



MINUTES OF THE FINANCE COMMITTEE

TUESDAY, AUGUST 24, 2021, 4:30 PM

Virtual Meeting. Public may join via Zoom.

Immediately following Personnel

A. ZOOM MEETING INFORMATION.

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

B. ROLL CALL.

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

Others Present: Finance Director Diana Ellenbecker, Alder Lynn Gerlach, Brian Powell, Green Bay Water Utility, Purchasing Manger Calvin Winters, Attorney Lindsay Mather, Alder Mark Steuer, Director Nancy Quirk-Green Bay Water Utility, Economic Development Director Neil Stechschulte, Attorney Vanessa Chavez, Grant Administrator Susan House, Alder VanderLeest and others.

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

C. APPROVAL OF THE AGENDA.

Moved by Ald. Brian Johnson, seconded by Ald. Veronica Corpus-Dax to approve as amended moving item #6 to #4. Motion carried.

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

D. APPROVAL OF MINUTES.

Moved by Ald. Bill Galvin, seconded by Ald. Veronica Corpus-Dax.

Motion carried.

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

I. Approval of the Finance Committee minutes from the August 10, 2021 meeting.

E. REGULAR BUSINESS.

1. Discussion and possible action on the purchase of a Pumper Truck for the Fire Department from Fire Service Incorporated for the sum of \$674,920.00. If full pre-payment is made a discount of \$17,700 will be applied for a total cost of \$657,220.00. Fire Service Incorporated was the lowest bidder to RFB 2021-26. Quote summary attached. Funding source is 2021 bonded funds.

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

2. Discussion and possible action on awarding a three year contract to Purple Mountain Solutions, Inc. for courier services for Clerks office & Parks department. Purple Mountain Solutions was the lowest bidder to RFB 2021-29. Estimated three year spend is \$26,500. Summary attached.

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

3. Discussion on the proposed 2022 City of Green Bay fee schedule.

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. For consideration with possible action to approve the American Rescue Plan Act Fiscal Recovery Funds Administrative Policy.

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

5. A request by Ald. VanderLeest to the Finance Committee which states: Request that the 2022 City Budget submitted to the Green Bay City Council hold the property tax rate flat. Also for City staff to investigate what grant and federal monies can be used to assist with our 2021 and 2022 city budget needs.

Moved by Ald. Brian Johnson, seconded by Ald. Bill Galvin to refer to Mayor's Office. Motion carried.
Yes- Barbara Dorff, Bill Galvin, Veronica Corpus-Dax, Brian Johnson

6. 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. Barbara Dorff, seconded by Ald. Veronica Corpus-Dax to go into closed session. Motion carried.
Yes- Barbara Dorff, Bill Galvin, Veronica Corpus-Dax, Brian Johnson

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

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

Moved by Ald. Barbara Dorff, seconded by Ald. Brian Johnson to proceed as directed in closed session. Motion carried.

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

F. INFORMATIONAL.

1. 2021 Contingency Account: \$104,650.00.

2. The next Finance Committee meeting will be held on Tuesday September 14, 2021 at 4:30 PM.

G. ADJOURNMENT.

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

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

H. VERBATIM MINUTES.

- [Diana] Yes, are all four voting, Kim?

- [Kim] Yes.

- All right, is everybody signed in?

- [Diana] Yes, everyone is signed in. We're ready to go. Thank you.

- Okay. And then I'll call on the August 24th, 2021 meeting of Finance to order at 6:31 PM. I will entertain, oh, roll call, first of all, roll call. Alder Galvin?

- Here.

- Alder Corpus-Dax?

- Here.

- Alder Johnson?

- Here.

- And Alder Dorff is here. And then approval of the agenda. I'd like to move up item six to come after item four. I'm sorry, after item three. Because there are some staff members here that need to comment possibly on item number six, and I would like that to be done earlier. Anyone who's willing to make that as a motion?

- I move to amend the agenda to move item six to number four.

- Second.

