



MINUTES OF THE FINANCE COMMITTEE

TUESDAY, JUNE 22, 2021, 4:30 PM
Virtual Meeting. Public may join via Zoom.

A. ZOOM MEETING INFORMATION.

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

B. ROLL CALL.

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

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

Also present: Ald. Mark Steuer, Ald. Lynn Gerlach, Procurement Manager Calvin Winters, City Attorney Vanessa Chavez, Finance Director Diana Ellenbecker, Asst. Finance Director Pam Manley and others.

C. APPROVAL OF THE AGENDA.

Moved by Ald. Veronica Corpus-Dax, seconded by Ald. Mark Steuer to Approve.

Motion Passed.

Yes- Barbara Dorff, Veronica Corpus-Dax, Mark Steuer

D. APPROVAL OF MINUTES.

I. Approval of the Finance Committee minutes from the May 25, 2021 meeting.

Moved by Ald. Veronica Corpus-Dax, seconded by Ald. Brian Johnson to Approve.

Motion Passed.

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

E. REGULAR BUSINESS.

I. Discussion and possible action on 2-year contract for Cellular Phone service with Cellcom.

Contract rates piggyback off Brown County contract agreement. Rate plan analysis attached.

Moved by Ald. Brian Johnson, seconded by Ald. Veronica Corpus-Dax to Approve.

Motion Passed.

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

2. Discussion and possible action on updates to the Procurement Manual, including updating the procurement threshold to \$10,000. Updated manual attached.

Moved by Ald. Veronica Corpus-Dax, seconded by Ald. Brian Johnson to Approve.

Motion Passed.

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

3. For consideration and possible action to adopt a resolution supporting the legislation of how municipalities pay tax refunds.

Moved by Ald. Brian Johnson, seconded by Ald. Veronica Corpus-Dax to Approve.

Motion Passed.

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

4. Consideration with possible action to have staff study the need for more staff for the City Attorney's office, referred from May 25, 2021 Personnel meeting.

Moved by Ald. Brian Johnson, seconded by Ald. Barbara Dorff to approve Law's proposal to pay for outside counsel to provide assistance on certain projects out of the contingency fund for a total of \$43,450.

Motion Passed.

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

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

Moved by Ald. Brian Johnson, seconded by Ald. Veronica Corpus-Dax to Receive and Place on File.

Motion Passed.

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

6. For consideration and possible action on the 2021 borrowing request.

Moved by Ald. Brian Johnson, seconded by Ald. Veronica Corpus-Dax to Approve.

Motion Passed.

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

7. An Initial Resolution Authorizing the Issuance of Not to Exceed \$2,145,000 General Obligation Bonds for Street Improvements.

Moved by Ald. Brian Johnson, seconded by Ald. Veronica Corpus-Dax to suspend the rules to take

Items 7-17 together with one roll call vote.

Motion Passed.

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

Moved by Ald. Veronica Corpus-Dax, seconded by Ald. Brian Johnson to Approve Items 7-17.

Motion Passed.

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

8. An Initial Resolution Authorizing the Issuance of Not to Exceed \$1,415,000 General Obligation Bonds for Sewerage Improvements.

9. An Initial Resolution Authorizing the Issuance of Not to Exceed \$725,000 General Obligation Bonds for Parking Lots or Other Parking Facilities.

10. An Initial Resolution Authorizing the Issuance of Not to Exceed \$720,000 General Obligation Bonds for Fire Engines and Other Equipment of the Fire Department.

11. An Initial Resolution Authorizing the Issuance of Not to Exceed \$840,000 General Obligation Bonds for Parks and Public Grounds.

12. An Initial Resolution Authorizing the Issuance of Not to Exceed \$375,000 General Obligation Bonds for Bridge Improvements.

13. An Initial Resolution Authorizing the Issuance of Not to Exceed \$460,000 General Obligation Bonds for Harbor Improvements.

