



MINUTES OF THE FINANCE COMMITTEE

TUESDAY, JANUARY 25, 2022, 4:30 PM

Immediately following Personnel.

Virtual Meeting. Public may join via Zoom.

A. ZOOM MEETING INFORMATION.

I. This item contains Zoom information, instructions, and a link to the Virtual Comment Form.

B. ROLL CALL.

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

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

Others Attending: Alder Gerlach, Alder Steuer, Diana Ellenbecker, Pam Manley, Steve Grenier, Dan Ditchett, Joe Faulds, Dave Litton, Susan House, Amaad Rivera, Joanne Bungert, Chris Davis, Mike Hronek, Paul Ebel and Nina Robinette.

C. APPROVAL OF THE AGENDA.

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

Motion Passed.

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

D. APPROVAL OF MINUTES.

I. Approval of the Finance Committee minutes from the January 11, 2022 meeting.

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

Motion Passed.

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

E. REGULAR BUSINESS.

1. For consideration with possible action on the first amendment to the Green Bay Electronics Record Program (GERP) software agreement between the City of Green Bay and Brown County.

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

Motion Passed.

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

2. For consideration with possible action the approval of American Rescue Plan Act (ARPA) allocation within the Stormwater, Green Infrastructure, and Climate Resilience category for Roosevelt St. Green Infrastructure for \$360,000.

Moved by Ald. Veronica Corpus-Dax, seconded by Ald. Barbara Dorff to approve contingent on receiving additional information.

Motion Passed.

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

3. To approve the American Rescue Plan Act (ARPA) allocation within the Stormwater, Green Infrastructure, and Climate Resilience category for S. Van Buren St. #2 for \$570,000 contingent on receiving more information.

Moved by Ald. Veronica Corpus-Dax, seconded by Ald. Bill Galvin to approve contingent on receiving additional information.

Motion Passed.

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

4. For consideration with possible action the approval of American Rescue Plan Act (ARPA) allocation within the Stormwater, Green Infrastructure, and Climate Resilience category for Rain Barrel-Rain Garden Green Infrastructure for \$60,000.

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

Motion Passed.

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

5. For discussion the 2022 draft bonding request.

Moved by Ald. Veronica Corpus-Dax, seconded by Ald. Bill Galvin to refer to council for bonding threshold limits and for committees to further review.

Motion Passed.

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

F. INFORMATIONAL.

1. 2021 Contingency Account: \$104,650.00

2022 Contingency Account: \$200,000.00

2. The next Finance Committee meeting will be held on Tuesday February 8, 2022 at 4:30 PM.

G. ADJOURNMENT.

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

H. VERBATIM MINUTES.

- Thank you.
- She's good, all right. So I'll call the January 25th meeting of Finance Committee to order, and roll call, Alder Galvin?
- Here.
- And Alder Corpus-Dax.
- Here.
- And Alder Dorff is here. I'll entertain approval of, a motion to approve the agenda.
- So moved.
- So moved.
- Second.
- Second.
- All right, moved by Alder Galvin, second by Alder Corpus-Dax. All those in favor, say "aye."
- Aye.
- Aye.
- Those nay, the motion carries. Approval of the minutes.
- So moved.
- Second.
- Approved, okay, all right. Motion made by Alder Corpus-Dax, second by Alder Galvin, and the discussion, seeing none, all those in favor, say "aye."
- Aye.
- Aye.
- Opposed nay, motion carries, regular business. Per consideration with possible action on the first amendment to the Green Bay Electronics Record Program, the GERP software agreement between the city of Green Bay and Brown County, staff.
- I am actually going to let Joanne speak to this one.

- Okay.

- Okay, good evening, everybody. So this agreement is just essentially changing the start date from June 1st, 2020 to January 1st, 2021. We've already been operating under this agreement, but we just need to formalize the approval so that the city can execute this agreement.

- Okay, any questions? Yes, Alder Galvin?

- What happened, what's... I see that there's some monies involved, and, I mean, why do we have to change it if we've been operating under it since the beginning?

- Not that we are changing, we've been operating under the amendment or the amended agreement, which just basically changed the start dates and a prorated fee payment per usage in 2020. So I'm sorry if I misspoke or if there was a misunderstanding. So we're not changing anything from the prior agreement. We're just bringing it forward for formalized approval and signature.

- Okay, but I guess I'm still confused. Didn't we, I remember meeting, a year where we talked about this, we came to an agreement, everyone said, "Yea, let's go ahead," so why do we have to have it amended? Did something stop it from going forward, or?

- Right, no, I understand the confusion. So that agreement that was approved at that point is what is in front of you today. It just never was formally approved by Council for signature, so we're still bound by the agreement or bound by the amended agreement that you have in front of you, and that's what we've been operating under. It just needs the formal approval of council so that the mayor can sign off on it, and Brown County has already done so.

- So kind of like an oversight or something?

- Right.

- Yeah, that's what I was gonna say. We forgot to do, or we didn't, we just didn't do it formally. It's not, this isn't amended since then, this is the amended agreement.

- Correct, yes.

- Okay. This is what we approved a year ago.

- Yes, yes, yes.

- Okay, all right.

- Any... I'll entertain a motion, if there are no other questions.

- Motion to approve?

- Second.

- Motion approved by Alder Corpus-Dax, such by Alder Galvin, any further discussion? Seeing none, all those in favor, say "aye."

- Aye.

- Aye.

- Aye, opposed nay, motion carries. All right, next item. It was number two, for consideration with possible action, the approval of the American Rescue Plan Act, ARPA, allocation within the Stormwater, Green Infrastructure, and Climate Resiliency category for Roosevelt St. Green Infrastructure for \$360,000. So that's one of the categories that we approved, ARPA, and are there questions, or staff, do you want to present anything? Does anyone have questions, yeah, Alder Galvin?

- Yeah. It says it's going to be installed in the terrace, okay? So as I understand it, that's that space between the curb and the sidewalk, some kind of a filtration system built in probably underneath the grass that's normally there. I'm just trying to figure out how much water do they estimate is going to be going through this system on the terrace? Is the thing going to the stormwater, or do they figure it's just gonna absorb into the ground? I guess there's not a lot of details as to how something like this works.

- I'll be honest with you, Alder. I'm not 100% sure what exactly this green infrastructure is. This is something that the Utility Manager and the Assistant Director who is also the city engineer, working with the assistant city engineer in the Project Development section, they are comfortable with this green infrastructure. They're the ones who need to know. I can definitely find out the particulars of the design, if that's something the Council's interested in.

- Well, and look, Steve, I mean, or Director Grenier, you know people are always questioning how we're spending money, and people are scrutinizing these ARPA funds very much. I'm all about saving pollutants from going into the stormwater and then having to be filtered out. You look at how the East River and the Bay and everything else turns nice and thick green every summer from all the phosphorus and everything going in there. But when I see it rain in my neighborhood, I see more water running down the curb from the sewer than I see on the terrace. I look at how much terrace we have, and, I mean, imagine if you add it up, it adds up to quite a bit. But I guess... And we always say, we hire staff that we trust to do the right thing, but I think we're gonna need some better explanations moving forward on some of this stuff, instead of just... 'cause what do I tell my constituents when they ask, "How the hell does this work," and I go, "Well, there's this guy and he's at the city and he can explain it to you." But we don't even have anything here, any drawings or renditions or anything else like that explaining how much water do they plan on capturing this way, compared to how much is normally going through the storm sewers and that kind of stuff. So I guess it'd be nice to have more detail.

- There's a pretty nice summary, right, the project summary. But you're right, it doesn't give exact amounts, but it talks about the filtered media captures and immobilizes pollutants, and then they're decomposed, volatilized, and incorporated into the biomass. But I guess it doesn't say how much.

- I get all that, but we're talking about \$360,000 for a section of the street that runs on Roosevelt, it runs from Main Street to Stuart, which is, what, six blocks, seven blocks? And then I think about all the other street that we have in the city, and I extrapolate that out, if this is something we want to do everywhere eventually, what's this gonna run, and are we only doing this because we have ARPA money, and when the ARPA money runs out, you'll never see us doing it again in the future? I mean, I just... I mean, it almost seems that we're doing this just for this small section. Is it gonna have that much of an impact that it makes it worth spending \$360,000 of ARPA money on this, or are we better off looking for something else that is more feasible and is gonna have more of an impact?

- Well, when we get to the item related to discussion of the Capital Improvement Program, you'll see that one of the things that I provided to Director Ellenbecker that she's included in the packet is supporting documentation for the Department of Public Works for our program, our part of the annual CIP. And if you look in there under the local streets, which is our page two of seven, you'll see that we are proposing green infrastructure on Van Buren, Roosevelt, Eliza, Finger, another Van Buren. So GI as a function of city projects, where it's possible for us to do that, that's a directive that we've been given by the mayor to implement GI as a standard to supplement our traditional infrastructure to help alleviate some of these concerns relative to

flooding that we're seeing across the city. So I think in answer to your question, no, this is not simply because of ARPA. This is the new standard that DPW's gonna be looking at. Part of the reason that you're not seeing detailed design, I don't, detailed design is complete on some of this stuff yet. What we've put out here is what our best estimates on the cost are gonna be, but I don't know that the detailed design on some of these things has necessarily been completed at this point because it's still early in the year. One of the reasons that we are directing ARPA money to it is because stormwater is an explicitly identified expense for ARPA funding.

- Okay, would we be better served, because my district is one of the ones that was hurt very badly by the flooding over the last few years. I had many residents that were like, "I'll sell you my house, it's right next to all the greenery of all the parks," and in fact, the city did buy a house on Mason Street and turned it into green space to help alleviate some of this flooding. With \$360,000, would we have more of an impact on stormwater, pollutants, and flooding if we were to just buy some of these houses along the East River and start a process that way, instead of doing terraces on a few streets here, there, kind of check marked all over the city?

- Well, considering that you would... for every house you purchase, you would eliminate that house as a potential liability for flooding in the future 'cause the house isn't there any longer, but on a straight stormwater evaluation, infiltration, water quality, water quantity, slowing the water down so it doesn't get into the storm sewer as fast, I don't think purchase of a house is gonna be a one for one trade with any of the green infrastructure initiatives that we've proposing as part of the CIP because those green infrastructure initiatives, whether it's bio infiltration, whether it's permeable pavement, those are intended to maximize the amount of infiltration for the square foot or area that they're taking up. We're trying to get best bang for the buck because we know we have physically constrained areas, whereas you tear a house down and put turf grass on it, turf grass is somewhat permeous until it gets soaked, and then all the water runs off. So from a stormwater perspective, if you're looking at reducing pollutants and slowing the water down, I think these GI projects are better. If you're looking at eliminating the potential for a flood claim, taking a house that's within a known flooding area, yeah, by taking a house, you're gonna eliminate the potential there. So it depends on what your endgame is.

- Well, and I guess my endgame is actually both, and I guess that's why it would be nice if we had some data here, showing how the amount of terrace that's being proposed would actually, what would the impact be, versus just removing homes and just having that green space, I mean-

- Well, Alder Galvin, it doesn't sound like one has anything to do with the other, removing a home doesn't do anything for the green infrastructure, it just does something for removing the home, but it-

- I beg to differ because even as Director Grenier has said here, it does have some impact, so we're being asked to approve \$360,000, and as you said, there's gonna be other GI programs on DPW's side of the ball here that we're gonna be asked to approve, and I'm all for that. But I want to know what kind of impact it's gonna have. Are we taking, for every 100 square feet of terrace with this system in it, are we taking 10 gallons of water per how many inches of rainfall? I mean, what is the impact, how much are we actually doing, versus what it would be just to have green space, the green space that's there right now? And how much-

- So you're thinking the green space of the house would be, that would be the green initiative? Is that how you're-

- To a certain extent, it would not only be a green initiative, but it would also, like Director Grenier said, take away the ability for people to claim flood damage and other things like that, and the city having to respond to the flood damage by blocking streets, inspecting homes that have been damaged. I mean, you look at the cost to the city with the last major flooding that we had, particularly in my area, I mean, it was flooded almost up to Baird Street on one side of the East River and it was flooded up one to two blocks the other side. I mean, there's still a house, if you go down on Hartung, that's sitting up on blocks that the poor owners have been

struggling for three years to get the insurance and everything squared away to get her home repaired so she can live in it again.

- So what if, I mean, we were asked to submit proposals. What if we don't have to do this or that? What if you would submit the proposal to spend another 360,000, I don't know whether we'd pass it or not, to remove some houses, because this idea to do something to the pavement, that's gonna keep going, and that's forever. You remove a house, you're done removing the house, then what? But both ideas might be good. We might not have to choose-

- I'm not necessarily looking for the money to remove houses, I'm just saying, I have constituents that were willing to sell, would have loved to sold. We had a big meeting, the mayor was there, I mean, other city officials were there. They did say that was one idea, that's why they did buy one house on Mason Street and tore it down. I'm not proposing that we do one for the other, but when I have constituents asking me, "What does this do for us," there's nothing in this proposal that says what it's going to do. How much impact is \$360,000 of this going to have on our systems? How much pollutants will it capture, how much rainwater will it divert from our stormwater systems? There's nothing here.

