



MINUTES OF THE FINANCE COMMITTEE

TUESDAY, DECEMBER 8, 2020, 4:30 PM

Virtual meeting. Public may join via Zoom.

AMENDED

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, Veronica Corpus-Dax, Brian Johnson, Bill Galvin

Also Present: Ald. Jesse Brunette, Ald. Mark Steuer, Ald. Chris Wery, Kelsey Donohue-Axon, Police Lt. Ben Allen, Police IT Jason Bamman, Procurement Manager Calvin Winters, Police Chief Andrew Smith, Deputy City Attorney Joanne Bungert, Public Works Director Steve Grenier, Baker Tilly Partner Carla Gogin, Baker Tilly Partner Kim Shult, Finance Director Diana Ellenbecker, Assistant Finance Director Pam Manley, and others.

C. APPROVAL OF THE AGENDA.

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

D. APPROVAL OF MINUTES.

I. Approval of the Finance Committee minutes from the November 17, 2020 meeting.

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

Yes- Barbara Dorff, Bill Galvin, Veronica Corpus-Dax, Brian Johnson

E. REGULAR BUSINESS.

I. For consideration with possible action to approve the Axon Officer Safety plan 7+ five-year agreement to not exceed \$2,707,837 contingent upon Law Department review and approval.

Moved by Ald. Brian Johnson, seconded by Ald. Veronica Corpus-Dax to Open the Floor. Motion carried.

Yes- Barbara Dorff, Bill Galvin, Veronica Corpus-Dax, Brian Johnson

Moved by Ald. Bill Galvin, seconded by Ald. Veronica Corpus-Dax to Close the Floor. Motion carried.

Yes- Barbara Dorff, Bill Galvin, Veronica Corpus-Dax, Brian Johnson

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

Moved by Ald. Brian Johnson, seconded by Ald. Veronica Corpus-Dax to advance to Council with no recommendation. Motion failed.

Yes- Veronica Corpus-Dax, Brian Johnson, No- Barbara Dorff, Bill Galvin

Vote made on original motion and that motion also failed.

Yes- Barbara Dorff, Bill Galvin, No- Veronica Corpus-Dax, Brian Johnson

2. Request for approval to purchase a used tractor replacement from Service Motor Company for \$41,750.

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

Yes- Barbara Dorff, Bill Galvin, Veronica Corpus-Dax, Brian Johnson

3. For consideration with possible action the distribution of required communication from new auditing firm Baker Tilly US, LLP.

Moved by Ald. Brian Johnson, seconded by Ald. Bill Galvin to Open the Floor. Motion carried.
Yes- Barbara Dorff, Bill Galvin, Veronica Corpus-Dax, Brian Johnson

Moved by Ald. Brian Johnson, seconded by Ald. Bill Galvin to Close the Floor. Motion carried.
Yes- Barbara Dorff, Bill Galvin, Veronica Corpus-Dax, Brian Johnson

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

4. Resolution for state trust fund loan for \$340,000 (financing reevaluation assessment service for the City 2020-2022) approved at the Common Council meeting November 10, 2020.

Moved by Ald. Veronica Corpus-Dax, seconded by Ald. Bill Galvin to approve the resolution. Motion carried.
Yes- Barbara Dorff, Bill Galvin, Veronica Corpus-Dax, Brian Johnson

5. To refer to staff 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" with request that they return to the next Finance committee meeting with an approximate window of how long it will take to complete the project internally in addition to providing recommended actions should we need to outsource the service. Motion carried.

Moved by Ald. Bill Galvin, seconded by Ald. Veronica Corpus-Dax to refer to staff to continue working on it and to come back in February to give a status update and to be treated as a priority. In addition, if this does not look to be on track to be completed by the end of April or early May then we look at other options to see what can be done to get this project done. Motion carried.
Yes- Barbara Dorff, Bill Galvin, Veronica Corpus-Dax, Brian Johnson,

6. For consideration and possible action on the status of pending litigation in Harris v. Meves et al.

The Committee/Council may convene in closed session pursuant to Section 19.85(1)(g) Wisconsin Statutes for the purpose of conferring with legal counsel for the governmental body who is rendering oral or written advice concerning strategy to be adopted by the body with respect to litigation in which it is or is likely to become involved. The Committee/Council may, thereafter, reconvene in open session pursuant to Section 19.85(2) Wisconsin Statutes to report any actions taken during the closed session and to consider all other matters on the agenda.

Moved by Ald. Brian Johnson, seconded by Ald. Bill Galvin to go into closed session at 6:04 p.m.
Motion carried.

Ald. Brian Johnson read the closed session language.

Yes- Barbara Dorff, Bill Galvin, Veronica Corpus-Dax, Brian Johnson

Moved by Ald. Bill Galvin, seconded by Ald. Veronica Corpus-Dax to return to regular order of business at 6:14 p.m. Motion carried.

Moved by Ald. Brian Johnson, seconded by Ald. Veronica Corpus-Dax for staff to proceed as directed in closed session. Motion carried.

Yes- Barbara Dorff, Bill Galvin, Veronica Corpus-Dax, Brian Johnson

7. 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. Brian Johnson to receive and place on file. Motion carried.

Yes- Barbara Dorff, Bill Galvin, Veronica Corpus-Dax, Brian Johnson

F. INFORMATIONAL.

1. 2020 Contingency Account \$26,561.45.

2. The next Finance Committee meeting for the 2021-2025 CIP / 2021 borrowing will be on Tuesday January 5, 2021 at 4:30 PM.

3. The next Finance Committee meeting for regular business and CIP/2021 borrowing follow-up will be on Tuesday January 12, 2021 at 4:30 PM.

G. ADJOURNMENT.

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

Yes- Barbara Dorff, Bill Galvin, Veronica Corpus-Dax, Brian Johnson

H. VERBATIM MINUTES.

- Okay, I'll like to call the December 8th meeting of the finance committee to order and I will do the roll call. Ald. Galvin.
- Here.
- Ald. Johnson.
- Here.
- Ald. Corpus-Dax.
- Here.
- And Ald. Dorff is here. We'll move on to approval of the agenda. I will entertain a motion.
- Still moved.
- Moved by Ald. Corpus Dax.
- Second.
- Second by Ald. Galvin, discussion? Hearing none. All those in favor say, aye.
- [Committee] Aye.
- Opposed, nay. Motion carries. Approval of the minutes from November 17th, 2020.
- Still moved.
- Second.
- Moved by Ald. Corpus Dax, second Ald. Johnson. Discussion? Hearing none. All those in favor say, aye.
- [Committee] Aye.
- Opposed, nay. Motion carries. All right, item number one. Into regular business. For consideration with possible action to approve the Axon Officer Safety Plan, seven plus five-year agreement, to not exceed \$2,707,837 contingent upon law department review and approval. Who would like to talk?
- Okay in your packet, you had quite a bit of information. There was a little bit of a summary on the report page. Then there was a summary of costs and then there was a very detailed what made up all the cost in your packet. We have the vendor on the line, we have the chief, and we have the captain on the line. I guess I would send it back to you and ask you what questions you have.
- And so this was what we had the report on it canceled last week?
- Correct.
- Correct, so we... That was, I don't have any questions, does anyone else have any questions? Yes, Ald. Johnson.
- Thank you chair. I'm gonna ask you a couple questions specifically about the proposal and then maybe call there, maybe a little broader. So the first thing is on the page the Packers discount.

- What page are you on? Do you know?
- It is page one of the proposal it says, Axon Packers Partnership Discount. Can somebody please explain to me what that is? And should we open the floor? I mean to these questions that perhaps, I mean the vendor would be best positioned to answer directly?
- Yeah, I can answer that if that's okay.
- We'd have to open the floor.
- I'll do a motion to open the floor.
- Second.
- Can motion open the floor, second discussion? Hearing none. All those in favor say, aye.
- [Committee] Aye.
- Opposed? Motion carries, the floor is open. Okay, Ms. Donohue.
- Yep, so we did establish a bit of a partnership with the Packers where we were providing some discounted pricing. So we have already applied that discount to this particular contract. So that's all that means is that we've established a partnership with them and so that they're able to help more departments. We're able to give them a little bit better pricing which in turn to you.
- Okay, so when I'm looking at the vacant minus Packers contribution, are they making a bigger contribution other than just being working and negotiating in good faith on behalf of multiple organizations?
- Yeah. So Ben, do you wanna comment on that? You or Kevin or Diana?
- Sure I can step in and then certainly Ben can talk too. At this point, it hasn't been disclosed the amount so we're not able to bring that too. We talked about trying to go into closed session but we really didn't have the right reasons to go into closed session and that really, you know we can refer to attorney Bungert if she... I mean if you can explain why we didn't go... I have closed session language on here. And then Ben if you wanna talk too about the full rollout by the Packers.
- Attorney Allen, are you gonna talk?
- You want me too-
- Okay, I'm sorry Captain Allen, Captain, right?
- That's all right. I didn't know if Joanne wanted to talk about the closed session language or?
- Oh.
- Well I'll tell you basically it sounds to me like we don't have an answer to that question right now. Right? I mean, is that accurate?
- Essentially what we've been working on them with is to cover a portion of the body camera itself. So inside of the body camera, the taser that's gonna come out of the city, along with these squad cameras. So they're a big interest and they're a big push on the social justice front is that effort with the body cameras. So that's

where their interests lie. We've talked about doing the possibility various different ways of their funds assisting with this from this going to the first full year of the contract to portions of the first and second year. And then the city would be responsible for second, third, fourth, and fifth year or a combination of that.

