MINUTES OF THE FINANCE COMMITTEE

TUESDAY, FEBRUARY 8, 2022, 4:30 PM

Virtual Meeting. Public may join via Zoom.
Immediately following Personnel.
AMENDED

A. ZOOM MEETING INFORMATION.

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

B. ROLL CALL.

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

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

Also present: Mayor Eric Genrich, Ald. Lynn Gerlach, Ald. John VanderLeest, Ald. Mark Steuer, Ald. Jesse Brunette, City Assessor Russ Schwandt, Public Works Director Steve Grenier, Police Commander Kevin Warych, Police Chief Chris Davis, Development Director Neil Stechschulte, Parks Director Dan Ditscheit, Finance Director Diana Ellenbecker, Assistant Finance Director Pam Manley and others.

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, Brian Johnson

D. APPROVAL OF MINUTES.

1. Approval of the Finance Committee minutes from the January 25, 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, Brian Johnson

E. REGULAR BUSINESS.

1. An update from the City Assessor on the city-wide revaluation for the 2022 assessment year.

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

2. For consideration with possible action the approval of American Rescue Plan Act (ARPA) allocation within the Stormwater, Green Infrastructure and Climate Resiliency category for East Seymour Park Storm Water for $1,000,000.

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

3. For consideration with possible action the approval of American Rescue Plan Act (ARPA) allocation within the Capital Needs category for Roads for $1,500,000.

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

4. For consideration with possible action the approval of American Rescue Plan Act (ARPA) allocation within the Capital Needs category for Body Cameras for $307,316.25.

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

5. For consideration with possible action the approval of American Rescue Plan Act (ARPA) allocation within the Affordable Housing Development and Small Business Support category for City's Façade Improvement project for $1,000,000.

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

6. For consideration with possible action the approval of American Rescue Plan Act (ARPA) allocation with the Affordable Housing Development and Small Business Support category for the Blueprint Accelerator Program for $40,000.

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

7. For consideration with possible action the approval of American Rescue Plan Act (ARPA) allocation within the Affordable Housing Development and Small Business Support for Farmers Market for $75,000.

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- Brian Johnson.

8. For consideration with possible action the approval of American Rescue Plan Act (ARPA) allocation with the Arts, Culture, and Tourism category for Tourism Grants for $250,000.

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

9. For considerations with possible actions the 2022 revised bonding request.

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

10. A request by Ald. Brunette to the Finance Committee which states: "To use all unbudgeted and unspent 2021 revenue from the Cooperative Governance Agreement with the Oneida Nation on items found in the 2022 Capital Improvement Plan as opposed to the suggested rebranding initiative. The rebranding initiative should then be considered during the 2023 city budget process if it is worth pursuing."

Moved by Ald. Brian Johnson, seconded by Ald. Barbara Dorff to use the remaining funds received from the Cooperative Governance Agreement, $157,192, towards 2022 capital purchases or bond reduction.
Motion Passed.
Yes- Barbara Dorff, Bill Galvin, Veronica Corpus-Dax, Brian Johnson

11. Report of the Claims Committee.

The Committee may convene in closed session pursuant to Section 19.85(1) (g), Wis. Stats., for the purpose of conferring with legal counsel for the governmental body who is rendering oral or written advice concerning strategy to be adopted by the body with respect to litigation in which it is or is likely to become involved. The Committee will thereafter reconvene in open session pursuant to Section 19.85(2), Wis. Stats., to take action on items discussed in closed session, if appropriate, and to consider the remainder of the agenda.

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

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 22, 2022 at 4:30 PM.

G. ADJOURNMENT.

Moved by Ald. Bill Galvin, seconded by Ald. Veronica Corpus-Dax to adjourn.
Motion Passed.

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

H. VERBATIM MINUTES.

- Committee, are we ready to call it to order?

- Yep.

- Okay. All right. I'll call the February 8th meeting of Finance to order. Roll call. Alder Johnson?

- Here.

- Alder Galvin?

- Here.

- Alder Corpus-Dax?

- Here.

- And Alder Dorff is here. I'll entertain a motion for Approval of the Agenda?

- So moved.

- So moved by Alder Galvin.

- Second.

- Second by Alder Corpus-Dax. Discussion? Seeing none, all those in favor say aye?

- [Alders] Aye.

- Opposed nay? Motion carries. So that, I'll entertain a motion for Approval of the Minutes from the Finance Committee from the January 25th, 2022 Meeting?

- Motion to approve.

- Second.

- Motion to approve by Alder Corpus-Dax, second by Alder Galvin. Discussion? Seeing none, all those in favor say aye?

- [Alders] Aye.

- Opposed nay? Motion carries. All right. Regular Business. The first item is, an update from the City Assessor on the citywide reevaluation for the 2022 assessment year. And I think this would be worthwhile hearing from staff on this report, so who would like to speak on this?

- Well, I'm not sure if anybody would really like to speak on this, but I guess I've got the task. So the re-evaluation is going well. The majority of the work that we're doing is auditing, basically going through the files that we have currently to make sure all our records are up to date and accurate, which is the most important part. The next important part is looking at the sales that we've had and gathered over the past three years, which will be the basis for the reevaluation and making sure that those actually represent the information that we have in our files. So that's the second portion of that. And as you see from the progress report that we sent in there, we're doing sketches as we go because we have sketches in our files, but they're not electronic, and that's one of the goals that we've had over the past number of years, as we've gone all electronic, is to make sure that all the sketches, photos and everything are up to date and in format so people are able to look at that stuff online. And that's what we've been doing. And progress is going a lot quicker now, as you can see. Between November and January, we've actually got like 6,000 sketches done. So we should be able to finish those sketches up, and the photos will be just a quick thing too over the next several months. In March we'll be doing the reviews of the properties as we do preliminary values on these. What we'll have is staff will be getting numbers on their pads, 'cause we're using Microsoft Surface computers, and they'll have a list of the properties and they'll be driving around in the neighborhoods and looking at preliminary numbers that we have on the properties and comparing them to what we have in the field. If they seem outta whack, they'll be able to see that, and they'll be looking at the gradings and so on with the properties. So we'll make sure that the property owners are aware that we're in the neighborhood. We'll be setting up press releases that we'll be in certain neighborhoods at certain times, so that we are aware. We'll be letting you as aldermen know also where we're gonna be at what time so that we try to keep people aware so we're not getting a lot of calls to the Police Department that there's some strange people in their neighborhood, my staff, myself included, looking at property. So in this day and age, that's always something that's good to have. By the end of the summer we should have all that work done. And by the middle of September we send out assessment notices. And once those are sent out, we'll be having our open book. And this time around, we'll be doing something a little bit different for open book, which open book is basically when the property owner has the opportunity to talk to the appropriate staff member that has put the value on their property so that they can come to an understanding as to how that was arrived at and any questions that they may have on the property on a one-on-one basis or by phone, or however they want to do it. We're gonna do it by appointment this time, because last time when we did the reevaluation, it was a matter of first come first serve and people were waiting in the hallways and it wasn't a very good way of doing things, but it was the way it had been done in the past. So this time around, we're gonna do appointments only. And whether people want to come in and talk to the property appraiser, or if they want to talk by phone, it's totally up to them. So it's gonna be a lot easier. And I think this time around, too, if you notice, by looking at the properties that have sold in the past, most people will realize that the market has gone up quite substantially since they probably purchased their house, whether it be two years ago, three years ago, or even five years ago, even over the past year the property value has gone up 7%. So what we're looking at, and just our statistics, I think is probably a 20% increase on average for properties, 'cause we're at 79% on average for our sales versus what the property assessments are. And honestly that's an average. So there's some that may be a lot more than that and some may be less than that. What it seems to be is right now that the larger properties in the $800,000 range or higher, somewhere in that range, probably won't go as much up as the ones that are on the lower end of the range, which is a normal thing for this type of reevaluation when the properties are hot. Those properties that were selling for maybe $60,000 back in the last reevaluation are now selling for like 120 to $140,000. And if you're not in the market for properties, that could be a little bit of a sticker shock. And I know anybody that's been looking to houses over the past number of years, you go out and look at a property and by the time you make your mind up whether you want to look at it a second time, it's probably got four offers. So it's a tough market and we're chasing it as we go. But hopefully, only from our sake, the City's sake, that if interest rates cool it down a little bit, we'll be able to catch up. But the plan is after this reevaluation is done, we're gonna continue to do it every four or five years so that it's not a big catch up over a 20 year period, like has been this time around. So that is the plan. We'll keep you updated as we go along. But what we're doing right now is just keeping things, getting them up to date, making sure all our information is accurate. And if you have any questions, I'd be happy to answer them.

