know, some park revenue, Park and Wildlife sanctuary rentals are programing \$52,000 there. And then an increased costs, in the form of our Landfill monitoring requirement. But then some savings here, you know, 153,900 in the Gas, Oil and Lube line, just some reassessments on the part of finance, but then also some savings within Police Department given the fact that they will be using hybrid vehicles, we're bringing out more hybrids, so some savings there. And then that Travel and Training reduction, that we were able to make based on past practice and also given the fact that, that I think we're going to be doing a lot of trainings in 2021, at least for the foreseeable future. And then this, you know, a few different numbers here, just in terms of, of expenditure growth. The one really positive number here, that I pointed to in my presentation to the public relates to growth in the TEDS, so we have seen a 28% growth in TEDS, which has really, you know, it's tremendous. I think it's really important to identify, the prudent use of TEDS, and the way that they can act as a really constructive development tool. So it's important to note that, that that's been very successful for us. Also, you just see the, you know, the overall growth in valuation in the city, that's a big number there. And thankfully Green Bay continues to grow, you know, by and large we're sort of landlocked. So we have to be smart about how we develop and redevelop the city, but we continue to see value creep up, year after year. And then you see on the bottom, the 3% proposed increased in the city's tax rate. While at the same time, you know, there's that, there's, you know, that

difference between the equalized evaluations, which is actually seeing a reduction because, we haven't done that City-wide re-evaluation in so long, that there is that gap between, the increase in the assessed millwright and the equalized. And then director Ellenbecker, if you want to walk us through the next few slides, and I can chime in here and there,

- Absolutely. Thank you Mayor. Everyone knows that... Well, as you know, there are some limits in which the city must stay within for, at our budget time period. One of them is called the Expenditure Restraint Program. And so this is a calculation, I'm just kind of want to walk through it real quick. The city was fortunate enough to have net new construction of 1.55%, the state takes some factor of that, giving us a 0.9% increase that they allow us on expenditures. Then they take the CPI projection, that's a 1.4 that they rounded at about 2.3, that is saying that expenses can go up 2.3% over last year's budget, allowing us to go up taking expenses. Again, there's still more calculation behind the scenes, but that still allows us to go up just over about \$2.1 million that is the limit in which we can go up. And if we can stay within that factor, within that limit, we do get a state shared state aid amount of \$1,572,000. So it is definitely worth it for the city or the state within this. And we have to stay within about 2.3% increase from the year before. And that we will get a payment of about 1.6 in the following year. And so this has been an ongoing program. So we do continue to get about 1.5, 1.6, or that's where we're at right now, in this expenditure restraint program. The second limit is we called, It's a Levy Limit, same situation. They just want to make sure that those cities, stay within a calculated increase, a lot of levy increase. They take any adjustments that you took from the year before we get the adjustment of the net new construction, which I talked about before at 1.55, that gives us an increase in our levy. They subtract the personal property aid, again, kind of a complicated calculation. Anything unused last year we get to add back. So at this point, this calculation says, we are allowed to take, go up. Our levy can go up \$1.8 million, and that is where we are. The proposed budget shows us \$1.8 million increase in levy. So this is showing that, we are within our two different limits that has come down from the state.

- May I ask a question Director Ellenbecker?

- Yes.

- Our current proposed budget, is basically right at the limit. That means there would be no ability to add anything to the budget?

- No, that is not quite accurate on expenditure restraint, where the lower expenditure restraint at this time, and they levy the limit is, we are taking an adjustment that we're allowed to take, it's a debt adjustment. So at this point I have taken, when I did the calculation, I had taken a debt adjustment to match the amount that this levy is increased. We do have capacity either go up slightly or down... So we do have capacity to go up or down, based on this allowance in this adjustment that we can take.

- Okay, thank you.

- And this slide is kind of an interesting one, 'cause it just it kind of tracks the reduction in state aid that municipalities have seen over the last couple of decades. So if you use 1999, as the start date there. We're essentially down \$12 million in \$99, if you take us to the current day. So when you look at, you know, an \$87 million budget, \$12 million on an annual basis is a significant reduction in revenue, which is why many of us in local government are saying to our state leaders, you know, we really need increased, shared revenue support and, or some flexibility with regard to local sales taxes.

So at the municipal level, we don't have the authority to levy a sales tax like the County does. And so many of us at the local level, have been advocating for, as I said, increased, shared revenue on some flexibility with local sales tax.

- Mayor.

- Yes, Alder Galvin, go ahead.

- Thank you. Just a quick question on this. And it probably helps that you were in the legislature at one time. This reduction data, this was done by the state legislature, and the Governors, whoever they were at that time will reduce the state aid and then, gave us back the savings technically, that we've seen announced a few times over the years, is that how they came about this?

- Yeah. You know, I think it's, you know, it's been something that you can't put necessarily on either party. It's been a trajectory over the last couple of decades where there's just been less and less support for local governments. And, you know, talking with my colleague Mayors, just over the weekend, talking with a few folks, you know, we are kind of putting together a shared agenda, requesting some significant increases in shared revenue, and that access to the local sales tax, because, you know, we're in a really tight spot here. We're heavily reliant on property taxes, and we live under these levy limits, and so, you know, as I've said, it creates a situation, where you sort of overtaxed and underfunded at the same time. And something just has to give at a certain point.

- All right, thank you.

- And then this just kind of breaks things down by department. You know, not a lot surprising here, police and fire make up the vast majority of the... Or the majority, I should say, a little over half of the, almost half of the City's budget, which makes sense public safety, you know, should be the priority here. But then obviously, you know, public works a big chunk, parks and rec significant slice there. And then, you know, debt service is as another one there.

- Mayor on this one too, just for the public's information. I've had people tell me that our debt service is 17% of the budget, which obviously it looks like that. But when it says 9% comes from other funding, what other funding is that?

- Correct, you're right. Overall, our funding is our debt service is, and that is the amount of debt that is obligate and we do have to pay that in 2021. But the other fundings are... A general levy means, it's coming from the tech seller as the other funding is going to be your sanitary storm, the beach, and the tips, and parking, all those funding sources, we do pay the bill, but we collect 100% of that back from those different norm utilities, or those different divisions.

- Okay, so the, the levy on an actual homeowner, 8% actually comes out of that? It's not 17.

- Yes, that's correct. All right, thank you very much.

- That's a good question, alder, you know, you never want to see that number creeping up obviously, but Director Ellenbecker, could you speak to where we're at with regard to capacity for debt spending, allowable under state law?

- Yes. So both debt, the ones funded by the general lobby, and those funded by the other funding sources, sanitary storm, TIF, those all are used in the calculation for the state debt calculation. And as of the end of 2019, we were under 50% of what the state allows. They allow you 5% of your equalized value. And at the end of the 2019, we were at about 50% of that. So we're really at about two and a half percent of our equalized value.

- Okay, thanks Director. Any comments on this slide, Director Ellenbecker? Any comments here Director Ellenbecker?

- Yes, sorry about that. There's a lot of numbers on the screen, and matches the numbers that are in the book. It just shows you some history, on the different departments, and the different types of expenses, so you can see a 5-year trend. I think there was a question on why the IT information tech moved up quite a bit, and that is actually just a switch from, further down in the line, there's something called capital equipment. Last year, there was 450,000 in their budget, and this year it went to 144, down 300,000 and in the information technology line, and they went from 1.1 million to 1.4 and so went up about 300,000. It's really a switch from one line to another. We were putting something in what is an annual cost for software, and we're putting in a capital equipment. And since it's an annual cost, we put it into the normal operating budget, 'cause that wouldn't be really qualified more as an operating expense. So that was a large switch from one line item to another. Thank you.

- And then just another way of breaking down the city's expenditures, you know, big chunk coming from salaries and fringe benefits in the form of employee compensation there, and then breaks out the other costs. So here you see, you know, obviously positive growth in our property evaluation generally, for the last several years, up to, you know, nearly \$7.4 billion in terms of the equalized value. And then the assessed value, is significantly low or as we've noted, which really necessitates that city-wide revaluation. And then you see that, that divide again with the, you know, the mill rate creeping up, but then on an equalized basis, trending down significantly, again, reinforcing that point.

- Mayor, Mayor.

- Yes.

- Yes, thank you Mayor. I'm just wondering, you know, you'll look at some of these graphs, and, you know, the initial 2012 through 2017, you know, the equalized tax rates are higher than the assessed rates. I'm sorry, they get higher in the last couple of years. So as part of that do housing, or I don't know if both can talk about that briefly, you know, why are those changed like so much?

- Yeah, I mean, and that's really a big part of that is due to the under, under assessment of the property values in the city since we haven't had that citywide re-evaluation since 2004. The value of people's property has increased significantly, but the assessments have not.

- Okay. Well, that'll be interesting to see how the reveal will come into play down the road, but I'll let you continue. Thank you.

- Mayor, if I can jump in, and really take on just on top of exactly what you said. And I think it's just anyone, who's in good to try and sell a house now, right now, in most cases, the people are selling homes for more than they're assessed for. Back in 2012 or 13, in most cases your house was selling for what it was assessed for or less. And so it's really just like you said, it's the housing market, it's

the economy, how it has switched over the last couple of years on how the value of houses now has gone up and that on this chart.

- Yep, absolutely.

- Okay. So that brings us to the end of the presentation. Before taking questions. I do just want to make the point, prompted by Mr. Shea's question again, at our last meeting, I missed an opportunity to note a couple of changes, Director Ellenbecker noted one of them however, pretty significant changes in health insurance, offered to our employees, spouses of employees now will be required, to obtain health insurance from their employer, if it's offered. And then there's a support program in place to assist employees that are in that position, but that's a pretty significant change that we're asking of our employees, and we'll, you know, we'll bring in some pretty significant savings, as a result. The other thing to note, something that I proposed with the CRA last year, which was a reduction in the cost of living, increase for our employees from 2% to 1%, council reversed that proposal at our council meeting last year. But I am making that proposal again, unfortunately, you know, wish obviously I didn't have to go that route, but I am asking for that 1%, rather than a 2% increase. And it's important to know, and Director Ellenbecker can chime in here, or Director Faulds as well. I believe it's about a \$57,000 savings or expense if you were to bring that back up to 2%, but the savings in the out year, is even more significant. So in 2022, I believe it's in the neighborhood of 200 plus thousand dollars that that change would have on the city's budget. If council had agreed with my proposed budget last time around, you know, that, that would've made things a bit different, obviously, you know, saving in the neighborhood of \$200,000. So just wanted to note that as well. You know, we are asking our employees to deal with that reduction, in the cost of living and, these are tough times for everybody and, you know, so we recognize that.

- [Faulds] Mayor Genrich, I can jump in here. So, in regards to the health insurance, so right now we're looking at a decrease in a savings of about, I think, \$200,000. I think it was a decrease of about 1.3% around 1%. If you look at it, if we would've stayed with our health insurance and did not make that change, we would've had about a 4% increase, anywhere from, I think a 2% to a 4% increase. So that could have been a 200 to \$700,000 increase, to our budget if we did not make that change. So I think that's worth noting to the common council, that they did make an intentional change, and that did save about 200 to \$700,000.

- Right, and I should note that I think, you know, many alders are probably familiar with the benefits committee, but for those who aren't, they had a very significant role, in vetting these different ideas, and bringing them forward so appreciative for the input of our employees that serve in that capacity. So with that entertain other questions from council.

- There are no other questions, we will move on.

- Alder Dorff.

- Yes, Alder Johnson.

- Thank you. Mayor, I do have a couple of questions. You talked, with the addition of the 2 police officers, you alluded to the creation of a crisis intervention team working with the County. Can you just explain that a little bit more on that? I'm not sure that I understand how that works.

- Yeah, so that's a good question. There is this crisis intervention team that is existing today. So we have 2 officers that are Behavioral Health Officer trained, and they work in tandem with a County clinical social worker, to respond to crisis situations. With the addition of 2 officers going from 185 to 187, Chief and the rest of the department, they're going to be able to create another team of these crisis intervention trained officers to work with an additional social worker that will be provided by the County, thanks to County board approval of that position last week.

- Okay. Thank you for that explanation. Alder Dorff, if you don't mind, I have a couple of questions that are actually just more like overarching, and aren't specific to line items. Would it be appropriate for me to ask those now, before we get into line items?

- I mean, I'm not sure we will necessarily get into line items. We're going to be going department by department. So that's more of, of the vision that I have for this meeting. Would it be questions you're going to be asking of directors?

- Well, I have a couple of questions that would apply to all departments.

- Oh, let's try it and see. Go ahead Alder Johnson

- And some of these are a little bit more specific. So we talked about the loss of hotel room tax, and this was actually before I was elected, we did the deal with the County where I thought we gave up hotel room tax in exchange for the County being able to do that half a percent sales tax. Am I missing something there, in terms of how that operated?

- Nope. We can jump in there. Every municipality gets to keep a very small portion of the room, in between Vegas to keep 4% of the 8% that's collected. Overall 10% is collected, 2% right off the top goes to the CVB, and 8% is put into the bank. The city then gets 4% of that 8%. So it's a very, very small piece of the total amount that's collected. The city gets that 4%, and that comes into our operating budget. The remaining all goes into a pool and that helps pay for the KII convention center one, pays for the rest center helps pay for the KII convention too, and any remaining money, someone split the CBB, and then it's going to be going to the expo hall. So it's kind of a waterfall effect, but the city does get again, 4% of the 8% that's collected.