- Okay, let me ask a question of Steve Grenier. Is that even possible to answer those kind of questions right now? Is there a way to even predict that, Director Grenier?

- I'll have that conversation with the Utility Manager and the Assistant City Engineer in the morning.

- Okay, so you'll try to get that... and then Alder Steuer has-

- Well, no, and if I may finish.

- I'm sorry, go ahead, Alder-

- If I just may finish, this is much like the Police Department's proposal for the shot locator system, and we're putting pause on that to a certain extent because we want more information on how effective it is, same thing here. I want to know how effective this is proposed to be before I get behind it. I like the idea, I'm not saying it's a bad idea, but for staff to ask us to approve this without any information to me seems... you really-

- Well, not without any. Look, you're talking about, not without any. We have a lot of information, we don't have specific information you want, but we have a really nice description, right?

- Look, I could put together a proposal for a combustion engine for cars and say \$360,000, we're gonna put these new engines in these cars, and you could find out later on, they're only slightly better than what they were, and it's not worth the money to do it. I want to know, what will this change? And I guess I would hope that any time we get a proposal from anyone for anything, that there's some kind of information of how does this make it better? Is it worth \$360,000, or are we gonna do it and find out later on, yeah, it diverted one gallon of water per whatever, and it caught maybe some pollutants, but still, it had no difference, really. And so then we have to explain that to the taxpayers, this is how we spent your money. And like I said, yeah, it explained how it's going to work, but they don't say what the actual impact is gonna be and I'd like to see that, thank you.

- So in order, I saw Steuer, Gerlach, Corpus-Dax.

- All right, thank you, Chair. There's some good discussion here, listening to what Alder Galvin said, we're talking about this green infrastructure, and it seems like a fairly new entity, and I think I'm happy that Director Grenier is gonna look into this tomorrow, but I kind of concur with Alder Galvin, that we don't have as much as we need here to look at this. And I look at all the issues with repaving and reconstruction of roads, there's 450 miles of roads. How many miles are there of city streets that need this GI infrastructure? I would like to

know that. I mean, there's a lot of... sounds good on the surface, but I think there's some other things that we have to think about, and like I said, if you do this for two roads, there's many more roads that might need this. So I'm a little concerned, as well. So I'm looking forward to getting more research on this so we can make a better plan. I know there's some things out there right now, but it seems like, especially with all these requests that are coming in, I'd like to... maybe Susan House can help on that too later, just to talk about all the different requests that are coming in. I'd like to know, are we on pace here? Are there too many from a couple of people, not enough from others? It just seems a little hodgey-podgey to me right now, and I gotta get more up on that myself. But as time goes on, are we gonna have to tighten up and make some good requests? And I just want to make sure that each request that we have has enough research, thank you.

- In response, Alder, Director Grenier, did I hear you say that it's not just these two streets that, in the bonding proposal, you're proposing more streets? Did I hear you say that a little while ago?

- That is correct, and I guess I'll have a conversation with Alder Galvin offline about this. I need to know what, what information are you looking for, because if was simply look at these two streets, and we look at them compared to the entire stormwater system, no effect, I can tell you that right now. If we look at these two streets and we look at it compared to the basin that the street lies within, the stormwater basin that that street lies within, negligible, okay? I can say that with pretty good confidence right now. The journey of 1,000 miles begins with the first step, and this is the first step, and as we start layering project upon project upon project, that's where you start seeing the effect, but you're not gonna see a massive effect with a single project, okay? I don't say this flippantly. We're talking about \$360,000. If you go out into what's now Alder Corpus-Dax, or was Alder Corpus-Dax's district previously, at the corner of Superior and Sitka Street, we put a stormwater pond in there a couple of years ago that's gonna support three residential subdivisions. It's a fairly small pond. That was 1.2 million for a pond, okay? Green infrastructure is expensive. \$360,000 we're talking about is above and beyond the \$725,000 worth of gray infrastructure that's already on that project. We took the stormwater cost of this project... Let me get down to the right number, so let's see here. We're talking about... I want to make sure I got the right project.

- I think 15001.

- Okay, so this is for Roosevelt, Roosevelt. On Roosevelt Street, \$725,000 worth of storm, and the GI is going to add 360,000 on top of that. So green infrastructure, give or take, is anywhere from 30 to 70% of the original gray cost. So, again, if you're going to look even just on the basin that this street is located in, this one project, I can say with almost certainty, it's not going to have the big bang for the buck that you're looking for, and as such, it may not... and that's up to you guys, okay? We don't make the policy, we administer. You tell me not to build green infrastructure, I won't build green infrastructure, I'm fine with that.

- Director Grenier, that's not what I'm saying. In fact, it would have been nice if someone at City Hall had deigned to come to the Council and say, "We're going GI as much as we can, and here's one proposal that we have. We want to do programs, like we're gonna do on Roosevelt, throughout the city, it's gonna take time, it's estimated it's gonna cost this much money, but it's estimated this is what the impact is gonna be." Back when I went through Leadership Green Bay, we had Environmental Day. I went to Saint Mary's Hospital. They put in their own system to catch all the stormwater coming off their property, roof, parking lots, sidewalks, everything. They had their own filtration system. They were able to tell us, "This is how much water we're capturing, this is how much sediment and how much pollutants that we're taking out of it. In addition, we put a garden on our roof that captures so much water because it allows this garden to grow and it doesn't have to go down through the pipes and everything else." They were able to do that and they were able to say, "This is how much it costs, and it may seem a lot, but this is how much it's helping the environment." So, I mean, if the staff and the Mayor's Office wants to do this GI, I'm not saying I'm against it, but just don't feed it to me piecemeal, like it's being fed to us right now. Tell us, "This is where we want the city to go. This is our vision." I've been asking for five, 10, 15, 20 year plans out of staff for I don't know how long, and this sounds like one of those, but we're being told this just with this little focus on this \$360,000, and that's why it may seem that

that's what I'm focused on, but I'm not. I can get behind this if someone can tell us what the grand project is, what the grand plan is. I'm saying, thank you-

- Okay, it's Alder Gerlach's turn.

- I have a quick question for Director Grenier, and then I want to point out that Susan House has been raising her hand for 15 minutes, and since she's- Our grant person, I bet we ought to listen to her. But a quick question for, 'cause I got a chance now for Director Grenier, is this, this project, was this designed by our Utility Manager?

- Not necessarily. He is involved with it, but I can't say for sure that he's the one who sat down and designed it.

- Has he said to you, 'cause I've worked with Matt Heckenlaible on flooding issues and things like that, and I trust him. Has he said to you, "Steve, I think this is the way to go"?

- As a group, he, my assistant director, myself, and the assistant city engineer in the project development area, we have looked at street reconstruction projects and we have tried to select technologies that we think are going to be successful. That's what's being recommended.

- Okay, thank you. Please, Susan House.

- No, no, it's really... I said Alder Corpus-Dax next, unless she wants to... okay, then Susan House.

- Thank you, I apologize for not having-

- I gotta do that, okay.

- And thank you, alders, for letting me go ahead and speak before you. I understand what you're asking for in the future requests, and I totally get that, that I will now include the detailed information. I just wanted to remind that a lot of these projects are concepts, and so we will be doing RFPs or we will be doing project design phase next to come up with what is the project really gonna be. So where we may ask for, I don't know, \$500,000, we may only use half of that in the end, and then I would be bringing that money back, saying, "Okay, now we need... we have this project to bring forward." But I can certainly add the detailed information when available, this project, I get it, it probably does have that detailed information. I would have to check with Steve, Director Grenier before I included all of that. I did not think that you wanted to see all of that detailed information, so that's on me. I will improve that in the future and I will bring the detailed information when available, and if not, I will lay out that this is just a concept that we are bringing forward and will be doing an RFP or a project build out to come up with a more detailed plan that we just need that project concept approved. So I apologize for not bringing you that detailed information in the past and in these three items that I'm bringing forward today, thank you.

- Thank you, you just didn't know, I mean.

- And now I'll improve that.

- Okay, thank you, Alder Corpus-Dax?

- Thank you, I agree with what Alder Galvin's saying regarding needing to have, what is it, why do we need it, how is it better than what we have right now? How is it going to improve the lives of the residences of city of Green Bay? What are we expecting out of the project, and having all of that information is absolutely necessary because, like you said, we answer to the residents. We answer to our constituents, and they want to know how we're spending the money and why this over something else, why we're choosing this. And if this

is part of a bigger project, whatever it is that's being asked for, if it's part of a bigger project, I think we definitely need to know that, otherwise we're looking at this one thing and we're being told, "Oh, it's not gonna make that much of a difference," okay, that one piece isn't gonna make much of a difference. However, if it's one part of a bigger project that, yes, will absolutely make a difference, we're able to get behind that better. So that was all that I really had to say for this item.

- Thank you, Alder Corpus-Dax. Any other questions? So alders, how were we wanting to, before we even go onto the next one, how are we wanting to handle this? It sounds like we want to have more information. But what are we being asked to do, approve the 360 today, or just approve that you guys are gonna look into it? What are we really being asked to do? Okay, Susan, you're muted, okay.

- You are being asked to approve the project and the funding, however, and it is for all three projects. All three projects, I did not bring you that detailed information, so we can do like we did with the shot detection system and we can approve the concept and I can bring it back, or you can table it and I'll bring it back with the detailed information. I guess I slipped on this one, did not bring you that detailed information. I didn't know, so now I know, in the future, I will make sure you have all this detailed information when it's available.

- Do we have this for Council, do we have that detailed information for Council if we decide to go with it?

- I would refer to Dir. Grenier.

- I can ask, but I'll... there is a possibility that as Susan indicated, some of these may be in a concept stage where we haven't advanced it. I don't know that, again, the getting down into the weeds of an individual project within our Capital Improvement Program, that's a little much for a department head.

- Well, and Director Grenier, now that I'm getting a bigger, broader idea of what's going on here, how about we just have a, instead of getting into the weeds and all the minutia that's gonna make everybody who's not into this kind of stuff have their eyes roll up into their head and they check out, how about we get just a broad view plan of what is the city's, what's the city looking at doing this? Are we looking to do this to every street eventually, just some streets where there's issues? I mean, this is the thing. Not only are we being asked to approve 360,000 here, but actually, another 700,000 on top of that, so we're blending these two projects together. I mean, isn't the concept to eventually take all the terraces in the city and turn them into this?

- No, it's to look at each individual street for appropriateness, is it appropriate to implement green infrastructure? But the initiative to move forward with a green infrastructure approach I don't think would be a surprise to anybody, that's one of the reasons the resiliency coordinator's position was established and funding, and being funded partially through the Stormwater Fund the way that it is, and that's why the city has been working for over a year on code audits and code revisions, to promote the use of green infrastructure not only on redevelopment projects or development projects, but also on internal projects.

- Okay, and so if we're trying to develop, I mean, 'cause like I asked you, is this plan for all the terraces, you said no. We're gonna have to look into that. But what if we start looking into it and at the end of it you go, "No, after looking into it, maybe five miles worth of streets this would apply to." Is that worth it in your opinion that the city move forward spending these kind of monies?

- Again, when we bring a project forward, it's because we believe that the project is worthwhile to bring forward.

- So you think this is worthwhile, even though you say if it were to stand alone, it would have no impact whatsoever, or very, very minimal impact?

- Yes, I do.

- Because when you're proposing a project to us like this, it's one puzzle piece, and that makes it very hard for the common person, even the part-time alder to understand what the whole puzzle's gonna look like when it's done. And so that's why I find it very hard to be asked to approve these kind of monies and these kind of projects when all I'm looking at is one little puzzle piece. What is the when this puzzle is done? What are we looking to obtain, and how is that gonna impact our community? And then that gives me a better idea, am I doing the right thing by approving this or am I doing the right thing by not approving it? That's all I'm asking for, I'm not asking for a lot of minutiae or anything, but just kind of give me an idea of what we're looking at here, that's all I'm asking for.

- Susan's hand was up again, and then I'll go after Susan.

- Alder Galvin, I just wanted to point out that the ARPA funds can only be, they cannot be used for streets, for that type of infrastructure-

- I get it, I get it.

- And, and we need to make sure that they are being used in the, the high-risk neighborhoods, for lack of a better word, the Quality Census Tract. So that's why I included that information in, that it does meet that requirement.

- The affordable housing development and small business support? No, forget it, I got the wrong-

- No, the- The Qualified Census Tract. It has to meet on the Qualified Census Tracts.

- Okay.

- Okay, all right, Alder Steuer.

- Thank you, Chair. Director Grenier brought up the fact that their office and other departments have been looking at projects over the last year with this in mind. That's a shame on me for not picking up on all those nuances. This seems somewhat new to me. I don't know if that was just included in the Capital Improvement Program or what have you. I agree with Alder, that this is, probably will be a very good thing in the future. I think that's just the way we're dealing with it now. We need to have as much data, and Susan House mentioned that in the future she'll do that. But Director Grenier, maybe you can help me on that. You said you folks have been looking at this for quite some time, and I just want you to let me know that maybe I'm missing the boat and not keeping up with this. Can you help me on that?