- What month did you say they're gonna go out and start looking at houses and taking pictures?

- Probably in the month of March, probably towards the end of March we'll be looking. So we'll let you know--

- Okay. But they haven't done that yet?

- No.

- They haven't been doing that yet? Okay.

- Only for building permits that we've had over the past year. We're still doing our normal work. This is kind of an extra thing, but we're still doing our normal annual work, which consists of the building permits and the reviews that people call in for. The reevaluation stuff is kind of an extra thing that we do on top of this. But the reevaluation, review type thing, will probably start in March.

- Thank you. Anyone else have any questions?

- I've got a quick question.

- Yes, Alder Steuer?

- Thank you. Russ, I was just wondering, it starts in March. How long will that take, roughly, to do the city?

- We'll probably be going from March through August doing the reviews and then the final numbers will be sent out in the notices in September.

- Okay. And I was gonna ask the question about--

- Yeah, yours will be probably doubled, Mark. I'm sorry.

- Oh, will it? Well that's good. I've got nothing, so twice nothing is nothing. So, anyway.

- Right.

- But I was just gonna ask also is, you threw me off there.

- Yeah, that was the plan.

- Yeah, that was a plan. Well, you did a nice job. So I'm glad you mentioned that we're looking every four or five years to do this rather than waiting, we've had quite a lag there. Do you foresee any issues or problems coming up because of the delay from the last re-eval? Or do you feel like we'll move along well?

- No, I think, like I said, people understand the way the market's been, that there is gonna be a jump in it. If anybody's paid attention to their property, that's the biggest investment for the most part is, if you keep track of it, you gotta be happy. You buy a house for $100,000, and you don't have to do anything to it, and like four years later it's worth 150. That's a great investment. So as long as people understand that, we're okay. But most people understand it to the point until the tax book comes out and then we'll get the calls, but. That we're putting out there and plan on putting out there, I think will be a lot easier this time around than it was the last time around. So hopefully with the PR that we're looking at, it'll be a lot easier. And I'll stand on you people.

- All right. Thanks, Russ.

- You're welcome.

- Yes, Alder Galvin?

- Thank you, Chair. Russ, I was living on the far west side I think the last time this was done. It was quite some time ago. I had a complaint or an issue with my assessment. Now, at that time, I called the City and they sent out some inspectors and they went through my house and actually went through it and inspected it and adjusted the value. But from what I read here, anyone that has a question or concern, if they're not satisfied by calling staff and to talking to them, they have to appear before, and I cannot remember the board or the committee that they have to appear before, but will they have the opportunity to have assessors come out and go through their homes? Or is this gonna be the set in stone process?

- No, no. They'll always have the opportunity to have somebody come out and take a look at the property. That's why we're trying to get through them as quickly as we can. Our information is based on what we have in our files plus everything that's gone through the sales process. So we're trying to do inspections of sales as they come through, and there's been quite a few of them. So we have gotten through a lot of the houses because of the sales that are quite extraordinary as a fact. So if we haven't gotten through a property recently, and if somebody wants us to come through, we will always, always make that a point to go through a property at a request of a property owner. That's not a problem.

- Okay. All right. Thank you.

- You're welcome.

- I have a question for Diana, for Director Ellenbecker. Is there a paragraph that we can be sent, kind of in simple terms, to explain that while the assessment of your property may go up, the impact on your taxes, for example, if your property doubles in value, does not mean that your taxes will double in value. And then because, what's the because part? Because that's my understanding, that things kind of even out a little bit. And I'd like to have the public clearly understand that. Or can someone just explain that right now?

- Oh, I'll jump in here, Russ. Just in the packet, on your electronic version, on page 14 of the large packet, there is "How is this going to change your property taxes?" So try to walk you through on why, it kind of takes you through a value of, if the budget was this amount, and then your valuation was this, this is how we got the per thousand. And then it goes through a same budget, but a higher valuation, how it goes down. And then it just tells you how it would've. I'm not sure if that would answer your question?

- That's on page, oh, page 14 of the whole packet.

- Right--

- I think it's number six.

- Number six. Okay.

- It's six of the memo, or actually the FAQs, right?

- It's FAQs. It's number six on the FAQs.

- You guys are great. That's good. It's gonna still be hard to understand probably, but, right?

- Right, it's not an easy process, but hopefully we won't have anybody's double and we'll have to explain that to them. But I'd rather use the explanation of going from 150 to 165, like we did in our example, 'cause that's a little bit more palatable. But there will be some that probably do go up substantially.

- Okay. But it doesn't mean that the mil, we may not stay. Rate. Because we have so much more assessed value, right?

- Right, and that's generally what happens. When we increase the tax base, if everything were to stay the same, as far as the budget goes, your mil rate would go down by the same ratio.

- Right. Okay. I guess we're just not all gonna know till September. But...

- Right.

- All right.

- We'll try to get it done as quickly as we can. I understand everybody is anxious so that we can get a rough idea as to budgetary numbers. That is our goal, to do it as quickly as possible, but I understand that we're trying to do the best we can. And to Alder Galvin's question, if quite a few people want us to go through their properties, that's also gonna take some time with the limited staff that we have to do it. So we kind of have to balance off against each other. But we will try to end this as quickly as possible so that we have enough time to get the numbers in there before budget so you could do some calculations as to where we're gonna be for next year's.

- So just let me make this clear. Most people save up all year long or they put money in escrow or whatever to pay their taxes. Does this apply to the very next property taxes or the one after that?