- Okay. Appreciate that clarification. One of the things that I've just noticed about some of the other departments, I look at like Bay beach, where it looked like, "Hey, we're expecting kind of almost to hit full revenue." But then on this side, we see like hotel room tax, where maybe we're not expecting to hit that. I mean, were these projections just sort of like... And I understand this is the era we live in, but it was kind of like throwing a dart at the wall, and taking your best guess at where you think it might land, or was this done in conjunction in consultation with some of the other municipalities?

- Yes. It was taken into consideration, Director Manley and I also attended a room tax commission meeting about 2 weeks ago. So Pam, if you have anything, you can certainly jump in, but we met with them, and there's your hotels at this are still about 33% capacity summer, making up to 50%, but it's pretty low yet we did... They have now gone through and projected out the next 2 years of estimated room tax, where they think they're going to be at, very, very conservative number. But again, we are working with all those running municipalities using kind of general similar assumptions. There is an assumption that really well into next year that the room tax is going to be lower than what it was in previous years. There is an expectation that there will be a packer season next year, but the large

amount of our... A large percentage of our room tax comes in really from year July to year December time period. So we do have over half of a year that there the assumption is that, hotels are still going to be a very low anywhere from the 30 to 50%. So there was quite a bit of discussion calculation. Again, it is an estimate whether you decided to put 20,000 back in it or take 20,000 out of it, you know, we were at 440 if I remember last year's budget, we may be at 250. Again, it's a projection, it's an estimate. It could be a little bit conservative, it could be. Well, you know, year over year, we could see the number growing, this year, we are not going to be coming close to hitting our number. It is an estimate. It's a calculated estimate.

- I appreciate that. Mayor, this question, I think would probably be for you. You alluded to the firefighter position, and you indicated that there was a position that we did not still last year. However did we budget for that position last year? And the reason I'm asking are we looking to fill a new position and when we left open, or was this just my position?
- It might be better left when we get to that department Alder Johnson. I would like perhaps the Fire Chief to answer that, but I don't want to start going to directors right now.
- Sure. I'm happy to wait on that. I just thought I'd bring it up...
- Wait on that one, wait on that one. Go ahead, what's your next question.
- Yeah. Okay, and this one goes to the span across multiple departments. So I think it makes sense to ask now, but that the budgeted losses related to interest or investment income, could we talk about that a little bit more detail?
- Sure. I can start on that one. Again, this is just a calculated an estimate. A year ago, we were at about 1.75 on an average of our return higher. I can see Director Manley saying it was even higher than that. So even could have been as high as 2% based on some long-term investments, and what we were getting in money markets. At this point, any money markets, we are fortunate enough if we're getting about 1.5, or maybe up to, okay, that that'd be a stretch. Okay, so we went from almost a 2% down to about 1.5. So our interest, has drawn and again, what that means is all also our longer term investments, some of the agencies and treasuries that we'll put out sometimes on what we call is our reserve. We've put out for a longer period of time of, you know, anywhere from 18 months to 3 years, those right at this point, we can't get them as high. So again, it is a calculated estimate, going from 700,000 down to, if I remember about 200 is what we have in the budget somewhere in that ballpark, it's a calculated number from any projections that we're hearing, that that number is not unexpected to rebound. It could be a quite a long time before that would be rebound back up.
- Okay, so it's really in response to the market conditions, and less about like a directive. I mean, COVID could be what's causing the market conditions, but it's really the market conditions, and how that fluctuates.
- 100%. It's absolutely markets and projected that that rate is not going to bounce back up within the next 14 months.
- Okay. And then just one last question. I remember I submitted a communication that's a while ago about doing it annual schedule. Should we anticipate seeing other fee adjustments, in the upcoming year? Or is that all been accounted for as we go through this budget process?

- There has been some of the adjustments taken into consideration. I will tell you that actually this past year, we took a reduction in liquor license fees that has not been taken into consideration next year, we haven't gone back to what their original fee structure work was. DPW, many of the departments continue to look at their fees and have some, have built in increases, in places where they feel that that would be necessary. Unfortunately, we're still waiting on the finalizing of what I think it's called many community code, so in this case, I might be referring back to our attorney Chavez for the answer on that. But I mean, that was one of the answers that was going to help make sure that on an annual basis that these rates were going to be increased. But I will tell you, each department does continue to look at their rates and see if there's a way that they can increase their fees. If it's feasible, either that they can justify that they are more expensive than what the fee is, or if it's sizeable dollars, I mean, we might have something that we only collect 10 fees and we may not have gone through that process of increasing the fees, but in most cases they are being looked at.

- Okay.

- Okay.

- Yeah. All right, thank you. We'll move on. We're going to begin with the common council page 15. And is that also the page on the electronic copy? Now, if you're talking, Director Ellenbecker, I cannot hear you.

- I'm sorry, I was...

- Okay. We're just going to start with page 15, which is common council. Are any questions on that? Is this also the page for those people using the electronic copy?

- Okay, the electronic copy would be online within the city website, and that would be it actually, it adds five pages. So it would be page 20 if you're on the electronic version, otherwise your paper copy of your page 15.

- So for every one of these, I'll just add 5 pages.

- Correct.

- I can handle that math. All right. Any questions for council? No, all right. We'll go on to mayor's office pages 19. Was there a question?

- No, at this point then either, usually we go through line by line, and we do actually re-approve the budget, by each line.

- That's right. We have to approve this budget, the council budget. Okay, so hearing no questions, I will entertain a motion to approve the budget on page 15, page 20 electronically for the conduct council section, our committee, actually that Alder Corpus-Dax.

- Second.

- Or did you have a question Alder Corpus-Dax?

- Actually I have a comment.
- Okay, go ahead, go ahead.
- I'm seeing that the budget, the proposed budget that we have in here we're going from a 2% cost of living increased onto a 1% cost of living increase for city staff. I, at this point would make a recommendation to hold the council budget and have gone through the rest of it. Because I feel like if we're looking for staff to potentially only receive a 1% budget increase, I feel like we have to take our share as well.
- We will not get any increase. Do you understand that part? That council does not get an increase.
- Right, I understand that.
- Okay, would you like to hold this, and see what happens later on?
- Yes.
- Okay. Motion to hold voting on this. Someone's got to keep track of that. Is there a second?
- Point of information.
- Yes, Alder Johnson.
- In Alder Corpus-Dax I'm not sure if the intent is to evaluate council salaries, but I'm just looking for legal perspective on that. Can we actually modify that? It's my understanding that you can like do it for a future elected session. Could we just get a clarification on that?
- [Joe] That's my understanding then Attorney Chavez can chime in as well. But my understanding is that, you cannot change the salary until the start of the next term. So you can't change it midterm.
- But the one thing we could do, is decide not to allow health or dental, so we still could hold that, 'cause that would be a deduction. It's a small deduction, but we still could hold it if you wanted to look at that portion of it. It's up to you, Alder Dax, it's up to you, Corpus-Dax. We can move, we can move on. We can vote on this one.
- Okay.
- Motion to approve.
- Motion to approve by Alder Johnson. Any second?
- Second.
- Second by Alder Galvin. All those in favor say aye.

- Aye. Oppose no. Okay, motion carries. So the council budget is approved. All right, Mayor's office pages 19 and 20, are pages 24, through 29, right. 24, 25. All right. Any questions, comments on the office of the Mayor? I'll entertain a motion to approve that question.

- Motion to approve.

- Motion to approve by Alder Galvin. Is there a second? I'll second that. Any comments? Okay, all those in favor... Yes. Okay, go ahead Alder Corpus-Dax.

- So as far as like, so with, because I've had questions on the increased boards or the Mayor's salary, because this pertained to that as well, as far as...

- The law covers that. And so we are not to make any changes that this was decided before the last Mayor was elected. So we cannot...

- Not until the next term that we could change that.

- Next term, we could change that.

- Correct. And I can step in and then maybe Director Faulds can step in if we need to. But yes, when it was voted on, it was approved to have all 3 years step up. There was a pre-arranged schedule on what the rates would be and what the increase would be year over year. So that has been on pre-approved.

- Okay. I look done, as I wish we would have bitten the bullet, made the raise completely that first year, so that every year it doesn't look like we're giving the mayor raise. There was a full raise approved. We tried to save the city some money, and we tried to eat out that raise over 4 years. That's not giving the mayor the full amount that we wanted to as a council and saving the city money. And now each year it's going to come up, it's going to look like we're giving him a raise each year when in effect, we saved the city money by not giving him the whole rates when we should have given it to him, I think. Go ahead Alder Galvin

- Just for a point of a historical fact, I think it was 8 to 12 Years since Mayor's office, has had a raise.

- Right.

- For one reason or another. And it was felt that it was time, with an election coming up and a new Mayor, whoever it would be coming into office, that that person would get a raise because it was justifiable for the responsibility that, that office bears.

- All right. Any other comments on the Mayors? I'll entertain a motion to approve this... Think I got one from Alder Galvin, did I?

- Yes. Is there a second? I'll second that. All those in favor of approving this part of the budget say, aye,

- Aye.

- Opposed. Motion carries. All right. The next part, you know what Diana, I'm going to let you say the electronic part. I'm going to say the paper part. Administrative services pages 29 and 30.
- And then the electronic version would be 34 and 35.
- I have a question from Kathy Lefebvre. She wants to know what the meal allowance is for. It's on page 29 and it's line item 52011.
- Correct. In the past years we used to have all their individual departments within admin services separated. And now either it's for poll workers, and they get a \$4 meal allowance for Election Day.
- So this whole meal allowance goes to the poll workers?
- Correct.
- Thank you.
- Any other questions on the administrative services? Yes, Alder Johnson.
- Thank you, chair. Director Ellenbecker, just looking at a couple things. One under equipment rental. Would you explain, what are we renting?
- Can you say the line item please?
- Oh, sure. 55120
- One moment please kind of drawing a blank on that line. Oh, it is election-related for Director Manley, but if you give me one more minute I'll look at details. It is election equipment, chargebacks. Thank you.
- Any other questions on that Alder Johnson?
- So I presume that that's a tangible expense that we are anticipating that, you know, cause I'm looking at almost a 30% increase in that line. I mean, is that a like a new equipment rental that's not being addressed perhaps through the grant that we received this year?
- It's for the \$1,200, is that what you're looking at?
- Nope, it's \$24,770.
- Oh, I was looking at new equipment.
- And in particular, when I'm looking at 2019 actual, I mean, we're almost double that price and I'm just trying to figure out if there's something new that we're doing there that necessitates that.
- I apologize, I'm just looking it up.

- Of course, the question comes into place with the grant that we did receive this year. I know that we purchased a number of things.

- I do have some details from Clerk Teske and it's really fees for the polling locations it's as you know, last year we bought express votes. So that is the amount of come off warranty. So that is going to be paying for express votes, it pays for our equipment of DS 200s. And now we also have a DS450. So that is paying for election equipment. So the newer ones that we've received in the last couple of years, the DS450, we just got this year. There's an anticipation that we'll have some additional fees for equipment for rental might not be the right choice, it is just equipment, but it's really to pay for the express votes, the DS200s and the DS450s.

- Do you think there'll be any opportunity or will there be any surplus from the grant that we received this year that we might be able to apply it forward looking at some of those investments?

- Not typically, you know, that would have been for directly expenses related to this election. These are ongoing annual costs that are being budgeted for next year. The grant typically, like I said, I believe the grant was really designed to pay for expenses for this year. Fortunately, we were able to buy this PS450, which was around 61, \$62,000 with the grant. This is just a pay for ongoing maintenance, service. And then again, that's for our own, some of the other equipment that we have.

- Okay. Two other line items in this one is, maybe a little bit broader speaking to 56302 cell phones. I've noticed a pretty significant budget increase on cell phones in multiple departments. Could you maybe shed some light on that? Are we changing our policy or?

- In this case, I believe there were 2 additional phones that were added for elections, for the clerk's office election staff, as they are we're you know, floating around, mostly due to this year's election and it was really related to COVID because of having them offsite, others are using their personal phones. So two things, it was a multi-purpose as they were at one person was expected to answer phones from home. Again, this one's able to give them a cell phone that was clerk related. And then this also, we knew could be doubled up and give us more resources as we went into this busy election between the August and the November election. And in some cases we had a 1-year, in some cases we have a 1-year contract on them, so we would have to keep them through sometime next year and then re-evaluate whether or not we can turn that phone back in.

- Okay. And then my last question for you, 59003 tax adjustments, could you just clarify as that, when we assess something, somebody appeals it and we have to be making a decision to forgive it. Is that essentially what that is?

- That's a portion of it. And then there's also on delinquent personal property. There are any small businesses that have closed within the last year and a half to 2 years, I'm going to kind of look that's when we do a write off, and so in these cases, these are delinquent taxes that we were expecting to get in. And in some cases they have closed. So we have to write those taxes off, delinquent personal property taxes.