- Well, I don't know that anyone's necessarily missing the boat, Alder. Again, maybe it's because I work in this world all day, every day, okay? I'm here at City Hall, the Resiliency Coordinator is a member of my staff. Stormwater falls under the department, so I'm immersed, I live in this, okay? So maybe that's part of it. Again, I didn't realize that alders are as surprised as you are, relative to the amount of GI that the city is pursuing, again, because when the mayor proposed the resiliency coordinator, not only was that person tasked with handling resilient from flooding, but part of her job would be to prevent flooding from happening in the future, which includes implementation of green infrastructure. I've heard the mayor say that at budget roadshows. I heard him say it at Council, I heard him say it multiple times. The fact that we hired a consultant to do the code audit last year to look for barriers, not only look for barriers that would prevent folks from instituting green infrastructure within our current ordinances, but to rewrite the ordinances to promote the use of green infrastructure, and some of those ordinances are gonna be coming forward through various committees in the very near future. I thought this was common knowledge, so if that's, then that's on me, not realizing that it wasn't common knowledge with-

- No, I think it is common knowledge. I think we have-

- Not completely.

- A lot on our plates, but I certainly remember everything you're talking about, and for me, it is going toward green infrastructure. This particular project maybe I'd never heard of before, but certainly, because of the resiliency, because of climate change, because of the environment, that we've been talking about that for a year. Don't you think, Alder Galvin-

- Alder, could I just finish up, I had the floor.

- Oh, sure, okay, I thought you were done.

- No, well, I just wanted to state that, okay, ignorance, maybe yes, a little bit, but we have a lot on our plate, as well. I mean, we've got Sustainability Commission, we got equal rights, we got a number of other things that are coming into play, but we're trying to keep up with on all that. So I'm not saying I was saying that we're not able to handle all that, I'm just saying that, sometimes they get caught up in different committees, they get lost here and there. Everybody can't make every meeting. It's a challenge to try to keep up with all of this, and so I'm not saying that I'm totally ignorant on it because I pride myself in looking at issues and trying to get as much information as I can. So to make a broad brush statement that we've been doing this forever, well, not forever, but at least for some time- I just need to know that, okay, if that's the case, then I need to bring it forward and get up to speed on all of this. But as Susan House mentioned, she will be bringing up some information, as well, so that I will be more informed. So that's kind of where I'm at right now.

- I didn't want you think I was berating you. Anyone, there is so much that we have to be aware of. There are so many committees, there's so many initiatives. And part of where I'm at is that we hire our staff to be the experts and to bring forward, so there's a certain level of trust I have with the staff members. I'm certainly aware that we're looking toward doing the green infrastructure, that we're looking toward affecting the climate in any way that we can here in the city of Green Bay, and we're trying to stop flooding in any way that we can. So-

- Right, no, I agree with you on some of that. I do agree, and I guess all I'm saying is that the more information that we have that we can look at to make wise decisions is good because like Alder Galvin said, there are times where our citizens ask us, "Okay, what's going on with this," and we can't fully say that we totally know. And we just, you don't want to be in that position. You want to be in a position where you kind of know what's going on. So I'm good, I'm off my soapbox, thanks a lot.

- And I'm gonna throw that in there, too. I mean, I'm not, I didn't understand that vulnerable index, SVI, the Social Vulnerable Index or the Quality Census Tract indicates that these projects are gonna be done in economically depressed areas in our community. I didn't understand that, I didn't realize that. That's part of the minutia that we should be aware of and I understand that we have a resiliency director, which means we're going green, but that doesn't mean I'm gonna rubber stamp every project that they put through if there isn't sufficient information to justify it. Ex-cop, hey, shot locator, great, let's do it. Well, wait a minute, six, \$700,000 with a \$150,000 maintenance fund after that, that's a lot of money, and then you start hearing information that maybe it's not quite that good. So we have to do our diligence on this, and I think it's incumbent on staff not to assume that we understand all this stuff. Like I said, I want to know what the whole puzzle's gonna look like when it's done, and I don't like being given things, little piecemeal here and there, and then all of a sudden later on you're like, oh my gosh, this is what we were approving all along. This was the big picture 10 years later. So maybe I should pay more attention, I don't know, but it just, it seems like we don't always get all the information we need at the committee level. And there's a lot of information here, I'm not saying that, but when I started asking, what is this doing, how is it gonna be used, I would hope that that can be explained to us and shown to us, that this is what the big picture is and this is what we're working towards, and what's our goal, so-

- I think that's good, Alder Galvin, and I think that by asking for it, this is what Committee is for, right? To delve into it deeper, we've asked for things now, we're gonna try to get the answers before we make the decision. We're gonna go... if we do the next item, we'll go through the exact same discussion that we just had, maybe a little shorter, but we were asking and Susan's gonna do something and Director Grenier's gonna do something. They're gonna respond to us. So I think it's good to have Committee and I think it's good to have the questions that you and Alder Steuer and Alder Gerlach brought up. I think that's great, 'cause then it gives us a chance to learn and then take that learning to our constituents. So maybe it was too abrupt to want to pass this tonight. Go ahead, Alder Gerlach.

- I just want to tell you that this was the most interesting question you ever had in Finance Committee, from my perspective, no numbers, thank you.

- What shall we do, alders? Well, there's two different... I mean, the Van Buren Street isn't exactly the same. There's more permeable pavement and such, but should we move on, should we... we have these separate on the agenda. Would you want receive and place on file or hold, Alder Steuer?

- I just want to know, Chair, are these time sensitive? I mean, I don't see-

- Good question.

- Why holding this for a little bit or just getting more information would be the way to go. That's the way I'd look at it.

- Good question, are they time sensitive, Director Grenier?

- I'm actually going to defer that to Susan because of... We have to move sooner rather than later on the concept of green infrastructure being implemented into these projects, because final plans have to be prepared and we need to know whether we're including this in the final plans or not, otherwise, we're not gonna get the projects bid out and built this year. Whether this becomes levy supported borrowing, utility supported borrowing, or ARPA funded, that, I need to defer that to Susan. If we're going forward with GI, we're going forward with the GI, and I just need to figure out how we're paying for it.

- So alders, do we want to have the first Saturday discussion at Council and not just hold it here, but get Council kind of up to speed, and then probably come back here, and then go back to Council? What's the way best way, do you think, to handle it?

- Well, you know what, things should be handled at committee level to save time at Council, but we all know how that works, so.

- They'll have the same questions you did, they will.

- And that's why if we can, and again, I don't think we're asking for the chemical makeup or any of that kind of stuff. We're just asking, how does it work, what do we think it's going to impact, how is it gonna impact, what's the big picture that this is all related to? Something bullet point, easy to grasp and hold on to and understand what's happening, what it's gonna look like when it's all done. So maybe we go to Council and then it comes back to Committee or we approve it at Council, if that information is there. I just don't want to spend three hours at Council going over something that could be handled at a committee level.

- How about I go ask Susan, could you have anything ready for next week?

- I believe I can have information ready for you. It is a little bit time sensitive in that if, like Director Grenier said, that if this project is gonna be approved, that he needs to get it in his queuing and then bid out, and now is the time when they would start bidding out, so that the construction companies, they know what they're

gonna be doing, as you all know. So it is a somewhat time sensitive, but not hard and fast, today you have to decide. I am bringing you projects every month and I'm trying to go by the different categories, so, I mean, it can shift, I can combine categories. I'm trying to keep it clean for you to have a topic each month, but it's a little bit time sensitive, but not where if we wait two weeks or wait, I think we're gonna be fine. I would... but the funding part, I would refer to Director Ellenbecker.

- And we're not really, we're not even, I think, worried about not funding it yet, as, do we want to do this, and is there enough evidence that this is a good way to go, and our staff is telling us, "This is what we recommend to you." We're saying, thank you for recommending it, could you give us more information so we can understand it better? Is that what I'm hearing, Alder Galvin, Alder Steuer?

- Yeah.

- So would we want to bring it to Council? I hate to bring stuff to Council with no recommendation. I don't know.

- Well, being at the Council, I know, Alder Galvin, I agree with, that you don't want to bring all these issues to Council. You're trying to get 95% of everything done at Committee. I agree with that. But this might be one of those times where we need to have people weigh in on because you don't want to be sideswiped with something like this after the fact that, and you don't feel like you had all the information. I have all confidence that Susan House and Director Grenier and that are doing due diligence here. I have a lot of confidence in our staff. That's not a question. I think the big thing, for me, it comes down to, constituents come up to me and ask, "Well, what is this all about," and if I don't feel like I have all the information, then it makes it very do to move forward. So I'm just looking for more data, more information, just things to make better decisions, that's all.

- I agree with Alder Steuer, I've defended staff I don't know how many times over the last six years, and the fact that we hire and we keep them on, for the reason that they're doing a good job. But, again, I have to answer the people that pay these bills and I have to be able to convince them and make them understand why moving forward with something like this is good for the city and good for everybody with.

- Well, my question to you guys is do you want to talk about it at Council next week? And let me get to Alder Gerlach because she will make it clear.

- Well, my questions always make it clear, right? Is it possible, first of all, I understand from Susan that there is information that simply hasn't been provided, and is it possible, is it okay for that information to be sent out to all of the alders when it's assembled? Can that go out by email, is that legal, so that we have more information before the Council meeting?

- We can go out as part of the agenda and Council if we could get it done before Friday, right? That would be legal. Alder Corpus-Dax, did you... yeah, you wanted to say something?

- I'll go ahead and make a motion to approve the condition that we have that information prior.

- Okay.

- So we can have that. We're gonna have a conversation regardless, it's up to either to read that packet and read all of the information so that some of their questions are answered prior to pending Council meeting next Tuesday. I think the big thing is with this, specifically with the green initiative, is just answering the question is, what is the big picture, what is this supposed to look like when all the dots are connected? So even having the resiliency coordinator available for that meeting I think would be a great idea if they could present something to us, letting us know what is the big picture, because, yes, we've been getting all of these, we've been having all these meetings and these agenda items coming. I don't think we're connecting those dots.

- Right.
- That's the piece that we're missing.
- And I will... And is there further discussion? So the motion is to bring it forward to approve it and discuss it at Council, as long as we get, or contingent upon getting information provided prior to the Council meeting.
- Yeah.
- Yeah.
- Okay, are we ready to vote? This is on the first one only. Okay, all those in favor, say "aye."
- Aye.
- Aye.
- Aye, opposed nay, motion carries. All right, number two is gonna be the , I'll see how fast this-
- Agenda item three?
- I'm sorry, I can't get back to my agenda, okay.
- Yeah, agenda item three.
- There you go. Item three is for consideration of possible action the approval of American Rescue Plan allocation of Stormwater, Green Infrastructure, and Climate Resilience category for South Van Buren Street number two for \$570,000. It wasn't the same memo, but it's also, right, it's in this section, as well. All right, can we talk about that one? Susan, you want to go first, go ahead.
- All right, so this project is part of the Green Infrastructure Initiative with the city. It is, again, I've learned from what the prior discussion, so I'm gonna try to help answer some of the questions at the onset. This is a part of the approved qualified census tract area in the city that this funding can be used for the green infrastructure. It is installation of about 850 feet of permeable pavement and bio filtration systems on Van Buren Street, which will improve the water quality, the stormwater runoff, and have an aesthetic appeal in the area. This I do not have any detailed designs of this. Again, I believe is gonna have to be part of the bigger picture with the DPW, so it's kind of a domino effect of if this happens, then Director Grenier is going to have to move up or change some of his, it all works together. It's kind of like when you redo the street, you have to make sure electrical is there, all the, everybody's in line at the same time. So that's, part of this project is in line with Department of Public Works' street repairs and their road improvements and stormwater improvements, thank you.
- Thank you, discussion? Alder Galvin?
- I'll keep it simple this time 'cause I understand about the type of pavement that they're looking at. I'm just wondering about the, allow stormwater and snow melt to infiltrate into a sub-surface storage layer. Now, is that just the soil, or is that going to be an actual, like any storm sewer system? Can anyone answer that question?
- Basically what the permeable pavement will, it will soak through the permeable pavement and get into a drainage layer under the pavement. Then ultimately, will find its way into the storm sewer system, but by putting it into that infiltration layer, you're slowing down the time it takes for that rain or precipitation to get

into the storm sewer. So instead of running down the slope going into the curb and immediately falling into a pipe, by trickling through the permeable drainage media, then leaking through the drainage media to the perimeter of the road, ultimately getting into the, okay, you've slowed that down so some of the other water that was previously occupying that pipe, by the time this water gets there, effectively allowing you to use the pipe twice or multiple times, okay? So that's, in essence, that's how a pond works. You're slowing the water down so that not all the water hits the storm sewer at the same time, you're metering out the water that's in the pond over time so you don't then recede. Same kind of thing is here with the permeable pavement. You're slowing that water down so that some of the other water goes away. You don't get that big peak and then drain back off, you kind of attenuate that water and make it a more constant flow.