- Well, this will be, this reevaluation will apply to the bill that comes out in December. This is the 2022 tax bill.

- It's important for the public to know that they maybe should be setting a bit more side each month, this year.

- Well, not necessarily, unless they have purchased their property. And that's one thing that we do get questions from realtors all the time as to what they can do. And we do our best to answer the question, because we do have some preliminary numbers on new homes and so on. But what we always tell people that if you have, if you just recently purchased the property, look at what you purchased the property for, use last year's mil rate and calculate it out based on that, and you should be fairly close, because we're not gonna go over what you paid for, obviously. So unless you paid for it like a couple years ago, so that's what. And that should be close. But if you haven't had your property, and you hadn't bought it or sold it for. More difficult. So then that way you might have to do a little bit more work and see what other properties in your area have sold for that are similar to yours, and then get a rough idea that way. But that's something that's always possible to do based on the amount of properties that are sold in the area.

- Okay. Does anyone else have any questions or clarifications? No? All right, I'll entertain a motion, oh, really it's just receive and place on file.

- Yes, that's correct.

- Would you like to move that Alder Galvin?

- Absolutely. So moved.

- Moved by Alder Galvin. I think Alder Johnson wants just second that, it looks like he does. Yeah. Okay, seconded by Alder Johnson. Any further discussions? Seeing none, all those in favor say aye?

- [Alders] Aye.

- Opposed nay? Motion carries. I want to mention too that we have some additional alders here tonight, in addition to our committee. So welcome to Alder Steuer, Alder Vander Leest, Alder Gerlach. And I think, I don't think, is there anybody else? Oh, there's two pages now. Two pages. Okay, Alder--

- Alder Brunette.

- Alder Brunette is there on the second page, my second page. So, all right. Thank you. Okay. Item number two. For consideration with possible action, the approval of the American Rescue Plan Act, ARPA, allocation within the Storm Water, Green Infrastructure, and Climate Resiliency category, for East Seymour Park Storm Water for $1 million. So you have, as it was last time, the memo looks very long. But there are many parts to the memo for each individual item on the agenda. So the first item is 5-5-001, East Seymour Park Storm Water, $1 million. And that is what we're talking about. Any discussion on this item? Alder Johnson?

- Yeah. I just wanted, looking for clarification. My understanding, basically, is that this allocation would reduce the overall bond request for that project. Is that correct?

- I will have someone explain that.

- Director Grenier, is that, would that be you?

- That would be me. Yes. Well, our overall need, it's hard for me to speak specifically to bond requests, because storm water projects are funded by a combination of bond requests and operating budget transfer capital. Our total need would not go down because we're doing with this, again, this was part of the memo last time. The $1 million in storm water projects that ARPA would be funding, the money from the storm water utility, whether that's storm water utility supported bonding, or the transfer to capital from the storm water budget, wherever we select that money to come from, that money will still have to be bonded for or come out of the storm water utility, because what that is going to do is create a segregated fund that will be used for grants and or a revolving loan program for property owners to do green infrastructure on private property. So what we're doing, we're using ARPA money to offset some of this utility money, but that utility money is still needed to fund a brand new program.

- But we've already, and just bear with me for a moment, if you could just sort of walk through this with me. We've already set the storm water rates for this year, correct?

- That is correct.

- And so whatever, I guess, rate allocation existed for this particular project, it's already been decided upon? Meaning that whatever, the balance would have to go to bond, right?

- Not necessarily. The overall need is determined by us. There is a certain amount of money that's already been determined that comes out of the operating budget, and then there's a differential that needs to be bonded for.

- Okay. So this overall, the overall cost of this project, do we know yet, I guess, what that final cost will be, 'cause we're still going through that design phase, right?

- We are still going off of the design assumptions that were used to generate the capital improvement number, yes.

- Right. Okay. So the overall cost, I guess, to do this project, it may come partially this year. Could it come in subsequent years as well?

- That depends on how quickly we get the project bid out and on the street.

- Okay. So really, but the allocation of this wouldn't necessarily matter, right. This is just going to the overall project cost?

- That is is correct.

- Yeah. All right, thank you.

- Any other questions? Yes, Alder Galvin?

- Steve, I don't really wanna go down the road I went down at the last meeting. And I know this is all in the development phase. But you're asking us to approve money now, committing to it, basically. I've already heard that some of the neighbors in the Seymour Park area are not super wild about this project, maybe because they don't know how much it's gonna impact the actual park property, and also how much is it gonna impact the amount of flooding that occurs down in that area.

- Okay.

- And I guess if, you're asking for approval. Again, I don't see anything here that indicates how much it's going to impact it, but we're looking at between everything, right now it's estimating, just an estimate of roughly $2 million. So how much will it impact the flooding down in that area?

- Both the east and the west ponds are created. The expectation is to remove the flooding from Ashland Avenue. It should also have a measurable impact on flooding on other connected storm sewers upstream from that Ashland Avenue, where Ashland splits the east and west sides of Seymour Park. It's also tied in at a future, and we're gonna talk about this once we get down to the capital improvement, the reconstruction of School Place, Howard Street, and Oakland Avenue, it's required that. Simply because we're reconstructing streets, that water is intended to discharge into the west pond, not necessarily east pond, that this one, that this money is talking about, but a companion project on the west side of Ashland Avenue. So they're all kind of interrelated. We don't have the details on exactly how much it's anticipated, 'cause we're still working out the design details.

- All right. As far back as I can remember, a heavy rainfall has always affected Shawano Avenue in the area of the fire station. Is that considered upstream and would this potentially have an impact on that flooding?

- It may have an impact, but I don't think it's gonna remove that flooding.

- Okay. All right. Thank you very much.

- Any further discussion? Yes. Alder Johnson?

- Thank you, Alder Dorff. I would just add, Alder Galvin, to your question, Director Ditscheit, I know the Mayor, Melissa Schmitz, some other folks from City Hall and myself, we're part of the Seymour Park Neighborhood Association, annual meeting, and we did present these concepts, and I want to just sort of tip my cap to staff, who've been very responsive to the feedback from the neighbors in that area. So I get your point, and I've heard that too. I mean the loss of a big chunk of the park is never desirable, but you gotta kind of weigh the impact that that has relative to something plaguing that area, which is chronic flooding for many decades. So I think at some point those are tough decisions we have to make and I think staff has been very, very sensitive to that feedback, which I've been very grateful for. So, I support the project where it stands right now. I know Director Ditscheit and I are gonna be meeting again here shortly to talk about some revisions to that design. So they've been very good about neighborhood outreach. And like a lot of these difficult projects, you're never gonna satisfy everyone. And that's, I think, one of the most difficult things that we we have to do as elected officials. But everything that I've seen so far shows that we're on the right path with this.

- All right. Thank you.

- Thank you, Alder Johnson. Any further discussion?

- [John] Barb, I'd have one question.

- Yes, Alder Vander Leest?