- Not been decided that's still being negotiated or discussed?

- So their plan is, at city council, they'll have their full funding package out and ready to go to us, and ready to go for the city. There's some dynamics there that they're working through to address, you know, and they're being... From the beginning of this project they said they were going to fund a big portion of this, not just for us but for Brown County and Ashwaubenon as well. So as we work through this, every one of 'em is gonna be very different based on product that they choose. The number of units that each need, obviously Ashwaubenon is very small compared to what our needs are, Brown County is probably very similar. But they're in a different vote with the equipment that they need as far as tasers, and squad cams, and those things go. So they're looking at really what can they do to minimize the cost upfront for us that we're able to purchase as for, you know, this five-year really long-term agreement.

- Okay, so when I'm looking at... And perhaps, you know the answer to this captain, perhaps not, but when... In the agreement it's laid out as kind of like a five-year plan of what things would look like. It's anticipated then that the Packers contribution would be heavily weighted towards that first year with the net five-year payment plan?

- Yes sir, that's the plan we're... And again, we talked about maybe that one year, that first year they would take on a large portion of that and then this or putting their portion into the first and second year.

- Okay, but we won't have that answer until the city council meeting next week?

- Correct and I know that Diana has worked numbers upside down and backwards to try to make this work so she may have a better answer on some of the particular finance numbers.

- That at least is helpful. I just was looking for an update kind of where we were at on that conversation so thank you. The next question I had is on page 18 and Kelsey maybe a question for you, but maybe city staff, I'm not sure. It talks about the need to pay for additional equipment. So the equipment that is not covered by Axon but equipment that the city would need to provide. And I believe, and I'm scrolling here, if that was related to like servers, monitors, that type of thing?

- Yeah. And actually this is probably better suited... I think I saw Jason on here 'cause Jason has... Well I don't wanna speak for him but I'm pretty sure he's reviewed our statement of work here inside and out. And that's where you is page 18 of the actual quote, where it has a statement of work and Wi-Fi offload considerations.

- Yap. That's exactly it. And what I'm trying to determine here is in addition to the quote that's being provided by Axon, how much additional expense is the city going to need to incur, to fulfill, you know, this thing holistically?

- Right, so the quote that we provided is going to provide all necessary components. Now, again, I wanna turn that over to Jason just because from a technological standpoint, from the IT standpoint, he's probably best suited to speak about that. And we've had significant amount of conversations around that as well. Jason, are you there?

- I am. Can you hear me?

- Yep we gotcha.

- Okay, good afternoon, ladies and gentlemen, I'm Jason Bamman, I'm the IT specialist here at Green Bay Police Department. What we have in place really is we're going through and revamping our Wi-Fi infrastructure throughout the city. That's really where the majority of this is gonna focus on. This is all part of an overall sweeping transformation of our Wi-Fi. It's not really any additional costs that hasn't already been incurred by this Wi-Fi project.

- Okay, so any IT equipment required by the city is already accounted for in our annual budget?

- Yes, sir.

- Okay, thank you. Answer that was looking for. In terms of... So once the warranty expires, because I believe a lot of these components were one year, I think some might've been a little different. But once that warranty expires, perhaps Kelsey you might be able to expound upon this a little bit. Like in other events that use your product or service how would we expect in terms of maintenance costs every year?

- So that's a great question. I'm going to start off first and foremost by saying that nothing that anybody can make on this planet is cop-proof. And I am pretty sure chief has figured that out and so has everybody else in the PD. If there's a way to break something a cop's gonna do it. That said though, this is a comprehensive program. So the reason that we included that quote summary document that really breaks things down and gets pretty granular into what's included, is that everything's covered under extended warranties. If there's a repair or replacement that's needed, it's covered under this program through the full five-year first upgrade, the body cameras every two and a half years. So you're actually getting three sets of body cameras throughout that five-year contract 'cause you're gonna get 'em in the first day of the contract. You're gonna get 'em again at month 30 and then at month 60. And when I say upgrades, I truly mean that. If we've come out with the Axon body four, at that point that's replaced the body three, that's what you'll be receiving. Same goes for the docking stations that they utilize to offload the data. And then also for the in-car system, we upgrade that at the end of five years because there's a useful life for those components as well. So the idea being, this being a full comprehensive maintenance program as well so that they're not coming back to you every so often and saying, "Look, I had a bunch of equipment break. Now I need, you know, 20,000 more dollars to go ahead and replace it or repair it."

- So this is really more of like an equipment lease program as opposed to purchasing?

- It is not a lease, no terms have already been reviewed and actually we sent back our final copy today that was accepted, I believe. So you do own the equipment from day one. The beauty of us serving law enforcement is that we allow flexible payments, so that gives you the opportunity to pay that over time even though you own the equipment from day one.

- Okay so as part of the agreement, you kind of rotate the equipment to, exactly. Yeah, I mean the cameras have lithium-ion batteries inside of 'em so I would consider it like, think about your cell phone, right? So a lot of the reason that people get new cell phones other than another new shiny toy, is that the battery starts to die on them, right? So you're having to charge them more often, they're dying a lot quicker. Same goes for body cameras typically because they have those lithium-ion batteries, it degrades over time. We try to get ahead of that by replacing it for you automatically every two and a half years. But again, if something happens to that, you know, captain Allen can call me up or call up your dedicated customer success manager that you're gonna have and say, "Hey this camera went down." They'll have spares on site to replace those with that are free and included with the program, and then we'll send them new cameras to replace whatever they've sent back to us.

- Okay, thank you for that. So those are some of the more general questions I had, but I mean maybe more difficult question, director Ellenbecker, how are we paying for this?

- At this point, it would have to be a long-term borrowing. It would have to be put in our CIP at this point, if it is not been added to the CIP after tonight's meeting and council meeting if they are approved, it would be put in our long-term borrowing. There would be some expectations that there would be cost in the year two, three, four, and five.

- Okay, so would you pull on that bond? I mean, is that what you're proposing is that we pull on that bond every year? Because you wouldn't wanna pull more on the bond than what's necessary. So that would be part of the annual bonding process that you would pull whatever amounts necessary for that year's agreement value?

- Yes, correct because the agreement, once we have it all locked in place we'll know exactly how much we owe on an annual basis.

- And is that the long-term plan? And the reason I asked the question is because clearly this is demonstrating that it's an annual expenditure that's necessary to maintain the program, so it would seem odd to me that we would automatically put ourselves... We're gonna indebt ourselves, you know for one year needs.

- We certainly... Obviously every year we should try to put in our operating budget but really the fallback is going to be, if we can't get in our operating budget, it would have to be borrowed for.

- Okay, and then the last question that I have, did we do an RFP on this? I know it was mentioned a little bit, you know, at the council meeting, but I'd like to just talk about that a little bit.

- I'm gonna let Calvin speak to that item.

- No, there was not an RFP done. There were initial discussions about doing that. And we started working through that process but Axon is on the Source Wall contract which is a group consortium, it's nationwide. It's something that they did an RFP, Source Wall did, with multiple reviewers. I did review all the documents, all the contracts the RFP that they put out. Everything does line up to our policies, meets our policies, so they did the competitive process for us, we are just piggybacking off of their contract.

- Okay, so I just wanna make sure that we're following city policies and, you know, certainly correct me if I'm wrong on this Calvin, but it was my understanding that an RFP was required, Is there sort of an escape clause, if you will that allows us to go about your approach that you mentioned?

- What is required by our procedures is some sort of competitive process. So the Source Wall group did the competitive process for us and now we are tagging onto their competitive process just like we recently did the financial services, RFP. The village of Ashwaubenon piggybacked off of our RFP to get the same results and go with the vendor that we chose. So this is no different. This is a very standard practice throughout the industry and we are following all of our policies and procedures.

- And Ald. Johnson, if I could jump in for a second, we did a five year... We did a comprehensive review of the different body camera systems that were available out there and Axon rose to the top. Again, when we started exploring this, this year, we went ahead and looked at all the top vendors that were out here and Ben Allen can talk to that in great specificity if you'd like. But we didn't just pick Axon because they were the biggest and best known, we really took a long look at other agencies, what they were using, what other systems were available out there and the cost benefits of each of those systems. So this wasn't just a, "Hey, let's go with Axon 'cause they're the biggest name out there and I happen to have experienced with them." It's because they rose to the top in our search through all the other vendors that are out there.