14. An Initial Resolution Authorizing the Issuance of Not to Exceed \$2,040,000 General Obligation Bonds to Provide Financial Assistance to Blight Elimination, Slum Clearance, Community Development, Redevelopment, and Urban Renewal Programs and Projects.

15. A Resolution Authorizing and Providing for the Issuance of Not to Exceed \$8,720,000 General Obligation Corporate Purpose Bonds; Providing for the Notification and Sale of Said Bonds; and Other Related Details.

16. A Resolution Authorizing and Directing the Publication of Notice of the Adoption of Initial Resolutions.

17. An Initial Resolution Authorizing the Sale and Issuance of General Obligation Promissory Notes; and Certain Related Details.

F. REPORT OF THE FINANCE DIRECTOR.

G. INFORMATIONAL.

1. 2021 Contingency Account:\$150,000.00.

2. The next Finance Committee meeting will be held on Tuesday July 27, 2021 at 4:30 PM.

H. ADJOURNMENT.

Moved by Ald. Brian Johnson, seconded by Ald. Barbara Dorff to Adjourn.

Motion Passed.

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

I. VERBATIM MINUTES.

- June 22nd meeting of finance to order. We'll start with the roll call, which would be Alder Dorff here, Alder Corpus-Dax.

- Here.

- Alder Calvin is excused, I expect Alder Johnson, but instead we have Alder Mark Steuer is gonna seat in for him.

- Here.

- Thank you. Approval of the agenda, I'll entertain a motion to approve the agenda.

- Second.

- Proposed by Alder Corpus-Dax, second by Alder Steuer, all those in favor, say aye.

- Aye, oppose nay, motion carries. And approval of the minutes from the May 25th, 2021 meeting.

- Steuer moved and Alder Johnson's here. I see Alder Johnson, there he is. There you go Alder Steuer, bye.

- Bye bye.

- And Alder Johnson is now with us and we are just up to approval of the minutes. So I will entertain a motion that I think Alder Corpus-Dax seconded by Alder Johnson, okay. All those in favor, say aye.

- Aye.

- Aye, oppose, nay, motion carries. And Alder Johnson, there's just so much on the agenda that we just wanted to get through the first couple of things.

- Well, I was like, I'm looking it's 4:31.

- No, 4:32, sorry.

- Well, now it is.

- We waited 30 seconds. All right, regular business. Number one, discussion and possible action on two-year contract for cellphone service with Cellcom. Contract rates piggyback off Brown County contract agreement, rate plan analysis attached. Committee, are there any questions about this two-year contract?

- So what did we say, we're just piggybacking, I mean, is this getting, do we have an existing cell service with somebody else?

- I'm gonna let procurement manager, Calvin Winters answer that.

- No, we have existing service with Cellcom a few years ago when Fire and PD decided to make the switch to AT&T, the decision was made not to sign a new formal contract with Cellcom, they currently provide the service. By signing a two-year contract and committing to them for two years, we're able to get discounted rates each month, which will be a savings about \$1,100 per month, by signing a contract with them. So we currently have them. This is just an opportunity for us to commit to them, in turn they'll give us a discount rates.

- We're just using the Brown County contract.

- Correct.

- Because we can do that.

- A long time, we would go out for bid and Brown County would piggyback off of our contracts and this time around it's going the other way.

- Okay. Is that okay Alder Johnson?

- Yeah, I mean, it seems to me that we just paid for a fourth of the contingency requests from a law department then, right?

- [Inaudible], it's only \$1,100.

- A month.

- That's per month.

- No, really?

- Yep.

- I'll take it. All right, thank you, Calvin, okay.

- Move to approve.

- Approved Alder Johnson's, second by Alder Corpus-Dax. All those in favor, say aye.

- Aye.

- Aye, oppose nay, motion carries. Number two, discussion and possible action updates to the procurement manual, including updating the procurement threshold to \$10,000. Updated manual explain about the procurement threshold going to \$10,000. That be Calvin as well?