- Okay, so this is really just a guess based on historical data,

- Correct. And historically year over year, we've been budgeting 20, and you can see historically, it's getting closer to 30 to 40,000, so we put a \$30,000 line item in there. So when this is the first year, we've increased it over the 20,000 for a while.
- If we were to spend over that budgeted amount, would you go to contingency for that?
- In some years, if it's over a period of a certain amount, but within the whole administrative department and we haven't spent over our whole budget in that case, we hadn't been going to contingency.
- Okay, thank you.
- All right, anything additional on this? I'll entertain a motion to approve then, administrative services, motion by Alder Galvin. Did I hear you say something?
- Yeah, motion to approve.
- All right, is there a second? Alder Corpus-Dax. Further discussion? Hearing none, all those in favor, say aye.
- Aye.
- Opposed. Motion carries. All right. We are on to Information Technology pages, 39 to 42.
- Which would be 44 to 46 on the electronic version.
- Any questions on Information Technology pages 39 to 42. Alder Johnson.
- I hope I'm not the only one with questions. You guys are going to get sick of me in earth, Director Hronek, if you could just shed some light for us in particular, I'm looking at contractual services and software maintenance, significant increases in those areas. Is this related to the shifting of things that was alluded to before?
- Or you had the line item or...
- No, I'm sorry. 53001 and 53020.
- Yes, that is correct. You'll see the, on the paper on the electronic copy on page 39. You'll see that that software maintenance went up 100%, but on page 41, you'll see, it went down 100%. So it is a shift.
- I had that one highlighted too. So good, thank you.
- Anything else?
- Okay, see, no other questions. I will entertain a motion to approve this section.
- Motion to approve.

- Second.

- Motion to approve by Alder Corpus-Dax, second by Alder Galvin. All those in favor say aye.

- Aye.

- Opposed. Motion carries.

- Thank you.

- Let's go to law page 49.

- That's page 54 electronically.

- Yes. If anyone besides Alder Johnson. No. Okay Alder Johnson, go ahead.

- So one thing I just wanted to ask attorney Chavez about, and I do have an amendment one offer to something else, but it was underneath, the narrative that you provided under a records request. We talked about a substantial increase in records requests, which obviously takes away from staff's time to perform other things. Could you just maybe talk about what's driving the increase in those requests?

- It's really just whatever happens to generate public interest at the time. So we did receive a number of requests related to the election and then actually Deputy City Attorney Bunkers on the line as well. So she can actually give you a pretty good explanation of what else has been the priorities. But I can tell you that the election took up a bunch of them.

- Okay.

- Attorney Bungert.

- And before attorney Bungert answers, the reason I'm asking, should you want to, you know, like shed light on this? I'm trying to determine if this is a one-time blip in the radar, or if this is a trend that we should be anticipating.

- I can chime in on that. Good evening, everybody. As far as for this particular year, yeah, I would echo city attorney Chavez assessment that the spring election, and the results of that election, and the administration of that election, spurred a large amount of records requests, particularly with respect to email communications, which tend to be time-consuming simply because our searching capabilities are not super advanced and super specific. And so it requires a lot of manual time to review, read, redact all those records. So that was acute influx. As far as anticipating, how those requests will come in in future years, or for the next year, for that matter. It's difficult. A lot of it is driven by issues that are coming before common council, issues that are being heard by committees, things that are being picked up in the media. And that is unfortunately something that's out of our control and not something that we can readily anticipate. It kind of goes in ebbs and flows. Since I started with this study and our increased our number of records requests has increased steadily this year, I think in light of the pandemic, and in light of major issues going on in the community, I think

that kind of drove up the number of requests by not just individuals, but large community groups, advocate group, law firms, things of that nature, watchdog groups, whether we're going to see something similar like that next year is hard to anticipate.

- I would actually say, would anticipate an increase next year as well, given that we are dealing with an election in November. And so I would anticipate we're going to see a large number as well. And then we have litigation that has resulted in a number of records requests as well.

- So at least for 2021, I would anticipate that we're going to see an influx again.

- I have a question.

- Yes Alder Galvin.

- It's either for attorney Chavez or Bungert. With the anticipation of the police department obtaining body cams. Has that been factored in that the ammonia requests that will result from that, under the same records to request? I mean, is there any thought as to what that's going to cost us to have staff go through and redact the videos and the audios and everything else related to that?

- So that is partly, that will only partly affect our processes that will primarily be handled by the TD. They do have their own records custodians, we get pulled into handle or chest just, I should say with PDs records when there is something that potentially needs assistance. So I'll let chief address that. But for the most part, those are something that would happen at the police department level.

- And would this be more appropriate discussion for bonding? Or is this a discussion for right now? Diana, I cannot hear you. Let's say it's for now. Because I think he's asking whether or not they need more attorneys because...

- But they're not any more attorneys. Okay, thank you.

- Yap, so I think the chief can explain what their record staff would have to do and what this new software they have II.

- Yes, Chief Andrew Smith here. What I'm thinking is that we met with Appleton and we looked at them and kind of used them as a model for what it would take us. We're certainly going to have a lot of requests at the beginning and they said it tapers off. We're hoping that we can handle it with the staff that we currently have. We may have to change some transcriptions job description, or transcription positions to help with the redaction. We're seeing that maybe we have a little bit of a wiggle room there in the transcription side. So we may have to reclassify some of those prints to redaction specialists.

- But if we do reclassify that.

- It means a reclassification of a salary increase, I would guess it would be a small salary increase. Yes, sir.

- All right, thank you, sir.

- All right, yes Alder Johnson.
- Thank you chair. I'm looking at account 53021, legal expenses. And here's where I would like to offer, the proposed budget, to increase that amount by \$300,000 to 337, 500.
- I will step in that motion.
- Yeah. And this is for the benefit of those watching. This is recognizing that we have a couple of... we may be engaged in the coming year that will require some funding.
- And one thing that I can actually help with this number, 'cause I double-check things at the prompting of Director Ellenbecker, but the school district is currently cost sharing with us on one of the litigation items that we use this for. So we anticipate that the number would actually be \$80,000 less than I quoted. So it'd be 220 that we would need about 300.
- Would you like to mend your motion?
- 220 is the number that I'm offering up.
- And I will second that.
- So it would be 220, meaning a total of 257, 500.
- Yes.
- All right, good job. Anything else? Okay then we will, I went to a motion to accept the law budget as amended.
- What was that number again? I'm sorry, what was that number again that was mentioned?
- Well, it's an additional \$220,000. I think Alder Johnson has a total.
- What was the total again?
- 257, 500, right. You can add that on that line.
- Thank you.
- That's good, thank you.
- I'm gonna entertain a motion to accept the law budget as amended.
- Motion to approve.
- Alder Johnson, do I hear a second from you? You're like frozen, I think.
- Second, second, second.

- Okay, there you go, now I got it. I thought you were speaking, I couldn't hear anything. Okay. Alder Johnson seconded. All those in favor Say aye.

- Aye.

- Opposed. Okay, motion carries. Alright. As amended and all of these. The next item is pages 54 and 55, the municipal court budget.

- That would be page 59 and 60 electronically.

- Are there any questions on the municipal court budget?

- Motion to approve.

- Motion to approve by Alder Johnson, is there a second? I'll second it, okay. Unmute yourself alders so that I can hear you say all those in favor say aye.

- Aye.

- Opposed. Motion carries. So municipal court is approved. Human resources, pages 62 and 63 in the book,

- 67, 68 electronically. Any questions. I noticed that flex benefits on 51501 is down a hundred percent. Did that just probably move somewhere else?

- Yeah, that's correct. That got moved to the health fund.

- To the health fund, okay.

- Director Ellenbecker that's correct, right?

- I couldn't figure out where it went, so thank you. Any other questions? Yes Alder Johnson.

- Thank you. Director Faulds, 53001, contractual services. Could you just touch on what that is?

- Yeah, definitely. So that's you is mainly for either legal services, or it's used for maybe a consultant for strategic planning, sometimes it may have to be team development for senior staff, I think it's also in there. And then also some coaching for employees that can be used for that as well.

- Is this just kind of an estimate or are we planning a specific project?

- No, so I... Thank you. So there's also one other item that I missed is arbitration as well. For the most part, whenever we have legal services, the department that's using legal services, pays for the bulk of that, but there are times where either HR will help out to the extent we can. And then also if we have our own legal questions about HR matters, we talk, we use it for that as well. So I believe in like 2016, this was like 60,000 and then it got cut down to 20,000. So we've been using pretty close to 20,000 every single year. And if you look at where we're at right now, projected, I think is for 2020, we're at about 5,000, 6,000 based on some of the legal invoices coming in, I know we're going

to be very close to 20,000. So I mean, each year it kind of fluctuates, but if we ever have to go to arbitration or anything like that, we can use those funds for that as well.

- Okay, and I believe we do have MUN contract we're negotiating next year. Is that correct?

- Well, there's one ongoing right now, and then there's another, the transit mechanics is starting this year as well.

- Okay, so those expenses, if we have to go to arbitration, those expenses would likely be incurred next year?

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

- Okay. Any other questions or comments on human resources, pages 62 to 63. See no hands. I would entertain a motion to approve.

- Motion approved.

- Motion approved by Alder Corpus-Dax. Is there a second?

- Second.

- Second by Alder Galvin, all those in favor, say aye.

- Aye.

- Opposed no. Motion carries. Community and economic development pages 75 and 76

- Electronically, that would be on page 80 and 81.

- Alder Johnson, go ahead.

- Thank you. You have to renew your WIC. So I have, in my district, been receiving an incredibly large volume of communications about rats. And I know that I've talked, and at least I've seen the numbers come from your department about the number of complaints that the city's receiving, but that doesn't necessarily reflect what people are experiencing if they don't call your office. And the other thing that I'm thinking about, is the report that working put out, you know, which put us on a list, which is basically, I mean, it's based on the number of service calls they're getting. So there's some legitimacy to it, in the sense that I don't like the list, but they are getting the service calls. And so one of the things that I would like to maybe float here and I am looking to you for a reaction, but I'm also looking to you maybe for some advice on what you count would make the most sense. I would like to propose that the city creates a matching grant program with specific details to be hammered out, by your department, a matching grant program, to contract professional services for the eradication of rats. So the number that in my mind, I was going to put out with \$10,000, I'm happy to put that in the form of the motion, but I'm also willing to maybe have you respond to that first.

- Well, out of everything I studied in my budget, rats was not one of the things I thought would come up tonight, but I happened to... We just did some numbers on rats and you're right. People have not been calling in as often as they have in the past. So we were not aware of this influx of rat complaints. That being said, how we've done this in the past, of course has been an education program, sweeps neighborhoods, sweeps enforcement, which helps knock that population down. If you wanted to do some type of a matching grant, I think the best, my opinion, the best place for that money to come from would be probably neighborhood enhancement funds. We have enough money in that account to set that up. And that's certainly, I think would qualify as an eligible expense using those dollars. So I would recommend it would come from enhancement funds. And Diana, do you see any issues with that coming out of enhancement, a program like that?

- Right now that money is bonded money I'm not saying we couldn't do it, it's just a consideration we'd either bonded forward or we have used deep trust fund on for that program with the expectation that we've done, the last of our borrowing for different hand enhancements and then going forward, we would be using tax increment is closed for housing programs. So I just want to explain that someone that that's money for funding sources for that, I think that'd be okay.

- So if that's a qualifying expense, would it make more sense to leave this out of the budget discussion and bring that as a separate item before the RDA? Because the neighborhood enhancements have already been allocated.

- Maybe.

- Correct. Well know the other thing we could do is, it may qualify under block grant as well, under like neighborhood improvements. So it probably wouldn't be a bad idea to take it to RDA because those are some options.

- But I want to think about it before city council made me, because obviously if I put it in the budget, then it secures its space if a majority of council supports that, if I've got to go before RDA, I still don't have a guarantee. So let me just think about that over the next week on how I'd like to proceed with that.

- Alder Galvin.

- Thank you. And I mean, this whole thing about rats, a private company that makes money out of people being concerned about rats or an overpopulation of rats, puts out a report which generates more complaints, which generates more business for them. We spent, I think it was \$5,000 in the County trash there's still from what I heard or read in the news, literally hundreds of unused rat traps, sitting at the museum, waiting for concerned people to come in and pick it up. I wonder truly, if some of these rats really rats, or people find some evidence of something, someone says it must be rats and it's like social media. So, I mean, we have a rat problem when in reality, we don't, I mean, we have less calls, and I think when we did have the hysteria before about rats, and the city went out and investigated, or they found some concerns, and I think they did a very good job of education, and holding the property owners sensible for allowing habitat to be maintained on their property that invited these rats to come and live within our community. I'm concerned about spending thousands of dollars for stuff that I think private homeowners should be taking care of themselves and with the city's assistance, and the fact that we have hundreds of rat traps available that have already been paid for by tax dollars. I'm really concerned about this money being used then to hire private companies,

to do this. When we already have the staff, we have the processes, and we have the free rat traps to hand out to those that are concerned or if the city staff does find that there are issues within certain neighborhoods. Thank you.

- Thank you.