- Okay. Thank you for that chief. And I wanna be clear, you know, not picking on this particular item. I feel like I've been very consistent with other committees as well. Asking questions when we don't get a sufficient number of bids and so I'm just kinda following that practice. Okay, that's all I have for questions right now.

- Thank you, alder. Are there any other... Yes, Ald. Galvin.

- Thank you chair and thank you Ald. Johnson for those questions. I guess I'm gonna piggyback on some of those. As I was reading through the documentation, it looks like the overall cost is roughly \$2.7 million over five years, is that correct? And Axon is saying that because of the package we're getting and because of the Packers input we're saving just under a million dollars.

- Yeah, so if we were to do these items all apart rather than bundling them the way that we have here where that they're receiving. So from the automated redaction tools, from the replay coaching tools, what we call Axon Performance, which is gonna help with policy adherence. All of these additional pieces of software added separately actually equal a higher dollar amount which is what that discount reflects when you... If we actually take it all and put it all together in one single bundle, rather than piecing it all together, that's where you see a lot of that savings. Additionally, we did provide trade-in credit for the current tasers that they have. And then we also have the Packers discount, like we said in there for the partnership that we have with them.

- Okay, it's just seems kinda odd going into an agreement that we don't know what the other party is gonna put forth into there. I mean, it's like, you know, like I'm gonna go buy a car with my parents and I don't know how much they're gonna give in. So, you know, how's that deal kinda working? You know what I mean? It seems kinda weird that we don't have firm numbers yet because those decisions should be made at the committee level and it's almost like we're gonna have to wait until we get to council. And I mean if that's, how it ends up working, that's how it works off help as it should be, I think in my opinion, vetted out more at the committee level. And despite whatever decision is made, it can again be vetted at council. As I'm looking at this and it says 190 units, I guess that's based on basically 190, officers will have body cameras, tasers. So each officers- - 150.

- 150.

- For the tasers, yeah. So there's more that are gonna carry the body cameras, than have the tasers 'cause you're gonna include like command, staff and those that don't necessarily carry tasers on a day-to-day with body cameras.

- Unless they have a difficult staff meeting or something. Okay, so we're gonna have every detective, every sworn person carrying a badge is gonna have a camera issued, is that correct? Okay and obviously this is for Ben, and the chief, and Kevin. Undercover, who's wearing those cameras? I mean, I can't see paying for a camera, if it's gonna sit in an investigator's drawer for nine months and then he goes out on an investigation and jumps a patrol call and then something serious and he doesn't have a camera on, or didn't know how to operate it or something like that. I'll see in procedures gonna be updated to cover the use of these cameras?

- Yeah, a 100%. So the idea with investigators having them is they'll use those for their recordings of their interviews. They'll use them, you know, out on the street, when they're doing an interview in one of their detective vehicles, with those use them in the interview rooms. That way we have that one storage system, that one place where all those things go. So that's the idea behind that. We also know that our detectives work a lot of over time special event type things. So we wanna make sure that we have the resource there for them, particularly for the Packer games, for, you know, the big events, the Bell Runs, those things. When we get back to a normal time when we can have those things, we have that resource available to them.

- Okay, when they leave the station to go to lunch, are they gonna be wearing that camera?

- As far as detectives go?

- Yes.

- You know, I haven't really thought about that part of it. We certainly could.

- I guess, you know Gordon Graham predictable it's preventable, okay? And I've lived by those words and I could name off 10 incidents where detectives left the station thinking it was just gonna be, go to the gas station or something, they end up in a shooting or a fight or something like that. So I'm just wondering and the same thing goes for command staff. I mean, I can name some incidents where we're on the road and something went on and they weren't equipped to be able to go and help or deal with it. So I'm just wondering, if we're gonna be buying these cameras, I think our policies should be reworked to cover that. They're held just as accountable as every patrol units out on the street and that they have those cameras on 'em and that they're working. You know, I'm sure there's gonna be situations where you don't want 'em on. I understand that, but I just wanna make sure as we're moving forward with this that the department's prepared because you know there are a lot of people out there that have lost some trust within departments throughout the United States. We've seen it and we have to deal with it. And I think the thing is we have to earn that trust back in a lot of regards. And I think we have to have those policies and procedures in place to be able to show people that, yeah, we're standing on our two feet and you know we're gonna show 'em that we're gonna do everything possible to make sure everyone can see that we're transparent in every action that we take so I appreciate that. Five years of borrowing, director Ellenbecker, you know, my complaint on police officers borrowing for squad cars that only last four or five years and other equipment, and this equipment is gonna last a maximum of five years with some updating by Axon. But it's, you know, is that... I know we need to get these, I understand that. I mean, this is a need that probably should have been taken care of years ago, and we all know the financial stress the city's in. But is this the smartest thing going forward for us?

- You know it is something that we want. The only thing I can tell you, the only thing currently we have in our budget is around \$21,000 annually for our tasers. So we wouldn't be potentially the way we structure the payments. We wouldn't be required to make a payment in the year 2021 that would have given us time to ramp up and start putting money aside in the budget year over year. Either maybe there's a year or two maybe where you bow for a portion of it and then by the fifth year you are putting it in your operating budget. But at this point I don't have a set dollars set aside for this project. So it's either we find a way to get it into our operating budget or we'll have to be borrowed if we want this equipment.

- Okay and I-

- And that's kind of on us to decide to do that as council the next time the budget comes around.

- Absolutely.

- Right?

- And then one suggestion I would make that the department did do when we initially were trying to find the monies to buy our initial tasers, was we went to city hall and the... I can't remember like when laws prevention thing to take a look at the amount of officers and suspects that were injured while making arrest. And look at the cause from lawsuits and time off and that, and see if there was a cause analysis that we could say, "You know something, this is worth getting these because we prevented officers being off duty because of injuries, we prevented claims being made against the city because of injuries." And things like that and I guess I would encourage the city to look at doing that as we move forward here. Thank you and that's all I have for now.

- Ald. Brunette.

- Thank you chairperson Dorff. Good questions from Ald. Galvin and Johnson today. For a little more specific answer though Diana, so we're going to be bonding money for the next five years for the cameras. How long would the bond? 15 year, 10, 15 years, 20?

- Really any bond or note can be taken off for any period of time. You know, we've taken on old notes as low as one year, and we've taken notes out for 10 years and the bonds can go up for 20 years. You know, when we worked with bond council, you prefer not to borrow something longer than that. Which we also look at the average of everything that you're borrowing and in some cases they're saying, "Well pay out the items that have the shortest life span" But again that is something that would be at the time of borrowing, we can decide how long we would want to borrow and try to pay for those. Especially if we are looking to get it in your operating budget. You know, that would be certainly something that we can try to keep it on the short end and then knowing that again in a few years that we are now older percent on operating and no longer paying off a previous years borrowing.

- The bond issue would be in January or typically... I know the mayor was attempting to have everything lined up with the budget year, are we still looking at perhaps April or May like we had been in previous years?

- Well, the reason why we'd wanted to try to line it up with our budget, is so that if there are some dollars in your budget that you could tick things off of your capital improvement plan, put it in your budget, and then not since we were not able to have any room or capacity to put any items, we put a few small items in it but because we didn't have room in our budget, this did not move into our 2021 borrowing. We would never borrow it in at the budget time, we would certainly move it into the next year. And so we are still looking at springtime to borrow for anything that we want to borrow in 2021. Again, this would not be something that... If we continue to move forward with the financing structure that we have, we wouldn't have to borrow food in 2021, it would really be at spring, probably of 2022.

- So the Green Bay Packers are going to be contributing something and it's odd for me that this committee is... As Ald. Galvin said, this is a very astute point. We're discussing something without knowing what they're going to offer. So it could be that they offer the full \$778,000, or it could be that they're offering a hundred thousand. What this committee decides, is almost as if the city of Green Bay, is tipping our hand with our approval. So we as committee goes for forward said, "Yep, we're okay with this." Then the Packers know that, I mean we should know the amount that the Packers are contributing before this discussion even happens. We are definitely putting the cart before the horse and the timing just seems very odd to me and I'm not directing that at any specific person just an analysis for my perspective.

- And so we don't. So I wonder if we should be doing this at council and not here. I mean, we can talk about it here, but can we do it as the committee of the whole item? Or can we just send down to council without a recommendation? We've done that before because you're right, Ald. Brunette and Johnson, know how much we're hoping and thinking that we're going to be supported because the Packers have indicated they want to support us. And yet we do have to be responsible to our constituents and we don't know what that number is but we will know by the next meeting. So director Ellenbecker, is there any concern with us just holding it till then?

- Can I just ask a follow up question on that Ald. Dorff?

- Sure.

- Is there a sense of urgency around this? Because my fear then is now if we're asking the full city council to be taking on the committee work.

- And I would like to chime in here and I am really gonna look to the captain or the chief. Part of the timing is, you know, I guess... I know those two we have worked with kind of have discussed and worked with the Packers about rolling this out as one big plan, as long as it's... 'Cause they wanna make sure that Ashwaubenon is on board to wanting to move forward with the cameras, and that Brown County wants to move forward with the cameras and that Green Bay wants to move forward. So they're looking to see whether or not the municipalities are willing to move forward with this plan. And so Smith, do you have any more to add? I know you had talked with some on the Packers side.