- Yep.

- Okay.

- So currently the procurement threshold, which requires us to do some sort of competitive process is set at \$5,000. I'm not exactly sure when that threshold was set but from my research and from my previous positions, that threshold is very old. That was kind of the threshold set typically back in like the '80's and the '90's. \$5,000, doesn't get you very far anymore. So I am proposing to up that threshold to \$10,000. So anything up to \$10,000 can purchased at the discretion of the department. 99% of the time when a department comes to me with something in that five to \$10,000 range, they say, can I buy this? I say, did you get three quotes? They say, well, we talked, we know this is the best price. Now they're having to go back to the vendors and request a quote, even though they know that that vendor is not gonna win, they're just creating busy work for everybody. So I'm proposing to raise this threshold to \$10,000 and when we get above 10,000, that's when we start going into our competitive processes. So really the departments are already doing their research. It's their money they're spending. They obviously wanna get the most for their dollars. So, we're just creating less administrative burden on them.

- Any questions about that?

- Just one Alder Dorff.

- Sure, Alder Johnson.

- Calvin, if I recall correctly, we raised the threshold a couple of years to 25,000. Was that for the ability to just make staff level decisions on purchases?

- Yes, so 25,000 is the level that requires us to bring it to committee and then ultimately to council.

- Okay, so really what this is affecting is the need to conduct an RFP?

- Yeah, so we don't do formal bids or RFPs until about the \$25,000 threshold, certain circumstances we might, but below that threshold, we'll do an RFQ where we'll get multiple quotes. This is raising that from 5,000 to 10,000.

- Okay, seems reasonable to me.

- Would you like to make that into a motion?

- Well, I don't want to take all the fun away from Alder Corpus-Dax.

- All right, Alder Corpus-Dax?

- Motion to approve.
- Second.
- Second by Alder Johnson. All those in favor, say aye.
- Aye.
- Aye, oppose, nay, motion carries. Number three, for consideration and possible action to adopt a resolution, supporting the legislation of how municipalities pay tax refunds.
- Motion to approve.
- Okay, great. Is there a second?
- I am.
- Second by Alder Corpus-Dax. All those in favor say aye.
- Alder Dorff, I could, I mean, I would certainly, if the assessor would like to speak to it, maybe we'd let him, but the people-
- We've been waiting here for hours.
- At least five.
- At least five. Would you like to just speak to it briefly?
- Well, I can speak to it briefly.
- Okay.
- Basically this was a housekeeping thing that the legislature put together because the two different tax refunds, whether it be for a unlawful tax or an illegal tax, whether it be for, if there's an excessive tax for a claim on a 7437, which is if somebody thinks our assessments too high and they go through court, or if it's an illegal tax where it's, somebody disagrees over an exemption issue, those two different options, they have to pay the taxes in advance then it goes through the process. And as the clock is ticking, they pay interest on that and then if they do win in court, we have to pay interest back to them. And in this case, the two different types of court cases have different interest rates on them. This is just bring them in line with each other. And also in this interest of fairness, the judiciary and the people down in Madison decided that it's only fair that the other taxing jurisdictions share in the pain of paying this back. So up until this point, the interest was only paid by the cities. Now they're gonna have the counties and the school district also sharing, paying interest back when it does accrue. So it's just a common sense type of law that doesn't come out of Madison very often.
- All right.

- State is both wise and just.

- Yes they are.

- And at the same time, they are right now passing a law that I already signed on Thursday to exempt personal property, so there's that.

- Talk about that more next time probably, huh? Yeah.

- Yeah.

- All right, so we have a motion and a second, I think already, all those in favor, say aye.

- Aye.

- Aye, oppose nay, motion carries.

- Thank you very much.

- Great, now this one will be a little bit more discussion, consideration with possible action to have staff study the need for more staff for the city attorney's office referred from the May 25th, 2021 personnel meeting. We will go to Attorney Chavez.