- Yes, Alder Johnson.

- Just a follow-up comment to that, because I did, you know, reach out about doing a neighborhood sweep, which I believe is what our funding was intended to provide. And it sounds like because staffing is a little short, I was told that that's not something we are able to do right now. So, I mean, are we doing anything right now to address the complaints that are coming in? Do we have the resources to do that?

- I'm sorry, Alder Johnson, did you say neighborhood sweep?

- Yeah, so we did, I think one, maybe two of those earlier this year, or it might've been last year. I work with do this, do that.

- When I checked with inspection staff, we had not received a large influx of rat issues. If we get a couple of rat complaints that are close together, we actually canvas that block as kind of an SOP to take a look at it right now. But as far as a larger area, I don't believe we've done that this year, just based on the fact that we haven't had the huge number of complaints.

- Right, and they did make a request recently, and unfortunately it wasn't something I was told that you had the stuff to do right now. So again, I'm happy to take this out of the budget discussion today. I'll revisit it perhaps with one of these other outlets we can approach it that way.

- Okay, we'll move on. Any other questions on this part? Alder Corpus-Dax.

- Line item 51402, clothing allowance. So as of today we've spent \$101 and 65 cents. Is that correct?

- Yes.

- Okay, and then we're looking to increase the budget for that 33%.

- Yes. So we do all of our clothing orders at the end of the year. So we've just placed that order for our standard inspection uniforms, I should say logoed shirts. So we'll be spending the normally budgeted amount. The reason that it's higher is because we actually added winter jackets this year. They have not had winter jackets since 2016. So we added the cost of winter jackets this year onto that budget, which is why there's an increase.

- Okay.

- I have a question from Kathy Lefebvre, Alder Lefebvre on line item 59008, neighborhood associations. And she's asking why it's going from 0 to 5,000.

- Diana, can you help me with those numbers? We have drawn down. Those are the neighborhood association mini grants, and I know that we've spent money with that mini grant program. So I don't think those zeros are...

- Oh, okay.

- What we did was there's normally \$10,000 that is funded for neighborhood mini grants. And that's normally in a different portion of this budget, it's usually in miscellaneous expenses. And I think this year we decided to move it into our departments. We have right now, I think we've got about \$4,800 pending, that'll go out the door this year. So we'll probably spend about 7,500 for those neighborhood mini grants. That being said, we know that associations are ramping down what they've been doing. Some of them haven't, some of them have, so we didn't feel the need would be there for the full 10, so we actually asked for 5 this year instead of 10. And just to jump in, yes, all the expenses and in the end has typically been budgeted on page 133 in our miscellaneous budget. You know, at one point I talked to the director and said, it's a program they manage, it's a program they watch over, and for some reason, years ago it was put in a miscellaneous budget. So I just asked if we get it moved out of miscellaneous and really put it in the department in which typically handles it. And so historically again, if you jumped ahead, we'll see that when we get to that page, but last year they spent about 11,400, the last several years, we budgeted \$10,000. To date, when this book was run, it had only spent \$400 but as the director had just said, they're going to spend a boat. She thought about 7,500 and as it's coming down. So this year she's only asked for 5,000 for this line item again, it just got moved ready to put it into the appropriate department who manages this program and get it out of a miscellaneous budget.

- Alder Johnson.

- Does that give you the flip? I mean, does this commit levy dollars for that purpose or does that give you the flexibility to use block grant or neighborhood enhancement as well?

- This is levy dollars.

- Okay.

- If the council wanted to move that money to neighborhood enhancement, that would be a council decision, but block grant, would limit the number of associations that could use it based on where they're located.

- And I'm not looking to move it or modify it, I was just curious if it gave you some flexibility by bringing it under your department, as opposed to the miscellaneous section of the budget.

- As it was in the budget, I would want some council approval on that if you want to choose enhancement, for example.

- Any more questions on community and economic development?

- Alder Dorff, I have a very small minor change I would like to request, this page.

- Okay.

- On the very last line item on page 76 paper copy, there's a line item called 59940, transfer out. And I'm going to explain it cause I'm surprised nobody asked why did all of a sudden we had nothing, and now we went up to \$59,000. And so I want to explain it, and then I need to change that by \$50, so what, within this group, we also have the weights and measures group also falls within in this category and per state statute you have to, for the amount of revenue you need to bring in, you also should have the same amount expense, or really the expenses, you should have your revenue should match your expenses. And within the expenses for weights and measures, there are some equipment and future equipment budgeted. So we have the amount of revenue they have and then the amount of expenses, this balance is the remaining expenses to again, have revenues match expenses. And the reason why there's a change this year is, it might've been there for a while, but our state statute says that you need to, again, you can't bring in more revenue than your expenses. So we had to show that the additional expenses, we had to show in the book. And so that is what is creating this line item. Unfortunately it should have been \$59,481, not 431, we made a \$50 miss as we made some changes, we didn't calculate it correct. So I'm asking whether or not we could change the line to 59,041, which is, it does increase expenses by \$50, but it does balance out our weights and measures division.

- Sure. So as when we would, with someone like to make a motion to amend that line item, to increase it by \$50.

- Motion to amend.

- Motion to amend by Alder Galvin. I'll second it. Any discussion? All those in favor, say aye.

- Aye, aye.

- Opposed. Okay. The budget isn't amended, that line item is amended. Are there any other questions on this portion of the budget before we vote on the amended budget? All right. I need a motion to approve the community and economic development budget.

- Motion to approve.

- Motion to approve as amended by Alder Corpus-Dax, I'll second that. All those in favor say aye.

- Aye.

- Opposed. Motion carries. Okay. Economic development is approved. Police department, pages 84 to 86. And electronically Diana.

- 89 and 91.

- Are there any questions? I believe I have one from... Let me see. Okay, this is from older Lefebvre. The item is 50506, packer overtime. Why is the request 3979, kind of that less than the 2019 actual?

- I am seeing it. I see the actual actually 563,000, and the revised budget is at 20 is about 337,000. Our projection for this year, as you know, due to very little packer season is on much down closer 150.

- That we understood. Yep, she understood that.

- One more time, what was her question?

- Well, she's asking why it is 397 instead of 563, but I'm thinking it's because of the January and February games possibly, but...

- This is a line, when we talk about expenditure restraint, we have modified this number to maximize our expenditure restraint, and we're able to maximize our expenditure restraint. We have modified this number and I can explain why we do that because all packer overtime is 100% reimbursable. So when you do exterior expenditure restraint it's based on what you budget. So we want to budget out the maximum. So what happens is whatever we do not budget for in the packer overtime, it is 100% reimbursable. So anything that goes over the amount that's budgeted, at that point, we do a budget amendment, and what happens is that it increases our expenses and our revenues, so we are using this line and so last year we were not able to, we had to reduce the packer over timeline a little bit by a couple hundred thousand dollars to stay under expenditure restraint, but also maximize it. And again, we have got approval and we have discussed this with our auditors, and in many cases, many municipalities do not even book like a packer overtime, because it is 100% reimbursable and they do a budget amendment. In this case, we want it to maximize and show, 'cause your expenditure restraint builds upon last year's number, that it pulls up on... So we want to be able to take all the capacity that we do have allowed through the state, through the state to maximize it. So that number did get reduced last year because of expenditure restraint. But as you know, this year, we will, obviously we're a projection is way down because of the last...

- We understood that part. And then my question for item 51399, I assume the pension, it got moved somewhere that it's down a hundred percent that line. Why is that down a hundred percent?

- I'm gonna start, and then I might have to look at assistant Manley. That is a line item that, it is from past, it's for insurance for when there has been somebody, an officer or who has passed away, in the line of duty and we have paid their wife or their spouse, and their spouse insurance. But now years over years, there are less spouses still living that we still pay this additional insurance, or this additional payment out. So that has been over time that the number that has continued to reduce. So we no longer have an obligation on the police side.

- Okay, thank you. Other questions on the police department?

- Alder Johnson and then I'll go... Well, you know what? Let's give Alder Steuer a chance. Let's just give him a chance. Let's give Alder Steuer time.

- Thank you Chair. I like Alder Johnson, he's good. Now, I was just going to ask the chief on... Let's see, item 53001, contractual services. Just, you know, just a little description of that please. It's on page 85 of those hard copy.

- I can jump in and just start while chief is looking at that line, and as you can see, it jumped up from 463, and went up from 32,000 up to 463,000, which is an increase of 431,000. And that is, there was just recently it got approved through personnel and that was outsourcing our crossing guards. So if you look at there's several line items that it affects, if you look at the second line on page 84 on your paper book, we have a seasonal salary of 372,000 that has gone down to 0, so there's a reduction of 372 in that line from last year's budget. And then there is also fringes and wages, clothing allowance,

and some personal supplies that we're taking out of several different line items and has been replaced with a crossing guard outsourcing our 431,000. So it's really been a, it was a switch, but I will then let the chief talk to you if you have any other additional specific questions on the crossing guard contract.

- Well, I think, I just wanted to know if that was a wash. I mean, was there a much of a difference in the monies on that, or also pretty close?

- I think it's going to be pretty close. And one of the things we're saving on, is the injured on duty. If we have one of these folks, that's a crossing guard that gets injured on duty, the company is going to cover that instead of us. So we saw that on several occasions where someone would slip and fall there twists a knee, and we would be on the hook for their injury, and their workers' comp. And now that'll be on the private company that we have. So I think it's a big win for us.

- Okay, that suffices, thank you.

- Thank you. Anyone else?

- Alder Johnson.

- Thank you Alder Dorff. So all their stories actually alluded, I wanted to know where those salaries were located previously. And it sounds like they were under seasonal salaries, correct?

- Yes.

- Okay, good. Chief, could you, and I don't want to get too far into the weeds in terms of how you manage your budget, but do we still have that mounted patrol unit?

- We do not have the mountain patrol unit. We eliminated that about a year and a half ago, and the horses have been sold.

- Okay. And then the other question that I have is related to the boats, how many boats do we have within the department?

- I believe we have 2, but Kevin Warych who's on the line is in charge of our Marine unit. He supervises that, and I believe we have 2, possibly 3, but I'll toss it to Kevin and let him answer that.

- We have 2 boats assigned to the Marine unit, they're both Zodiac. One was the coast guard vessel that we got for free and we're amortizing over 5 years, so we're getting about 70% of that money back from the DNR. We have a third boat, and that's assigned to the dive team and that boat spend in existence with the city for quite some years cause that previous to that as the fireboat. So, and then we have like a small Zodiac, which is equivalent to like a row boat and a floatable, but the essence is we have three boats.

- Okay. Okay, I appreciate that clarification. The other line item, I just want to hit, 55105 radio maintenance contract, I presume the stand sport that has seen obviously a very significant reduction. I just want to make sure that it's accurate and that we're not, you know, we missed, that we didn't miss a 0 or something. Could we maybe touch on why we saw such a reduction there?

- Yes, I can jump in there chief, and then you can add to it. If you see that just got moved to a different line item. Give me a moment, I should have had it highlighted before we get there. It was moved to software maintenance. So it wasn't... There is still a slight increase in software maintenance, but if you see last year's budget, there was 0 and it went up to 255,000. So I'm sorry, it's still 53020 in the paper book of page 85. We'll cut in the middle of the page. There's was again, nothing budgeted last year, and it went up to 255,000. The offset is on this page where we went down from 280 down to 24. And again, the real reason why radio maintenance contract, these truly are all different software programs that the police department has and then we're paying annual software maintenance contracts, somewhere years and years and years ago, they just continue to use this radio maintenance contract line, and we really wanted to move software maintenance into the software maintenance line. So it really is a direct move just trying to be more clear, and make sure that we're more consistent across all departments on which line item we're using. So truly software maintenance, is in the software maintenance line. Radio maintenance contract is when we work internally and get service on our radar police radios.

- Okay, thank you for that clarification. And very coincidentally, I also had that line highlighted.

- So the question for me.

- And then just one final question on this particular budget, 56303, data cards. This doesn't seem like something we've really budgeted for in the past. We had some expenses this year. What is that?

- I can start with that data card actually it's new. And that is actually, data card is really getting your, I think it's like wifi in vehicles, or I might actually have to turn it off to Mr. Hronek or maybe the chief Smith knows about it, but it's really, it's getting cellular service to either radios or to some equipment. So a data cards are they actually what you insert, to have that access.

- I would throw it to Mike Hronek who's much more knowledgeable about wireless software than I am.

- I'm sorry, could you repeat the question?

- Yeah, Mike, I'm just looking at the, we had some unbudgeted expense this year for data cards, and then of course we're budgeting for it now for next year. Just looking to get maybe some clarification on what...

- What your increase.

- Those are the data cards that are in there, mobile data terminals, and that's what, how the cramps or information back and forth between the records management system in the car and the CAD system.

- So is this something...

- It's for our squad car, sir, for cellular, it's inside the squad car?

- Have we previously not had this service?

- I believe we have, and I think it was just buried in another line item. Unfortunately, I don't have that answer right now. I do believe that Richard Canis is on the line, if we need to, just to him to tell us what line he was in. Otherwise I believe it was just when we just moved it, trying to be more, again, more transparent for exactly what we were expensing.