- All right, and permeable pavement, what I've seen in the past, and I'm sure it was dated, was examples were shown where cement blocks, hedge, with dirt in between, grass growing out of it. I don't think that's what we're looking at here, is it?

- No, what we're looking at here would be more like how we built the westernmost parking lot at Bay Beach.

- Oh.

- So it's an open... it looks like a coarse asphalt, so it actually allows the water to infiltrate right through the asphalt.

- Okay, you're not talking about the gravel lot in front of the Zippin Pippin, are you?

- Zippin Pippin.

- No, no, keep going west, like you're heading down to Metro Boat Launch.

- Okay, all right, I haven't gotten down that far lately, so. Some spring I'll take a look.

- There's a permeous parking lot that's been down there for two or three years now.

- Okay. And with permeable, how does that weather the wear and tear, as opposed to our regular streets?

- Okay. It's not as durable, not gonna fall apart in 10 years, either, okay? I don't want to reach out and put a date on it to say that a normal asphalt is 35 years and this is gonna be a 25 year, okay? The fact that it is being built with some void spaces in it, by the nature of that, that's going to be slightly less durable than a more densely compacted asphalt, but if you want to... that's one of the trade-offs to having green infrastructure.

- Okay, and these are things that we need to understand when we're approving, and I appreciate you telling me that, and also understanding Van Buren from Mason to Stuart, that's definitely a very low usage residential street where you don't have... it's not like Mason Street or Webster, even Baird Street. It's mainly the residents living there are the only ones using it, so.

- The other things we want to make sure you know, we're not out here pioneering technologies either, okay? As we're entering the green infrastructure arena, we are relying very heavily upon tried and true GI technologies. So bio infiltration and permeable pavements have been utilized by other agencies around the country for a period of time, long enough that we're comfortable that this is not risky technology. We're kind of being very, we're only dipping a toe in the pool at a time, if that makes sense.

- Sure. That's all I have, thank you.

- Alder Galvin, are most of these that we're talking about, are they in your district?

- Scary, but yes.
- Oh, all right, so your district, you're gonna lead the way in environment, yay.
- Well, I'm pumped, I mean, if it's gonna have an impact, that's what we're looking for, I mean.
- Cool, all right, cool, okay. Well, other discussion on this one? Otherwise, I'll entertain a motion, 'cause there... okay, are we gonna be asking for more information for Council, as well, because I think it included, did it include some of the same stuff as the first one?
- Yeah.
- Yes.
- I think so, so by getting that info about, from the first one, it'll transfer to the second one, too, right? So we'll say, again, if we do the motion to approve, contingent on receiving the information requested prior to Council, do you want to say the motion that way?
- Sure. So moved.
- Yeah, I'll make the motion.
- Okay, well-
- I'll second it.
- Okay, well, all right, Alder Corpus-Dax moved and Alder Galvin seconded it, further discussion? All those in favor, say "aye."
- Aye.
- Aye, opposed nay, the motion carries. Okay, the next item is the rainwater barrels, number four, for consideration with possible action the approval of an American Rescue Plan Act allocation within the Stormwater, Green Infrastructure, and Resiliency category for Rain Barrel Rain Garden Green Infrastructure for \$60,000, let's talk about that.
- All right, so this program is a concept that we don't have a, here is the details, here's your program that we're gonna follow. This is something that we are developing, however, we do have models that we are going to work from, where cities and municipalities have already implemented. Basically, rain barrels, if we purchase them, this is what, it's a free rain barrel that will help with the stormwater, and if you purchase, then we would look at reimbursing, and the reason why we'd let you purchase is because our blue barrel might not match your landscape rate. We want to make sure that we are implementing the program. We don't want to make sure that, we want to make sure that people actually implement this. Shade tree and the bushes, that is another type of program that we, other municipalities, and it is just to get the more of the trees... my internet is unstable. But is to make sure that we do keep this tree city and we do help with the shade and the environment by having the trees that will help soak up the water, et cetera.
- Okay, so this is kind of a program that throughout the city or only in a certain area of the city? Does it, again, have to be in that census tract?
- So it would be available for all residents.

- Okay, and is it a grant program where they have to fill something out to request it, or prove that they're really doing a project, not just reselling the rain barrel, or what?

- I would have to collect information that does get submitted to the treasury, so there is a little bit of trust there that I'm collecting your information and submitting it to the Treasury, so you probably don't want to sell this. But we would also notify everybody that this is what is happening, I'm collecting your information, I'm not selling your information. It is going into a database that the Treasury has, there is no tax to it. It is ARPA funds related, is federal dollars. We would have all of that as a part of the brochure that the constituents would get.

- Well, I guess what I'm, and maybe I didn't understand Alder Dorff. If we're getting a maximum of up to \$5,000, so say I put in a garden and I got some trees and I got barrels and I got a max of \$5,000 I'm getting in ARPA money, is anybody checking to make sure I'm doing that, or am I just filling out some forms and it gets rubber stamped at City Hall and go forth and have fun?

- It would be auditing.

- Okay, that's all I want to know. Thank you.

- And Alder Steuer?

- Thank you, Chair, some very interesting discussions, and I will tell you that I went to my first Sustainability Commission meeting the other day. And I know it's been around for a while, but I learned a lot, and I think we have a number of standing committees, of course, and that the city that report out at Council, but for example, I'm on the Landmarks Commission and we had an hour and 15-minute discussion about a deck on a historic house, okay? I mean, it seems kind of frivolous, but you know what? If we let a crack open and decide to go against that, that could cause problems down the road. So I don't know, maybe I should put in a communication, but I think it would be good to have reports of sustainability, landmarks, other committees that aren't normally a city council. I don't know, what are your thoughts? Because lately there's been a number of issues that have been brought up by these committees that we're not fully up on unless we go to the meeting or study it ourselves, so that's just my... what's that?

- And so for, well, sustainability has been on the agenda, and at Landmarks, that one is so interesting because wasn't it in front of an RDA, no, Board of Appeals, something. There's a reason that I went to that, but I wasn't at Landmarks Commission, I don't think-

- No, we had, it was Landmarks.

- I was there, it was really interesting about that porch. That was really interesting.

- Right, but I'm just saying-

- We did talk about it, so you're saying maybe standing committees, so that those committees will hear?

- We listen to all the standing committees in all the different things, but these other committees that aren't always there, even Transit, a lot of times we don't always have information out there. Maybe it's because partly they don't have anything to report out on that particular day, but just listening to the conversation tonight with this green infrastructure, I'm just saying if we were more up on these other committees and all the things they're talking, I think we'd have less questions and we'd have shorter committee meetings on some of this stuff. So that's just my point, and I don't know, I just think it would be helpful for the city if we could look at that, and I don't know what I have to do to do that, but I'll pursue that if need be. Okay, that's all, that's all.

- Okay. Alder Corpus-Dax.

- I just had a question regarding the \$5,000 reimbursement. So I know I've seen on whatever social media, some of these arbors or gardeners have really big rain barrels, so that would qualify up to \$5,000 reimbursement? 'Cause I know some of these people who are heavy into gardening do have quite the system, rain barrel system set up so that they can water their own gardens, or what have you without having to spend the money.

- Currently, the rain barrels, what the sustainability coordinator is suggesting is up to \$70 per rain barrel, and you would get one rain barrel.

- Okay, so it would be-

- And then the whole concept of the green infrastructure would be the max, the 5,000.

- Okay, so it would be specifically this type of rain barrel, 70 gallon rain barrel, it wouldn't be... I don't know, I don't even know how big these rain barrels get, but it wouldn't be just one of these giant, 100 gallon rain barrels?

- Yeah, so if you bought-

- Rain barrel.

- If you bought a \$150 rain barrel from wherever, we would reimburse you up to \$70.

- Is that it?

- Yeah, I'm wondering if we would want to look into potentially accepting other ideas when it comes to, or other sizes when it comes to those rain barrels. I might not want, I don't even know, again, I don't know what sizes, so I might want a 300 gallon rain barrel, versus five rain barrels. Type situation, but okay, that was just a thought.

- Okay. Any other discussion about the rain barrel, rain garden green infrastructure, a project intended for residential properties and nonprofits? No more, seeing no discussion, is there a motion?

- I would make a motion to approve this.

- Second.

- Okay, motion made by Alder Corpus-Dax, seconded by Alder Galvin, any more discussion? Seeing none, all those in favor, say "aye."

- Aye.

- Aye.

- Opposed, and aye, opposed nay? And the motion carries. The agenda. Oh, yeah, this'll be the short item for discussion, we saved the best to last here, guys, discussion, the 2022 draft bonding request, which we will let staff discuss.

- So thank you, I will get started. I'm not exactly sure how we want to take this down the path. But every year we try to move this up a little closer to budget time, for many reasons, it just didn't happen again this year. And so it's full Capital Improvement Plan together, which we were getting very close to it, and we know we have pending, fun other pending funding sources potentially coming down the work line, and we're looking at this ad hoc Facilities Committee. We decided we can't stop the 2022 projects that need to get done in 2022

while we're waiting for all these other things to kind of get streamlined. So there was, at the last Finance Committee meeting, we decided that maybe we would go back to all of our department heads and say, "What are your priorities?" And when was defined the priorities as what needs to be done, in your opinion needs to be done in 2022, which means you would need funding in 2022, and you have no other funding sources for it. So that is when... the list that really has been put in front of you are things that are projects that meet or on the plan that have to get done in 2022 that we'll need the funding for, again, construction projects, park projects, and then in some cases, in other cases, it's also equipment that they need to get ordered this year, and in some cases, we have 12, 15, 16 month lead times on these items. So again, the request was priorities only, things that had to get done this year based on the department heads' opinion, and that is what's been put in front of you.

- Can I ask a question, just off the top? 'Cause I read through it all, I looked at all the numbers. Isn't this an incredibly much larger request than we had-

- Yep, it is larger than the last, it's larger than last year. Last year we worked very hard to find every possible other funding source and looked at every fund balance and every unused bonding to try to get that list down, and so not all that-

- It was down to about a million something, was that it?

- Correct, but that was a year there just wasn't as many big purchases fund balance is correct. So it was a dollar request, yes. So this one has jumped up pretty dramatic, and as you can see on the bottom of the list, on that third page of the spreadsheet, it kind of shows you, yes, total request right now is at 31 million dollars, 19.5 million would be general fund borrowing requests, and then the remaining would be for your sanitary, storm, and parking. So yes, this would be a high request compared to previous years, so that is why I just really brought it up for, this is for discussion for us to... again, I'm not sure how you want to go through and handle this. Do you want to kind of talk about the financing on the end? I worked with our alders, our financial advisors, and kind of see, well, what if we would move forward with a 19 million dollar borrowing for the levy, how that would affect, or next five years worth of debt service on the general fund for next year's five years of budgeting, or do you want to go through and look at all the items by the departments, get a better understanding of what's out there? It's really gonna-

- Let me ask a big picture question first, which is, we're comparing what we did last year, which was around 11 million to 19 million. Those are the two numbers we're kind of comparing, or are we doing 11 million to 31 million?

- I'm gonna-

- Which is the right comparison here? Was it the general fund, or, oh, no, it was only eight, eight million. It was 8,874,000 last year, and now we're asking for 19. Okay, so 11 million more.

- Nope, I'm gonna correct you. That eight million 474 is what is being paid off. So there was a goal of one point where we were trying to not bond more than what were being paid off. So that is what this, I apologize, I don't have a header on that one, but it does say 2022 debt outstanding payoffs. So in a normal course of 2022, we will pay up 8.474 of general fund outstanding debt. That's principal only, not in interest, and then between sanitary, storm, and parking and kids, we will pay off an additional six, seven million dollars. In total, we will pay off 15.052 in debt in principal in 2022.

- So we're proposing back, right? I mean, the bottom line of the request is 31 million and we're paying off 15 million. We're not holding it flat, as we've tried to do in the years before. So my first question is why, why, ARPA to cover some of this, or why would we be doubling? That just seems so huge to me, it surprised me.

- It is just being presented in front of you. This is based on what the department heads have requested. ARPA funds, there are a few ARPA dollars available to you to be used potentially for some of these items. We've already actually used 655,000 really in our 2021, 2022 budget to cover some equipment that did not come to our bonding request, and then there are a few items on here that have already been approved at the last council meeting, some equipment. But back to your ARPA question, yes, there is a potential that there are, you could use, there's minimal ARPA dollars available for this. We would have to use our lost revenue calculation. We also know there is an infrastructure bill that could possibly cover something on this list, and again, these are items that, at this point, the more, we are just learning more and more how this infrastructure bill would work, and it appears that we have to apply for, every time there is a pool of money that's being passed onto us, you have to apply, and you won't know until months later whether or not you're gonna have that money. So has said they need or want to work on this year, so then in the CIP, this is part of their plan, and they don't have another funding source. I can't explain to you exactly why this list is much bigger than it has been in front of you before. I'm actually... Director Grenier could probably talk to you a little bit on the payment side about I think doing a few more roads than in previous years, but that could be part of what's drawing part of the request up.