- Speaking with the Packers, they are very anxious to move forward with us. I think speaking from the community, I think there's a very strong level of support for us moving forward with these cameras. In fact, people are asking why we didn't do this years ago and there were a lot of reasons that I spoke about last time when I talked about the changes in the state legislature that happened this year that make it a lot more feasible for us to have cameras. The upgrades in the camera systems and the redaction software that's gonna make it more affordable for us, and us wanting to move forward smartly. I think the DPR already has them, UWGB already has them. Ashwaubenon is moving forward quickly, I talked to the sheriff last week. He's moving forward on some camera system, I don't think he knows exactly which type he's going with yet. But I think there's a sense of urgency from the Packers, certainly from the community. The officers are eager to jump on board and be a part of this 'cause I think they see the benefit in protecting themselves from the false complaints that they see out there from time to time, so I think that's kind of where our urgency is.

- And if I can jump in just for one second. So I speak with the Packers regularly, almost daily at this point, they're probably tired of me. And we... I mean, it's gonna be offering you guys. I think that what we're trying to just make sure that we're ironing out here is the logistics of it and how it comes to the city, and goes to the PD, and how those payments get made or payment gets made. The ideal here would be that you wouldn't have to spend any dollars here in the first year of the contract, aside from the \$21,600 for the tasers, that was already bid for. Now that's not, you know, what is committed quite yet, Like I said, we're finalizing all of that and believe they're gonna be a part of the city council meeting next week to, you know, finalize that and address it as far as our discussion went today. But that's really the ideal and where we're striving to be is that you owe \$0 this year aside from the tasers you already had budgeted for.

- Ald. Brunette.

- Yeah, thank you. By the way, thank you for all those comments, everyone. And that's good to know, 'cause it seems from what Ms. Donohue just said, the Packers will, you know, be willing to give a very sizable contribution which may mean it's very easy to do in year one. I guess what my concern is year two, three, and four or five which spears 307,526, 547,000. Which again is what it is, and we'll get to that point in future budget years and borrowing years. My question though is we, as city of Green Bay are stewards of our taxpayer dollars and what I'm hoping we do with an RFP that in this case wasn't necessarily publicly disclosed. Mr. Winters, our purchasing manager, would that scoring criteria, that analysis that you said had happened? Would that be a public document that we could, one as a city council look at but separate lease to the public. So they know that we did our due diligence that we're just not moving forward with a \$2.7 million contract without the supporting documentation that this was bid out competitively?

- Yes, all of the documents in public. I can certainly pull that documentation up and provide it if it was requested.

- Prior to the city council meeting?

- Ald. Brunette actually on the report page, it's really the summary page for this item. There is under reference number two, there is a link to the RFP that. If that doesn't give you what you need then please let us know. But that should be the link to the RFP that we are using and piggybacking.

- Yeah, not so much, and thank you for that director Ellenbecker, but not so much a link or I'm gonna actually print it and make it part of the attachment in our agenda when it goes to the council. And thank you for that. I did not click the link, but I appreciate that. The reason why I'm really kinda driving home on this because just a day, bear with me for a minute, the "Prince Times" had published an article that in Ashwaubenon, their public safety manager indicated that there were like five different companies that they were looking for in regards to their body cameras, so I think that that's important to note. So I agree with the chief. I think we are all at... Not all, I don't wanna speak for everyone, but I'm at the point now where I think body cameras are critical to protect our officers and the public and it's good to know. One final question regarding detectives, chief,

perhaps, or commander. Detective wears a camera and it's on, and they're questioning someone on the street. Do you find that a person would be more willing to give information, to help solve a crime if a camera is on? Like, is there concern from people when they talk to the police about a crime that had occurred, to have a video recording of that crime or that conversation is that?

- You know, sir, I think that depends on the person, you know some people are eager and anxious to get their voice heard and they don't care that there's a camera on other people will. If we're talking about crime victims, or we're talking about children, or peaceful doing with regard to sensitive crimes, then the expectation would be at the officer would turn the camera off. And so those are the policies that we're working on and looking at best practices across the country where it's gonna work. But most people, their behavior changes somewhat when they know there's a camera on them. Some people are hesitant to speak up. Others are just as eager to talk whether it's on camera or not. Ben you have an experience with that you wanna share from other?

- If I would say you're right on, you know, it's gonna really depend on the situation, on the person, on types of incidents, those types of things. There's very strong policy that crime victims are not recorded. That's our current policy for our interview room area. Like if we have a crime victim in, that interview is not recorded. That would be the same for certain areas, hospitals, sensitive crime investigations, those types of things. And those are thankfully laid out by the state as far as state requirements go. Our policy, we can design that and have worked through multiple different policies that have been sent to us from other agencies that have had long-term body camera programs. So we've been working pretty diligently on policy but like chief Smith talked in the last couple of meetings that we've had about this. We have Lexipol and that's really the goal standard for policy across the country. So we really lean on that quite a bit to help us design that.

- Okay. Thank you gentlemen. No other questions Ald. Dorff.

- Ald. Steuer.

- Thank you. Thank you, Chair Dorff. A lot of the by the previous alders and I appreciate all of that. I guess I was gonna ask Captain Allen, but the surrounding areas are all at Ashwaubenon. So have you talked to Ashwaubenon at all as far as the dynamics of something like this? As far as body cameras, whether you're in Ashwaubenon or in Green Bay? Especially the fact that everything is so closely tied together in that area.

- Yes, so they're actively searching for what body camera system they're gonna go with. They have been in talks with Axon as well. One of the initial things we talked about with all agencies in Brown County was to kinda streamline that process a little bit and get it to where we have one consistent or a couple of consistent systems. And really that's to be able to get these videos, the recordings, interviews, all those things to the DA's office and to, you know, the end user which is both the DA's office and the general public that's going to be sitting on a jury, those types of things. So we really did talk about that quite a bit with our partnering agencies in the county about the system that we wanna use.

- Okay, that helps. Just one other thing, I agree with the fact that, you know, the amount what is it, 7.2? Was that it? I'm sorry, what was the amount for these cameras again, 2.7?

- 2.7, yes.

- For the whole package, right? And I know we've talked about different strategies and would it be a one, two, three five-year bond, that type of thing, and how much per year. Remember that the last couple of years, we were talking about a new safety building as well. And I think we got a really not forget about that as well. Things that are kind of reaching a certain point and I just want people to be aware of that as well that we got that coming down the pike as well. So it's a good discussion. I'm learning a lot. And I think some great questions were asked, but we'll be definitely on top of this, thank you.

- And committee, another thing I just want to mention is that in a week, we can vote on this. Nothing until council votes on it, nothing is really settled. So whether we vote on it here, if we support the idea, we support this in theory thinking we'll get a large amount, you know, that will help us. We can't support it here because it doesn't become real until council approves it anyway. And we will have more information then. So I'm open to also having a motion to support. I will call on you Ald. Galvin but Diana please go first.

- Nope, I just wanna remind you to close the floor before you to make your motion.

- Oh, okay. And I wasn't gonna make a motion, but okay. Does anyone still want to talk to Kelsey or anyone else that's on the floor? Do you think we should close the floor?

- Motion close the floor.

- Motion close the floor by Ald. Galvin. And Brian and Veronica are very silent. Ald. Corpus-Dax seconded that. Okay. All those in favor say, aye.

- [Committee] Aye.

- Opposed? Motion carries. Okay, the floor is closed. Okay. So what would you like, Ald. Galvin?

- I would like to make a motion to accept this proposal. I mean, the police department has done a very good job, a lot of due diligence in comparing the different products out there. And they've done a very good job of comparing not only just audio recording and video recording, but also because the cars, the tasers, the redacting, everything that's gonna be involved in this. So this is like an octopus and there's a lot of different things involved here to make this all come together in the package that we have. The tasers were out of date when I was in the department six years ago and we're in poor shape. And I know that the squad car cameras were having a heck of a time even six years ago. So, I mean, these are all things that are on the verge or are past the verge of needing to be replaced. When Mr. Winters explained them, my concerns about the IRP, I accept that, that this has been vetted properly. I think moving forward, which means not just the link but have them in the packet so that the citizens and residents first can see it but I think we've done everything we need to do. The only thing we need to see is what is our final cost gonna be and what are the Packers gonna give. But I'm gonna make a motion that we accept this and approve it.

- Is there a second?

- I'll, second, I think we had, you know, I had a lot of the same concerns and questions that were asked, with the other alders. You know, I think we're gonna have a lot of great conversations and additional questions once we hear more at the next council meeting so I'll go ahead and second this.

- Thank you Ald. Corpus-Dax. Yes, Ald. Johnson?