- Okay, if we're just moving it that's good enough for me.

- Awesome. Again, just cleaning out an account that was really buried with a lot of things that really didn't belong. I mean, they really wanted to make it more clear. So thank you, Rick, for explaining that. And that got also moved out of the radio maintenance line.

- Any other department? Okay, I'd entertain a motion to approve the police department portion of the budget.

- Motion to approve.

- Motion to approve by Alder Galvin. I'll second that. Further discussion? Seeing none, all those in favor, say aye,

- Aye.

- Opposed.

- Motion carries. I'd like to propose that after we finish the Fire Department, we take a 5 minute break where we'd be about halfway through. Would that be all right? Yes, I'm seeing some nods. Okay, Fire departments, here we go. Pages 95 to 97.

- And in the electronic version would be 101 and 102.

- Questions, Alder Steuer.

- Let me unmute here. Thank you Chair. For chief led and I had a chance to speak to him during the week, but I just wanted to... for 50099, department turnover is 21% decrease. I just wanted a clarification on what that stood for.

- If you want, I can certainly jump in chief and then you can always add if you want. As you know, the city of Green Bay, we've tried to budget more or less, a hundred percent of staffing but we also understand and expect that there are going to be some vacancies. So there is a number that the city has chosen to budget for. This year, we are budgeting at \$785,000. It's been bent as high as 1.3, which we know has been higher than we typically run for vacancies. This year's budget includes \$785,000 in vacancies. Then at that point, we turn around and take an allocation and put something in each one of the departments to try to show some offsets and some vacancies that we would expect. It's a budgeted number. Some departments, some years have a higher number than what is projected, some is lower, but... So what happens is, you are seeing a reduction in the fire department is becoming a little bit about a change in the allocation, the way we did it last year, but we also had a change in the, the reduction in the amount of turnover that we've budgeted.

- So Diana is that an overall city number, so to speak and it's divvied up accordingly to the various departments.

- Correct. Because knowing that we do budget a hundred percent and you do have some vacancies, it is just a way to, again, to just, you know, over time, that number has just been built in to try to make it by the stick number. Every year we do show, we do kept trying to calculate it in the, through an Excel spreadsheet we do to calculate, and then we do show, anywhere from a half a million to well over a million dollars annually savings based on open days, open positions. So that is a true number and over time we continue to have budgeted it, like I said, fortunately, we were able to bring that number down from what was somewhat of an unrealistic 1.3 million to closer to \$785,000 anticipation of open positions. But it is overall for all of the general fund we have each department takes a small allocation of that number.

- Okay. Thank you for that. One other line item 51212, which is workers compensation, I guess just checking one, you know, just a clarification on why the reduction,

- Alder Steuer, you know every year, the folks in the risk department within human resources, looks back are our rates are based on a 3-year average. And I guess looking back, and because we've had some barely good years over the last three years, our rate is being reduced by our carrier.

- Okay.

- I would like to tap onto that. Overall, we take the total expenditures for workers comp on our safety manager. Nate priming helps pull this one together, but overall in the whole budget, we did reduce workers' comp expense by 45,000 based on premiums, based on unexpected expected claims. But as you see in the fire department, is actually probably experienced really the bulk of the reduction. But as the chief said, we overall reduced 45,000 and then we allocate it over the departments, and the departments are based on a 3-year average or 4-year average of plaintiffs. And because the fire department has had less claims in the last 4 years on average, they did experience a pretty large reduction, but overall general fund wise, we did reduce a 45,000.

- I haven't looked at the Lester's budget or soul as far as chief Litton, has kind of trended downward as far as claims in your department? Yeah, you know, a lot of that is luck of the draw Alder Steuer, we have made a focused effort of all with our safety committee and learning injuries. You know, we do a review of every single injury that occurs on a job as reviewed by the safety committee we make recommendations, then that's shared with the entire department, just in order to, you know, try to bring it, put it in everybody's mind that, "Hey, this, this happened, this is how it happened." In order to put it in the future. And so I think that's been successful over the last 7 or 8 years actually.

- Okay. Well good, thank you for that. I just want to make one comment too. You know, the fire position is being asked to be added some 181,000, at least in some on 172,000, so total is about 254, which I figured out to be one fifth of 1% of the total budget. So unless I'm wrong, I just thought I'd throw that in there. 'Cause I know that we're always talking about, you know, positions and such, so I don't know. I'm pretty good with that unless anybody else can change my thought on that. That's all I got, thank you.

- Any other questions about fire? Alder Dorff, Can I just make one comment?

- Oh yes, Chief Litton, go ahead. I just want to point out to all the elected officials, and the public that are watching, if you look at the printed copy page 91 of our table of organization, you know, it shows that we've got, you know, we're going to have 193 personnel and that's what everybody really focuses on. I think really what you need to also be aware of is if you look at station 8, that is our contract with the village of Allouez. And so we have 21 people assigned to the village of Allouez, and that generates \$1.9 million in revenue. So that's really that, you know, that part of it, you know, when you're looking at the 193 number, that's really not accurate, it's 21 of those people are assigned to Allouez. And, you know, I just want to make sure that everybody understands that, you know, we do have, you know, the potential of, you know, an additional merger here coming up and there's confidential information out there that all the alders have received that I do not want to speak to tonight, but we will certainly be taking it up hopefully on the 10th. So I just wanted to point that out. We're actually, if you look at that, if you go back and look at our budget books, and what we were authorized, or and what we actually had in our budgets and mostly 2019 and 2018, we had 24 people assigned to that station. So we actually had a 3 person reduction there. And if you look at station 2, which is kind of in the middle of the page, there's only 17 firefighters assigned there now, there used to be 18 there. So totally, even with adding the 1 we're down still 4 positions that we were at one point authorized for. And that was a result of staffing the ambulance at station 7, which I worked very hard over a period of 3 years, to get it staffed. So I just want to make that point. We're good with adding one person, we hope that we think that it's necessary, it does help to reduce over time, it does with all of our special events and things that we do. It becomes a little bit of a stressor on our personnel with having to work so much overtime, to keep the shifts filled for minimum manning and to, you know, keep up with all the special events that go on in the city. So I just wanted to make that point.

- Thank you, if there's no other comments from the committee, I will entertain a motion to approve the fire department budget. Alder Johnson, Alder Corpus-Dax, Alder Gallatin, Somebody want to make a motion to approve the...

- Motion to approve.

- I have a question Alder Dorff.

- All right, go ahead Alder Johnson.

- Chief Litton noticed a substantial increase in cell phones, could you just touch on that?

- Yes, sir. We're moving into the 20th century. We had flip phones and a lot of our apparatus out there, and because of the protocols and things with the hospitals and reporting nature, and needing to be able to take pictures, and send those pictures in on accident scenes, for instance, to the emergency room doctors and so forth, we are upgrading to smartphones on all the vehicles. The cost of the phones is not prohibited, it's 99 cents for the phone, so through the package, it's the data package that actually is causing that increase. One other area of increase there will be, you know, I talked about it in the police department, with the change to the new CAD system, the County has changed into a new CAD system and going up live next week, we have to install what's called a modem in all of our apparatus to make our computers, our mobile data terminals in the vehicles, actually communicate with the County. So there is some increase in that, to make that happen right after the start of the year in 2021 as well.

- Okay, so this is more of a long-term permanent change where we could expect this year in and year out?
- That is correct.
- Okay.
- Yeah, we don't assign a phone to each personnel they're assigned to apparatus. So that's a little different than some of the other operations in the city.
- Okay. Was there a motion to approve? By Alder Galvin? Okay, is there a second?
- Second,
- Second by Alder Corpus-Dax. All those in favor say aye.
- Aye.
- Opposed. Motion carries. Oh, and we didn't change anything. So we've approved this budget as stated. So now how about, would you guys want 5 minutes, 7 minutes, 10 minutes? What do you want? Five? Alright, well let's come back here. Let's split the difference, and come back here in 6:05. It is now 5:58 on my computer will be back here...
- Alder Dorff.
- Yes.
- I've got a 6 o'clock plan commission item that I have to go to. So I'll probably be off for a while, but I'll try to get back in.
- Okay. So do I need a motion to have for a recess? Do we need a motion? Or can I just decide?
- Yeah, that's awesome.
- Then deciding we're done until 5 after 6, see you back in 5 minutes.
- Alder Steuer, let me look it up, there was discussion that the plan commission meeting was going to be moved and you're saying there is an agenda?
- Yap, there's an agenda.
- Okay.
- There's the meeting today.
- I got issues and what not as well.

- Okay Alder, so thank you. Really when we talked about it weeks ago, there was discussion of having it moved. So that didn't happen. So thank you Alder. Okay, all right.

- So we are all set on our end, and we are recording right now.

- We are, is everybody back?

- I don't think so, but just want to let everyone know.

- Oh, okay. Okay. Well almost, almost we just need Alder Galvin, he's just getting his milk. He'll be back in a minute. Alder Galvin, are you there? Only when we need.

- Oh.

- Yay. So I am going to read a statement that I'm really not sure where to throw this in, but Alder weary had another statement he wanted me to make, and I think I'll just throw it in right now. When midway through, From Alder weary, this is such a harsh for everyone in our country. I believe it is grossly inappropriate to ask our citizens who are suffering financially to pay more. I am not convinced we turned over every rock in order to avoid a 3% increase next year, after we had 3% increase this year, Alder Wery, further States, many companies implemented fur laws to avoid layoffs. Why have we not explored this? Many had to lay off workers. I'm not suggesting we... I don't know what he means. He has DOP, but I'll maybe do. I'm not suggesting we do this, but suffering residents who pay our wages, must shake their heads at are all well in court's attitude. He ends with, we asked the people of Green Bay to tighten their belt and hang in there, yet or not willing to do so ourselves, sharpen those pencils and make some tough choices. Okay, I just wanted to make sure I did my due diligence with reading Alder Wery's comment. Right, Department of public works. That is on pages 105 to 112.

- And if you're looking at the electronic version, that'd be pages, that'd be pages 110 through 117. Right. Does anybody... okay. Questions on the department of public work? Alder Johnson.

- Looks shocked.

- I can't believe it, okay.

- Director Grenier, just a couple of questions for you. One is page 107, we have a line 50501, over time. We're looking at a 33% increase on overtime. Could you just touch on that for us?

- Absolutely, that's the way we've been trending lately, so we're deciding to try to budget for it rather than overrun our budget.

- Which staff is incurring the overtime? What services or is that for?

- Primarily that still polling. If you go back and look at the 2019 actual, we were at 546,508.

- Okay. We had budgeted 300 that year.

- So snow really anchored the bulk of that?

- That is correct and based on long-term projections, we're anticipating winter to start earlier, and last longer this year.

- Nobody heard what you said.

- Okay, thank you for that explanation. Page 108, item 53011, it was alluded to or saw, I think in the Mayor's presentation that there was going to be an increase in landfill monitoring.

- Yes. Could you just explain that? Is that something that's being required by somebody else? I thought I read that somewhere.

- Department of Natural Resources, yeah. So a number of closed landfills, some of them were city owned facilities. One of them was actually owned by a paper company. That's the H&R landfill, which also happens to be known as The Finger Road Ball Diamond Complex, with some of the initiatives that we've been taking on with outside groups. Some of the lower Bay, we've been talking at parks and INS committee, about some of the initiatives that lower Bay group has been looking at with the Ken years nature area, the optimist club, doing some work over at the H&R landfill, those historic fill areas, which have sat basically unchanged with their monitoring over many, many years. Now that we're looking at doing some additional work and trying to not let it be an eyesore on the periphery of the community, but rather turn it into a valuable asset, that can be used for recreational purposes that has caused DNR to go back and take a look at what the long-term monitoring facilities are, and has caused the cost for that monitoring to go up.

- So when I'm looking at 2019 actual, the actual still exceeded what we're budgeting for in this coming year. Was there something in 2019 that drove that up, or did we just budget to reduce the monitoring in 2020?

- No, in 2019, we actually had some consent order stuff that we were finishing up with the DNR, especially at the H&R facility. So there were a number of monitoring points that had been lost or destroyed over time, specifically as they related, more so over towards the golf course area, towards the woods. So there was a one-time uptick, in 2019 to help bring those costs up. And again, we're just starting to budget what the actual costs are out here, at the core, starting to utilize them more.

- Okay, thank you for that clarification. Items 54061 and 54064, black top in the joint ceiling, correct me if I'm wrong, but I believe these were the items that we removed last year and opted instead to use wheel tax funding for, is this for like repairing potholes?

- That is correct.

- Okay. And again, if I'm not mistaken, I believe that number was 231,000-ish. Is that kind of what you're planning on again for this year? And if so, where does that expense get lost now with the wheel tax covering that?

- That is correct, that is the intent. When we bring forward discussion on the capital improvement program, that's typically where that discussion is held.

- Okay, that makes sense. Thank you. Are these numbers, I'm just looking at the actuals from 2019. I mean, they're pretty kind of like, you know, like 50/50, they're pretty close. Is that normally the trend on that?