- [John] I was just gonna ask Mr. Grenier, how big of ponds are they gonna be and are they gonna be like fenced off type ponds, ponds that people can't have really get into them at all, as far as that, in other words, the safety part of it? I just wanna ask about that question.

- We do not fence our ponds. Instead they are designed with what are referred to as recoverable slopes and with safety features built in. The problem with putting a fence up is, in the unfortunate event that somebody is able to get beyond the fence, then a rescue of somebody falling into the pond becomes complicated because you now have the fence to contend with. Rather than doing that, what we do is we build the slopes leading down to the pond at a shallow angle, and then there's a 10 foot wide safety shelf where the water is less than a foot deep. So in the unfortunate event that somebody got too close to the pond and wound up getting down to the water. There's a 10 foot area there that somebody could stop, regain their footing and extract themself from the pond. It's a matter of design and limiting your liability.

- [John] How large are the ponds gonna be roughly?

- Off hand I couldn't tell you. They are substantial.

- [John] Okay. Thank you. That answers my question. Thank you.

- Further discussion? Seeing none, I'll entertain a motion on item one?

- Motion to approve.

- On two, I'm sorry, on two.

- Motion to approve.

- Motion to approve by Alder Gavin.

- Second.

- Second by Alder Corpus-Dax. So right now we're considering action on the approval of $1 million for the East Seymour Park Storm Water. All those in favor say aye?

- [Alders] Aye.

- Opposed nay? The motion carries. Item number three. For consideration with possible action on the approval of the American Rescue Plan ARPA allocation within the the Capital Needs category, for roads for $1.5 million. And are there any questions or would staff like to present something?

- I guess, Alder Dorff, I would just, it's a pretty broad thing. Again, I would maybe ask this question, does this reduce our overall bond request? Does it expand our capital campaign? I guess, how does this get applied?

- This reduces our overall bond request.

- Okay. I move to approve.

- Motion to approve by Alder Johnson. Is there a second?

- Second.

- Second.

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

- [Alders] Aye.

- Opposed nay? Motion carries. All right. Number four. For consideration with possible action, the approval of the ARPA allocation within the Capital Needs category for body cameras for $307,316. This would be for the Police Department. And I suppose that question is the same, does this reduce our bonding?

- Yes, this is a direct reduction. It was in our CIP. We were going to bond the 307,000, which is year two of the agreement for our contract with Axon. So this is a true reducing bonding and using ARPA money for year two of the Police program.

- Okay. Any questions? Yes, Alder Galvin?

- Thank you. This, I don't know if it's for Diana or the Police, but I was looking through the contractual agreement with TASER to provide the cameras, the tasers, the holsters, everything that goes along with it, the storage of data. I believe we also, besides these monies, that we're gonna use ARPA money for, isn't there a yearly amount of money that we have to pay them as part of a payment plan for this program?

- Commander Warych, do you know that answer? Or do you know, Director Ellenbecker?

- Go ahead, Diana.

- I believe this is all encompassing, this is all one big package. That includes the TASER and the whole Axon, the whole body camera program and all the software to go with, it is a complete package.

- True. But I thought there was a five year payment plan that was set up, unless I misunderstood what I was reading?

- No, that's true. That's what the $307,000 is in year two.

- Okay. So are we gonna be bonding for a contractual agreement for every year that we have this, on into infinity?

- I can tell you, on the electronic document, I will find the page, the five year plan. And the next three years, the amount goes up to about little over 500,000 per year. At this point, unless we can get it in our operating budget, it will be a bonded item. The plan, the billing schedule, is on electronic page 45 of the full packet. That is what it was approved by the Council in December of 2020. The first year was a very low amount, second year went up to 307, 'cause the first year, one and two, the Packers were taking on the cost of the body camera program. And so this is the billing schedule that was agreed to.

- Okay. So right now is the plan to be bonding potentially every year for this?

- I have a note to try to put it in our operating budget next year, it's a half a million dollars, or we start ramping up and putting a portion of it in your operating budget, 'cause as long as you wanna continue to have body cameras, there is going to be a significant cost every single year because it is what you would consider an ongoing operating cost. It really needs to be in the operating budget. So until we can get it into our operating budget and find room for that, it's either gradually gonna have to get into, it's gonna be either bonded or ARPA for the next couple years, or again, and try to phase it and get it into our operating budget.

- I guess the only thing that concerns me is, as we move on year to year and we hear the constant complaint our taxes and our levy is too high, and then we have people within council that want to spend more and more money, but they don't want to raise taxes, and all I see us doing is bonding more and more for things that should be part of our operating budget. Ballistic helmets that expire in five years. Squad cars that are pretty shot within three to four years. And it just continues and goes on. And I know we're trying to solve this one minor problem right now, but as you look at it, I just see a real problem where once again we're gonna find ourselves in some real financial straits down the road. And again, I don't have the answers. I certainly don't. But I'm just, I'm concerned. I'm concerned we're painting ourselves into a corner. But I can't say I don't approve of this item. I think they're vitally important to the safety of our community and the safety of our officers. And I just think they're a real answer to a very prevalent problem throughout policing in the United States. So thank you.

- Mayor Genrich?

- Thanks, Chair. And appreciate your comments, Alder Galvin. I would echo them and echo what Director Ellenbecker has said, in terms of what our intent is. We would not like to be borrowing for this type of expense into the future. I think we all felt it was an appropriate action to take, to acquire body cameras for our officers and for the public. So we took that step. This is, I don't know if this is a phrase or not, but I think we're actually painting ourselves out of a corner with this action, because we're not borrowing for them. I think, like Diana said, like Director Ellenbecker said, our intent is to get these cameras into operational budget. Whether or not we can do that in one fell swoop, given the fact that we are also right now, the priority based budgeting, we're taking a really tough look at all of our expenses across the board, in every single department. Obviously the public has identified this as a priority. Council has as well. And it's appropriate to have it in the operational budget, for sure.

- I agree. And I understand that this is ARPA money, but I guess my thought, and I should have voiced it, was that this money does go away within, what, two years? And so we're, hopefully we'll have some answers, some better answers by then. Thanks.

- Just to clarify. Yeah, these monies have to be spent by 2026. So we have a little bit of a glide path in that respect.

- Okay.

- They're limited, for sure.

- All right. Thank you so much.

- Thank you. And I would agree that, if we, over the next three years, can put a portion of this each year into our operating general budget, then, and fill in that gap with ARPA funding, and then when the ARPA funding's gone, then we have it. It's not just using one time money as a we've done in the past to get us in a pretty deep hole, as has happened in the past. So I'll entertain a motion if there are no other comments?

- Motion to approve.

- Motion to approve by Alder Galvin.

- Second.

- Corpus-Dax. Any further discussion? Seeing none, all those in favor of, let me just repeat here what we're doing, we're approving the ARPA allocation within the Capital Needs category for body cameras for $307,316.25, say aye?

- [Alders] Aye.

- Opposed nay? Motion carries. All right. Number five. For consideration with possible action the approval of ARPA allocation within the Affordable Housing Development and Small Business Support category for the City's Facade Improvement project for $1 million. Any questions or any explanations by staff? Alder Galvin?