- I'm not gonna support the motion. That's why I think we ought to be advancing this without a recommendation, because we talked about it here that we are going to be asking the city council to do committee work next week. And so I don't feel confident putting a vote on something for which I'm missing critical information. And there's a couple of pieces to me, they're very critical. One is what is the Packer's contribution? I mean, we're making a very sizeable commitment, a financial investment here for... And again, we're missing critical information. And I think that it's really important for us to understand so that we actually know what we're voting on. I do agree with chief, there's public sentiment out there for this. I do support making the investment in cameras, but I don't think that it's an excuse for us to rush something through when we're missing certain bits of information. And so I do think that we need to take our time and be patient and make sure all of our questions are answered. So that's one key piece that I'm struggling with right now is not knowing what that piece that I'm struggling with, is getting stronger clarification. You know, whether it has to come from this body or staff but how we're going to pay for this. So we're looking at a seven year agreement

that is being paid for over five years. So one could argue that you've got two years that, you know we're gonna really be able to have without a payment, but otherwise we're looking over the next five years here at making payments of you know, four to \$500,000. And for us to bond that amount, and again, I recognize those two years we're not gonna have a payment. So let's say then for the sake of discussion you average it out, we're adding approximately \$400,000 a year in annual payments through our annual budget. And that's an indefinite expense, right? That's never going away. At the end of this seven year agreement, we're gonna have to sign a new one and that's gonna come with those same annual payments. I cannot support a bond on that. I mean that's like the equivalent to saying we're gonna bond for pay roll. I mean, this is an annual expense that we are incurring every single year and we need to find a way to pay for it. And if we can't pay for it, I mean, that's when you have to start having those discussions, if this is the right time to make that investment. Personally, I think we need to find a way to pay for it. I do believe that. But I mean if we continue to bond for this, indefinitely we're gonna get ourselves caught into a cycle where we're just growing debt on something that we can't ever retire if we can't ever find a way to incorporate this into our annual budget. So those are my two major comments that I wanted to offer up. I'm not gonna support the motion only because I think those are critical pieces of information. And I would prefer that we refer this to council without a recommendation, until that information is provided to us. In fact, can I ask legal for opinion? Can I drop Ald. Galvin's motion with a new motion to advance this with no recommendation? You're on mute.

- Sorry. You can make a motion to amend the motion.

- Okay. So I would offer up that motion and to amend the motion that we advance this without a recommendation.

- Well, I'm going to speak too. I will not support that motion, I'll support Ald. Galvin's original motion for a couple of reasons. First of all, we've known about this. We've asked about this like months ago when I said, "Isn't this in the budget?" And the chief answered, "But that's coming along the line in the capital improvement plan. So I mean, you've known for many months that it was coming up. I know we could not afford it the way our budget was this year. We are hoping that there will be other things that happen, for example, COVID will be gone. We'll be getting back some of the revenue that we didn't get. We'll hopefully get some revenue from other sources that I don't wanna really talk about right now. But we need to have body cameras. The police need to have body cameras. The public demands body cameras, we are not serving our city well, if we don't have these. So I also have a certain amount of trust in the Packers knowing that they've been with us on this journey and they certainly understand what we're going through as a city. And so I have it that what we hear at the next council meeting will be very good and we will be very acceptable to us and will help us. And then alders it's on us to figure out how are we gonna add this to the yearly budget? And we will figure that out. We will, we will have to because it's something we should have had years ago. So anyway, you have an amendment out there now and is there a second to the amended motion?

- Can I second it? I mean, I seconded Ald. Galvin's, I don't know if I can second Ald. Johnson and he has very valid points.

- You certainly can. You can second that if you want to.

- I'll second it.

- The amended motion... Yes Ald. Brunette.

- I am not on the committee. So it's a committee decision. But I just wanna say that, you know, hopefully attorney Bungert, you can put on the agenda a closed session. I don't know why that wasn't allowed here, Director Ellenbecker hinted at it. But I think that that's a... Go ahead.

- I'd like to chime in with an explanation as to why there wasn't a basis for it in law. Essentially, what was thought to be discussed is privacy considerations of a private party. And the attorney general has the, under

the basis for negotiation of public funds. That the closed session language is specifically just discussing our contribution and our investment of public funds that would qualify. But really the basis would have been to afford privacy to a third party. And that doesn't ensure the closed session language to apply.

- If the Packer organization between now and the council meeting come forward with what they're willing to contribute towards year one in and any future years, could we then have a closed session discussion at the city council?

- At that point closed session wouldn't matter, because the information will be public.

- I'm not understanding, are you saying that when this goes to the city council it will not be discussed in closed session?

- It wouldn't need to be discussed in closed session with respect to the Packers contribution, because at that point, my understanding, the Packers contributions would be announced.

- Yeah, okay. Thank you. I just heard the recent thread. I like the new recommendation. I don't think it's appropriate for the committee to recommend something with the open-ended part of the equation. The open-ended part is what exactly the Packers be contributing and what exactly the tax payers of the city will be on the hook for. That's not saying that I don't agree with the body cameras I think those speaking for the rest of the council, seems like there's a pretty big consensus on the council but that's probably the right way to go. And certainly being heard by certain people and, you know groups and constituents within my district so those are two separate things the argument for body cameras but the process in which this is being played out. I do think that I would have a... It seems like committee work to me, I'll just end by saying it does seem like the cart is before the horse seems like we're kinda... I don't know if we're trying to coordinate with other municipalities or coordinating around the Packers, announcing we're trying to line up with other municipalities, I don't know what the reasoning is, but to me it doesn't seem like extra ordinary, you know, thing that we cannot solve by a special meeting of the city council, if that's what's needed. So we can probably still, you know, vote on this at the end of the year. And as city council president, I certainly would allow and approve a special meeting in the city council as long as we do this the right way. But I do like that. I don't think you should make a recommendation, but again your committee, you can make your own votes obviously, thank you.

- Yes, Director Ellenbecker.

- I just wanna like bring it to your attention. Yes, we did ask for a closed session language, and then again we didn't have a strong enough case to put it on there. So that was the expectation that we could talk through maybe some potential numbers in closed session. And then the other point that Ald. Brunette said is again, it's really trying to coordinating with the Packers timeline and the municipality's timeline. And so we aren't able to, you know, share that information till we get that finalized from them. So those are the reasons why we're not being transparent. It's just that we have some things that are limiting to us at this at this point we weren't able to bring it to you at this point.

- To me, it seems like council is the failsafe. If we think this, that we need body cameras, we know we have to spend a certain amount of money on body cameras and we have a good proposal in front of us, if we recommend it based on those items, we don't need to know everything about every bit of financing right now, because it can't go forward unless city council approves it. And when it comes to city council, we will know, we will have those answers. So other than that, is there anything that's objectionable in this proposal because we know it can't move forward without city council's approval? That's where I'm coming from. That's why I would like to at least support the concept of getting body cameras to show that I believe that they're very necessary right now in this certain political climate that we're in. Ald. Galvin.

- To tag along with that, we all agree we need body cameras. Body cameras were needed a long time ago, and not just because of the current political climate that we're in, but we should've had them a long time ago. And it would've saved us a lot of grief over the years. And a lot of trouble, a lot of litigation, a lot of costs. At the same time, we're approving this and move forward. We haven't discussed how to finance it, I think that's set for another meeting. And so all we're approving is to move this forward as is. I mean, if the Packers didn't give any money to us at all we know that we would still be shelling out \$2.7 million. And so the only question would be, do we think it's worth it, right? Is it worth it at 2.7, then yeah, we have to go on board then yeah, we have to go back to Axon and start saying, "What are we cut out of it?" It's like being at the checkout line and the groceries, you know, do you approve of everything in the cart? Then let's get up to the cash register and get it going. If you don't approve of everything in the cart then get rid of it before you get up to the register, 'cause we've seen those people. They gotta start taking things out 'cause they don't have enough money. So are we approving that 2.7 million is worth it for this program? If so, I think we should vote on it today. How to pay for it, is something else I think that is gonna be reserved for another meeting down the road, thank you.

- Ald. Johnson.

- I just wanna make the point, I appreciate where you guys are coming from, you know, but I'm gonna maybe spin this around. I mean, we all recognize that we need more police officers, right? We've talked about that. We're fully staffed at 192. But then we have to stop and ask ourselves, why haven't we done that yet? Because we have to have the financial discussion. I mean, the finances don't appear out of thin air. And so I'm gonna stand behind the no recommendation because I think there are a lot of things that we want. There are a lot of things that we have to have but when you don't have all of the information, I have never seen a committee, and I could be mistaken, I mean, that votes to support something without knowing what they're spending. And so I'm gonna stand behind the no recommendation. Again, I do support the cameras, but I also support having all of the information that's necessary to make a big picture decision here. I agree with... You know, it just seems like some of these things might be held up because we're trying to make a PR announcement, and I can appreciate that. But we've routinely talked about how committees should be doing committee work and council should be, you know, that oversight body we're making... We're very intentionally, we're saying we're gonna wait for the full city council to do the committee work and make this decision. And so let's just give it to them and let them do that. And I just don't think that's an inappropriate process. I'll make a no recommendation. I'll support a no recommendation. So that way we can kind of agree to let council do that. And if they want to kick it back to committee, they can do that. If they wanna make the decision, they can do that. But I cannot... I mean, for me to sit here and say, "I'm gonna vote yes on this," says that I accept the terms as they're laid out right now. And without having those missing bits of information, I just can't do that.