- Yes or no. It varies from year to year. The joint sealing materials is on concrete streets and the blacktop materials. Blacktop materials has been a little bit misunderstood even by my own staff over the past several years. There's two components to the blacktop, there's what we're doing for routine maintenance programming ourselves, and then there's also, the staff had been utilizing some of that money to purchase the asphalt that's used for utility cuts. So if Wisconsin public service does a gas operate on a residential street, and we have to go back in there and patch that trench, some of that material was being counted in here, but we weren't necessarily recovering the revenue, and we changed that again. As director Ellenbecker has mentioned, multiple times already tonight, as far as making more accurate cost center to counting, we've been taking some pretty significant effort over the last couple of years to make sure we're tracking that a lot more closely. So I had a request from Alder Burnett late last week asking about the wheel tax fund. So when I responded to him, I showed that the actual expenditures for blacktop materials was significantly higher than what we had anticipated, but there was an offsetting revenue from when we had built that back to the Wisconsin public services of the world and got that revenue tracked back into the wheel tax fund as well.

- Okay, so here's why I'm asking the question, and it's a motion I'm going to make. When we took that 231,000 out, city council approved that in last year's budget. I did not believe that that was in the spirit of why we passed the wheel tax. When we passed the wheel tax to me, the intent was that we were going to expand the program and not use the wheel tax as a way to subsidize budget shortfalls. And so the motion that that I'm going to make, and Director Grenier I'm looking to you maybe for a little bit of guidance here, because I'm going to include 2 account numbers within this motion, the 54061 and the 54064. The motion I'm going to make is that we add, \$231,000 to those 2 accounts, the guidance that I'm looking for Director Grenier is, what would be the appropriate way to split those up?

- I believe what we would be looking at is 54061 at 141, and 54064 at 90.

- Could you just restate those numbers again?

- 101550354061, would be at 141,000 10150354064, would be at 90,000.

- Okay. That is my motion is to add those amounts to those respective accounts.

- Is there a second?

- I'm hearing no second.

- Yap, and I anticipated that, and I'll be reintroducing that motion again at the full council.

- And I will be adding my discussion at the full council then, since we can't discuss the non-motion. So thank you. Okay. Anything else, Director Grenier, Alder Johnson. Nothing, anything else from anyone for public works? No.

- I'll entertain a motion to approve the public works budget. I'll make that motion to approve the public works budget, I need a second.

- Second.

- Second by Alder Galvin. All those in favor, say aye.

- Aye.

- And opposed. Did you vote older Johnson or not?

- Oh yeah.

- You voted aye?

- It's fine. Okay, all right, thank you. Okay. Now that's motion curious in that budget is approved. All right. Parks rec forestry and equipment replacement pages 125 to 128. Okay, any questions for parks and rec, for the parks and rec budget?

- I guess I will ask a question line item 54003. It's not a huge number for total of money, but the housekeepers pleased went up 53%. So are we going to clean more bathrooms this coming year or what's happening Director Ditscheit.

- Yeah, so all of that is for City Hall housekeeping. So we have to purchase more chemicals, more supply due to COVID. I will tell you though, that there was an error in that one line item, and we really only need \$5,000, not \$8,000. So if you would like to cut 3000 out of the budget, you could.

- You know, it says 23,000. So I was so...

- It was 8000 over the last year.

- Okay, so what's my total number supposed to be?

- 20,000.

- 20,000, got it. So we are cutting out 5000, right?

- 3000.

- 3000, minus 3000. Okay. I will entertain a motion to approve that line item change.

- Motion to approve.

- Motion to approve by, I think it was all the Corpus-Dax. Second by Alvin Galvin. All those in favor of making that change, say, aye.

- Aye.

- Opposed? Motion carries. Okay, good. We just saved \$3,000, great. Alder Johnson.
- Thank you. Director Ditscheit, I'm looking at item 1110. The description is cut off, but I believe it's unemployment compensation.
- Do repeat the item again, 'cause you cut out a little bit.
- 59110.
- Okay.
- Oh, that would be unemployment compensation. Typically that line item is given to us from the finance department and correct me if I'm wrong, but isn't that based off of the previous few years, when that's all calculated, I don't know how many years you go back though.
- I don't recall seeing that in the other department budgets, which is why it caught my attention, unless I totally missed them.
- In some cases there's other departments that have a few, few dollars.
- Okay, I'm seeing it.
- What I am guessing though, is there some employees in the summer that did not come back to work because of the COVID. And so I'm expecting that is why we have a projection of \$22,000 this year.
- So is that an expectation that we're going to see an increase in our rate, and this is the rate being passed on to the department?
- No, this is when we actually pay out for somebody who wasn't employed, that didn't get called back to work their job. And so we actually help pay a portion of the unemployment or pay their unemployment until they do find another position.
- Does that work differently in government than in the private sector?
- I'm hearing Assistant Director Manley say yes. So I don't have all the answers. I don't know of other Director Faulds, if you're aware of how that all works.
- Well, the reason I asked by sir, right, you have a pool of money and it goes out of the pool, they adjust your rate then the following year up or down, depending on how many claims you've had against the pool. So that's why this one just... I'm not familiar with, on appointment working that way, that's why I was kind of asking the question if the city actually contributes directly to that, and doesn't have the advantage of a rate or a pool.
- You are correct Alder Johnson. We do not have a rate, so we don't have to pay a flat amount all the time. We just pay when our employees, or former employees actually claim unemployment, and then we pay that dollar amount. So it could also be that the summer employees who worked for us, now got a full-time job during the year, but now they're claiming unemployment. Well, we claim, the

city as one of their former employers, right? So we end up paying a percentage in at that point, but we don't have a flat rate like other businesses do, governments are an exception.

- We can learn something new every day. Thank you for that explanation.

- And can I jump in and remember this summer, there was an extra bonus on unemployment, the extra \$600 that employees received. So that is why you're also seeing an increase in the projection here. More and more people who might've had a part-time job in the past, all of a sudden, now were unemployed this summer so that they could get that extra 600. Now we're still paying, of course, you know, that unemployment is we again, director had said, because they were a former employee of ours.

- Okay.

- We did have a few employees this year that did claim unemployment because they had to be taken off of work for COVID reasons. There just wasn't the work for them.

- This mostly affects you to any of the STEM departments that have seasonal part-time employees. We don't typically see this much in our full-time employee positions.

- Okay.

- And then on our end, it was the seasonal positions. It was not the full-time positions.

- Okay. Director, line 54072, it is on page 127, labeled concessions. Can I make an assumption that is the cost of goods sold for concessions at Bay beach, or elsewhere?

- This would not be for Bay beach. Can you repeat the line item?

- 54072.

- 72, okay. So that would be more for the pools, Bay Beach has their own line items, I think it's strictly for the pools.

- Sure, so this is cost of goods sold on whatever it is, concessions that we're selling?

- Correct. And then we make it up in revenues by selling it. So you'll see an offset in our revenue line items.

- Okay, and the reason, I wanted to at least touch on this and the same question would apply to Bay Beach and I can skip it later, but I mean, we're looking at roughly, Are we projecting that guests to be at full capacity next summer?

- We're projecting full capacities for all of our recreation programming, because if we don't put it in our budget, we can't run the programs accordingly. So we did budget for a full season for all of the pools, and as though we had a standard season for recreation.

- Okay, and I just wanted to confirm that. So I appreciate that clarity. Okay, I think that's all I've got right now.
- Keep in mind that most of our programs run in the summer months. So we have a few months early in the year that hopefully the COVID will play out over those first few months. Obviously we don't know if that's the case or not, but most of our expenses are in the summer months.
- That's right.
- Other questions for parks, rec, and forestry. Okay, so seeing none, I want to a motion...
- Alder Dorff, I just have one question, I'm looking for clarity on. Dan, I'm looking at your director dish, and I'm looking at the positions. And I noticed that we have 2 park Rangers for the wildlife sanctuary underneath the parks area, as opposed to the wildlife sanctuary area.
- Correct. So those are considered admin positions. So that's why they're under the parks and not the wildlife sanctuary. So that is how it was set up. Initially those positions were kind of run through our parks crews, but they've kind of merged into their own wildlife sanctuary positions, but yes, they are still under that.
- So those 2 positions are full-time dedicated to the wildlife sanctuary.
- Yes they are.
- And the parks department is, kind of picking up the tab as opposed to having it allocated to the wildlife sanctuary cost budget?
- Correct. Right now, those positions are under, like I said, those are under the park tab too, but it would just be an offset cost.
- I know that. It just, to me, it seems interesting because if you're trying to get a true snapshot of how the wildlife sanctuary is performing, you know, on the cost end, I mean, you'd have to dig into another, another category to figure that out.
- The reason that they are put under parks, is because they are more of a maintenance type position. So they, we do oftentimes at the sanctuary call the park shop and request assistance with maintenance, et cetera. So up that way that they were part of parks, and not the wildlife sanctuary.
- Okay, thank you.
- So we have amended this budget by \$3,000. Is there a motion to approve the Parks, Recreation, Forestry budget as amended?
- Motion to approve.
- Motion by Alder Galvin.
- Second. Second by all the Corpus-Dax. Discussion? Seeing none. All those in favor, say aye.

- Aye.
- Opposed. Motion carries. Okay. We are on page 133 miscellaneous wants to talk about that. First of all, are there questions about miscellaneous? Is there any questions?
- Motion to approve.
- Motion to approve by Alder Johnson.
- Second.
- Second by Alder Galvin. All those in favor, say aye.
- Aye.
- Opposed no. Motion carries. We're done with miscellaneous. General fund toward... I'm sorry, we're skipping that. Page 143 to 145, sanitary sewer
- On the electronic document that would be 148 and 150.
- Okay, are there any questions about the sanitary sewer portion of the budget? Yes, Alder Johnson.
- Director Grenier. I'm looking at 2 accounts in particular, 53001, contractual services. That got quite a bump to 150,000. Is there a particular projects that are being worked on there?
- Yes. One of the things that we have to worry about with sanitary sewer that we don't have to worry about with storm sewer, is a phenomenon that's called inflow and infiltration, we referred to it as I and I in the industry. The reason that you don't want, I and I, you don't want Clear water, grown water leaking into your sanitary. Cause that goes off to the treatment plant, and then you're treating clean water. I, and I is a concern for everybody. The anticipation is to hire a consultant, to begin the modeling with the I and I within the city system.
- Okay. So I presume that that's a problem that's currently present.
- Yes, it has been for some time.
- Okay. Would this expense get covered by storm water fees as well?
- No. So sanitation is part of the levy?
- No.
- Or the general fund.
- No, no, no, this is the sanitary sewer fund. So when you pay your water bill, it's water, sanitary, and storm all in the same bill.

- Copy that. I follow you now. Okay. And then 53112, we have \$2 million to sewer service cut off.
- It's like rain adjustment.
- Rate stabilization fund.
- Okay, got it. I just wasn't sure exactly what that was. I'm good, thank you.
- Any other questions about the century store? I'll entertain a motion to approve sanitary store.
- Motion to move.
- Move by Alder Johnson. I'll second that. All those in favor say aye.
- Aye.
- Opposed. Motion carries. Okay, so then we're up to pages 147 to 149, the parking division,
- 153, 154 in the electronic version.
- Any questions about parking?
- Yes, Alder Johnson. Oh, I'm sorry, Alder Corpus-Dax first, then Alder Johnson.
- Inner 46% increase.
- I didn't hear what you said, but...
- 53038, credit card fees. There's like a 46% increase there.
- Well, if you look at the 2020 actual to date, we're at over 209,000 with our PARCS system, PARCS access and revenue control system. So the system that operates not only the ramps, but also paying in our surface lots, anything except for the passport app. Oh, I shouldn't call it. I should qualify that passport also charges us some service fees. Plus, not only the parking access and revenue control system, but when people are paying parking citations or the like, we get assessed credit card fees and that's the trend we're seeing as less and less people carrying cash, more and more people wanting to pay with credit card and we got to pass those, those fees along or include them in our budget as a line item.
- Then 55112, meter maintenance, 78% increase.
- You can see that we're at 11,800, a couple of years ago, in 2020, we dropped that down to about, well, we had a revised budget of 11,800 we're anticipated to come in at about 99, but do some major maintenance on the interior workings, the housings themselves last for a long time, but the mechanical pieces inside need to be updated, and this is one of the years that we're anticipating quite a few of them are due up in their rotation.
- Okay.

- Anything else Alder Corpus-Dax?
- I don't think so.
- Okay, Alder Johnson
- Thank you.
- Alder Corpus-Dax kind of touched on this one too, but I want to go back to the credit card fees for a second. And I do appreciate that explanation, you know, it was my understanding that parking was down this year. So it strikes me as an interesting correlation that the fees are up and you know, I don't know what percentage we pay. And that's why I'm curious if there's more in this account than just credit card fees, you know, but a normal credit card fee would hover probably right around 3%, I would think. A city, the size of Green Bay can negotiate even a more favorable rate. But if you're looking at, you know, \$30,000 on a million dollars of transactions, that would suggest to me that your, how many million dollars of transactions?
- Well, a large portion of this, isn't just credit card fees. It's the passport parking fees. So we pay a certain cost per ticket that's issued automatically to passport. We do pay merchant service fees, which is like your credit card fee. We also pay gateway fee, and escalation fee, harvester fee, a letter sent fee, and then an additional fee per every transaction that they process. So there's a lot of, I guess it's hard to split it up between, what's the contractual fee, and what's the credit card fee, and so it's all been lumped into the one account.
- Okay. So it's of it.
- Yeah.
- When we do passport though, we pass on those feeds, right?
- Not entirely.
- No, not necessarily.
- Not entirely, we set our...
- Alder Johnson for some reason we can't hear you. Can you hear him? Okay.
- I can hear him.
- Okay, we're good.
- We have set our parking rates, but the parking rates aren't necessarily 100% correlated to what passport charges.
- Okay. Okay, that's all I've got right now. Thanks for the detail.