- Okay. Any discussion?
- Move to amend as adopted or amended.
- Second.
- Oh--
- Move to adopt as amended.
- Whoop.
- Okay. All those in favor say aye?
- [All] Aye.
- Did we vote right? I feel like we missed one, but, all right. Yep. We're, okay, we're moving it up. Okay. And approval of the minutes?
- So move to approve.
- Motion to approve.
- Second.
- Okay, all those in favor say aye?
- [All] Aye.
- Opposed nay? Motion carries. Okay. Regular business. Item one, discussion and possible action on the purchase of a pumper truck for the fire department from Fire Service Incorporated, for the sum of \$674,920. If full prepayment is made, a discount of \$17,700 will be applied, for a total cost of \$6,057, I'm sorry, \$697,000, 220, just say that Fire Service Incorporated was the lowest bidder to RFB 2021-26. Quote summary attached. Funding source is the 2021 bonded funds. Any questions? Any questions from the committee?
- Is there a reason we wouldn't do a full prepayment?
- I don't, I believe, I would assume we would move forward. I certainly could ask our procurement manager if there was any pros or cons to that, but I would think we would make the full payment.
- So I don't see any cons. I just know it's typically not a normal practice to pre-pay things, but obviously in this case, given the large discount, it would be advantageous to the city.
- Okay.
- Okay.
- I just wanted to make sure everybody had all the information.
- I'll move--
- Any other discussion? Oh, go ahead, Alder Johnson.

- I'll move to approve with the prepayment option.
- Okay. Is there a second?
- Second.
- Second by Alder Galvin. All those in favor say aye?
- [All] Aye.
- Opposed nay? Motion carries. You can buy your pumper truck. Discussion and possible action on awarding a three-year contract to Purple Mountain Solutions Incorporated for courier services for the Clerk's Office and Parks department. Purple Mountain Solutions was the lowest bidder to RFB 2021-29. Estimated three-year spend is 26,500, summary attached.
- Move to approve.
- Second.
- Second.
- Okay. Any further discussion?
- No? All those in favor say aye?
- [All] Aye.
- Opposed nay? Motion carries. All right. Number three. Discussion on the City of Green Bay fee schedule for 2022.
- So included in your packet is the proposed fee schedule. Attorney Mathers has been the one who is working on this. So I guess if you have any questions, please ask myself or attorney, and we can try to answer your questions.
- I just have one, I had a conversation with Director Stechschulte earlier today, because in the proposed fee schedule, it does reflect a reduction in the mobile food establishment license from the current rate of \$500 to \$100, which was directly relevant to a communication that had previously been submitted. And I'm okay with that. And I will support that reduction in that fee. However, what I mentioned to the director earlier on the phone today is what I didn't want to get lost is the other half of that original communication, which was to work with the county on simplifying that application process. So really what I just wanted to call out is that I support that, I will vote for that, but I still want that previous communication that I submitted, that was ultimately referred to staff, to still come back to committee.
- Alder, which committee did that communication go to?
- I believe that was Protection and Policy. Is that correct, Alder Dorff, do you recall?
- I think that was Protection and Policy, yeah, I think so.
- [Lindsay] Correct. If I could, Alder Dorff, I can respond to that. So this change was actually suggested by the Clerk's Office to reduce the fees. But on our list of ordinances to still completely revamp is the mobile food establishment ordinance altogether. And subsequent communications that have come in related to that

ordinance have been kind of attached to that original project. So that includes your communication about simplifying the process with the county. So this is, I appreciate you reminding us. This is kind of an interim measure, I would say.

- Okay.

- [Lindsay] But we haven't lost sight of that.

- Yep. That's all I just wanted to be sure of, is that this wasn't meant to replace that communication. So if that's not the case, I'm good.

- So this just says with discussion, it didn't say action? Is this an action item?

- [Vanessa] No, this is not. So the reason this is appearing on the agenda as is, is because this will be adopted as, along with, the intent was always that this would be adopted along with the budget, but we want to give you all ample opportunity to make adjustments to those and allow for those numbers to be transitioned over to matching with budget numbers. So there is no action on this one. This is just, if you are seeing numbers that you feel like either aren't numbers that you would like to reduce or don't reflect what the actual costs being recouped, this is our opportunity to adjust them up and down to see how those will impact the budget for next year, before we actually get to adoption.