- I think, here's a further question. We always had kind of a guideline. There was always a number where we're aiming for in the past, which was far more than what we had paid off, and now that's kind of out the window. Is there sort of a guideline, were you just about to explain when you talked to Ehler's how much can we afford to borrow, or how much it raises the levy? Help me with that, 'cause I think we need some of these big picture things answered first, rather than step, each tiny little item. Where do we get the money, where do you get the money from?

- Picture again is, the goal would be to not borrow more than what you're paying off. But at this point, this is a list that was brought to me, all it's been is summarized together, and this is how, what has been brought to you at this point. Again, it would really be the directive of the finance or council to decide if there are projects on there that they feel that need some, through discussions that really can or should wait. Your next question, kind of pertaining to the big picture, each slide that was sent to me by alders after using, getting this information, we pulled it together. I would like to share one screen with you. In a moment.

- Just an aside, a point of order. Could we get this copy sent to us? I was trying to save this as a document.

- Which copy?

- This whole nine page document. I'd like to have it so I could print it up myself.

- Yeah, you would just like it sent to you as a PDF?

- Yes.

- [Barbara] Like an email or something?

- Yeah, that would be good. I mean, if I could, I was trying to do it here, but it wasn't working for me.

- So I just want to verify that you need it sent to you again just to reprint? 'Cause you should be able to print right from CivicClerk, or did you want a hard copy mailed to you?

- No, my printer is down right now, but I just needed to be able to open up the document and get it printed, hard copy, I'd like a hard copy myself.

- Okay, I can resend you the PDF. It's the identical one that's in the CivicClerk-

- Okay, that'd be fine. Thanks, I appreciate that.

- So this is a document that was pulled together by our financial advisor at Ehler's, and I know it's a busy, busy chart. Are you all able to see the chart?

- [Barbara] Yes.

- Okay, so what it does is our advisor into consideration, right, you'll see in the first column "Levy for Debt." He's got, basically he threw three scenarios out there. We didn't even go back to the 8.5 million. When we already have a request of 19 million, I'm not sure how we would get back down to eight and a half if that's, we're trying to get that flat. So I asked him for scenarios, what if we get down to 12 million, what if we get down to 15, or what if we keep it at 19.5? We decided that this is, one year we are going to get all these priorities that the department heads say they need and we're gonna, just we're gonna bite the bullet. They're all projects that have to get done, and how will it affect your tax rate, how will it affect our debt service going forward? So there are some scenarios here. What it does is, so it's looking at 2022 at a 19.5 million dollar borrowing for levy, and then that is to go us back to, for the next following four years, then back to eight million, hoping that at that point, back to don't borrow more than what you have, there are some other funding sources, whether we can use ARPA money, or we can use any infrastructure money, or there are other funding sources. So what this is saying, the third column, you're seeing the 19.5 million. So in 2022, we're sitting at about 10.7 million dollars of levy for debt. On our budget book, you're gonna see something less than that because that is how much is owed for principal. However, we have some miscellaneous revenues that bring that number back down. But what it's showing is if we do take 19.5 million dollars out this year and not eight, it will basically increase my levy \$200,000 every year. So in 2023, it'll go up about to 10.9. The following year, it will go up over 11 million, the following year, about 11.2, 11.4, 11.6. So to borrow 19.5 this year, every year for the next five years, my levy that we need for debt service alone will go up about \$200,000-

- Which means 1.43, I mean, the tax rate, I mean, if they were saying how much will work, but what does that mean as far as how much more taxes people pay?

- That is where, yes, you keep going to the third group, annual cost on \$150,000 home. It's gonna go up starting at 208, and this year it'll go up to, basically it'll go up \$6.00 and some cents on an average home over the next five years. But, again, remember, that is only the impact of one year more borrowing than what we're paying off, and this is only on the debt. So if and when your general levy expenses go up and other tax interests or exclusions go up, those are all gonna go up also. This is just the impact. So this is showing you, yes, with the 19.5. If we decided to move forward with the 19.5, the Council will have to understand that our levy will go up over the next five years because we decided to borrow 19.5. It's not as dramatic, if we do 15 million, there's not as dramatic as if we do 12. So this chart is, again, it's kind of a busy chart, but it really shows you the impact of this borrowing, and I really am just trying to show the big picture. Again, at this point, this is what the department heads said were priorities this year. Nothing really has been cut, removed from this request. This is as being presented. So, again, I also want this to be a discussion tonight of, again, do you want to look at the big picture and say, okay, we're only gonna do 12 million, we're only gonna do 8.5, and then try to figure out how to cut it down, or are you willing to say these are, my note that these are all necessary, and for one year, do you decide to take a little more, over more, borrow more than what you are paying off?

- So I know Director Grenier's been wanting to talk. So Director Grenier, do you have something to add to that?

- Well, when you take a look at what Director Ellenbecker has provided you, of the levy supported borrowing, okay, we're talking about a 19 and a half million dollars worth of levy supported borrowing. DPW represents approximately 14 million of that, total. Of that 14 million, about 1.3 million dollars is our equipment, which was committed to back in December. About 1.3 million dollars is repairs at our garages, which are necessary. And then we've got about 11 million dollars which is part of our Capital Improvement Program, our annual. In the packet beyond the three page summary sheet that Director Ellenbecker has provided you, she has also provided an eight page document, which is a draft of our 2022 Capital Improvement Program, which identifies

all of the projects that we're proposing for this year. And again, the lion's share of this borrowing is related to the DPW CIP, and that reflects the directive that we'd been given by the Common Council to do more roads.

- True that, we sure have directed you to do that.

- Okay, and we've got new programs that we've installed, which, including our sidewalk program went from \$150,000 a year to over \$450,000 a year, by doing the systematic replacement. One of the things that came through Improvement Service Committee last year was this here on road sidewalk, which is almost a quarter of a million dollars, okay? There's some big ticket items and pavement is not getting any cheaper. We're seeing almost a 30% increase in pavement costs over last year. Part of that is due to the same supply chain and workforce issues that everybody in the world is dealing with. If you can't get people to work and you have to pay them more and you can't get equipment or materials up here, the materials cost more, we're seeing that, as well, okay? So last year we had some really good pricing. This year we're not anticipating that to happen. Again, a function of, we're being directed, "do more work." If the work we're doing is more than we've done and the cost per unit of work is more, you wind up with 11.4 million dollar bond.

- And so I also noticed there's a million dollars for the bridge repair. Was there another fund that we were looking at, though, for that bridge, wasn't that in there? I thought I saw a million for the Main Street Bridge, okay. Were we gonna get that somewhere else? I thought there was rumors of that.

- From the state.

- There are all kinds of rumors out there, providing to this date, I have not seen a single publication from any reputable source, reputable source being the Wisconsin League of Municipalities, the American Public Works Association, anybody that specifically takes the infrastructure bill, the bipartisan infrastructure legislation and breaks it down and tells us how much money is gonna be available for various things, they're not even breaking it down to what money's going to the state, versus what money's going .

- Okay, so we don't, we can't , and we really probably have to do something about that bridge, right? Well, again, we keep putting it off. Alder, did you have a chance, alders, to look at each of the individual items? Do you want to go over that?

- I've got a couple of questions.

- Okay, Alder Galvin, go.

- At school, right up to the top, Police Department, the armored vehicle SWAT BearCat. I thought, at least it used to be that the BearCat was a jointly owned vehicle between Brown County Sheriff and our department. Is that changing, or was I under the wrong assumption this whole time?

- Well, we have one vehicle that was purchased with state funds from the Alert Program that is shared with Brown County's Sheriff's Office and it is housed at Brown County's Sheriff's Office, and then this is to replace our own piece of armor that is used often on really short notice by patrol for incidents involving firearms. It can also be used by the SWAT team. The issue with just relying on this shared equipment with Brown County is that would require someone to go out to the Brown County Sheriff's Office in Bellevue, pick up that piece of equipment and come get it and bring it to wherever it's needed, which is not practical for emergency-

- And I get that. So we currently do not have a BearCat, or we do, and we're replacing?

- We have one currently that needs to be replaced. It is nearing end of life. We have had one, and I believe maybe even two issues with it now where it's a cost in excess of \$15,000 to repair it, so we've reached that point in that vehicle's life where it's costing us more than it's worth to keep it and it's time to consider a new one.

- All right, thank you, Chief. That's all the questions I had on the Police Department. I know that we put off, I think we know we put off replacing the roof bladder or whatever that thing's called to keep it from leaking. I'm kind of surprised the Fire Department has got almost two and three quarter of a million dollars in requests, and, I mean, engines and rescue squads are not cheap, but, I mean, it just seems like they got an awful lot going down, off of-

- I know they postponed, but Alder Steuer, or, wait, Chief Moore, Alder Galvin?

- It's just that, this is for Director Grenier. This money for the bridge, is that the Nitschke Bridge? Is that that one part that there's supposed to be two things, two parts in there, one's definitely broken, one we're crossing our fingers doesn't break. We're finally gonna get that second one up to speed.

- Yes, what we've done is we've, the two million dollar estimate that we had asked for in previous years was based off of a bid for replacement that we had done a couple of years ago. So what we've done is we've brought a consultant in and asked the consultant, can you re-look at how we're looking at this project and reuse as much of the existing stuff that's in that bridge as possible? And we're also looking at approaching the replacement, so we're only gonna do one side, then the other side in a subsequent year, rather than doing both sides at once. So we've reduced our ask from two million to one million to reflect that change in approach.

- Okay, and just a quick question. How old, do you know offhand, is the Tilleman Bridge?

- Tilleman Bridge went into service in 1972. So it was constructed between 1970 and 1972.

- Okay, and the Nitschke Bridge?

- Nitschke Bridge opened October 2nd of 1998.

- Okay, yes, Bart Starr Bridge?

- Bart Starr Bridge I don't know. That's one of the bridges I don't have a full history on.

- Okay, if we were to ever do it again, would you go with the same design plan Nitschke Bridge, because between the three bridges, I don't know, maybe it's just, it was bad luck or what, but that thing seems to be breaking down way more often than the other two put together.

- We were not involved in selection of the design for that bridge. Because it resides on a connecting highway, that's also business 141, it's alternate I-43. So because it resides on a connecting highway and we applied for state funding for that bridge, when we enter into the agreement with Wisconsin Department of Transportation, they actually select the consultant. We turn everything over to the DOT. So that was not a... it's a city bridge because it resides on a city street, not on a state trunk highway. But we weren't necessarily involved in the design process for that level.

- Okay, thank you. And I guess just comments on this proposal here. I thought we were doing pretty good the last two years, trying to hold down our bonding versus our payoff. This is a real kick in the keister. It's a lot of money, I mean, but if your roof's leaking, how long and how many buckets can you keep putting down underneath the leaking roof, maybe four? You hurt yourself even more by not doing the necessary work that needs to be done, so. I imagine we'll be looking at this a lot harder at Council, but I have a hard time nitpicking any of these requests and saying let's put it off for another year. You put it off for so long, and you're gonna hurt, you're gonna do more harm than you do good by putting it off, so. I'll wait to see what happens at Council and what other questions and information is garnered at that time, thank you.

- So I just want to ask Director Ellenbecker. Are we gonna take pieces of this at each meeting, or are we gonna try to bring this... when do you want. We get a more detailed document than this, don't we, usually, for bonding?

- I can bring you more information. This was, again, I actually put it on the agenda, it was only for discussion purposes because-

- For discussion, got it, okay.

- It was such a large document, a large request that I wanted to get some more direction. Are you okay with us trying to give you more information on all these items, do you want more research or more information from certain department heads on certain projects? Do you want to see the financial impact on this big of a dollar amount? Do we want to set a goal and say we're only gonna do 12 million, and somehow between all the department heads, we have to over, like general levy, do we have to figure out how to get six, seven million out of here? I was looking for some direction 'cause I didn't-

- I think I see, yeah, and I was, too. When I looked at this, I'm like, whoa, this is so big, we have to decide, are we gonna ask the department heads to justify everything here, or are we, and are we gonna set a target? I don't think it's realistic to set the target at eight million, there's just no way. But even if we set it at 15 million, then Director Grenier's doing exactly what we asked Director Grenier to do, so, and it's not fair that it all comes out from the other departments. Wow, I guess isn't not used to having such a wide range from what's been asked for to what we can do, probably because behind the scenes in the past, I think the departments had to have, narrowed it down more, isn't that accurate, department heads? Just nod if that's accurate. You've narrowed it down more so that what we get is closer to the goal, or have we always seen everything you've asked for? Yeah. You have, we have seen? David, did you see, yeah, go ahead.