- I'm gonna hope that my internet holds up 'cause I've not called in yet. So, as requested, I have brought to this committee a document explaining the various items that we would be hoping to have farmed out to outside counsel. So you'll recall that we had looked at a couple of different options to kind of help respond some of the back laws and the long timeframe delays that we've been experiencing in our department. And what ultimately came out of that is that the best option at this point to address that specific issue of the timeframes, and to get everything in front of you guys faster, it's really farming out specific items to outside counsel. So I went through, identified the items where I think we can create some, we can alleviate some of the major issues or some of the smaller issues to allow for employees to start moving forward on other items. So for example, if we farm out these, then I can have our legislative attorney start focusing again on some of the other ordinances that are currently in the queue. And then these are some of the ones that we really have to get done quickly as well. So these are the main ones that we feel like we can farm out at a reasonable rate. And then also in that is some litigation that if I have to pull those in house, then I'm going to have to pull our attorneys off of existing workloads and those other projects. So the first three are ordinances. It is the ethics ordinance, the emergency management ordinance, and then the massage licensing ordinance, the ethics ordinance, we received a quote from Michael May who was the former city attorney in Madison. He is now of counsel with Boardman Clark based on his expertise in municipal law we felt like he was the right person to afford with this because he does have experience dealing with ethical recommendations and directives to counsel. So he would be able to implement those at a reasonable or within a reasonable amount of time. So he gave us the quote on there. We would also be tapping his experience for the emergency management ordinance. So the emergency management ordinance is what we have, whenever we have to declare an emergency. What happens administratively within the city is not clarified. So you'll remember when we had to declare the state of emergency with respect to the curfew, we didn't really have anything in place where we could cite to our own ordinances so that we were able to cite people who were in

violation of that ordinance or own violation of our curfew under municipal law, we actually had to cite them under state law. And so this would clean that up and create that framework for what actually happens anytime an emergency declared within the city. And then the last one of course is the massage licensing. And the reason we picked this is because we haven't had an opportunity to do a whole lot of work. What we have done is kind of some of the baseline policy evaluation and then also generating what we anticipate will be the amount of time that will be dedicated to these. And it's gonna be a while before we're able to get that one in the queue. And we also recognize that it's an ongoing need. So pulling these three off allows us to focus on the sign ordinance in chapter 3, which are couple of the other ones that have really been outstanding for a really long time, which is why we picked these ones specifically.

- [Inaudible] About the first one, so does that, that doesn't include the code of conduct, right? That's just the ethics or it will.

- It will, yes.

- It's the ethics ordinance and the code of conduct.

- Yeah, to be clear our ethics ordinance, there's nothing wrong with our ethics ordinance. It's how it interacts with the code of conduct that's really the problem.

- Okay, okay.

- So we'd be creating a unified codified ethics ordinance that we would apply to everything, rather than having a separate code of conduct and a separate ethics ordinance.

- So the code of conduct, that kind of lengthy document, that won't exist anymore?

- Correct, this would be taking what exists and turning it into something better.

- Okay, good, I'm glad to hear that, all right.

- And then the two items that, the two litigation items, the Lynn's Meyer and the habitat for humanity, so those are both issues that they're being appealed, a variance was granted and a variance was denied. And in those cases, both of them are seeking review of the board of appeals decision. They will require time to research these issues as well as brief them. And so this is litigation that we would be entering into, in order for me to continue to dedicate employees to the actual ordinance drafting, I have to take some of the litigation off our plates and these new items are perfect for that. So that's why I'm presenting these as options. That was my cat, Poppy, makes everybody smile, Poppy comes around whenever I'm talking. And then the, wait I think that was it. So those are what those items are.

- Are there any questions? Alder Johnson.