- It would be like a receive and place on file kind of a motion?

- [Vanessa] Yes.

- Okay.

- Alder Dorff, I did have one more if I could?

- Oh, yeah, sure.

- Yeah. And I almost forgot about this one. But it seems to me that most of, there's only a handful of increases, obviously, and there's a couple of decreases, that all seem to be within margin of expected cost increase. There was one, however, that I was unsure what it was and it seems that it might be new. And that is the fee in lieu of providing stormwater management per equivalent runoff unit, ERU, for \$3,600. Could we just get an explanation as to what that is?

- [Lindsay] Sure. So, Steve's not on here, right? All right. I'll do it. So the ordinance previously, our stormwater ordinance provides for if the property is not going to be hooked up into the stormwater system, the property owner has to apply to DPW and get it approved by the director of DPW and has to pay this fee to compensate for the amount of runoff that would be, that won't be in, or that is not going to be going into the storm sewer because the storm sewer is not connected. So this fee, we didn't, it was in the ordinances when we did the recodification, but because of the way that the language was worded, which was that the fee would be negotiated with the Director of DPW, we didn't immediately flag it when we did the recodification as something that belonged on the fee schedule. In subsequent discussions with Director Grenier, I was informed that there is this flat rate and it's not actually done by negotiation. And so it was more appropriate to include that amount here on the fee schedule and actually, not this week, but at the next I and S meeting, we will be bringing an ordinance to change the language of that provision so that it references the amount that's in the fee schedule, as opposed to the previous negotiation language.

- So, if I'm understanding correctly, this is an annual fee, not a one-time fee, is that correct?

- [Lindsay] Um... That's a good question. I don't actually know off the top of my head.

- And I can watch the I and S Committee for discussion, just that 3,600, it seems, I don't know what work we're doing to earn that. It seems more of like an incentive to hook up to storm water as opposed to a fee for service, if you will. But again, if I and S is taking this up, I'll just watch for it there.
- [Lindsay] Okay. And I can make sure I have an answer to that question at the time of the I and S meeting.
- Okay. Thank you.
- [Vanessa] But what I can tell you is that stormwater has to go somewhere. So if it's on property, it's probably turning into our problem.
- Like flooding, maybe?
- Grass?
- It could, depending on how hard the rain is falling.
- Unless it's a huge parking lot.
- Yes, and then it doesn't. Okay.
- Or it's a 10 year storm.
- That's true. Or a 250 year storm. All right. Anything else on this, then, before we take a motion to receive and place on file?
- Motion to receive and place on file.
- Thank you, Alder Johnson. Is there a second? Alder Galvin is muted. Alder Corpus-Dax gets the second.
- Second.
- 'Cause she's not muted. Okay. Alder Corpus-Dax gets it. All right. All those in favor say? Motion carries. All right. Now we're going to go up, move up into the report of the Claims Committee. And I have a question before we do that, to the attorney, would it be all right or is it appropriate for me to ask if Director Quirk could come into the closed session?
- [Vanessa] Yes, it's appropriate for her to come.
- Okay, so I would like to, I will move that we go into closed session, and ask that Director Quirk come into closed session with us.
- Second that.
- And Alder Johnson seconded that. And since I moved it, I guess I'll read the language. The committee may convene in closed session pursuant to Section 19.85 Wisconsin Statutes, for the purpose of conferring with legal counsel for the governmental body who's 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 Wisconsin Statutes, to take action items discussed in closed session, if appropriate, and to consider the remainder of the agenda. All those in favor of going into closed session say aye?