- Anything else for the parking division? I'll entertain a motion to approve.
- Motion to approve.
- Motion to approve by Alder Corpus-Dax. I'll second that. All those in favor, of approving this part of the budget, say aye.
- Aye.
- Opposed. Motion carries. Alright, so we're on storm water. 151 to 155. Questions on the storm water budget.
- Line item 52001 tray. An increase of 57.2%.
- We have a couple of engineers on staff that we didn't have. We've added positions to the table of organization. Plus we've added the fog oil and grease inspector. So those four continuing education requirements do also have additional training and travel that we didn't have previously.
- Okay.
- And then 53001, contractual service increase of 100%. What are those contractual services?
- That's based on studies for storm water issues. So for instance, the consultants that we have hired in the past to take a look at the flooding issues down at Mason and Maine, the consultant that we currently have engaged, taking a look at issues out, along the East shore drive consultants that we have brought on to take a look at assistance with helping us, with the design of the repairs out on the... Along the South of the Bay. As we see the number of studies, we've got out there and the things that we have yet to get done, we're adjusting those consultant fees accordingly.
- Thank you.
- Any other questions? All right. I'll entertain a motion to approve this store's four pages budget.
- Motion to approve.
- Motion to approve by Alder Galvin second by Alder Corpus-Dax. All those in favor, say aye.
- Aye.
- Opposed.
- Okay, we are on transit pages 160, 161.
- And that would be paid 165, 166. If you're on the electronic version.
- Any questions on the transit department? It looks good to me. Anybody else? I will move to approve that budget.

- Second.
- Second by elder Johnson. All those in favor, say aye.
- Aye. Opposed. Motion carries. Thank you, Patty that was the fastest one, thank you. All right.
- Very glad for that.
- Good. Keep doing this, okay. Bay Beach page 168, 171. Bay Beach. And what is that electronically?
- That would be 173 through 176.
- Okay.
- Questions on Bay Beach budget. I have none. All right, hearing none seeing none, I'll entertain a motion to approve.
- Motion to approve.
- Motion to approve this budget, is there a second? Second by Alder Corpus-Dax. All those in favor, say aye.
- Aye. Opposed. Motion carries. Debt service pages, 173, 174.
- The electronic version 178, 179.
- Any questions on the debt service ages? Yes, Alder Johnson.
- Director Ellenbecker, if I'm reading this correctly, essentially we're going to retire \$19.7 million of debt this year. Is that correct?
- With interest, correct. It's our little over \$13 million of in principle, and then about \$6 million of interest. Yes, correct. And that is what makes up the \$19.7 million.
- Okay, so when we take a look at the City's overall debt we're only going to be reducing it in 2021 by the principal amount then, is that correct?
- Yes.
- Okay, thank you.
- Just to take in again, this is all debt. This isn't all just general levy. This would be sanitary, storm, Bay Beach and TIF, and also anything that's supported by general levy.
- Any other questions on debt service? Hearing none, I'll entertain a motion I think.
- Motion to approve.

- Motion to approve by Alder Galvin. I'll second that one. All those in favor, say aye.
- Aye.
- Oppose. We will move on to neighborhood enhancement, 176-177. Any question about the neighborhood enhancement fund? Yes, Alder Johnson.
- There's nothing here. It's somewhere to go.
- Okay, we've made a change. There's a trend here. I think at one point we decided to have the real estate specialist to be funded 50% from the general fund and 50% from neighborhood enhancement. But the neighborhood enhancement, for the last number of years now has only been bonded for. So we've been funding the neighborhood enhancement with bonding. However, we do not, or prefer not to bond for salaries. For the last several years, we've been putting 50% of this neighborhood... Real estate, especially around enhancement, and 50% in general fund, under Director Renier's area. So when the day is over, we've been budgeting under levy for this position 100% just in two budgets, if we're going to continue to do that, it would be so much easier to stop, using levy dollars to fund 50% of it, levy dollars in the neighborhood enhancement, we would all really we're just consolidating it and putting it all under the director Grenier's area. No budget, no levy increase, other than probably the 2% that this position would normally get. We're just moving in simplifying. It was just trying to make it easier to follow. So that is another change. Director Renier without the G.
- I'm sorry.
- I was super confused. Thank you for clarifying that.
- I was confused too.
- So was I.
- You got a new position.
- Could you change your name one of you? Just one of you. All right.
- I'm older.
- What are we approving here? It is all zero. We just approving it as zero then.
- Again, we just wanted to show you, there was a budget there last year. And so it's really just showing the history. There's an actual is coming out. And the reason why I actually they're so much higher is because there's bonded money. That's why you're not seeing a budget, but you're seeing bond a number. There was bonded number funding in this. So this is how it was spent over the time period. So there were numbers there, and we wanted to show you how there was a budget last year and no longer this year.
- Okay, right. So I'll entertain a motion to approve.
- Motion to approve.

- Approve by Alder Johnson, Second by Alder Corpus-Dax. All those in favor, say aye.
- Aye.
- Opposed. Motion carries. Workman's comp page 179. Any questions or comments on the workman's comp portion? Yes, Alder Johnson
- Thank you.
- That's the health insurance escrow, you know, it's all under the same category, but it goes by individual pages on this one. So we just have to be 179, and then 180 is general liability, 181 is health insurance.
- I will wait.
- Yeah, okay. And do we need to approve each one of these separately?
- Yes, please.
- Okay.
- All those in favor, say aye.
- Aye.
- Opposed. Motion carries. So we've proved the workman's comp now general liability is page 180. Any questions on general liability? I'll move to approve that. Anyone want to second that?
- Second.
- Second by Alder Corpus-Dax. All those in favor, say aye,
- Aye.
- Opposed no. And now health insurance escrow page 181. Alder Johnson.
- Thank you chair. I'm looking at the 800,000 for police, 200,000 for fire. Was this the related to the sick day, or is this completely separate?
- The sick what?
- We were talking, we've been having conversations about how we have more sick day payouts. Is that what this is related to?
- Yes, this is correct. This is up again, year over year, last couple of years, we've been spending well over a million dollars on sick escrow as employees are retiring. So we have actually gotten into a negative fund balance in this 704 fund. So we need to anticipate in budget more dollars. And again, we

have talked about it, those dollars. This will continue to be well over a million dollars until there is any drastic change in a police or fire contract, which is not anticipated. So you have a small amount that goes to really administrative or other departments. And then the bulk of it is police and fire.

- So it's not sick pay, it's for health insurance, right?

- It is when an employee fully retires with a Wisconsin retirement, if they have sick hours on the books, I put that into an escrow. They can also convert some vacation time, and if at any point they, you are over a max for a couple of years before you retire, you can start converting some vacation time into these buckets. What that allows you to do is once you're fully retired with the Wisconsin retirement system and you opted to, you move that into a sick escrow, you can draw upon that to help pay for your health insurance. It can either be health insurance, health insurance act with actively with the city of Green Bay. If you want to continue to take their insurance at retiree rates, or you can also go get your own insurance, pay the premium, submit it, and then, it draws upon this reserve, this account that we have on file for you to help pay for.

- I was looking at the other end it's to pay for health insurance, but it comes from sick pay and vacation pay. Thank you. Is there a motion to approve?

- So moved.

- So moved by Alder Johnson. I'll second that. All those in favor say aye.

- Aye.

- Opposed.

- Motion carries. Okay. So now we are on pages 183 to 193, revenue general fund.

- Just a reminder. I mean, if you're looking at the electronic version, it would be on page 188, through 198.

- This is all the money coming in, right?

- Right, this would be any revenue that is brought in. Your very first line is the levy and portion that we would be requesting, where now as proposed, levy that is proposed for the general fund, and every other line item is some other version of revenue coming in. Whether it's through a pilot, through state aid, it's any other money that as the levy portion that is needed to cover expenses.

- So with the increase in the \$300,000 under law, do we have to change something under here?

- Eventually in this book, yes. Line number one, if nothing else changes, the increase that we put 220 minus the \$50, and the \$50 minus the 3000, yes. It would get netted in that 44,000,003. At this point, you change the expenses automatically yes which would increase that levy line item. But at this point I wouldn't expect you to have to modify that number because we are really modifying on the expensive side of the offset, be the revenue.

- Okay, okay. All right. Is there a motion to approve the revenue?

- Question, question. Alder Corpus-Dax.
- Line item 44, I 10 tavern license, is that picking it back up to what they had initially proposed as far as like maxing out what we're charging for the different licenses?
- Correct. We did go back to look at the motion that was made by the council this past year. And it really was a one-time change, it wasn't a long-term change. So if for some reason we would decide to, again, almost do a 50%, 40% reduction in those licenses, it would have to go fully through a council again, to get those changed. This is putting it back to what, where our standard rates.
- Okay.
- Alder Johnson.
- Thank you chair. Director, Ellenbecker, it looks to me like when I'm looking at state shared revenue and personal property taxes, we're seeing increases in those areas. Is that accurate?
- That is correct. On the personal property line item, the 43415, I'm going to say there is four of them in a row, the 43431, 43531, 43532, 43610, might be the next one also. Those are all estimates that we get from Wisconsin department of revenue. They send us a form, this is our estimated amount that they plan to send us.
- Okay, so I mean, how did they calculate that? I mean, why did they send a shared revenue? Like, I mean, in these particular accounts.
- Can you be more specific? Explain that, say that again.
- So let's just take, you know, for example, the 43414 for the state shared revenue, I mean, they're going to increase how much they're giving us by 23%. Is that just because they want to give more support to us? Somehow I feel like it's not that simple.
- Can you verify? I think we're not seeing the whole description. I think that's at our utility payment mind, but if you can give me one moment, let me look that account out to make sure I'm talking the right line item. Some cases when they truncate the description.
- Yeah, I mean, even like the state aid video, you know, was another line that was up quite a bit.
- Well, let me start with a 414. That is our utility payment. That is an item that is driven specifically by the Pulliam plant. This one has bounced around 2 years ago, we budgeted 700,000. And because of them shutting down some of their units, we ended up only getting 400,000. So that was, as you can see, that it was in 2019. So then when it came to the 2020 budget, we budgeted 351 as being very conservative because I already took another reduction in so that we did get hit again. And we ended up getting in 432,000. I'm sorry, I think so we got something in slightly over what we budgeted for 2020, 2020 actuals is only 15% of the number, we get the remaining 85% in November. What happens is now the DOR came back and estimated 432, there's two calculations within the state, a utility payment. One is based out it equalized value times of factor, and then as also megawatts on how many, how much megawatts they have kicking out on their different units because of the

equalized jumping up so much, that has driven up a portion of the calculation. So in a year from now, equalized starts dropping, coming back down, that number is going to come back down. So it's a calculation, a couple of different factors. And the state is estimating the 432 for the 2021 payment for upstate utility payment. From the Pulliam plant. We did get confirmation that one unit is expected to continue to continue to stay running, and that the megawatts I'll put as about are going to be the senior year over year. So this point, I'm sorry, there was a long discussion, but this portable with the forward to the 32 now though I better understand the calculation of how we get reimbursed for that power plant.

- Okay. Then the next item that you discussed, if you go down to line 43614, and the line right below it, if you look that the state aid video, went from 93, up to 184. The next line of 826 went down to 715. I had to throw it out of my calculator, but I think they almost wash each other. So I'm going to quick, first item comes out to about 278,000. Yes, 278, so but it went up about 90,000 and the other line went down about 90,000. That was a state change in cable TV. The state has changed and I might have to look at the assistant director, Manley, they changed, Can you just step in please? They changed the rate that the franchise providers were paying us. So they reduced it by half a percent for this year, and now next year they've reduced it by a full percent, but the state with their change, they realized that that was an impact to the municipalities. So to make it up, they've created this additional state aid where they're paying us for the video service providers.

- Okay, good. And then I just have just 2 more questions. So one isn't seeing reduced state aid for the bridges. Is that because that is going to the County now?

- Yes. In most cases, that is because the, yeah, the bridge we used to get reimbursed for the brunch tenders, and when those no longer have the expenses, we also are no longer getting the revenue. That is a majority of the change, correct.

- Okay, thank you for confirming that. And then just one final question for Director Ditscheit and it's related to Bay beach, because if I'm not mistaken, I think we were intending to use the balance that Bay beach had, to subsidize the losses of operating the park this year. If we head into next year, I mean, we're planning for a full season. And if we don't hit these marks, I guess, what is our contingency plan if the park ends up operating at a loss again?