- Yeah, I think, I mean, when I look at ethics ordinance, that makes sense, right? Expertise, something we've been waiting on for a while. I liked the idea of including that. Emergency management ordinance comes with necessity, zoning and planning board of appeals actions. I mean, obviously that's very timely and we need to have that litigation defense there. The only one that I'm really questioning is

massage licensing ordinance. I know why, that's in front of the law department, but the thing that just crosses my mind of course is \$10,000 of taxpayer expense to outsource it. But it doesn't seem like it's a, there's a real urgency around that one. I mean, if we held onto that one in house and had staff deal with it, what would be the, like the timetable before staff could get around to that?

- It will be a while. So I actually pulled this one off the legislative attorney's desk about a month and a half ago, and just redistributed it to the other attorneys in the office to see if we could get movement on it a little bit faster. And what we're finding is that this was gonna be pretty labor intensive, not necessarily because of the drafting, that's gonna be the relatively easy portion of it, which still will take them a decent amount of time, but because there are a lot of other moving parts associated with it, since it is a licensing issue, we have to make sure that they're all of the issues pertaining to licensing are addressed as well. So that means making sure that everything within the offices is gonna be clarified, everything with regards to potential revocations clarified. So there's just a lot attached to it. So with that, and that's why I say what we've done is all just the preliminary work and realized this was a much bigger undertaking than I think the original thought was, which is just adopt [Inaudible] associated with. So with that, it's gonna be a while still, if we were able to get to, I would say at the very least, we're looking end of the year, potentially next year before we'd real estate, we have something in. Because I have my two non-legislative attorneys working on it, so just as a matter of course, it's not what they do on a regular basis. So it's gonna take them a little bit longer to track it anyways. And then they're also having to work on it as their workloads allow. I have a prosecutor who stays busy probing prosecutions and then I have our deputy who is really focused on all of the records requests and then all of our contracts. And we've been pretty heavy on record requests, and contracts this year.

- So are you looking at this one thinking that without outside expertise, that we can perform the work more quickly as well? For example, it might take 10 hours of work that's contracted out, but maybe it would take us 30 hours to do it in house? 'Cause I mean, I'm just kind of looking at the thinking, gosh, 10 hours of work. It's not a ton, right?

- So I'm basing it off of the experience of these outside attorneys and the fact that they feel like they can do it within this timeframe. Honestly, I feel like they're not numbers are slightly low, but everybody feels like they can provide us something within these time periods. I actually asked them to give us a higher number and they felt they were comfortable with these numbers but what I will say is that, if we go with somebody who's new to drafting, it's gonna take a much longer time than if we take somebody who is experienced. And then the other reason I picked these ones specifically is because they are something that we can hand off for a relatively reasonable rate, something like a signed code revision, which is what we have to sometimes wait to take any more than an inordinate amount of time. And I know that some people feel like they can do them in a real quick, I'm just gonna go and do some flashes, but there's a lot that goes into the sign code. I've done them in the past and these are more like 40, \$50,000 undertakings by themselves. So I didn't want to bring that as a solution 'cause I've just tasted one thing off the table whereas here I can get some more things moving. And a more cost effective approach would be to have those types of those really expensive, really in the weeds thick of it type ordinances remain in house. So we can pull one of those off of there. I would say that the massage ordinance is probably the one to pull off. If any of them, it would just be with the understanding that it's not as high on the priority list as the other ordinances that we are gonna focus on, which should be kind of ordinance in chapter 33.

- I would say, I will get you in a minute Alder Steuer, I would say that they're seeing the will of council seem to be, to get that massage licensing ordinance done. And it had to do a lot with the, is it the military avenue area? And maybe I'll let Alder Steuer talk 'cause maybe he knows more about it than I do. Go ahead Alder Steuer.