- Just one quick question. And I certainly understand we want our buildings to look appealing to people visiting and people that live here, I certainly get that. But with that amount of money, is there anything set in place as to how much or some kind of a formula as to how much someone can get based on the size of the building? How many stories? Or is there just a set amount, everyone gets up to X amount and that's it?

- Alder Galvin, that's an excellent question. It is generally, based on the existing, if we use the existing program, essentially, as our guidepost, which it is, that's currently staff's intent on that, it is essentially a case by case basis. A lot of projects there is kind of a match requirement that's usually, expenditures are limited to no more than 75% of the total cost of eligible improvements. So there is a list of the types of things that we will fund for those kinds of projects. But I think staff's anticipation of it, for a million dollar budget, we could certainly see a major project of up to like a half million dollars be eligible for it if it certainly meant the qualifications. Certainly we've got buildings like Schauer and Schumacher. We've got other buildings, certainly, within the area larger structures that could use that sort of improvement. Most of the time, these are smaller projects for the smaller businesses. Again, these are targeted towards small businesses for the most part, so those store fronts. So I think usually anywhere in the area of probably under $100,000 is almost generally, or is almost always going to be the case for a majority of these funds. But obviously we'd like to see, to stretch this as wide as we can for the biggest impact.

- Absolutely. All right. Thank you.

- Alder Steuer and then Alder Johnson.

- Thank you, Chair. Director Stechschulte, I was wondering about that last comment, as far as facades. In the historic districts, will there be, is there a way that we can leverage tax credits with something like this or piggyback with that or what's your take on that?

- My understanding, Alder Steuer, is that would definitely be a possibility for the proper combination of projects. Obviously it would have to meet the qualifications as the historic district can qualify for those credits. But I think in terms of a lot of the things that are identified on there are eligible. So masonry, brick, wood, glass. Restoration and preservation of historical and architecturally significant features is one of the categories identified in the Facade Improvement Program. So I think they would be very compatible.

- Okay. Thank you very much.

- Alder Johnson?

- Thank you, Chair. Director Stechschulte, so I just want to, again, reaffirm, this program would be managed the same way that it is right now, which would basically be a materials based reimbursement and labor would be excluded, is that correct?

- That is how we have it positioned right now at this point. And the main reasons for that is certainly to, in terms of bang for our buck, in terms of investment of public dollar, by focusing on materials, it does help usually the projects avoid certain labor costs that might be otherwise required by government funds. So certainly focusing on particularly, yeah, we are intending to base this on basically using it as the existing program guidelines. But we certainly have the ability to modify that for subject to a grant agreement. I think if it made sense to do so, I guess the opportunity here is that these funds would not be subject to the same as the same federal requirements. We have a little bit more flexibility, I think, with these dollars to be able to invest them accordingly.

- Okay. Thank you. And Director Galvin, just to kind of piggyback off one of your questions, I've worked in a number of these projects within the Broadway District, and they tend to be quite a bit smaller. You think of like 30,000, 40,000, but really impactful projects that property owners otherwise wouldn't be able to do. And quite frankly, it helps secure occupancy in some of those spaces. It makes your downtown corridors, and really this is applicable in a number, not just downtown, this is throughout the city. Even, Alder Steuer, to your point, the matching it with historic tax credits, that's very difficult sometimes because historic tax credits, utilization of those, come with a lot of strings And sometimes property owners look at that and the juice isn't worth the squeeze. So it's, I think it, I know it's something that I talk to businesses about regularly. I'm sure staff does too. But I at least just wanted to provide some insight to you, those historic tax credit are there, and it makes sense or some people, but a lot of them, it just, it doesn't line up. So I think this type of funding can really help accomplish some of these projects that we wouldn't otherwise be able to touch.

- Okay.

- Okay. Any further discussion on this one? All right, seeing none, we can vote on the ARPA allocation within the Affordable Housing Development and Small Business Support category for City's Facade Improvement Project for $1 million dollars. I'll entertain a motion to approve?

- Motion to approve.

- Move to approve.

- Motion to approve by Alder Corpus-Dax.

- Second.

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

- [Alders] Aye.

- Opposed nay? Motion carries. You might notice that I'm repeating the items. That was due to a request from someone in the public watching the meeting saying, "How do we know what you're voting on? "Things go so fast. You go back to..." So I'm trying to, we have more and more people watching us. So I'm trying to repeat the item, repeat the motion, so everyone is clear on what we're voting on, okay? All right. Item number six. For consideration with possible action on the approval of ARPA allocation within the Affordable Housing Development and Small Business Support category for the Blueprint Accelerator Program for $40,000. Much less than a million, 40,000. Any questions on this? I could entertain a motion?

- Motion to approve.

- Motion to approve by Alder Galvin.

- Second.

- Second by Alder Johnson. Again, where the motion is on the Blueprint Accelerator Program for $40,000 from ARPA. Any further discussion? Seeing none, all those in favor say aye?

- [Alders] Aye.

- Opposed nay? Motion carries. Number seven. For consideration with possible action, the approval of ARPA allocation within the Affordable Housing Development and Small Business Support for Farmers Market for $75,000. So are there any questions or comments on that item?

- [John] I have a question, Barb?

- Yes, Alder Vander Leest?

- [John] We have three different farmers markets in the city. Are they each gonna be allocated $25,000 per market? Is that how we're gonna work it or is that how they're gonna work the funds?

- Who would like to answer that?

- I can answer that. Alder Vander Leest, this is Neil. That is currently how we have it established at this point, Alder. Certainly if there's a reason to vary from that, we could consider that, but right now we have it as three grants of $25,000 each.

- [John] Very good. Thank you very much.

- Thank you.

- All right. Any other discussion?

- Alder Dorff, obviously my employer manages one of those markets, so I'll need to abstain from this vote.

- Okay. Thank you. I will be looking for a motion approving the ARPA funding of $75,000 support for the farmers market.

- So moved.

- Motion to approve. Second.

- Alder Corpus-Dax, seconded by Alder Galvin. All those in favor say aye?

- [Alders] Aye.

- Opposed nay? And one abstention from Alder Johnson. Okay. Number eight. For consideration with possible action, the approval of the American Rescue Plan allocation within the Arts, Culture, and Tourism category for tourism grants for $250,000. Are there some questions on that?

- Alder Dorff?

- Yes, Alder Johnson?

- Yeah. This one was interesting to me. And I just wanna make sure that I understand it correctly. Is this for the creation of new events only?

- I see it's five grants at $50,000 each, and I think Director Stechschulte will probably tell us.

- Yep, absolutely. I think we are willing to consider, we're certainly looking at either expanding either existing events, Alder Johnson, or a new required event that could have a new impact. So I think certainly from staff's standpoint, we'd be willing to consider either one, either growth of an existing event or creation of a new one. So obviously, but, certainly we are looking at major events. I think staff's recommending a visitor impact of 5,000 plus. We use that as just to support larger events. I think examples of things that would come to mind, I guess, would be certainly like the Tall Ships Festival, even some of the things that On Broadway has hosted, in terms of major venture, Busker Festival. I think other sort, the idea is to kind of really kind of enhance and promote the larger events that have the larger visitor impact. So I think we would consider certainly either a new event or supporting an existing event and growing and expanding an existing event.