- Ultimately, we would just have to carry that over into the next year then. So at some point, we'll have a season that operates successfully. Each year, we project that a certain amount of dollars goes into that account to give us that buffer. And if we don't hit those numbers next year, it would just be carried over into the year after that. The other option, if we don't want to carry it over, carry over that debt into the future year, would be that the city could always budget for that debt or that would be another option. But I wouldn't recommend that at this point, I would recommend you just carry that debt over into a future year.

- So you say, when we covered that debt, meaning that we find some funding from the levy debt to cover that, right.

- That's a possibility, yes. If the council wanted to do that.

- So we do have the ability to carry a deficit on that account?

- That's my understanding, but Director Ellenbecker can respond to that please.

- Sure, yeah. Correct, yeah. So we are really talking about general fund at this point, and right now, within that general fund, there is no extra dollars built in there for Bay Beach as we keep all their revenues and expenses completely separate. We are down a few lines is number 30 is when we would really be talking about Bay Beach revenue. But at this point there's nothing built into the general fund to help out Bay Beach, if they were to, not have enough revenues to cover their expenses in this year or next year. Again, there's a couple of options like you said, one is a, it is what we call a special revenue fund. And as long as you would have anticipation that the following year they'd have enough revenue to cover their expenses, you could go to a negative fund balance. We have other negative, other counts that when negative at year end with the anticipation that you're going to make it up in a future year. So that would be a situation we can allow that for Bay Beach if they were to go on a negative fund balance, you know, they always have a capital account. They could always try to, yeah, but I'll call it that wasn't obligated. They could potentially move it back on their operating fund, but at this point we did not budget anything in a levy to support baby H in the 2021 budget.

- This council has to take action on that hypothetically let's say we do operate at a deficit next year, who makes the decision about whether we use funds?

- If you were to take money from the general fund, something that was unbudgeted, it would have to be a council action to move it again. Part of it is because we also set it up as a special revenue fund, which is forced to cover its own expenses. So if you choose to take levy dollars and move it to that fund, it would have to be a couple of council action.

- And you choose to move money from the development account back into the operations account. That would also take a council action to do that.

- Okay, but so would carrying the debt, is that something that is made at a staff level? The decision at the staff level?

- I guess it has been, if it just turns into a yes... If they have less revenue than they had expenses, and it turns into a negative fund balance, I guess it probably would be at a staff level. It certainly is something that is, if you want more attention, it could be brought back to the council for decision.

- Yeah, and I have no doubt that if we end up in that situation, I know Director Ditscheit will keep us apprised of what's happening. I'm just, you know, and maybe I'm spending too much time asking hypotheticals, but I don't think it's a hypothetical that's far off from the truth, recognizing that we don't know what's going to happen yet, you know, with the pandemic potentially on the operation of the park. So I'm just trying to be, and I think it's important for us to all be prepared about scenarios that you know, could potentially impact the financial health of the park. So I'm good, thank you.

- Okay, all right, so we were on... So, do I have a motion to approve that? Okay, Alder Galvin move to approve. Is there a second? Second by Alder Corpus-Dax. Those in favor, say aye.

- Aye.

- Opposed. Motion carries. Now to item 25, which is sanitary sir, which is simply page 194.

- And 199 electronic version.
- Any questions about page 194?
- Seeing no questions, I'll entertain a motion to approve the...
- Motion approved.
- Motion approved by Alder Galvin. I'll second it. All those in favor say aye.
- Aye.
- Opposed. Motion carries.
- Alder Dorff, I didn't realize you gave me a long leash on that.
- And I was like, what are you doing? But okay.
- All at one time, my apologies.
- All right. 'Cause I finally figured out what was happening and I thought I was going to let him go, okay. All right, all right.
- I just have a lot of questions.
- Yeah. We are on page 195. Wait, do we approve that yet? We preach it. We did 184, okay. Page 195, Perking.
- Electronic version 200.
- Okay. Any questions on perky? Okay, hearing none. Alder Galvin do you approve it.
- Motion to approve.
- I will second it. All those in favor, say aye.
- Aye.
- Opposed. Motion carries. We're on page 196, DPW equipment replacement. 196, any questions on page 196? Well there's no numbers on 196.
- Again, very similar to a, to an earlier item. We used to utilize the 203 fund we have now gone to other special...
- A Capital project fund, projects funded as opposed to a special revenue fund showing up to the document that we've made that change to a 400 series of as opposed to a 203 series account.

- Okay, so I will move to approve the, this zero page. Anyone wanna second that? A second by Alder Corpus-Dax. All those in favor, say aye.

- Aye.

- Opposed. Motion carries. Now we're on revenue transit page... No way storms sore right? Page 197, Yes, Page 197 storm sore. I feel like I did this one, but it must have been something else. Any questions on page 197?

- I have none. All right. Would you like to move to approve by Alder Corpus-Dax.

- Second.

- Second by Alder Galvin. All those in favor, say aye.

- Aye.

- Opposed. Now we are on Bay Beach, Page 200 Bay Beach pretty much covered it, right? I think we did. How about, would you like to make that motion Alder Johnson?

- Motion to approve.

- Okay, I'll second that.

- Do we end up skipping a page on accident there? Or did I miss it?

- Did I skip a page?

- Transit Operating.

- Sorry. Let's move back to page transit, is actually 198 and 199.

- Electronic version would be 203 and 204.

- Move to approve this transit, unless there's any discussion.

- Second.

- Second by Alder Corpus-Dax. All those in favor, say aye.

- Aye,

- Oppose. Motion carries. Okay, now Bay beach. Now here's your moment, Alder Johnson.

- To approve. To approve by Alder Johnson, Second by elder Corpus-Dax, any further discussion? All those in favor, say aye.

- Aye.

- Opposed. Motion carries. We are on page 201, 202, revenue debt service. 201, 202. Any other further questions on revenue debt service? I'll entertain a motion to approve.
- Motion to approve.
- Motion to approve by Alder Galvin. I'll second it, all those in favor, say aye.
- Aye.
- Opposed. Okay, motion carries. We're going to move this down a little bit. Equipment replacement funds revenue pages 203 to 208. Zeros here too but, there's lot of zeros. The things get moved here too, like for police and fire...
- Nope. That would confirm that we have not really put any equipment into our budget. So if you're looking, I will...
- 'Cause we bonded it, got it. Okay, yes.
- The only one you're seeing is that there's some equipment replacement is on page 203, which is our IT area.
- I see that, Yep.
- And again, though there's a large change, there a large reduction. And in this case it really wasn't reduced, it was moved through the IT department. It wasn't really ongoing annual maintenance, software maintenance, and it really is an operational item. So we took it out of the capital cone. So it was really a wash on that line. But at this point, yes, if you'll confirm 423, we did not budget for any capital equipment, or 24 or fire, you know, I'm so pleased by your inspection and parks or San DPW is where we did not budget any capital equipment in our operating budget.
- Okay. Send a motion to approve this portion of the revenue.
- Move to approve.
- Second.
- Move to approve by Alder Johnson, second by Alder Galvin. All those in favor say aye.
- Aye.
- Opposed. Motion carries. Okay. So then we're on revenue neighborhood enhancement page 209.
- Again, back to the zero we stopped levying for, in this department for half of real estate specialist and that now has been moved. So that's what you're doing...
- You explained that before a bit, so all right. I'll move to approve this.

- I am.
- Second by Alder Johnson. All those in favor say aye.
- Aye.
- Oppose no. Motion carries. Okay then revenue workman's compensation page 210.
- Motion to approve.
- Motion to approve by Alder Johnson. I'll second that, all those in favor say aye.
- Aye.
- Opposed. Okay, motion carries. Now we are on general liability page 211. Any questions on general liability? Okay, did you want to approve that?
- Move to approve By Alder Galvin.
- Second.
- Is there a second? Okay, second by Alder Corpus-Dax. All those in favor say aye. Aye.
- Opposed. Motion carries. Okay. And then revenue health insurance, escrow page 212. Any questions on that?
- No, no, no. All right, who wants to move in?
- Motion to approve.
- Motion to approve by Alder Galvin, second Alder Dorff, All those in favor, say aye.
- Aye.
- Motion carries. Last year we didn't change it at all. So we didn't make a motion overall at the end because there was no change. This year, there is a change. So I'm not sure the procedure here. Do we need to leave a motion to approve the whole thing as amended? Or because we did each individual section, do we not need to do that?
- Well, if you don't mind, I can give you a quick recap of what changes were made and what impact that has had.
- All right.
- Okay, so yes, there has been three changes that were, there were three amended items. We added \$220,000 to law for litigation, we added \$50 to the weights and measures. It was really an accounting adjustment in our budget book. And then we also, we were able to take \$2,000, I'm sorry, \$3,000 out of the city hall expense line. And that is a change of \$217,050. There's one more that I would

recommend, it's only a \$2,000 change, but I would thought it would be worth to offer up. And I apologize, I should've taken that when we talked about general fund revenues, are you interested in seeing a \$2,000 change?

- Does it make it better?

- It would make, I should have brought it up at that time, back on page, very, again, small change. Attorney Chavez had offered up, and it would be on page 186. In the law department, there is \$500 in there and the attorney said that they believe that they would be doing bill backs and more like 2,500. So it would be looking to add \$2,000 of revenue into that line item.

- Motion to reconsider.

- All those in favor of reconsideration, say aye.

- Aye. Opposed. All right.

- Motion to add \$2,000 to line item 47400.

- Is that it? Is that right? Okay, is there a second? I'll second it. It okay, we'll second it. I sent you that. All right, all those in favor say aye.

- Aye.

- Opposed. Motion carries. And now we have to do the whole amended thing, and we have to amend the whole...

- Can I give you one more? So again, so that is now a total change of change of increasing of expenses in total are changing, increasing the levy of \$215,050. And the impact on the mill rate, again, this is assessed a mill rate. It is taking our mill rate from what is 946 on the assessed version up 2979, which would increase it by 33 cents, which is now a 3.4% increase.

- Over the IRP or anything or the...

- We would be able to still within the calculation, we can stay within that calculation. We would bring any change, we would need to bring again, that's where we adjust in the packer overtime line item. We would be able to make that adjustment before the council meeting, just on the other taxing jurisdictions, always talk, talking equalized value. We are at an equalized mill rate of 852. This would take us to an 844. We would still show a 1% reduction on the equalized side, but the portion that affects your tax bill is assessed. So, we were in a 3% increase that's would take us up 3.4 based on what your amended budget.

- Do we have to go back and re-approve the whole law, just not that line, but do we have to approve?

- I think he would just approve line number 24, which is the item in which it falls into. Line 24 is your road run revenue for the general fund and log would fall under that category. So if you were chosen then, okay.

- We did that, okay. All right, so now, are we going to end the night with this increase?
- Barb, I'd just like to make a comment?
- Sure, go ahead Alder Vander Leest
- Adding more to the tax burden at this time, I think is not a good idea for a lot of people. And I wouldn't support, you know, adding another 215,000 and going from 3% to 3.5 or whatever it might be or 3.4, I just don't feel it's real good timing at this time, due to our economic environment, you know, right across the board for the city a lot of people, you know, at 3% is an increase in, I just don't feel that it's really the best timing to do more increased if we already, we already have, in other words, the mirror proposed a certain budget and I didn't expect, you know, add another 200 and some thousand. That's my thoughts. And I think it's bad timing right now, personally. That's how I feel. And I really couldn't support any more increases. So thank you.
- Director Ellenbecker, so on doing the hundred thousand dollar home, again, this adds, there are \$34 for every a hundred thousand that your home is assessed. Is that correct?
- You're muted.
- Yes, it would be 33 cents per hundred thousand.
- 33 cents.
- It would so it'd be ended up being \$33, increase.
- A \$33 per 100,000. Well, and I understand why we increased it and I agreed and I voted on it and we do need to increase that we absolutely need to do that. So I guess what we'll just have to do is go to council with this because we did approve it all the way down the line. So Alder Johnson
- I was just going to comment. I mean, there's not a final vote that we need to take based on the agenda. So there'll be advanced as it is. And I think there's a number of alders who are not on the call today that we'll likely want to propose some modifications and I think if we're going to be pragmatic about this, we know that's coming, so...
- Okay. I don't think reconsider anything and let it go before the full council and...
- I agree
- Modifications.
- Okay, all right. So then let's go on the next finance committee meeting will be held on Tuesday, November 17th at 4:30 PM. Personnel will be held on Tuesday, November 17th at 4:30 PM. And the contingency account is probably down from \$93,322, but what is it now? Do we know the magic number?

- We do. Actually in the last finance committee meeting, we also approved 2 different contingency items. And now we approve one tonight, you just not seen the impact yet the general entry hasn't been completed. So last meeting, we did the tornado siren of 17,000 rounded, we had some admitted taxes about \$4,500, and then the 45,000 that we approved today, that would take us our contingency if down from 93,322, to \$26,697.70.

- Okay. Thank you. All right, I'll entertain a motion to adjourn this meeting.

- Motion to adjourn.

- Motion to adjourn by Alder Galvin. Second by Alder Corpus-Dax.

- Aye. Motion carries. Thank you all for your patience.