- Alder Dorff, I think that the problem has been is that we've all been deferring the things over the last five years, that we've always chipped away at things because we were trying to get to the number, eight and a half million, or whatever the number happened to be. And so now it's just kind of all coming to a head and when you look at the Fire Department requests, and Alder Galvin pointed it out, we've got a lot of equipment throughout the city that's end of life and breaking down, and so we have to replace it. The thing is, when we replace ambulances, for instance, we've got six that are frontline and we've got three more that are in reserve because those three reserves go into action every game day, every marathon, every special event, those things are getting used. So it's not like we have just six ambulances, we actually have nine, and so the three that are eight, nine, 10, 11 years old are really, really, really in bad shape and you wouldn't want to put your dog in the back of them, basically, and so we've gotta replace them, that's just the nature of the beast. And it's kind of the same thing when you look at fire engines. We already approved the one forward and we've already done that one, but if you look down at the bottom of the spreadsheet there, the remount of engine, fire engine seven, we're actually trying to save the city money there. We're talking about taking existing fire engines that have stainless steel bodies and just having a new chassis put on them, which ultimately saves almost 700,000 for a brand new one, versus 460 for a remount, and we can do that with these two particular ones because they have stainless bodies. Unfortunately, all the other rigs in the city did not have the stainless bodies, and so they are all rusting out and becoming almost impossible to keep on the road. So where we can, we're trying to do what we can to lower the impact, but it is coming home, and I'll just tell you that we've got two ladder trucks coming up that are gonna have to come up in the next two years after this, and we're talking 1.2 to 1.3 million on each one of those. That's just, it's coming up, so.

- And even with the police squad cars, I thought we were trying to move that over into out of bonding, weren't we? Weren't we trying to move those cars-

- Yeah, yeah.

- Out of bonding, and they're all in here again, and do we move any of them?

- These are squad cars. We have started to move some support vehicles out of the bonding, and as you see, there is no, they originally requested six I think support vehicles. They have been moved off this list over to the leasing program, which is going to be paid through the operating budget. So we're trying to get the, at least the support vehicles back into the operating budget's release program. They have just jumped on board with the lease program. So the squad vehicles, the squads, for many, many years, we've deferred the number of squads. So they are still trying to get back into the rotation of I think three to four, or around four years, three to four years of rotation so that they've been asking for and it's been in our CIP for 15 vehicles per year to get them back to-

- Okay, so pause. Isn't the life of the loan longer than the life of each vehicle? I mean, how long do these squad cars last?

- I think I can talk, in the past, it's been historically three to four years. I think some of these now we are maybe working on some SUVs, which I think had more of a useful life of four to five years. You are correct, that is, we borrow 10 years for on the, on all for the purpose of the exempt borrowing, as long as the average life of, really, you're seeing, the first couple years when you pay off principal, you potentially are maybe paying off the squads first, so you are at least paying for them by the time they need to be replaced. Yes, so our annual, these are operating items, but at 315 vehicles, there's a request for over half a million dollars for squads on an annual basis. Until we can get that money, enough money to put that back in the operating budget, it is still in our annual bonding request.

- So is ARPA helping us at all with anything from here? These are the necessary things we have to have. Can we use any of the ARPA funding for it, or are we doing that for other necessary things we have to have?

- I can tell you, at this point, we have used \$655,000 worth of ARPA dollars of items that were put in our 2022 bonding, which was a one-time equipment that we have already now used \$655,000 of ARPA. Could other ARPA dollars be used toward this? Yes, but part of it is that request then would have to come through to the committee, just like the request came through just before, and we would have to get approvals. It could be, they could be re-diverted and say use ARPA money for these items. We want you to go ahead and move forward with them, but we don't want you to bond for them, you could use ARPA funds for them-

- And I'm not suggesting we ever do what we did in the past where we take funds and... I would only suggest it be one time use things, for example, a million dollar bridge, fixing that. That you don't have to fix every year. You have to buy a car every year but you don't have to fix the bridge every year. Is that any, is there any potential to divert some of the 25 million to a one-time item like that, or isn't that even allowed under ARPA?

- It is going to be allowed. Again, the 23 million that we have was already allocated to the categories as laid out in that resolution that you saw in the previous item, and there's about that 10 million dollar bucket of lost revenue that can be used for these type of items. Otherwise, none of these other items would qualify, so any kind of equipment and street construction, none of this would qualify for ARPA unless you're losing your lost revenue. Again, that's a 10 million dollar bucket that so far has not necessarily been allocated, other than I think to date we've spent the 655,000 out of that lost revenue bucket. So there are some dollars that could be used for these, that is a much wider scope of what it can be used for. It's not replacing a long-term operating item. As long as you can prove it's a one-time item and it cannot replace an operating item, on a budgeted operating item.

- So we could replace... I'm just trying to get creative here 'cause I don't know that we can do the whole 19 million, but is there another way we can fund some of that 19 million? So yeah, Alder Galvin.

- Director Ellenbecker, if I remember correctly, the PD has been short 10 to 11 officers for an entire year? I'm thinking in wages and benefits, we're looking at a million dollars, a little over a million dollars. Where is that money?

- That is operating dollars that they are favorable on the operating side, offset by over time, that if and when there is favorability in their budget, that would fall to the bottom line in the general fund.

- We would budget for overtime, and I understand if they're short officers, they could be, I mean, obviously they may go over that budget, but my understanding is, it's not officers that have been shorted, it's officers such as community police officers that have been depleted, some other detectives, there were four of those that they're short. So we're not looking at overtime on the road, per se, because you don't have to have X amount of community police officers, you don't have to have X amount of detectives on. My understanding is if you have cases like 80 shootings, you probably need detectives out quite a bit, and that could be costing you, too. But everything I've understood in the past is that even with overtime because you're short-staffed, it certainly doesn't surpass the one million dollars or so in wages and benefits that aren't being used because we don't have the officers to fill those positions. So could that money be used to offset bonding for some of the squad cars or some of the other equipment?

- So for 2021, year end, it appears that the Police Department is going to be running favorable to operating budget. While that is correct, we have to make sure the whole by function comes in favorable, so police and fire have to offset each other. Unfortunately, fire has gone way over in overtime, so the two of them are almost going to wash, and then in total, you have to try to come in favorable for the whole general fund. If and when there is still favorable dollars, then those dollars would roll to the bottom line into the general fund, or those dollars could be allocated into a carryover resolution, and you could say yes, take the couple hundred thousand dollars or move, whatever is something favorable, yes. It could be used for some of these items and not bond for it, so yes, again, to kind of to Alder Galvin's point, if there is favorability, some carryover, which we'll know in about two months as we work through our audit, that could be used to offset something here. We also could use ARPA dollars. Again, those are potential funding sources, but these are items that, again, until we saw what the total list is, knowing what the requests are, we did not apply any of these additional funding sources at this time for these requests.

- Is it possible to put together a... I mean, and the Fire Department is, it went way over on overtime, and because of that, we've added more budget money to try and cover that in 2022. COVID has devastated them so badly, or is that because they're short firemen, like the Police Department is?

- Galvin, that was a combination of a lot of different factors, family medical leave, a younger department, individuals having families, babies and so forth, 12 weeks of family medical leave. We had two people on all year disability. We had two people deployed in the military all year, so that's 40, between those four people, there's 40 shifts right there. So we had, I went through this earlier this year-

- You did, yeah.

- We were somewhere around 31 or 32,000 hours of overtime. I broke it down by category. I subjected it to the provisions in the Labor Agreement, the cost of money, and so when you only have minimum manning and you have those requirements, that's where we ended up. It's not that we were spending money on training or anything else, that was all dictated and mandated by vacancies and contract.

- Sure, I'm not arguing that at all. I was just wondering if there was... and I couldn't remember. I remember you gave us a pretty lengthy explanation last year about that, but I was just wondering if there was some other savings somewhere within the budget, 'cause we have to find it. At the same time, I also agree, we can't keep putting these things off. You need cars, squad cars that can get to the call, same thing with ambulances, rescue squads, you need good roads to drive on, and I know we've been kicking the can quite a bit, and it looks like, once again, we're painted into a corner where we're gonna have some very hard decisions to make.

- Alders, what are your wishes at this time? Oh, sorry, Alder, go ahead.

- Thank you, Chair. I guess the question I had is that we spent a long time trying to figure out, let's get the Capital Improvement Program going, the five year program, which I'm very happy about. At first blush, looking at this request for bonding, it seems quite high, but I do understand where Police and Fire are coming from. They've explained it to us, but I'm just wondering, do we, as a council, maybe have to look at this Capital Improvement Program over a five year period and look at how this particular request falls into those five years? I know that we've seen a couple of departments that have put off things for two years in the Capital Improvement Program and then they ask for more in the third year, fourth or fifth year. Is there something that we can do to look at that overall Capital Improvement Program and see how we might be able to split some of this, stretch it out, whatever you want to call. But I think at first blush, this seems very high. That's just a question. And also, another question, I know Enterprise, we had the car situation. I know that those are mostly staff vehicles. I suppose none of that could be used for Police or Fire, but that was something that seemed to be a real good move on the city's part, too. So I'll just throw that out for general discussion, just a comment that I wanted to make.

- Thank you, Alder Steuer. Diana?

- Yep, I would like to respond to those two questions or comments that Alder Steuer made. Yes, the Capital Improvement Plan book, if you guys remember, you guys pages that we pulled together last year, it was a five year plan. We have not, all of our department heads have and their teams have already updated it again. We just did not pull the whole funding source together part of that book yet because, again, there's so many unknowns, and before that was going to happen, it was gonna slow down our process. So I will tell you that almost 99% of the information that's on the request that's in front of you was in the department, was in the last year's CIP, with the exception of Director Grenier. He has increased his role, so it's been voted on in the last year, approved in the last year. Otherwise, everything that you're seeing in front of you on this request was in the CIP last year in the 2022 column. We haven't added, haven't really tweaked things, changed things, other than some additions from the Department of Public Works with more roads. So it was in this 2022 CIP. We continue to pull the full CIP together. Again, there's too many questionable funding sources and why we just didn't have time to pull that whole book together. So that really was there, and again, as we move forward and you can give me more direction on how much more additional information you want, we can bring you more information. And then your second point on the leasing, we have looked at the leasing for squad cars, and the vendor that releasing, very few municipalities do any kind of leasing on squad cars. At this point, that vendor didn't strongly recommend doing squad cars in their lease program. Again, we can certainly explore if there's another vendor out there, but because of the short live, high miles, the number of hours used in a vehicle I think in three to four years, that was not recommended to be a lease vehicle. We also, on the Fire side, we also went and did the... our current vendor for leasing doesn't really entertain the fire large piece of equipment, and then we did reach out and work with a, and got a quote from a vendor for the fire equipment leasing, and that seemed very expensive. We at that point, after some analysis, we did not even bring that to Finance Committee because at the time it didn't seem like it was gonna pan out for our needs. The dollar amounts in those first couple of years for leasing was so incredibly expensive, that program we didn't bring to you. So we have evaluated both the squad and some fire equipment in leasing program. At this point, we didn't think it was worth, we didn't bring it to you yet because we didn't think it was a good spend of money and time and effort at that point. So I just wanted to kind of tackle those two items Alder Steuer had asked about.

- Well, that helps answer it for me, so and I think Director Grenier might want to chime in on that, too.

- I meant to call on him, Director Grenier?

- I'm good.

- Thanks, I just wanted to on with something that Director Ellenbecker made a comment on. The projects you see in our 2022 Capital Improvement Program are in last year's CIP. We may have updated costs, so there may be some increase in cost because we've updated our costs based on recent construction costs. The other thing that we're seeing, Director Ellenbecker made a comment about this earlier and I don't think it really

registered, when we went into the 2021 borrowing, we scrubbed every construction account that was there. If there was a purchase order that the contract was done and we were still holding \$3,000 in reserve against that purchase order, we closed the purchase order and put that money back in the fund and made it available, okay? We did all of that scrubbing last year and we were able to find some money last year. So the increase in program size, we didn't feel the impact of it last year. But on 14 million dollars worth of pavement work, I'm only carrying in forward 1.5 million dollars from last year, okay? We've had more carryover or a lesser net cost in the past because as we started closing these projects, okay, that's money that had been set aside. That project came in under what we had set aside. We can reuse that money somewhere else. Much like using one-time money, those days are gone. So that, all of you are seeing that dollar impact from us. Now, talking about looking at the five year plan going forward, okay, I can appreciate where Alder Steuer's coming from. But speaking from the department who represents 14 out of the 19 million dollars, unless the Common Council... I would love to get that 1.3 or 2.3 or whatever it is, I believe my equipment budget's right in the 1.3. That used to be part of the budget. I would love to have it back in the budget. I don't think that's reasonable at this time, give or take 30 cents on the levy to put that back in. I don't think anyone's got the... and that's just for me, okay, that's just my equipment. I don't think the Council's got the appetite for that. For the foreseeable future, I see I'm gonna have a 1.3 million dollar every year appetite for equipment replacement. The 1.3 in garage repairs, eh, maybe not. My buildings are pretty darn old, but we'll see what the ad hoc task force on buildings comes up with. But that pavement number, that 11.4, unless the Common Council elects to go back to a lesser amount of pavement, we're looking at that dollar value or more every year going forward. I tried to be... It sounded a little doom and gloom in the past when I said it, and it's gonna sound really doom and gloom now. Giving me a-

- Director Grenier, I'm sorry, but just, have you brought this to Improvement and Services? Do Alder Brunette, Alder Wery, do they know about this, 'cause they are the ones making the requests mostly to increase the number of roads, and they're not here. I see luckily Alder Gerlach is here, but do they know what this request is going to do to the budget and the levy?