- So I have a question--

- Okay, and the reason I ask--

- Okay, go ahead.

- Sorry, I was gonna say, the reason I ask is, obviously someone who works in this industry, the creation of new events that can attract 5,000 visitors or more are probably far and few between. But there are events that come around, like you said, Tall Ships Festival, they come around every four years-ish. But they could certainly be a good candidate for something like this. And there are others I think that would maybe expand or go to that next level with some additional financial support. So I think if we preserve that opportunity, I think that could be really useful. 'Cause you could really leverage it in a way where you can take an event that's maybe currently attracting a few thousand, but with a little extra bump could get over that hill and do something really meaningful.

- Yeah, I think that's exactly what we'd like to see, Alder. That sounds like an absolute perfect match for the program as we've kind of imagined it at this point.

- Okay, thank you.

- I have a question. So I saw five grants for $50,000. Then in another portion there was $5,000 minimum, of that--

- Sorry, that $5,000, Alder, is visitor impact, not dollars. So we're looking for a number of actual visitors, 5,000, it should have a creation of visitors of at least 5,000 people or more, in terms of qualifying for this.

- Oh, that's what it is?

- Yep.

- Okay, I see what you're saying. Okay. Thank you.

- Yeah, it's at the bottom of page four, is the 5,000 reference, I think, on my staff memo that I provided.

- Yes. And I'm on your staff memo that you provided too. So I understand now. Thank you.

- Absolutely.

- I should have noticed that before. All right.

- Chair?

- Yes?

- Chair, just one more question?

- Yeah.

- Neil, again, someone obviously who works in this industry, not all events are created equal. And what I mean by that is $50,000 towards one event doesn't necessarily translate to the same impact as another event. And I can see events that are much lower cost that can attract 5,000. And so, I'm just wondering if there's flexibility here, where, instead of saying they have to be $50,000 grants, and five of them, can we leave some flexibility where maybe we eliminate that requirement in this proposal? And instead say that it's capped at 50,000, and then preserve the ability for you to award lower amounts?

- Oh, absolutely. Yeah. I think, yeah, I think that was actually, certainly, I would agree, that's actually staff's intent, Alder. We were using that simply as a planning metric to identify for budgeting purposes. But yeah, I think we would certainly be more than willing to consider alternative amounts.

- That's a good point.

- 'Cause I could see this potentially impacting, again, more events, especially those that do have a great impact.

- Great. Thank you. So are we ready for a motion on the tourism grants for $250,000?

- I'll make a motion to approve.

- Motion to approve, second.

- Motion to approve by Alder Corpus-Dax, second by Alder Galvin. Any further discussion? Seeing none, all those in favor say aye?

- [Alders] Aye.

- Opposed nay? It looks like the motion carried unanimously.

- Thank you.

- All right. Number nine. For consideration with possible action, the 2022 Revised Bonding Request. So, as you recall, in Council last week, I asked Council to give us kind of a ballpark figure to shoot for, and it ranged from eight million to, I guess the mode would be 15 million. Most people said 15 million. And you'd be happy to see, I ran those pages off, and we came in right now at 13,695,411, with the adjustments that were made. So we came in lower than that 15 million. And I'm pleased about that. What impact, Director Ellenbecker, does this have on the $150,000 home?

- I don't have that calculated.

- Oh, you don't. Okay. 'Cause that was like in that Ehlers memo we had, right?

- Yeah. I could look.

- That's probably gonna be a question, at Council, I would guess.

- Yep.

- People are gonna be curious.

- Yeah, let me see if that, there was a reference if we were gonna do about 12 million.

- There was a reference of, yeah--

- And of 15 million, so it would be somewhere between the two.

- Yeah. It would. And it was, the 15 and 12, over the course of the time, were very, very close.

- Yes.

- I had the new stuff run, and I just don't know where the old stuff is now. And is that Ehlers number, that's not still in here is it? That's from our last meeting, isn't it?

- It is not in the new packet, correct. I am trying to find it from last week.

- Yeah.

- And I certainly will have that ready for Council.

- Well, you can get that ready for Council. So what is the will of this committee at this point? We came in below what Council had basically requested. Did you still want to look at all the different sections? Do you want to have Council talk this over again? What's the will of the committee here?

- Is it, I guess, is it the desire of staff to actually approve a bond request? Or is this still more in advisory/feedback mode?

- It's approve. It's approve, it is absolutely approve, just as I said at Council. We need to get the bonding approved if we are gonna get roads constructed. Because if we don't have a source of funding, we can't be sending out RFPs to say, hey, would you like to sign up and be our construction crew? We don't have the money yet, but we probably will. So we absolutely, as I said at Council last week, this next meeting, we are voting on bonding. We have to get that done.

- Okay.

- So whatever discussion--

- Yeah, and I appreciate that feedback. And Alder Dorff, for what it's worth, I think, to your point, this has come in under what Council directed. And I think we all know what's gonna happen when this goes to Council, it's gonna get talked about. And so as much as we'd like to get as much of the work done as possible at committee level, I would almost just kick it back to the committee, do we want to have this conversation twice or once?

- And the thing is, we could decide to make the motion to approve it, which is, we did not, we sent it to Council without a motion last time. We might be wanting to say motion to approve, because we did do as Council asked us to do, we got it down to 13.7, about 13.7. So that might be the difference between what we did last time and what we might want to do for next week.

- I would make that motion to approve, recognizing, again, that this is gonna get talked about at Council. We know that.

- Yeah. We know it's gonna get chewed on. But at least if the four of us approve it, I read through all of it today. I hate seeing the cuts that were made. Right?

- I know.

- The reality is, we can't afford it. And if you can't afford it, you can't afford it. So we're not going to Florida on vacation this year. We'll probably go down to Gurnee Mills and do the rides for a day and drive back home tonight.

- You might wanna talk a minute about what cuts were made. I think that might be relevant for our director, would you think it's relevant or not?

- Well, I think, you look at, the PD gave up the BearCat and I think one or two other items. Fire gave up a truck.

- Only for a year.

- And this is, everything that we put off, it's only for a year, until it breaks, and then it's like, oh crap, you know?

- And then some roads, some road projects are put off.

- You can see there's some road projects. And I'm not gonna lie. I'm happy none of them were in my district. But I know some other alders are getting impacted by this. And I feel for them because we hear it all the time, besides traffic enforcement, it's roads. But it's funny, you hear all the crying for roads, and then when they get the tax bill, all you hear is the crying about the tax bill. But one comes with the other. You're never gonna get the other one for nothing.

- Just for reference--

- We have a motion. Oh, I'm sorry, go ahead.

- I apologize. Just for the reference, if anybody wanted to see whatever was, the cuts are referenced on page 101 of the packet.