- [All] Aye.
- Opposed nay? Okay, we will go into closed session and--
- Alder Dorff?
- Yes?
- I'm just wondering, Commissioner Brian Powell is here as well, from there. I dunno if he would be part of that as well? That's according to Nancy Quirk.
- Okay. Yeah. If Nancy would like to be part of it. Okay. Then do we need to revise the motion, Vanessa? Or can we just invite him in?
- [Vanessa] No, you don't have to indicate who is coming into closed session with you as part of the motion.
- Okay. Thank you. You're invited Brian.
- All right. Well let me, give me a moment to put the others into the waiting room.
- We will.
- [Barb] Now is the motion gonna be just as we usually do, receive and place on file, with report of the Claims Committee?
- [Brian] I think we need to approve, 'cause you got two over 25,000.
- Oh yes, okay.
- Correct.
- Okay. I'll entertain a motion to go back into open session?
- So moved.
- Second.
- Moved by Alder Johnson, seconded by Alder Galvin. Will vote aye?
- [All] Aye.
- Motion carries. And now I will entertain a motion?
- Move to approve the report of the Claims Committee.
- Okay.
- Second.
- Second by Alder Galvin, moved by Alder Johnson. Any further discussion? All those in favor say aye?
- [All] Aye.

- Opposed nay? Motion carries. All right. So back to, then, item four, which should be interesting. For consideration with possible action to approve the American Rescue Plan Act Fiscal Recovery Funds Administrative Policy, which was a good read, it was a good read. So, go ahead, Diana. I mean Director Ellenbecker.

- Okay. I was expecting, oops, give me a minute, let me. Okay, we have a new grant administrator who is handling this grant for us. And she's been waiting around all evening. And I just sent her an email, so I don't see her quite online, but Susan House is our new grant administrator, and she has pulled this together. She is--

- I'm sorry, who is the person? Sue who?

- Her name is Susan House and I do expect her to be showing up sometime soon on Zoom here. But she has gone through and done lots of research. There was a strong recommendation from many of the webinars that we watched for the American Rescue Plan Act that you make sure you have a policy in place before you really start spending the money for the grant. They also strongly recommended that you either take your current grant policy and make an addendum to it, or create a new policy. So that is what Susan has done. She's gone, used a lot of research and advice from quite a few of the vendors and partners that are out there. And she has looked at what other municipalities have done and she has pulled together this policy. So again, this is a draft. This is a starting point. Until we have a starting point we can't, really, we need everyone to have a chance to look at it and make recommendations. One of the big things is, really, in this policy, it even says that we will not be spending any money until the policy is in place, so we know how it's gonna be monitored, who's gonna do the reporting, what, how, and when we can spend this money. So to date, the only thing, money that we have spent, and there is that exception in this policy, is that you had given us permission a couple months back to hire somebody to administer this grant. So the only expense to date has been some salary dollars and then a few office supplies. But otherwise it's really only for Susan to administer this grant. So again, this is a draft. We do expect you were gonna have some changes. You're gonna have some questions and some recommendations. And I see Susan is coming online in a moment. So really it's a first draft. And really looking for your feedback before we take it to the next step of taking it to the public. Our plan is to take it to the public, with a public survey, and to get more information, again from the public, and from the council, before we even really make an allocation internally to bring to you as a recommendation, again. So first step was to get a policy in place so you understand how we plan to administer it. Once the council has this information and it's like, again, the allocations or however we decide to allocate it, we have it all in place, it's all in a policy, then we can take the next steps.

- What wasn't clear to me as I read it. And I know that at the very end is a draft proposed use, but those aren't the only buckets are they? Or are those the only things that you can spend it on? Are those public health expenditures, negative economic, those are the things that are allowed, that's it?

- Yep.

- Okay. And then the one I think I had a question on was, oh, no, I guess I don't know. No. Okay.

- Okay--

- So that is the limit, so that when we send this out to the public and get feedback, any proposals need to fall, and from council too, any proposals need to fall within one of those one, two, three, four, five areas?

- Correct. I would like to introduce Susan House. She's our new grant administrator. She's the one who really pulled the policy together. And I'm gonna let her talk about the details, because she has spent weeks and weeks looking through all the details of this policy. So yes, Susan, if you want to kinda address that, even though we have received half of our money, but there are a lot of criteria, or there a lot of restrictions on how we can use the money. And so, Susan has really all the details on how we can spend the money. I see

Susan has turned her camera off at the moment, but yes, there are specific categories in which we can spend our money, and that is laid out in that document.

- Susan--

- Well I just think it would be nice for you to run through the document with us. Is that okay, committee? Does that sound good?

- Sure.