- We used to bring this through INS when the Finance Committee didn't approve the Capital Improvement Program. When Finance Committee assumed the role of approving the CIP prior to the bond request, that now comes here, so no, we haven't-

- I think it, yes, I think it has to go to that committee, that those alders have to at least see what their committee's asking for. I mean, not that they're gonna approve, but just for discussion, like we're doing, Alder Steuer.

- Well, there will be an INS meeting tomorrow and I know two of the agenda items are talking about roads and improvement and things like that, and Director Grenier can talk a little bit about that. I think they might talk about some of that, and they're also looking at what's the tax, I can't think of it right now, the wheel tax, there you go, the wheel tax. So there's a few things that they'll be discussing tomorrow, and that may reflect a little bit toward all of this, but that's on the agenda for tomorrow.

- Yeah, and thank you, yes, and I looked at that, and I'm definitely gonna be there tomorrow, but I don't know that we talk about this if it's not posted, so-

- Yeah, okay, well.

- I don't know, I'm asking the question, are we? Director Ellenbecker?

- Sorry, I'm not answering that direct question, but-

- Okay, go ahead, okay.

- I certainly, like you said in the past, Parks Department, Parks still takes some of their projects and they kind of get direction on which parks should be made priority and which projects should be their priority, and INS kind of gives them some direction and they kind of work on what roads they have. But every one of those committees are gonna say, "Yes, we want that, we want that, we want that." But until they're all rolled together into one finance CIP, every one of those committees are gonna say, "Yep, that's what we want. We want more roads, we want more parks done, we want more, all these projects," until you see it all as one rolled up in the CIP. That's why I think at some point it got to the point where every department was doing their own thing, and that's why we wanted this consolidated CIP. Every department has really been putting their CIP, but all of them have been having some kind of CIP replacement schedules in all their departments, and finally in the last couple of years, we're trying to roll it up as one. So, again, that is certainly the council or committee direction, if they now want to have, continue to have departments or other committees approve the request-

- I'm not suggesting that, that's not what I'm suggesting. I'm suggesting knowledge, so maybe this whole discussion that we're having here tonight has to get repeated at Council next week, since it is on the agenda. Well, it's not in the action items, but maybe what we have to do is at Council, just talk about what we have learned because I just can see some of the same alders that want more streets also don't want to raise the levy. We have flat taxes, you can't have both. You just can't have both, so alders, Alder Corpus-Dax, Alder Galvin, should we be talking about some of this at Council?

- Yeah, I mean, the very people that Alder Wery at I think INS, he is trying to add three more streets to the budget. I'm not sure why because before the wheel tax, he did everything he could to stop streets from being improved, and now that the costs are being spread out, now he wants to have more on, and it doesn't make sense. And so the very people... we can make decisions here, but they're the ones requesting it, and-

- So even though this is discussion, is this item going to be on the agenda, on the Council agenda from Finance, so that I can call it and say, "We would like to have a brief review of what we discussed because it's important, going into your committees, that you know about it."

- The agenda anyway, isn't it?

- I don't know, is it gonna be-

- We talked about it today.

- But it's a discussion item. Your discussion items get put on the Council agenda.

- I guess I may defer to Assistant Attorney or Deputy Director... I'm sorry, to Joanne Bungert, sorry, wrong. But, I mean, I did expect that we would have some direction coming out of here, so I don't think it was gonna be place on file, I didn't think it was gonna be, committee approve the list. I was expecting that I would have either, go back to staff, either do some reductions, bring you more information. I was expecting that you would be giving me some direction, and then, again, if you want to send it out to all the committees, have them have a discussion in every committee, what does their requests, what financial impact it has, then we come back to Finance. I was expecting some direction, so then I would guess this item then would come on the report because there was some action item. There was no approval, but at this point, refer to staff, or some kind of expectation coming out of this meeting.

- So we could-

- I would second, yes, essentially what Director Ellenbecker said was true. Essentially, if the committee either refers to staff or it could be a combination action where it can be referred to staff for bringing forth additional information and to refer to specific committees for their further discussion and action, as long as there's some

sort of action being taken on the item, it will appear on the report for Council, and then obviously it has the ability to be pulled by any of the alders for further discussion on the Council floor.

- So if we had some kind of... okay. Alder Corpus-Dax, go ahead.

- So I guess I would make the recommendation that we refer to staff for further reductions where possible, but also have each department head take this to their committee and have that discussion with their committee about what are we looking at when it comes to the dollar amount. I definitely want this pulled, that was discuss this at council next week because I honestly don't like the amount. I mean, this is an incredible amount, but I think this is a good example of, this is what happens when you keep asking for more and you keep expecting, you keep having departments push off their projects.

- So as part of the motion, could we make part of the motion be that refer to staff to be prepared to explain some of this at Council, just like we're doing tonight, answer questions, can we ask staff? You guys will probably be there anyway, right, at the Council meeting, the director-

- No.

- And so, so that there'd be an expectation that this is going to be an item that is going to, there's going to be some time spent on this item at Council on the first.

- Bring your snacks.

- Yeah, absolutely, I mean, if we can get information on how long have you been, how long has this city been putting off the repairs to the Nitschke Bridge? And how long have we been putting off fire equipment or roof repairs, some of these building repairs, these structural things that need to be done? And even for parks, I mean, how long have they been waiting to put in that ball diamond, I mean-

- And if you want more roads, where are we gonna get the money to pay for more roads? How realistic is that, and is that something, if we can't see going up to 19 million, then maybe we have to reduce our expectations, because a lot of this other stuff has just been put off year to year to year, the new part is getting additional roads. So I think we just have to have that discussion. Yes, Alder Steuer?

- I'd say another point, Director Grenier brought it up, too, is that cost of materials going up year after year. It'd be nice to have some kind of indicator about that, as well, kind of tie that in so that it goes up every year, and a lot of times, we don't even fully consider that, but that is part of the equation. So it'd be nice to have that, as well. That's all, thank you.

- So how shall we make this motion, then? To kind of started a motion.

- So motion to refer to staff to look at possible reductions-

- And to present, and to be ready do discuss at Council?

- Be ready to discuss at Council.

- On February 1st.

- On February 1st, do we also want to look at, have the different electors bring these items to their other committees?

- So do we need to put communications in for that? I mean, or can we just say, "Directors, put this on your agendas"? Yeah, I know, I'm gonna get you, Alder Gerlach, but I need to have that question answered.

- Committees can refer additional communications to other committees for their review and input, so long as it's within the purview of the committee-

- Okay, so can we refer a discussion on the 2022 draft bonding request? That would be a separate motion-

- Right, correct, that would be appropriate, so the Parks Committee can be discussing expenses with respect to parks, however, they wouldn't be making any approvals of expenditures because that's completely within the purview of Finance. But they can discuss the projects themselves and how they're presented and the costs-

- I just think all the alders need to see the big picture, Alder Gerlach?

- I was just, I've listened to all of this. God, it's so depressing. I wondered if the word priority is maybe more helpful. I know when your firetrucks are rusting out, it's hard to say that's not a priority, but instead of just saying discussion or give us information, I wonder if it would be helpful to hope priorities, and so we could see if things have to be cut, we see the things that can't be cut, just a thought.

- But are we at that point already? I mean, that's a point that we're gonna get to, but are we first at the big point? Diana Ellenbecker, are we at that point already?

- Well, motion is for the staff to make possible reductions, I guess I'm still looking for direction. How, I mean, are you asking the finance director to make reductions, are you asking every one of the department heads to make ? I'm gonna be honest, I don't know if by next Tuesday or the following Tuesday, I'm gonna come with any reductions 'cause every department head is gonna say that there's nothing on their list that they're really looking to, they really need. And so when you say with possible reductions, unless we're saying designate other funding sources, saying you still need it, but maybe we don't do it this time, and maybe it is a prioritization or maybe it's the delay on an item, and then my question will also be, what other additional information are you looking for? Actually more paper information on paper for the next Council meeting, or do you just want more discussion from the department head?

- Alder Galvin, feel free to answer those questions.

- Well, the department heads could certainly take their list and, number one, what's the most important thing to them on that list, what's number two, what's number three, what's number four? It's all important, I get that. It's all important to them, and looking at a lot of this stuff, yeah, I get it. But if they have to prioritize, what is the most important, and then have a descending line of how that works. The other thing, didn't we get some kind of a program going which is supposed to help us with our finances to see programs and that kind of stuff, and are we working towards that? I can't remember the exact name of it. We just approved it a month ago or two-

- Yeah, in December, we approved a priority based budgeting, but we're in the very, very, very beginning stages of implementation, and what I believe, it's really meant for operational services and not for any kind of equipment or long-term infrastructure. I do believe it's really operational budget only.

- Okay, then the only thing I would ask is that the department heads, and, look, I know this all, all of this is based on what the council has been telling you and what you know you need to do your job. But 19 million dollars is a huge pill to swallow. But if we could prioritize that, maybe that'll help us make a decision. And obviously they're gonna have to argue or explain why each one of these things they feel has to be done this year. I mean, the Nitschke Bridge breaks, we're screwed. I mean, it's been a bitch for a month, but if the alders can put up with bitching from their constituents about roads being, the amount of roads being replaced, you can't have squad cars breaking down, you can't have rescue squads breaking down. I mean, so if they could help us out with these decisions that we have to make, I would really appreciate that.

- And then Chief Davis wants to speak.

- Yeah, to your point and the discussion about prioritization, I'll let the other directors speak for themselves, but we've done that already, and what you're seeing, at least in our requests, and again, I won't make assumptions about other departments, but I'll bet we're all in a similar boat, is only the tip of the iceberg. We've already gone through and identified all of our unfunded needs in the Police Department and it's about 3.4 million dollars worth. And so knowing and the direction that we got from the Finance Office to only pick the most important things, at least in our case, this represents the absolute most critical needs that we have, and by no means all of the unfunded needs we've identified.

- Thank you, that's good information. And with Director Grenier, we've forced him to put more in there, and the Council is forcing him to put... I guess that's the question I would have, Director Grenier, how much of that 14 million is because we're asking you for more roads? Maybe that, if you don't have it tonight, maybe that would be a good thing for us to understand, how much of that is from us asking you to do it.

- Most of it.

- Really, that needs to come out at Council then, definitely, and then Director Ditscheit?

- I'm taking a look at the information we provided you already, stuff that's in the packet, okay? Reconstruct streets, streets we're going to reconstruct, that's about 5.8 million dollars worth of the 11 point. Then we take a look just at the resurfacing program, pavement repairs, which represents concrete panels or asphalt patches are on the city where we just have to go out and do a patch, so the asphalt resurfacing program, the local resurfacing program, our pavement repair program, and the sidewalk replacement, and only the sidewalks that are city problems, so head ramps and tree impact sidewalks, okay? The work, the asphalt portion of the asphalt resurfacing program is another 2.1. Add another half a million dollars for curb and gutter repairs and things like that, we're at 3.1, another 400,000. So call it another 3.7 million dollars, on top of the... So we're at 3.7 million dollars just to do our annual resurfacing program and our pavement repairs, with another 5.8 on the streets that we're gonna reconstruct next year.

- Thank you.

- But all of those aren't extra. You were gonna do some of those, but some of it is because Council said, "We need you to do more streets," right?

- The program is the same size as it was last year.

- Okay.

- I didn't bump the program up from '21 to '22. When we bumped up from '19 to '20, that's the new normal. We're at about 31, 32,000 lineal feet of street, like we were last year, it's just the costs keep going up.

- And we bumped up to the 32,000 lineal feet, but that was because Council asked you to bump up to that? What did you do prior to that, how many feet?

- I'd have to go back and take a look at what the memo says. In '19, between 2010 and 2019, we ranged from a high of 20,922 to a low of 12,970, with an average of 16,960, so we're up quite a bit over that average.

- That's gonna be an important question to answer at Council on Tuesday, so we've asked you to go way up. Now the costs have gone way up. Now part of this is going to impact the levy and the other departments are giving us their priorities, their highest priorities already. So maybe that's a place that we can take things away from. I don't know, it's up to the whole Council. Director Ditscheit had his hand up before.

- Yes, I just want to reiterate what Chief Davis said when he spoke. On the Park end of things, if you compare our Capital Improvement Plan from last year to what our request is today, we've considerably cut it already. So we're asking for less than half what was shown in our plan last year for what we really need to do in the parks. So I think we can continue to prioritize what's left on our list, and then you can look at each department as a whole to determine how much you want to divvy up to each department, but we've already made some substantial cuts to this list, and I just wanted to reiterate that. From the Parks' perspective, we've already done that, and just, I want you to be aware of that.