- A clarification Ald. Johnson, how is sending it to council without a recommendation any different, aren't we still making them do committee work?

- Well, because sending it with a recommendation, right? If I say yes to send this to council, I'm approving this. I'm saying that this is the proposal. So that means that the Packers come back and say, "You know what, we're not gonna give you anything." I mean, my yes vote would still have to apply, right?

- No, of course not 'cause we're voting on it again at council, this is committee, only council.

- I understand from a procedural perspective, I can change my mind, but principally if you support it here why would you not support it at full council?

- If the Packers came back with no money, I wouldn't support it at full council. I mean, I am trusting to a certain extent that they will do what they say that they are going to do.

- And if they step up and offer that, then personally I just don't understand why this is such a debate. What's the difference if we send this with a yes, or if we send this with a no recommendation, I need more information.

- I'll accept your yes, certainly.

- I mean, and that's all I'm saying is, you know what? I still need more information. And if that information has been promised to us for the city council meeting, then I will hear it at that time, and I'll make a decision from there.

- All right. We currently have a motion on the floor to send it to council without a recommendation. All those in favor of sending it to council Oh wait, sorry, sorry there's Ald. Wery at the bottom and attorney Bungert.

- Thank you chairperson. Sorry I was just listening intently to the good discussion that was going on and a lot of good questions. I did have a question on the bid or no bid. I think it's what 2.7 million is the price, right? And while we didn't go out for open bids, it sounds like there were some internal or another group who did some bids for us on that, is that correct?

- Yes.

- Yes. So the bid was done by a group called Source Wall. It's a national consortium that we're a members of it for all nonprofit government organizations, so those types of things. It's free for us to be members. They go out, they are doing this on a nationwide level. And so you, obviously when you have that big of a pool coming in, you're gonna end up getting better pricing or better contracts negotiated rather than just us being a single organization, negotiating with a company. So there was a competitive process done. When I reviewed, I can't remember the exact number. I believe there were almost a dozen responses to the RFP, so there certainly was a very competitive process that was done.

- Okay, and I appreciate that information I guess I'm as probably others as well. I'm used to seeing the bids and knowing, "All right and are we getting the most expensive, but the best? Or you know, could we have paid million dollars less and gotten something workable?" You know, I just little uneasy with and I couldn't even to trust you, but it seems like a decision I'd like to have that information. I mean, were the other bids considerably less or are we talking \$10,000, quarter million, half a million?

- Because this is done in a way that you know, each organization could be trying to obtain a different amount of cameras. It wasn't done on a per camera base or anything, It was actually done on a discount percentage off of MSRP. So in our range here, I believe we are in the 150 to 200 range for cameras. We're looking at a 3% discount off of MSRP that, you know whatever negotiations or agreements they've had with the Packers is beyond that, but off the Source Wall contract and Kelsey can, I'm sure talk to that better. What kind of other discounts are included. But off the Source Wall contract, we are receiving a 3% discount, which is in line with what was submitted in their RFP response. - You gave me a lot of information, but I'm still not sure like the number two, the number two bidder were they close? Or was it not even close?

- I would have to look up the final results. I don't have... I mean, I can go through and look at that right now.

- And it's something you can forward to council members?

- Yep, and I think Ald. Brunette asked for us to include the documentation. So I certainly will pull all those documents and include those, and get them so you guys can see them.

- I appreciate it. And I'm sure, you know, we're gonna, you made a good choice, it's just, we're gonna get questions about, you know really you guys didn't look at any other bids and you know there's just... I wanna be able to speak intelligently through that and why we took it on. And I'm glad the Packers are gonna help, they're

always willing to step up, I'm just... I wish they were ready today. And I'm sure they know exactly how much they're giving. There's no reason they couldn't add it for us today but well, it is what it is so thank you for letting me speak.

- Attorney Bungert, did you have something or not?

- Yes. Procedurally what is in front of you is a motion to amend so that needs to be voted on. And then once that passes or fails.

- Got it.

- Then you can-

- Got it, okay.

- Then you would need to approve as amended or then you can proceed with Ald. Galvin's original motion.

- Thank you. All right. So we're gonna vote on the amendment which is to... The motion was amended to ascend to council, without a recommendation. All those in favor of the amended motion say, aye.

- Aye.

- Opposed, nay.

- Nay. I didn't get what you said, Ald. Corpus-Dax did you say nay?

- I said, aye.

- I didn't hear it. Okay, so then that is a two to two votes so that the amendment fails. So now we're back to the original motion which is a recommendation to send it to... To approve recommendation, to approve by Ald. Galvin then to a seconded by Ald. Corpus-Dax, so-

- Point of information.

- Yes.

- Just to seeking clarity, if this vote were to fail on a two to two does it automatically get advanced as no or?

- Yes.

- Okay.

- It does, which we could have done right from the beginning, but yes it does.

- And I just wanted that clarity. Thank you.

- Okay. All right. So ready to vote on the original motion. All those in favor say, aye loudly.

- [Committee] Aye.

- Opposed?

- [Committee] Nay.

- And so this motion fails, therefore we're back to sending it to council without a recommendation. Right attorney Bungert? That's correct.

- Yes that is correct.

- Yes. Okay.

- And so then essence will be doing committee work at council.

- Which we would have done anyway and often do in fact, but yes, we will be. - Okay. Thank you.

- Yay. Let's move on. All right. Next item. All right. Number two, request for approval to purchase a used tractor replacement for service motor company for \$41,750, staff.

- I am going to turn this over to... I'm not sure if it's gonna be the director or if it's gonna be over to the procurement man. It looks like it's gonna go to director Grenier.

- Yeah, I'll take this one.

- Okay.

- Tractor 700 is one of our frontline large tractors. It's used on a daily basis. Summertime it's used for large scale grass cutting and in the winter it's used for cul-de-sacs and dead-end street ploughing, so it's a primary piece of equipment that we depend on. Mechanics have informed me that the rollover protection system, the ROPS, has fractured and we cannot repair that. All of our tractors, the large ones, have an enclosed cab so that they can be used during the winter time. And the rollover protection system is inherent with that having a cab on the tractor. So with the ROPS fractured, you could take the cab, cut the cab off of the tractor and use it as an open farm tractor, so the tractor still does have value to it, but not to us. It will not work for our intended applications. We do need to have that rollover protection system integral to the tractor. Again, because it's used daily and it's critical for snow operations. Nathan Wachtendonk, the fleet manager, any of you who've come to IMS during the acquisition or procurement of equipment or vehicles, know Nathan's pension for scouring the weeds as it were to find the best deals out there. So Nathan started calling around to a variety of his contacts in the industry and following a very gently used and in excellent shape case at Service Motor Company. By the time we get the trade value on tractor 700, Nathan was able to get that price down net to the city at \$41,750. I told Nathan, you know, I appreciated what he had done but you know, there's still \$41,750. What he was able to demonstrate was, earlier this year we were able to acquire one of the two sanitation vehicles that we procured. We were able to save 5,000 on that one. And the second one, we were able to buy a truck that had been ordered by another municipality but they were not able to take delivery of it. And we were able to realize a savings of \$41,125 on that piece of equipment. So with the money we already had for 2020, we have approximately \$46,000 to the good from Nathan's scrounging earlier in the year that could be applied to the purchase of this tractor to help us out with snow operations during the winter. So we did approach Calvin with all the legwork that Nathan did behind the scenes to get to this point and requested to bring it forward as a sole source because we're not actually going out on the open market to buy a used tractor. Number one, hard to spec that kind of a thing. Number two, we need to get that piece of equipment in inventory as soon as possible. So we brought forward the sole source request to the purchasing department and have it before you know, so we're ready to take any questions you may have.

- Thank you director Grenier. The only question I did have was how are we gonna pay for it? And you already explained that so anyone else have a question? If not, I'll entertain a motion.

- To approve.

- To approve by Ald. Johnson, second by Ald. Galvin. All those in favor say, aye.

- [Committee] Aye.

- Opposed? Motion carries, you got your tractor. Thank you.

- Thank you.

- Next, number three, for consideration with possible action, the distribution of required communication from new auditing from Baker Tilly US, LLP. So this is distributing the information that we got in the packet. Does anyone have any questions on that? - Place and file.

- They are. Both of our partners. Carla is with us and Kim are with us. They would actually like to do a quick little present introduction.

- For sure. Motion to open the floor.

- Second.

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

- [Committee] Aye.

- Opposed? Motion carries. Okay, the floor is open.