- Okay. Or if we have it open in a different way, we can see it, we can find it.

- Okay.

- So I have a motion to approve and send this on to Council. Is there second? I'll second it. Any further discussion on the bonding? Seeing none, all those in favor say aye?

- [Alders] Aye.

- Opposed nay? The motion carries unanimously. Thank you. Back to the agenda Item number 10. A request by Alder Brunette to the Finance Committee which states, to use all unbudgeted and unspent 2021 revenue from the Cooperative Governance Agreement with the Oneida Nation on items found in the 2022 Capital Improvement Plan, as opposed to the suggested rebranding initiative. The rebranding initiative should then be considered during the 2023 city budget process, if it is worth pursuing. And I'm afraid I'm gonna have to ask a question of legal. Is this motion properly before us? Because we have already voted at the council level that staff should investigate this and get RFPs. So are we able to basically reconsider the same motion? Not at the very next meeting, not even do in the meeting, but now?

- Right. So I did look into what the ultimate motion and actions were of Council with respect to the branding initiative. And the decision of Council at that time was to move forward with the RFP, but to hold off on the funding resolution to fund the branding initiative, which was utilizing some of the unspent revenue from the Cooperative Governance Agreement. So at this point, the request to fund the RFP is kind of in a holding pattern until the RFP has come to fruition and those recommendations are brought back to Council. And at that point, that motion comes back, or that item comes back in front of Council to decide on what to do with the resolution. So really the proper order of things would be to hold this item until that other action that Council had already voted on comes to some sort of resolution, because you do have that funding resolution that's utilizing some of this funding, kind of, like I said, in a holding pattern.

- So I didn't know the answer before I asked the question, I had no idea what the answer was gonna be. But does that mean that we should be holding this until a future meeting to decide?

- Correct? Yep. That would be one. Obviously there's always receiving and placing on file, but holding to make a decision on it. If you, essentially, if you place something on receiving and placing on file, you're holding it off indefinitely, and it can always come back. But to put it on hold is almost, under Robert's Rules, it's kind of putting a definite.

- A date to come--

- Even if not a date certain, it's contingent on something else happening first, and then it comes back for consideration in front of the body.

- All right. Let's have discussion. Alder Brunette?

- Well, a surprise to me. I mean, a courtesy would've been nice that my motion before a committee was not a valid motion or agenda item. Just through governance would've been a courtesy extension to me, so that I wouldn't had to have gone through this exercise. I don't think it's a improper agenda item whatsoever because we need a resolution in order to approve the funding using 2021 revenue to be used on an item in 2022. I talked to Director Ellenbecker earlier this week, and staff has not even started the RFP process. The agenda item is actually rather straightforward. It's not saying the RFP, or it's not saying that the branding initiative should be ended. What it's saying is that it's worth pursuing in the regular budget process, if it's worth pursuing. And so I think it was a really straightforward agenda item. But Chairperson Dorff, are you suggesting that, are you saying that you did not have any conversation with legal or the Finance director as to this agenda item being on the agenda?

- That is absolutely true. I wanted to do that. I wanted to find out the answer before the meeting, but I knew if I would call and tell you the answer before the meeting, I wasn't sure how credible that would be. I asked this question knowing that I thought it would be a good question to ask, because I've questioned for the last week, whether we can kind of go backwards on something that Council already did, but I didn't want to know the answer. And so it could have gone either direction. And I was--

- Attorney Bungert, Thank you. Attorney Bungert, had you had any conversation with Chair Dorff regarding this agenda item?

- No, I did not. And as far as not providing kind of. Just to clarify, I wasn't stating that the motion or that the item was improper. It can be considered. It just has to be considered in order because of the fact that Council had already kind of tied up these funds in a prior action and decision and that's being held up. So that has to be decided first before your communication can be decided. So it's not that it's improper or it can't be considered, it just has to wait. And to be frank, I hadn't had an opportunity to review the minutes of that council meeting until today.

- Okay. Thank you.

- Mm hm.

- Alder Johnson?

- Alder Dorff, just a question for Attorney Bungert, because I'm thinking about that motion. Of course, we permitted staff to proceed with the RFP, and at least when I made that motion, the intent was to get us the information that we need to make a proper assessment of the overall scope of that project. When I'm looking at, and we held out the funding, and recognizing that a funding resolution would have to come, I'm just curious why that would be relevant to this particular agenda item, because regardless of what we do, we would have to identify a funding source, whether it's from the agreement, whether it's bonding, whether it's holding off until the next budget process, we would have to identify the funding source no matter what. It would be my recollection that, to that last motion, I don't recall ever stating that we should hold up $100,000 for that project.

- Right. So the motion wasn't to hold up the funding, it was to hold the funding resolution, and the contents of the funding resolution was proposing to utilize the revenue, or the unspent revenue, from the Corporate Governance Agreement.

- Okay. I understand. That makes sense. Okay.

- Okay.

- Further discussion? We have to decide if we're gonna receive and place on file, or if we're gonna hold the item. And as Attorney Bungert said, it does not need to be a date certain, but it needs to be in order. Or we can talk about it some more, whatever--

- Alder Brunette, what we're recognizing, I guess, the legal's opinion, what would be your desire in terms of how to handle this?

- I respect Attorney Bungert and her professional opinion, but I think that it's very clear that there is some objection to, not from her, but objection from certain members of council to move forward with it. Because if there was any concern whatsoever, that would've been conveyed to me and I would've had a heads up before I attended this meeting. I just think it's strange. I think it's odd. I think it's not good precedent for this council to make at least a courtesy to explain what the objections are to a specific agenda item before it comes here. I don't, I really, if the Attorney is saying that it's not possible, I'm gonna talk to her after this meeting and pull the item at Council, because I really do think that there's a way, if I have to get an outside opinion from the League of Municipalities, I'd be willing to do that. But there's no reason why we need to hold off on that because, I'd have to look at the agenda item a little closer and the motion. I just think there's some interference and I don't think it's appropriate. Thank you.

- Alder Dorff, if I could, one other question?

- Yes, Alder Johnson.

- And this one would be for Director Ellenbecker. I think the last time when we talked about the resolution to carry over the service agreement funding, obviously $100,000 was being requested for the branding initiative, but we talked about some additional availability above and beyond that. Do you, and I know I'm catching you flat footed here, but do you know what that number is?

- Yep. I'm ready for that. We received 322,192 from Oneida. We have allocated 65,000, which leaves you a balance of 257,192. And then there was a discussion up to $100,000, for the branding initiative, if I remember right, that would, if you were to subtract that 100,000, then you would be at 157,192, of available balance of money that was unbudgeted for this Oneida Cooperative Agreement.

- Okay, so in that case, then, Attorney Bungert, would it be an appropriate motion to allocate that 157-ish towards bond reduction while holding on that additional 100,000 until there's further on that? Would that be inappropriate motion?

- That would be appropriate. Essentially we just need to be able, the money that was sent as part of the hold that Council wanted, and the funding resolution, shouldn't be touched until that item comes back to Council and Council ultimately decides to approve it or not approve it. And then it kind of can come back into the pool. So if there. Director Ellenbecker identified as part of that unspent revenue, then that's technically unspoken for, or not subject to Council consideration at this point.