- Mm hm.

- Okay.

- Okay. Hello, everyone. I'm going to share my screen. I have a quick presentation for you.

- Great. Great.

- I think the--

- I'm not sure if it's sharing?

- Not yet. Yeah, her expectation is, instead of going through the whole document, she kind of tried to summarize it into a PowerPoint presentation and kind of give you a high level overview of what's in that document. I'm not seeing--

- Okay.

- Oh, the host disabled participant sharing.

- Okay. One moment please. Are you able to now?

- [Susan] Okay, is mine sharing?

- Yes.

- [Susan] Okay. So first off, I'd like to thank you all for allowing me to present today. I am Susan House, your grant administrator, and internal auditor. So I'm just gonna give you a very high level look at the American Rescue Plan Act, or ARPA, Standard Operating Procedure. And any feedback that you have, I welcome and appreciate. So first off, the SOP is based on the information taken directly from the Treasury Compliance and Reporting Guidance document. And this table shows the internal controls best practices. Just to let you know, on the left side of this, I mean the left column, the best practices, are the things that you need. The middle is the description and an example. So for the written policies and procedures, we can check that box. We have our procurement manual. We have this SOP that we're presenting, and either approving or updating. The risk-based due diligence. The project manager I will be doing. The written standards of conduct, we do have a standards of conduct that the procurement director issues to any subcontractors, so that box can be checked. Any record maintenance and retention for this, ARPA funds, we have to keep our documents for five years at the end of the last payment, or until, hopefully, fingers crossed, we don't have this, but any OIG Office of Inspector general auditing. So once that is closed, then it's five years past that, but we're not gonna have the OIG come in and look at our records, we're gonna be top notch. Just to know more working on the SOP purpose page one. You'll see the purpose statement, which is basically saying we're complying with the CFR 200 internal control section and with the best practices from the federal government, listed on the prior slide. The first purpose statements, that we're going to administer these funds to projects and activities that are

consistent with the goals of the city. And we're gonna administer in an efficient manner, and we will have evaluations, and we will not exceed their annual approved percentages of the funds that are approved annually by the common council. That part, I'll go on, and I'll go over on the next slide. The second purpose statement is just like the grants SOP that we already have in place. And it just says that we're gonna comply with the Office of Management and Budget, Super-Circular, the OMB Super-Circular. Then page one and two are definitions. They're common terms for most of us, but there's just common terms that may not be common for everyone. And it just keeps everything clear as we move this spending along. Page three is our policy statement and it's similar to the grant SOP, I think I actually took it directly from that and then maybe changed from grants to ARPA. And then section four on page three is really where we get into the nuts and bolts of this. On the right side of the screen, that's just from the SOP, it's directly from the SOP, so you don't have to, I'm not gonna read every single line of that, but there will be an allocation spreadsheet with allowable categories that will be approved by Common Council. And a draft of that is on page nine and 10, I think it's page 38 of your packet. So basically the allocations of the current funds, we have 11 plus million, that will be allocated among the categories. As you can see and work your way across, there'll be a dollar amount and a percentage. And as for year one, the current year we're in, what we are allocating. And then year two and three are projections. As we go through each year, you will see which categories we didn't spend or which categories we need more money. And we can shift that money to address those needs. I will provide you those assessments so then you can make informed decisions as we go through each year. The process we'll keep us--

- [Barb] Could you just stop a sec? 'Cause you directed us to that draft, but those amounts you have in there, are those accurate amounts? Or is that just to draft an example?

- [Susan] That's just an example.

- [Barb] Got it. Okay. Thank you.

- [Susan] That's just the numbers that I plugged in and I was playing around with it. So they are all formula based, so if we move a number, then it's gonna change the percentages, but we can make them whatever we need it to be based on what information we get from you all, the common council, and from the public.

- [Barb] Okay. Thank you.