- Good evening. Thank you very much. I'm Carla Gogin, a partner with Baker Tilly and I have Kim Shult with me as well. We just wanna take a few minutes of your time. As you're aware, you've hired or engaged Baker Tilly as your new audit firm. And so we just wanna spend a few minutes giving you a brief introduction of ourselves, the firm, and then the overall audit process. I've been with Baker Tilly for 28 years. I'm a partner with the firm. I lead our state local government audit practice. And Baker Tilly, we've been performing state, local government work for almost since its inception and we've been around for 90 years. So we're very excited to have the opportunity to work with you. My primary responsibility on the engagement is just to ensure your overall satisfaction. Hopefully we meet or exceed your expectations as well as a technical resource. So again, one of our goals is to ensure that your questions aren't getting answered throughout the year. Our job is to issue the necessary reports and opinions. And we wanna make sure that that's done timely and that there's proactive communication along the way. So with that, Kim, I'll turn it over to you to give just a few more comments regarding the process.

- Okay, just to talk about the audit team, just real briefly, the team that we have selected to serve the city consists of professionals who work only in the state, local government space. So these are professionals who have dedicated their careers to serving local governments, are passionate about serving governments. And the whole team is excited about working with the city of Green Bay. We do have a number of subject matter experts assigned to the audit, and that is to make sure we're the best resource we can be for you as well as to just bring the highest level of expertise that we can. We have experts both in the IT risk assessment. We have a separate partner identified to assist with that work. We have one of our firm leaders in single audits that will help with the federal, and states, and glottic compliance. We also have a partner and manager. Jody Dobson is the partner that will... She specializes in enterprise funds, so she will be leading the effort on the transit program audit and also on the water utility audit and the PSC report compliance. So Diana and her team have our contact information. Please feel free to reach out to us if we can help with anything in the meantime. So looking at the audit process in general, we will be issuing our audit opinions. I will be the signer as Carla mentioned, I'm the city's coffer. Jody Dobson, the partner specializing in transits and water utilities will be signing the opinions of those reports that we will then bring into the city. At the end of the audit, we will issue a reporting and insights letter and that will cover all of our required communications. We'll also contain any

recommendations we have as to city processes, internal controls, and any other informational points that we feel are important to bring to the committee's attention or the city council's attention. Looking at timing and overall audit process, we will be starting the planning that we'll go through January. We do have some dates in early January set to do preliminary field work to start our documentation and our testing. We will be doing the city's audit field work, the last week in March, the first week in April. And then we'll be delivering draft reports the first week in June and issuing final reports in accordance with the RFP by June 15th. And then once everything is issued, we will be happy to come back to the committee and give a report of the entire process and deliver those results. Carla, do you have final com comments?

- So just to wrap things up, the document that you've placed on file, we refer to it as a two-way communication. So it is a required communication with the governing body but our audit process, it's a risk-based approach. And so we wanna be sure that the governing body has an understanding of the audit process, the requirements, and also to welcome your input. So we should take into the audit process. Again, we wanna welcome your feedback into our audit planning that we do as a part of the financial audit. So with that, that wraps up our comments today. Again, thank you for the time. Thank you for the opportunity to present virtually, and hope we'll be able to see you in person in the not too distant future. But with that, if there are any questions or comments, we're happy to address those while we're here.

- Yes, Ald. Johnson.

- Thank you, chair. I appreciate you coming here. And I was quick to receive and place us a file 'cause I didn't realize you guys were here today, so thank you. And since you're here, I'm just gonna ask you, when do you expect to start your work on the audit?

- Sir we received a signed contract today, so we're excited about that. We did, however, have a kickoff call with the city, we reviewed the city's comprehensive annual financial report. And so we've started our kickoff calls which will conclude in December. And then in early January, we will start our preliminary audit field work and then field work will take place in March and April.

- Any other question? Nope? All right, I'll have to close the floor. Motion to close the floor.

- Motion.

- Motion by Ald. Johnson.

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

- [Committee] Aye.

- Opposed, nay. Motion carries. All right, is receive and place a file the appropriate motion then? Okay. All right.

- By Ald. Johnson.

- Second. Second by the Corpus-Dax. Any further discussion? Hearing none, all those in favor say, aye.

- [Committee] Aye.

- Opposed, nay. And the motion carries. Thank you so much, ladies for coming to join us virtually.

- Thank you.

- All right, number four. The resolution per state trust fund loan for \$340,000 financing re-evaluation assessment service for the city's 2020, 2022 approved it council on meeting November 10th, 2020. So this is something we approved and now we need to vote on a resolution.

- Correct, that was the budget meeting and so we were trying to decide which route we were gonna go with the assessment. So I did make the assumption that we were gonna move forward with it. So I really actually forgot to put the resolution. And so the resolution could have gone along with that packet back in November 10th and it didn't. So this is really the follow up to get the resolution approved.

- Okay. So what? So you need a motion to approve?

- Yes.

- Questions? Questions alders? Nope? Is there a motion?

- Motion to approve.

- Motion to approve by Ald. Corpus-Dax.

- Second.

- Second by Ald. Galvin. Further discussion? Seeing none, all those in favor say, aye.

- [Committee] Aye.

- Opposed, nay. Motion carries. Thank you. All right, here we go. Number five. To refer to staff, request by Ald. Wery to the finance committee which states, "Due to ongoing reasons of inadequate staffing and prioritizing of tasks in our law department, I'm requesting we hire City Ethics Inc. Or 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. With requests that they returned to the next finance committee meeting with an approximate window of how long it will take to complete the project internally in addition to providing recommended actions should we need to outsource the service." Okay. So is there a report staff? Are we referring this to staff right now? What's happening? - Referred to staff at the last meeting. So I think we're gonna turn it over to attorney Bungert to-

- Okay. Attorney Bungert.

- Yes.

- So alders, we don't have a report. Essentially, I went back to staff and audited what outstanding projects we have and reviewed what our current workload is and what we anticipated to be over the next few months particularly with the city attorney on leave until February. And we were able to commit to a timeline of completion for the ethics code end of April, going into May with the understanding that we're also going to be simultaneously working on revisions of the signs ordinance and the zoning ordinances which are necessary in order for staff to be able to perform their duties. 'Cause at this point, the signs ordinance is not functioning due to a precedent setting, Supreme Court opinion and our zoning ordinances also need changes as they come up.

- Okay. Any discussion? Ald. Wery, but you're muted.

- Thanks, certainly don't wanna be muted. Thanks attorney Bungert. So from what I'm hearing correctly, is this a commitment to having it done by April-ish?

- It's our plan essentially and our hope obviously as we always try, and communicate, and be forthcoming. We don't have a crystal ball and we can't envision the future, but our plan and our timeline that we're presenting to the committee as far as what we are going to be working towards, is end of April, beginning of May.

- And?

- And regardless, even not completed, we will at least at a minimum provide what is completed or give an update as we're moving along. If we anticipate that, we're not gonna be able to meet that deadline.

- Oh, could you? What would it take? I think part of this was to, you know, if you needed to outsource, what would it take to get it done?

- If that timeline is not acceptable to the committee or to council, then we would need direction for authority to hire outside council. And we would need funds specified as to a funding source.

- 'Cause you know, that timeline at least is a timeline but it's a very soft timeline, right? I mean, I've been, as you know, and we've all known, I've been asking on this for two years and I'm always given a period, just enough out of reach. And then you get there and something comes up, and something comes up, and something comes up, and this sounds the same thing but you know, presented a little bit different. I'm wondering how we can, can avoid that. I think is what I'm looking for, and I think the committee was looking for. It's really the same thing wrapped up in a different bow.

- Right.

- I understand the concerns. Unfortunately, with the workloads that we have, and the staffing that we have, it's impossible to devote an entire attorney to just be working on this solely. It's just not a feasible function for our department. And so if the preference and the action of the , is that is that you would like to have an attorney that's solely focused on just working on this, then that would require forming an outside council.

- You know, I'm certainly not an attorney but something like this, I would think you can knock this out in a week or less. Honestly 40 hours of work on something like this, it's probably partly done already.

- Right, but again an attorney doing nothing else but this. And unfortunately that it's just not a reasonable or feasible thing for our department to be able to do. As things, lawsuits come up all the time, other issues come up all the time that require immediate action and require a shift in priorities. People go on vacation, people get sick, just like any functioning department or department

- Understandably so. And totally, totally understand that.

- We do our best to roll with the punches and try and prioritize what we can so that the city continues to function and that we are able to support our departments so that they can do their jobs and operate, and serve the citizens of Green Bay. And unfortunately, I can't provide. I can't dole out one specific attorney that would be working on this solely particularly point to through February with us being down to three attorneys, and a city attorney being gone, and me taking on her responsibilities, and also managing the department, and handling my responsibilities as well, so-

- Thank you attorney Bungert. You have explained, you don't need to explain anymore.

- You went on there.

- Answer other question, okay? Any other questions?