- All right, thank you, chair. Yeah, I agree with you on that. We've been beating with Military Avenue, Leo Weicker at the bid district there for several years now, and she's been taking this on almost by herself with the police department. So Alder Manley, myself, Alder [Inaudible], we've been involved a bit and realize it's on the west side, but there are other areas throughout the city that have these issues as well. So can we hold off? I suppose, but I think one of the worries that we have on Military Avenue especially is that these places are cropping up here and there [Inaudible] other businesses, legitimate businesses. And I think we're going to lose some of these businesses, and we don't want that. So there are people that own certain buildings out there that will rent to some of these folks because they want the rent, but they're not looking at who's renting. So anyways, it's kind of long and complicated. And I realize that there are a number of things the ethics or new things are important in them. I'd love to see that taken care of sooner and kind of on our plate for a long, long time. But anyway, I'll talk about that in a little bit, but I think it's pretty important that we look at this massage ordinance and not just sweep that under the rug. Thank you.

- Alder Gerlach?

- I have a question. So, when I read this, it sounded to me like you were talking about, possibly expanding the staff of the attorney's office. And I think the solution I'm hearing is temporarily, as the term you're using the attorneys Chavez, farm things out. So this would be a temporary fix. And then are we going to assume that it's going to happen again and again, has there been any consideration given to permanent staff or was that never the intent?

- There has been discussion about that, what was ultimately recommended at this point is that so onboarding somebody is going to take time and then getting them up to speed so that they're trained and know how to draft stuff is also going to take time. So I can add somebody to the staff, but it's gonna take a little, unless somebody is already trained on how to drop ordinances, you're not gonna be able to just step in and draft something that's gonna be ready for proposal immediately. It's still gonna have someone to review by other attorneys. And that does, and so with that, we recognize that that's not, what we were asked was how to get some of these projects going faster. And so this is the solution to make that happen. We are looking at whether or not another attorney in the department is appropriate but we also, given that the budget is coming up so quickly, and we know that it's not a solution for what was asked previously, we're looking at that to time it with the budget. And so that, that's why it's not being proposed at this time. We also looked at farming, instead of farming is a specific project. Now we looked at hiring somebody who is a seasonal attorney, maybe somebody who was recently retired, still taking a few gigs on the side, and we weren't able to find anybody who was looking for the type of work that we would be looking to to hand over.

- Thank you.

- Is there any further discussion or I'll entertain the motion.

- Move to approve.

- Move to approve Alder Johnson.

- I'll second there just for fun.

- Alder Dorff, I'd just like to provide a little bit of clarification. Alder Steuer brought up some really great points about the massage parlor ordinance. It was never my intent to suggest we should not do it, it was what's the most efficient way to get it done because I think clearly it needs some revision. So I just wanted to at least clarify that point, but I support the proposal after hearing the explanation from the city attorney.

- Thank you, all right, all those in favor, say aye.

- Aye.

- Aye, oppose nay, motion carries. All right, number five is of the claims committee. Were there any questions about the claims committee?

- No.

- Received and placed on file.

- All right, received and placed on file by Alder Johnson, second by Alder Corpus-Dax, all those in favor say aye.

- Aye.

- Oppose nay, motion carries. Number six for consideration and possible action on the 2021 borrowing request, who would like to start or do we have no questions? And we'll just approve that. We talked about it? Yes, Alder Johnson.

- For some reason, if my memory's tricking me, Director Alan Becker, please just tell me so, but I thought we had the total bond request down to 7 1/2 million.

- Yes, there has been a couple of things that have changed, just slightly. I'm trying to get to my document. There were, yes, there was one mistake that I found when I presented it last time, which was \$160,000 change. What that was, is in the parks department, they have a think it's called a spider lift. I have to go back and find it. Yeah, it's a spider lift, a spider lift trailer and in the very first version, it was in there at 100% and we move out 88% to storm. So I already had this manual calculation to move out that \$160,000 to storm. And when the final version came out to you, it already was reduced. So that took us from seven five up to seven six. And then on top of it, we all started making a intentional change on what we're doing with the bond issuance costs. And that is happening this year. We do have a representative Jonathan here also from Ehlers. But what happened is in the past, what we have done is we have used, it's the way that he has been doing it for a very long time is they would take, let's say somebody borrowed a half million dollars for let's say a fire engine. They would request that a half a million dollars, we would get a half a million dollars and then we would take about \$7,000 off the top. And we would take a portion of every one of the bond proceeds to pay for issuance costs. So basically we were using bond proceeds to pay for issuance costs. And we have a brand new finance and financial advisors team this year, which is Ehlers and they didn't necessarily