- So this process will help us to allocate our money best so that we're not just sprinkling money all over, we're actually addressing the needs of the community. So the SOP procedures, again, on page four through seven, that's just basically what I will be doing. And it talks about the reporting and it talks about information gathering that I will be doing. Information that I will provide as a summary to you so that you can make your decisions and you can provide information to your constituents. This is what we spent the money on. This is how we improved your lives. This is how we addressed your needs. So I will be giving that to you, depending on how often it's needed, but it could be monthly, it could be quarterly. And those will also be public documents that can be shared online. On the bottom of page seven, I'm not sure on your packet, I think it might be 36. It talks about procurement. This is taken from the procurement manual and it has been okayed by the procurement director and the IT director has been notified. I'm bringing this to your attention in case we do purchase any software or hardware that's gonna be on our network. We need to make sure that it's going to be compliant with our system and it's not going to be too costly to upgrade or fix, whatever might happen, once we plug that stuff in. So IT needs to be in line with this, along with the procurement director. And they're both okay with it. And then finally, the last page is just references that I use to create this document. I did use the documents that the Treasury gave us, along with our internal documents and then some other federal documents from the OMB, et cetera. And I can stop sharing And I welcome any questions or any improvements that we can make?

- Alder Johnson?

- Thank you, Alder Dorff. Thank you for the presentation, Susan. And welcome. We appreciate the content that you shared and the work you've put into this thus far. The one question really that I had, I mean, overall, I think it looks good. The only thing that just wasn't really clear to me and if I'm missing it, tell me, and if it's just not there, I think we should have a discussion about it. But one is, are department heads the only ones that are eligible to make requests?

- No. We will be gathering information from the public through surveys on different projects or topics that could be addressed.

- So members of the public could potentially submit a request on behalf of an organization or a business that's been impacted? It's not exclusively department heads?

- I would agree with that. We actually had an alder already--

- Correct.

- We have had an alder who has also put a suggestion in. So I think at this point, all those, any of those options that have been turned in could be considered by the Finance Committee and or our council as we're working through the allocations.

- Okay. So I presume there will be a formal application for that then?

- Well, it makes sense. Like we did for the money from, leftover from the stadium tax, that there is some, it's not huge, but there should be a formal application.

- Yeah, and I think there needs to be almost like a bare minimum expectation when city council's reviewing project proposals to ensure we're not doing like a back and forth with applicants.

- Right.

- That we gather everything we need upfront to make a qualified decision.

- And I was on that tax subcommittee. Were you on there Alder Steuer? I don't remember who else was on there?

- I was.

- Oh, Alder Galvin was.

- No I wasn't.

- Okay. So yeah. That would be a process that really might help Susan to look at that to, if that history is there, because those are pretty specific proposals. And then, then there were the scoring sheets, the rubrics that went along with them. And instead of recreating the whole thing, we have something from the past that might be very helpful to you, but that would have been five years ago, five years ago, 'cause now I remember Alder Zima was on that committee.

- Oh yeah .

- So he was still here. So that's four or five years ago.

- That was approved in 2016, correct.

- Okay.

- So that was just one question that I had, is that piece, understanding how that process would work. And then the second question that I would have leads into the timing. So we know when the funding needs to be spent by, but how do we accept requests? Is that on a rolling basis? Do we assess projects on a quarterly, semi-annual basis? I just want to understand that a little bit?

- We would take some direction from you on how you would want to handle that.

- So are we required to spend a certain amount of money each year? Or how does that work?

- We are not required to spend a certain amount each year. We just need to have it obligated, and then spent by a certain year.

- Again, I'm just spit balling out loud here, right? Do we maybe want to do like an RFP process that happens every so often? Do we want to target certain buckets based on what we perceive to be the need in our community? So even though I appreciate that the federal government has created these buckets, I don't necessarily think it means that they're equal needs in our community. I mean, one bucket might have a higher need in our community than another community. So I'm just wondering, do we want to get into that conversation or do we just let that up to an RFP process and you've got a good project or you don't?

- Right now we--

- That's kind of where I'm just struggling with in my mind.

- Right. Right now we do have about 80 million in requests, project requests, submitted.

- From where?

- From alder, mayor, different department heads.

- I didn't know we were accepting requests yet?

- Well, since the notice came out in March that this was gonna happen, people started submitting requests. And then I put them in a spreadsheet to start sorting them and making sure that they meet the requirements. Most of them are infrastructure. Most of them are stormwater.