- Well, I would just comment, sometimes reasons turn into excuses and it just keeps on going and somebody needs to put their foot down and say, "It needs to get done."
- Right and we're, we're putting up. We've done as much as we can with in humanly possible.
- Well, I don't think so. Now I'll listen to everybody else but.
- Right, I just don't feel like I wanna badger the staff anymore. They've given an answer. They've given the best answer they can that the staff has given their answer.
- We need more. I work in the private sector and this would not fly.
- Well, we're gonna-
- The projects get done. Things are falling through the cracks, we're seeing all the times at the Ethics Committee, things that should have been addressed already, that aren't. This has to get fixed at whatever it takes 'cause I guarantee you come April, this will not be done. I'll say it right here right now, and I'll replay it in April, it won't be there.
- Okay anyone else? Any other alders? Okay so at this-
- I guess what would be the-
- Appropriate, yes.
- Motion here to they will listen till October, or I'm sorry April and then follow up at that point?
- Right, to refer to staff to continue working on the revisions to the ordinance and to report back in whatever the second meeting is in April or beginning of May.
- Okay.
- Ald. Galvin.
- I would like to make an amendment to that, that we-
- I didn't make a motion. Oh, I'm sorry, I'm sorry. - What the motion would be.
- I would make a motion that we review this in February. That's a midway point between now and the end of April so that staff can let us know where they're at and who knows stuff comes up at that time. I think we should then take a hard look at maybe hiring some outside council to get some of these things up to speed. I think we'd have a better idea in February our attorney who's out right now on leave will be coming back I believe around that time, somewhere in there. And then I think this would give staff a couple of months to see what they can accomplish. And if it looks like it's not working out, they're able to let us know, and we can look at some other options at that time.
- Okay. Ald. Johnson and then Ald. Steuer.
- Yeah, I was gonna make a motion but maybe Ald. Steuer could speak first? Just in case it's something that would influence the motion.
- All right.

- I need to process. Do we have a motion on the floor right now?

- No.

- Then we kinda need a second to continue to discuss it. Okay.

- Ald. Galvin, I think just made a motion, that a motion to bring back in February. Seconded by Ald. Corpus-Dax. Is that what did you second it? No.

- I'll second that.

- Okay? Seconded. Okay, now we can have discussion. Okay and you want Ald. Steuer to go first or are you okay?

- I guess I didn't realize Ald. Galvin had made the motion that's why I was kinda waiting. But the point that I was going to make as well is that I actually wanted another thing included in the motion, which is that this particular item be prioritized as the most important item with respect to non-essential requirements from the law department. And what I mean by that is I think the law department has taken up a number of things, necessarily immediate things, right? And this one just kept getting pushed to the bottom of the list, bottom of the list and other things popped in. So I would like this committee to actually direct that this one would be put at the top of the list because I do recognize that two years is a long time to wait for something. And it is something that needs to be done. This isn't a nice to have. This is something that, you know, the outdated policy itself has actually created some problems for Ethics Board. And so I would like to see that prioritized above other non-essential loans. Has a comment on that.

- Could that be put in as a friendly amendment to my motion?

- Yeah, you can do that. If I could just chime in a little bit on that, I just wanna clarify that as far as non-essential, it just leaves a little bit of ambiguity in the sense of the city attorney has to have the ability to determine in her professional and legal opinion as the attorney for the city as a whole as a corporate body. As to what work needs to be done in the best interest of the city in what order. As an example the work on our sign ordinance, when you're looking at it between the sign ordinance and the ethics ordinance, while the revisions to the ethics ordinance are important. The revisions to the sign ordinance prevents... With the way that our sign ordinance is currently, our inspectors cannot enforce our ordinance. Otherwise it is exposing us to liability. So from a legal opinion, from a legal assessment as far as our duty to protect the interest of the City that would be considered essential. So the difficulty with that direction is that it creates a little of ambiguity because what council may beam as essential, may not necessarily be essential from a legal perspective and from a liability perspective from the city attorney on behalf of the city.

- And I appreciate that attorney Bungert, and I'm not necessarily looking to micromanage or dictate to you how to make those decisions. I still think that you have that discretion. I'm trying to create more of a generalized statement that, you know, if a member of council submits a communication says, "Hey I'd really like to have this." That it doesn't get put above the needs of this, or if you're even internally that you're not given you know, a direction to prioritize something because somebody else wants it as opposed to something that the city authentically needs.

- I think Ald. Johnson, we may just have to trust staff to do their job and to do it appropriately.

- Yeah, and that's what I'm doing. But I also think including that statement also just emphasizes the importance of the need to prioritize this item. Because like I said it has created some legal dilemmas for us as well. And I think that staff certainly has some discretion in terms of deciding, does this item create more legal dilemmas than this one? We're still giving them that discretion.

- And so what if we just put in that this should be treated with high priority?
- Yeah, that's fine with me, yap.
- You know, just something a little less specific.
- Yap.
- What was the original motion? - In our mid-February meeting
- Oh, to get report back on it and in addition, this item should be, treated with priority.
- Treated with priority.
- Right, and the furtherness of the motion was that, if it looks like they're not gonna get it done by April beginning of May, then we look at other options whatever they may be to see what could be done to get this project done.
- Okay. Right, I'll get you in a minute Ald. Steuer, but do you still second that Ald. Corpus-Dax, with the changes?
- Yes.
- Okay, Ald. Steuer.
- Thank you chair, Ald. Johnson touched on some of those things that I wanted to ask, but... And I agree with all the worry in the sense that, you know, we have been waiting a long time for this. I guess one of the concerns I've had at council over the years, and Ald. Galvin has fallen into this too at times where you put in a request or a communication and it languishes for a while. And if we don't keep on top of it, that just kind of disappears. So we really need to have a stronger sense of these... And I know we had a database or something set up at one time. I don't know where that is at. As far as ethics goes, you know we've had numerous cases heard or we've had a much time was spent. A lot of money was spent. A lot of times we didn't get a good answer as far as a decision. So these are very important. So I understand the sign ordinance is important and then there're some other ordinances that we're gonna be working on in the near future as well, which are very important. So we gotta look at all of that. So I guess I'll accept the fact that, you know we can look at this in February and see if this would be a viable timeframe but there's a lot to be spoken on this and I rest my case right now, thank you.
- The committee, are we ready to take a vote? Any further discussion? Hearing none. All those in favor say, aye.
- [Committee] Aye.
- Opposed, nay. All right, motion carries. We'll revisit this in February.
- Thanks committee, thanks attorney. - Status of pending litigation in Harris vs. Meves et al, and-
- Motion to go to into closed session.
- Okay motion to go into closed session by Ald. Johnson, second by Ald. Galvin. Ald. Johnson, you wanna read the language?

- Sure, the committee council may convenient closed session pursuant to section 19.85, subsection one, subsection G, Wisconsin Statutes. For the purpose of conferring legal concept for the governmental body was reading all the written advice concerning strategy be adopted by the body with respect to litigation which it is likely to become involved. The committee council may thereafter reconvene an open session pursuant to section 19.85, subsection two, Wisconsin Statutes. Report any actions taken during the closed session and to consider all other matters on the agenda.

- All those in favor say, aye.

- [Committee] Aye.

- Opposed, nay. Motion carries. Okay, we're going into closed session so we have to-

- [Pam Manley] I will pause it and then Diana if you can move everybody into the waiting room, you will no longer be able to talk to me.

- Say, aye.

- [Committee] Aye.

- Opposed, nay. Motion carries. Okay, we're back in open session. Wait a second now.

- Does that motion need to be made while we're recording?

- Well, I thought it did, but at RDA this afternoon I was told it did not. So you know, I'm confused on that 'cause I thought it did need to be recorded.

- I'll let the attorneys battle that one out.

- Okay.

- [Pam Manley] You are back in open session on my end.

- Okay. We are now back in open session. Is there a motion?

- To move that staff proceed is directed in closed session. - Ald. Galvin second by Ald. Corpus-Dax. Any other further discussion? All those in favor say, aye.

- [Committee] Aye.

- Opposed, nay. Motion carries. Okay. Next item on the agenda. What are the claims committee? Are there any questions?

- I didn't have any.

- I didn't.

- None.

- All right, need to motion?

- Motion to receive and place on file.

- Okay, by Ald. Corpus-Dax.
- Second.
- Second by alder Johnson. Okay. All those in favor say, aye.
- [Committee] Aye. Opposed, nay. Motion carries. - To account is at 2,656,145 unless we've spent more money.
- We have not approved any other expenses at this point. There still could be some continuing litigation for assessments expenses that could still be coming against the 2020 contingency.
- Okay, and there are gonna be two finance meetings coming up. The first one is going to be on the capital improvement plan and borrowing. And that will be on Tuesday, January 5th, 2021 at 4:30. And then the next regular finance meeting for regular business will be, and also we'll include the capital improvement plan, 2021 borrowing. Follow up will be on Tuesday, January 12th at 4:30 PM. Another whole committee to get through so, how about a motion to adjourn?
- [Committee] Motion adjourned.
- It's 6:15, let's come back at 6:20.
- Okay.
- Good.
- Okay, 6:20. Thank you.