care for that. And they said recommended that one, we could do two things. We could do it the same way we've always done it this year and then make the change for next year. And really, we have to increase our borrowing requests a little bit to borrow what is in the capital improvement plan. And then have if you borrow slightly additional dollars to cover the issuance costs. And I just decided at this point, we would bring it to you and explain that to you and let you know that they had strong recommendations, no matter what, going forward, we should do that. I just thought since we're the new, first time working with them, maybe we should make the change this year. So then it did change the total issuance costs and rounding was about \$220,000 on top of the 7.6 that we needed that when you're looking directly at the general fund, and then of course, there's some other additional ones in there for the shipyard, which is a tin of sanitary storm and parking. So those are the two things that would have changed, Alder Johnson since the time that we presented at the last finance committee meeting.

- So help me understand then next, I'm looking at this, the spreadsheet, and maybe it's just a matter of not following the flow. So I see the general levy total 7.6, but when I look a little further down, it says 8.5 for bond.

- So it should be the, so that's 7.6. If you look up at top there's 4.4 of it is bond, which means we're going to take it off for 20 years. And then we're gonna take out \$3.1 million in notes, which means it's going to be a 10 year borrowing. So general fund, we're gonna have, we're gonna split it between bonds and notes for 7.6. So then you take the 4.460 bonds on top, and then right below it you're gonna add, we're gonna add 20 year borrowing for storm and parking. So that \$4 million was added to the 4 million on top. So in total, we are going to borrow \$8.5 million of 20 year borrowing in bonds and we're gonna borrow \$3.1 million in notes. So the grand total of borrowing 11.7 million, and there's 200,000 after that issuance costs leaving a, and when I say rounding, for every one of the categories, they have to be rounded up to an even \$5,000 category. Our bond council has grouped these together and in some cases, if they had to round up a few of them to a even \$5,000, or if it was just slightly over, they rounded it down. So with rounding, the total net bond size that we are looking at bond and notes is 11,900,000. So when we talked in finance committee meeting last time, we were looking at where it's a seven six in the middle, [Inaudible] Five. So that's where you're seeing a slight increase of now we're adding the 220,000 on top of this whole borrowing, including signatures from parking and shipyard. And so the total borrowing technically really went up \$300,000 from what I showed you the last time, \$100,000 adjustments, and then there's \$200,000 for issuance costs.

- Okay, I appreciate that explanation. As soon as you started explaining after I asked the question, I recognize the bond in the notes separation. But I think it's good that you walked through that for everyone's benefit. Makes sense, thank you.

- And if we want further explanation, I'm sure Alder Gerlach would be happy to give us more of an explanation.

- I understood everything she said.

- All right, any other questions on this? I'll entertain a motion.

- Move to approve.

- Move to approve by Alder Johnson.

- Second.
- Second the Alder Corpus-Dax. All those in favor, say aye.
- Aye.
- Aye, oppose, nay, motion[Inaudible]. All right, now-
- So within your fact that I just wanna let you know, like really with that item, I should have told you that, I mean, there there's two packets of information that was pulled together by Alders. So I didn't know if you had any questions on those, that information, that leads into all the resolutions that we have to now get approved, the initial resolutions take to console.
- And the resolutions are just kind of the same what we just approved, right?
- Correct.
- But for breaking it down into individual resolutions, so-
- Could I do a motion to suspend the rules and adopt items seven through 17?
- Can he do that?
- 16.
- Through 17 I would believe, I mean, attorney could probably answer that, but I would believe that you should be able to combine them together, yes.
- [Chavez] You can take them up together and then you can't. So you'd want to take them all up at once, you bend the rules to take them all up and then he would suspend the rules again, to pick them up for vote. I know it's because we need to get them all on the floor. So that's what I mean by we needed to take them all up and then you can suspend the rules to adopt them together and it will have to be a roll call vote.
- No, Alder Corpus-Dax did say about, is 17, it is included then, it doesn't just go to 16?
- [Inaudible] 17, that is another resolution. The number seven through 16 really pertains to the bonding on request and the last item is really for the \$3.1 million on the notes.
- So should we do that one separately or does not even matter? It doesn't matter. Okay, all right. I'm sure you can repeat that motion, Alder Johnson, so-
- Repeated.
- Okay, so we're just suspend the rules to take up items seven through 17.
- With one roll call vote.