- Does that meet the requirements? We didn't even know what the requirements were. This is the first I knew.

- I didn't even know we were accepting applications or requests.

- Let me jump in a little bit.

- Okay, jump in.

- These were internal discussions that we've had during the interim final guidance of what kind of projects did we have available? So there was a request that went out through senior staff, senior staff meetings, like the mayor. We've sat down and we've had discussions on what possibly would be eligible to spend this money on. So it either has to fall in one of the several different categories. So really the majority of the requests that I really received, and then I forwarded onto Susan, she's been tracking them, were really internal department heads saying that they had qualified, based on the interim final guidance that we had, did they have projects

that would be eligible for this grant? So the majority of them are going to be all department head requests at this point.

- So there's only 23 million. Right?

- Correct.

- And there's 80 million already on the list. That doesn't mean that's the 80 million we're gonna go for, but all right.

- And then--

- I'm sorry, Alder Johnson, you--

- If I could just finish up it, it's one of the, this came before this committee previously and then through council in, the administration was directed to host a couple of listening sessions on this, to get feedback from the public. Do we have a timeframe for when that's going to happen?

- The Mayor would like to do those or has proposed to do those with the budget sessions as well. So that it'd be a dual meeting.

- Okay.

- Ah. That makes sense.

- In which case, then, I would hope that we're not making decisions about awarding until the public's had an opportunity to understand that process.

- This committee won't be making decisions before the public gets that opportunity. That's a big part of this all along.

- Right. Okay. That's all I had. Thank you.

- Alder Gerlach, you had your hand up?

- Yes, just to try to understand what has transpired so far. Is there any chance that one of these proposals or these suggestions or requests might involve flood mitigation for District Three? I'm just asking, because I talked to the mayor and I've talked to DPW, and I just wondered, did that constitute making a request? I don't know?

- 'Cause you were the alder, are you the alder that made the request? Is this the alder making a request?

- But I didn't put in any official requests because I didn't know how, I just had these conversations. So I'm wondering, is that what resulted in this \$80 million of requests?

- But I'm gonna tell you, none of them were formal requests. These were all suggestions, these are all informal suggestions.

- Suggestions, okay.

- Varied suggestions that some departments had and they had, including, water utility had some suggestions, different department heads had suggestions, Alder Gerlach's suggestion really follows suit to what Matt Heckenlaible and Steve Grenier had already submitted. So it wasn't anything unique. It was really just something that they had said, again, because some of the categories are water and sanitary infrastructure. So

most of our capital needs do not qualify for this, 'cause there potentially is another infrastructure bill, potentially lingering out there. So at this point it's either broadband, water, or sanitary/storm infrastructure. So if we are to do infrastructure, I would expect it's going to be some kind of sanitary or a storm flood mitigation, some kind of, if we're going to do a large project, that's a qualified capital expense. So that's not a surprise that that has made the list.

- No. Right.

- Okay. I just wondered if that's how it was working. Now I understand. And may I just quickly say to Susan, thank you for a very good written report and thank you for a very good PowerPoint presentation.

- Thank you.

- Committee, other questions from the committee, or Alder Steuer?

- I'd just like to make this, thank you, Susan, for that. Like I said, I'm not on the committee, but I'm on council, and we are very, very interested in what is happening here. And we will read this very, very carefully. We just need to be up to speed with this. And I thought maybe, in a perfect world, we'd be talking about some of the things that we would be choosing tonight, but I'm glad that you're looking at this policy. I think it's very important that we have something in place so that we can have something we can hang our hat on. So thank you again. That's all.

- So Susan, I hope you will come to city council on the 7th, because I have a feeling there'll be questions and you may want to bring that PowerPoint along with you. I invited everyone from council to be here tonight. I made a special email just, and I thought more would come, 'cause more were interested. But I'm afraid we'll do this again, all over again. All right.

- Alder Dorff?

- Yes?

- Just looking for some clarity from staff. Are you just looking for a general discussion right now? Or come September 7th, are you looking for council to actually adopt something?

- The policy.