- Thank you, I think that's important, Alder Corpus-Dax?

- Just to piggyback on that, so all these departments have already made their cuts. There already pushing off other items the next year to 2023, 2024. We're just gonna keep having the same issue.

- We are.

- Because we're gonna be asking them to cut more.

- Right.

- So I think that needs to be understood. This isn't gonna go away, and-

- It is gonna go partially away if we do fewer streets, but roads are a big deal, so the one thing Council has to understand, though, that if we're gonna insist on doing the amount of feet, lineal feet that we've been told we're trying to do, then it's gonna cost this much more. I mean, it sounds like we could say, the average was 16,000, and now aren't you saying it's, did you say 32?

- 32.

- 32, so we would, that's where we would get a significant savings right there, but then again, do people mind their taxes going up if they have better roads? We'll have to weigh that.

- And this is the issue. I mean, I was surprised, I didn't get any calls this year on our tax bill, no complaints, nothing, because it was almost nothing, right?

- Yep.

- But for everyone that's asking for roads, it costs, it costs.

- It does.

- And people have to understand that. You can only put off fixing things that really need to be fixed for so long before they break and then it's gonna cost you even more. Perfect example is the Brown County Courthouse. They put off the repairs on that for years and years and years, and when they finally did it, it cost millions upon millions of dollars. I mean, it was a huge bill, and that's why the Brown County Board has their meetings, pre-COVID, at City Hall, because they put off the repairs on their building to the point where it could be repaired. So these are, it's hard decisions, but people have to understand that it's just, you can only raise so much money through taxes.

- We're gonna have to re-explain, and we should do this every single year, what the wheel tax money was meant for, and it was meant for the special assessments that the home owners would pay was meant to cover that. It wasn't necessarily going to be able to cover 30, 16,000 more lineal feet, there's not enough money there. It was meant so that you as a homeowner didn't get hit with a huge bill, that we spread it out over everyone, and I think that's an important thing to talk about on the agenda, too, is to explain to the public

again what that wheel tax really does, 'cause you just hear that on social media or around. What is the wheel tax? I mean, you're using that for exactly what it's for, but it doesn't cover everything. Again, we four can't... we can make some decisions, but in the end, Council's gonna have to make the whole decision, and I think it would be good for us to bring it to Council, Diana?

- For many, many years, I think the bonding request has come to the committee in a silo, here's your one year request. It's kind of like what we're doing right now, here's your one year request, and now looking at the big picture, and every year, for many years, it was decided that there was kind of some management direction on how much we could borrow, and so by the time you guys got it, it was a certain dollar. It wasn't more than maybe what we were paying off. So there was a lot of deferral going on, and you saw one year worth of borrowing in a silo. So that is where, a couple years ago, it was like we really needed, what is the big picture, what is truly outstanding, and let's be a little more transparent on all the needs that are out there. And so that's when the five year CIP, I mean, it had been discussed before, but that's when it was really, let's roll it all up, let's have a big picture, and like you said, if you do look at this CIP, every year out there, there has been large requests. And I would agree, every one of them, every one of the departments have actually... If you look at the list, what they had in 2022 column, they submitted something less than that for their priority list. Every one of them had something less than, the items, they'd taken some things off their list and have already deferred. So I think I just wanted to remind people, that is the whole point of the whole five year, that it is a big picture, other than the one year look period, okay? This is what we're bringing to you, all the departments had already been told that they can't take everything, they have to really defer. And so I think I'm just trying to say that this is really a way to at least trying to start looking, there are so many needs out there, and this is just a look at a bigger five year picture of it. And again, so what you're seeing is really a one year look at it, it does follow the CIP from last year. It's a skinnied down slightly version of what was in the column of 2022 last year, but it really is still going along that same old path of, our needs are huge and they continue to forward.

- Okay, so back to the motion. Say it one more time, but the reduction thing was kind of a concern.

- We would like, definitely like the directors to bring these to their committees-

- Committees, right.

- Input, as far as-

- So that they understand the big picture, right, so that-

- Yeah, understand the big picture and understand what it's looking like this year, and what does it mean when you say, "Do more roads."

- Right, right, and then to discuss it at Council. Alder Steuer, did you have something to add to the motion?

- Well, not so much the motion. I just ask is, Director Ellenbecker, with this bond request, I know it's only for discussion. I would like to know what the impact would be on the levy, versus, and also on our tax rate, what it would go up. Is there any way to do that?

- It's in the chart, right?

- Is it on the chart?

- That was on that chart I put together for, earlier, and I apologize. I mean, we first met with alders today, so that chart, I could easily email that chart up-

- Yeah, that'd be good, that'd be good.

- It was kind of a busy chart. I think it would have been tough to send it out and have someone understand what was on that chart, but I can certainly send it out, and we got that information today. We certainly can, they can run any kind of scenarios we want. But yes, that kind of did kind of show what the impact would be on the levy if we stayed at the 19.5 million for the next five years, the levy would go up \$200,000 every single year. We're at 10 nine, it'd be about, in five years, it would be really 11 nine for the debt service. That's a huge increase on the mill rate, and then there was scenarios, and then it also tells you what that also, what kind of roughly what that impact would be on a average home of \$150,000.

- I think we all need that, we all need that.

- Yeah, I think we kind of put that in the packet-

- Include that in the packet.

- All right, thank you.

- So who took notes on the motion, then? You got that, Diana?

- Not exactly. Has the alder, Alder Corpus-Dax, have you removed the staff, possible reduction, or do you want that in there? Motion to refer to staff for possible reductions?

- I think she removed that, I think she removed that, right?

- Yeah, I removed that, I mean, do we talk about possible funding sources, is that even on-

- Well, I think we do when- To really voting on it. This is more of a discussion of, here, you guys, we just want direction. We're not making decisions at the Council meeting. What we want is to, what Diana wanted from us tonight, I want from all the City Council, to say, "What, guys, what should we be aiming for, 19, 15, 12?" So I don't think we have to go to the specific reductions yet. I think we need the overall direction. Does that make sense or not, maybe not, huh?

- No, that would be my question to Diana, I would refer to Diana, Director Ellenbecker for that.

- Again, we could reduce the bonding if we found other funding sources. So a part of it is, as a, like you said, as Council, do you believe that these are absolutely needed this year? Then the court discussion of this 19.5, do we just bond for it and move forward and then use those other funding sources for future borrowing and future needs, or out of that 19.5, are there any possible other solutions to, or funding sources for that 19.5? So part of it is, we need some direction on, yeah, how much are you willing to bond, or-

- Right, right, we need that first, we need that first. Council, look at this, what direction? How much are we willing to bond for? And then we'll look at if we can get other funding sources, but if the will of Council seems to be 12 million, well, then we're really gonna be stuck here, but.

- So the motion is still... I have several different ideas here. I have a motion to refer to staff to discuss to, at Council, you had comments that the department heads should also prioritize their own items. You also talked about, I'm not sure if you want to talk yet at this point about funding sources, and you also talked about taking it to other committees for input. So part of that is, are you talking next chance that the committee meets, so that's probably two weeks from now. That would be after the next council meeting, so kind of just wondering what kind of, do you want some discussion at council and then that way the department heads can take it to their next committee? So then that would come back to Finance again, but that would be the same week that INS would be meeting and Parks is meeting. The other items, Police, Fire, and IT, IT is very small requests, but those three departments don't actually go anywhere else. It really just comes to Finance, and historically, Parks has kind of looked at their budget or their bonding request, and INS historically had looked at Steve's request,

but, again, they've now talked about either the projects we think are priority, then they send it to Finance to really roll up in the consolidated CIP. So-

- It's fine that we'll vote on that. It's fine that we'll decide in the end, Finance will decide, but the other alders in these committees need to understand what they're asking for, so that's why I think it has to go back for discussion or information at those committees. But there's one... I don't think, I thought the priority thing was taken out. These already are the priorities, or we already have the priorities, right, Alder Corpus-Dax? I mean, we may have to cut the priorities. These already are the priorities, that's what they're telling us, so- And so 'til we decide on what we can spend, they won't know what, it still may have to be cut, but these are the priorities.

- Chief Litton had his hand up.

- Oh, who did, who did?

- Chief Litton.

- Chief Litton, okay, sorry.

- I just want to remind the board members, and this is not anything to do with advancing anything tonight, so we know it's not going anywhere, but keep in mind, as we talked before, on equipment, especially specialty equipment, with stuff that you're looking at in the Police and Fire departments, we used to have a lead time of nine months, we could get an ambulance eight months, get a fire engine in 10 months. Now we're talking anywhere 12 to 18, and they're talking longer to 18 month period now. So the reason that we kind of, at least I was pushing for the bonding to get on the front burner, so to speak, was because of these long lead times, and because of the condition of the fleet. So that's not to say that you gotta do anything tonight. I just want you guys to keep that in mind as you're discussing this, and so it doesn't drag into another four or five month long-

- That's not our intention.

- Okay.

- No, not our intention at all, no. And Director Grenier?

- I kind of want to tag along with Chief Litton. As I mentioned, I have about 1.5 million dollars carryover from last year that I can start using, and I'm anticipating about 1.7 million dollars in wheel tax money coming in this year. So that leaves me with about 3.2 million dollars worth of guaranteed funds right now, which means... and again, I'm not expecting anything to happen tonight, just something we need to keep in the back of our mind. Until the Council commits to going out for bonding, I can't put contracts on the street, either.

- And I think we're talking about committing about the 16th of February, we're just not talking about committing next week. So, yeah, I wasn't talking about holding, but we have to, if we don't kind of give the big picture, just like we talked about earlier where Alder Galvin was talking about the big picture of the permeable stuff or the green stuff, we need to give them the big picture for them to make an informed decision when we do bring it to a vote. And so this is our chance to give them a big picture, then go to committee, talk about it. At Finance, we'll probably make a recommendation, and then at Council, we'll have to have that bonding, the bonding discussion. So I don't see it going much past February 16th. Committee, what do you think?

- Agree.

- Okay. Yes, Alder Steuer?

- Just one more point. Council is on February 16th, and if each of the committees kind of look at it, the standing committees that would be involved in this type of issue with the budget, with the bonding, I should say, I think that would be more than enough time to vet it. So that's the way I'm feeling.

- Thank you, all right, let's read back the motion so we can get a vote here.

- I don't think we have one yet.

- I know, so we need to pare this down, so. You're taking out the priority thing, so what do you got left?

- Our staff to, I guess it's really to discuss at Council what you're asking the staff to bring back more information on their items to Council?

- That's not it, we're not really asking for more information. What we're trying to do is go to Council and say, "Here is the big picture, City Council. What do you want us to aim for," right? I don't want them feeling like they need to defend every fire truck or police car, that's not what, that's at the bonding meeting, that's not now, but it's bigger than that, just to have them available questions that we didn't think of tonight, or even ones we did already ask that we want answered at the whole Council. So it's not like I want them to put all this prep. They already know their priorities. They got the amounts that they need to spend. They worked on the five year CIP. I think they're pretty set with what they need. Now it's gonna be what direction do you want to give to Finance here, City Council?

- A suggestion would be to potentially just refer this item to Council for Council's discussion and decision without really a recommendation or a action from the committee, and specifying what the committee is referring to Council to actually accomplish, versus referring to staff, because if the item isn't really being referred to staff or staff to bring back additional information or explanation or reductions or priorities because that already has been done in preparation of this document, and ultimately, we're looking for Council to take a decision as to what threshold staff should be working towards, and it really should just be referred to Council with no recommendation from-

- But we do have the one recommendation, which is that we want the committees to discuss it.

- Correct, okay.

- Right, so I like, and then we add on that part you just said, refer to Council with what?

- So a motion to refer to Council for Council's review and determination on the threshold limits for the bonding requests.

- Yeah, so moved.

- Yeah, second.

- On the fly.

- And we still have the part about referring it to the committees in there, right, Diana?

- Yeah.

- All right, I want to get the nod from Director Ellenbecker.

- That can be added, yes, to what Joanne has just mentioned, yes.

- All right, so a motion's been made and seconded. Is there any more discussion? All those in favor, say "aye."

- Aye.

- Aye.

- Aye, opposed, nay, the motion carries. Great discussion, great discussion, people, and I'm sorry it's a long meeting, even without Brian, oh, can you imagine? I wish he would have been here for to hear all of this. I did text him a little while ago, saying, "I wish you could come." All right, so we're up to informational contingency account is 104,650 from 2021, and then 2022 contingency account is at 200,000. Anything else, Director Ellenbecker, that you want to say?

- Not at this time, thank you.

- Okay, and then the next Finance meeting will be Tuesday, February 8th, at 4:30 pm, anything else? If not, I'll entertain a motion to adjourn.

- Motion to adjourn.

- Motion to adjourn.

- Second.

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

- Aye.

- Aye.

- Aye, opposed nay, see you later-

- Thanks.

- Thank you.