- With one roll call vote. All those in favor, say aye.
- Aye.
- Aye, oppose nay. Now we're voting on them, right? Attorney Chavez. Okay, I'll entertain a motion to vote on the item seven through 17.
- Motion to approve. Motion to approve by Alder Corpus-Dax.
- Second.
- Second by Alder Johnson. All those in favor, say aye.
- Aye.
- Aye, oppose, oh, roll call, roll call, okay. Alder Johnson.
- Yes.
- Alder Corpus- Dax.
- Yes.
- alder Dorff, yes. Where there's three things we had to do or just two?
- [Chavez] You did it right, that was it.
- That was it, awesome. Well, thank you, Alder Johnson. Whoa, report to the finance director.
- Stick with me, I'll get you fired Alder Dorff.
- Thank you. Yes, Alder Gerlach.
- I just wanted to say that I would have done the same thing Alder Johnson did.
- I'm sure, I know you would have.
- I understand that part of finance.
- All right, do you have a report finance director?
- I just want to give you a report. I decided not to put it on as a special item, but it is a follow-up is something Alder Johnson had asked for and I didn't know if it needed to be a new item. But he had asked how we were planning to get some public input for the American rescue plan act. And at this point still very, very preliminary, but the mayor had suggested, and I wanted to bring it back to you and let him know that he is planning to have two public meetings late summer, early fall. So I don't have a lot more detail, but I know that is important and I've reminded him and he knows it that we

want that public input meeting to be prior to us having me decisions so that they have input on the front end not just kind of reviewing after the decisions have been made. So I just said that is that the only update I have on that. And then to go with that, if you remember a month or so back, you gave us permission to hire a grant administrator, to handle this large grant and we have hired a grant administrator and she will be starting on Monday. So, that will help us as we move forward with coordinating meetings and communications and tracking expenses, so-

- Can you tell us who you hired or not? Can you say her name or not really?

- I'm not sure. I'm not sure.

- Then don't.

- Okay.

- We'll find out Monday, it'll be the express.

- Right, and I can always introduce you at the next meeting or Tuesday, maybe once we started of course I can do that, but-

- Was it Lynn Gerlach?

- All right, thank you Director Ellenbecker. The contingency fund used to be \$150,000, but now it has been reduced by about \$43,000, correct? Director Ellenbecker, 'cause we did approve the money going to law, right?

- Correct, yes, I was going back, I apologize, I have to go back and exactly see how we did the motion for number four, if we mentioned the dollar amount or if these items, yes, it will be reduced by that. Does anyone remember what the exact motion was on that data?

- I said move to approve, but it was inferred that it would be approved based on the report that was submitted by law. So from contingency with the amounts that were indicated.

- Okay, thank you, that clarifies it, thank you.

- All right, so that's good. In the next finance meeting will be all the way, Tuesday, July 27th at 4:30 PM. I will entertain a motion to adjourn.

- Move to adjourn.

- Move by Alder Johnson, second by Alder Dorff. All those in favor, say aye.

- Aye.

- Oppose, nay, motion carries. And we'll go on to personnel, Alder Johnson you're in charge of that. Do you want a three minute break or just go right in?