- Right, so I'm trying to wrap my brain around this, or if there are modifications that people want to make. Is September 21st an acceptable timeline to formally adopt the policy? So that it gets referred maybe on 7th and you can refine whatever recommendations might be made. And then you come back on the 21st with, I'm just trying to help clarify that for everybody, I guess.

- Yep. I can jump in. Yes, absolutely. We did not expect that it would be approved without questions or maybe revisions or without the whole council looking at it. You certainly can make a recommendation to send it to council as is. You can send it back to staff. But we have time.

- Send it to council.

- We have time. To your point, there's no expectations that it was going to be approved at the September 7th meeting. We figured, we assumed there would be drafts, and there would be some modifications to it.

- Okay.

- So we could just send it to council knowing that, it's important that all of council talk about this, this is a huge thing, but what would our motion, wouldn't be to approve it? It would be what? Is it a committee of the whole item?

- I think, that's, I think we ought to have Susan present to the full council. I think this is a very substantial and important allocation that deserves everybody's attention. So I would make that a motion to refer this to city council for a presentation by staff on September 7th.

- Okay.

- Is there a second?

- And just to clarify--

- Second.

- Oh, just, yeah, Vanessa?

- [Vanessa] You can put it up for approval, so that if it meets everybody's expectations, you can just have it ready for adoption. And then just plan on pulling it and notifying staff that the expectation is that they will provide the same presentation.

- So I'll be honest. I don't want to make that motion, because I can already think of a few modifications that I'd like to make that I don't think I'm prepared to do today, amendments that I wouldn't be prepared today. And maybe I could bring them on the 7th, but I don't, I'd rather just refer it and have the presentation and take the time until September 21st to finalize it.

- I actually would too. Is that all right, Attorney Chavez? Does that work?

- [Vanessa] Yeah, that's fine. Then I would actually say that if you know it's gonna come back to committee, you would hold it and then have staff expect to address it at the council meeting.

- So, basically a motion to hold, with a requirement, a directive, to have Susan present at city council on September 7th. Would that be appropriate?

- [Vanessa] Yep. To hold to get council input on September 7th.

- Okay, that is my motion.

- All right. Is there a second? Second. Any other discussion? Seeing none, all those in favor say aye?

- [All] Aye.

- Opposed nay? Motion carries. And let's get to our last item under regular business then. A request by Alder VanderLeest to the Finance Committee which states, request that the 2022 city budget is submitted to the Green Bay City Council. Hold the property tax rate flat. Also for city staff to investigate what grant and federal monies can be used to assist with our '21-'22 city budgets. Oh, were we in closed session? No, we weren't. No. Sorry. Okay. So Alder VanderLeest, would you like to speak on this? He's been connecting to audio for a very long time.

- Yeah, I don't believe he is. I don't believe he's actually joined us at any point during this meeting.

- Okay. I personally think that this request is coming in a little bit too soon, because we haven't really started the work on the budget yet. And I do think city staff does investigate grant and federal monies, but we can ask them to do it, that part of it. But I really, I struggle with the first part of the motion. Alder Johnson?

- Yeah. I don't disagree with the sentiment of what he's proposing. I think that's an ideal world for everybody, if you can do that. But I don't know that you can handcuff city council, either, with this. So my recommendation, and I'll make this as a motion, is to refer this to the Mayor's Office, so that as he's constructing the budget, that he has this advice, and obviously it's at that point, it's up to him if he wants to, or if he can even, really, craft a budget that does that. And then obviously Alder VanderLeest has the opportunity at any point through the budget proposal to make amendments that would honor or deliver on that request.

- Sounds great. I'll accept that as a motion.

- I'll second

- Second by Galvin.

- Yep.

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

- [All] Aye.

- Opposed nay? Motion carries. It refers to the Mayor. Informational. Our contingency account is at \$104,650. And the next Finance Committee meeting will be held Tuesday, September 14th at 4:30. Anything else?

- Motion to adjourn.

- Motion to adjourn by Alder Galvin.

- Second.

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

- [All] Aye.

- Opposed nay? Motion carried. We're adjourned. Long meeting.

- Thank you.

- Bye.