- Okay. In which case then I am gonna make that motion, that we apply the 157,000-ish, and Diana, if you could get that exact number, to the bond request, while holding the additional 100,000 until that item's been properly dispensed of. And then the one point that I want to make with that motion though, is I would like to preserve the ability for this Council, when we talk about the bonding request, if this gets a second, and is supported, that that additional 157,000 could be used to add items back into the bond request that were previously removed. So I think the motion would, the way I want it to work is that it would allow us to at least have that conversation. And you would of course deal with those items on a case by case basis and conduct those votes.

- And I would second that. I would second it. But I have some question. So that ties us to using the Oneida Nation funding only on this bonding. What was the original intent for that money? And I know that we had had some flexibility in using that money where we don't have that flexibility with some bonding. So is that, the question I just want to ask is, do we think that's the best use? Obviously I seconded the motion. It is a use. Is it the best use? And is it the intent? Was that the intent of the agreement? I think Alder Brunette might know that more than anyone.

- I could answer.

- Go ahead.

- Yeah. It was unbudgeted revenue. I remember having a meeting with Mayor Genrich and Director Ellenbecker, and I don't wanna speak for them during the meeting, but we had talked about, we really didn't know that we would be getting that revenue this year because we didn't know if we would get an agreement. So it's just meant to offset any government expenses the City of Green Bay would have to provide municipal services to Tribal properties and other things. So I don't think it has any specific purpose other than to be used in our general fund to fund general government, because I don't think we want to earmark certain dollar amounts for things like garbage pickup for X number of Tribal properties. That was in the past agreement that we made that formula a little more clearly defined. But I like this motion, if I could, Chairperson, if I could just real quickly speak, my motives really were to make sure that some of the bonding requests were fulfilled. That's why I brought the motion. Of course, I get questioned as to whether or not my true intent was to kill the branding proposal. Obviously I've made my opinions known on that. But the main motivation is, is that we have substantial issues in the City of Green Bay that we need to fund. And the fact that you had to trim down five or six million of the bonding request, just says that there are other priorities, perhaps you could argue you or not argue, that should be funded ahead of the branding initiative. So I like this, because then it allows us to fund things this year using the Oneida Agreement money, because I think there are some critical things that were chopped off the list. So thank you. I support the motion. But that's the background.

- Thank you. And we're not gonna get a lot back, guys, when we get 157,000 back out of six million, but I also support the motion, which is why I seconded it. And I do think that we now have things, we will be doing things in the proper order that they need to be done. Alder Galvin, Alder Corpus-Dax, do you have any comments?

- No, it sounds like a, that Oneida money this year obviously wasn't earmarked. I'm sure next year it's gonna be earmarked right off the bat, which is what it should be. It's offsetting a loss of tax revenue. And I also think, though, at the same time, with this money was also earmarked for potentially rebranding. If it's not, then it can be put again towards the bonding issue or other things that may come up that we're not anticipating. So I think it's kind of a win-win going forward right now.

- I agree. It helps us a little, it's a drop in a bucket, but it helps us a little, and we'll go from there.

- I think it will was a win-win-win-win-win situation. And I don't think, I would have hated for Alder Brunette to go away feeling that he was not heard, and he was heard, but there were some problems with the original motion.

- Just keep me on your Christmas card list. I don't like to contend with you.

- You're already on my prayer list. I don't know if I can add you to my Christmas list or not.

- That's even better. We'll work on it. Thank you.

- All right, so the motion as I understand it is that we will, the motion is to use the 157, is that the right number?

- $157,192.

- Toward the bonding for the 2022, to replace or possibly add back something into the bonding and keep it flat. So who, that's kind of vague, I suppose we could decide next week, if we're gonna add something back?

- Maybe, Alder Dorff, maybe--

- Yeah?

- I was thinking about that after I made it. Maybe instead it could be apply it towards the 2022.

- Okay. 'Cause then it could go either way. I love it.

- Right.

- Okay, to apply that number that Director Ellenbecker said, toward the 2022 Capital Improvement Plan. Yes. Alder Galvin?

- You had me at bonding or looking at some of the things that were dropped for bonding.

- Yeah. That's what this is.

- Well, capital improvement is not necessarily...

- Oh, okay.

- Okay, now, 'cause I was just--

- Oh, okay.

- Putting down a list of things that were deleted that potentially that money could be used to make some of those things.

- Well, capital purchases in the 2022 bonding request.

- But I'm not necessarily looking at purchases, and I'll throw this out there.

- Go ahead.

- The BearCat was 400 and some thousand dollars. That 150,000 or some of it be used to take the BearCat, which is at risk of breaking down on its way to a call and rehab it or rebuild it back up where it's usable for several more years.

- Well, okay, we need to know, between now and next Tuesday, exactly what that money's gonna go for. And we probably want to let staff come back to us, with that, right?

- Exactly. Exactly.

- And so Alder Johnson, you just go ahead and tweak that motion to say exactly that.

- Well I think if we say for capital improvements, 'cause to me, Alder Galvin, your example there, that's a capital investment, that's gonna get bonded for, right? We're not doing that out of levy dollars. So I think if you say for capital improvements in the 2022 bonding request, I think it captures that.

- Okay.

- If that's a proposal you want?

- Absolutely. Thank you.

- [John] Alder Dorff, I'd just like to make a comment?

- Yes, Alder Vander Leest?

- [John] I think some of the money that originally was intended from the Oneidas was kind of, I think, earmarked because we have a loss of revenue as the homes go into trust. And I think some of that money was kind of deficit with the property tax reduction. In other words, that way we put it on our budget to reduce the bond, reduce the amount that we bond for and reduce our mil rate. 'Cause we lose the money that goes into trust. They don't pay the tax on it. So I think a lot of that money was kind of thought of as it would help with reducing our mil rate.

- And that's what this will do. And that's what this will do by not having our bonding be as high.

- [John] That was the mean, just to mention, I just wanted to mention that, but that it's money well spent then. Thank you.

- Good. Thank you. Ready to vote?

- Aye.

- Aye.

- Aye.

- Alders in favor say aye?

- [Alders] Aye.

- You passed unanimously and that will go to Council next week. All right. The last, I think the last item, is the Report of the Claims Committee. Are there any questions from the alders on any of the claims?

- No.

- It's been a while since we've gotten one of these.

- It has, and it's very long, but it has been a while since we've gotten one of these, and that's why it's very long.

- No, I have no questions for staff.

- Okay.

- Neither do I.

- All right. I'll entertain a motion then to approve the report of the claims.

- So moved.

- So moved. Geez.

- Okay, moved by Alder Galvin, seconded by Alder Corpus-Dax. All those in favor say aye?

- [Alders] Aye.

- Opposed nay? Motion carries. Informational. The 2021 Contingency Account is $104,650, and the 2022 at $200,000. The next Finance Committee meeting will be on Tuesday, February 22nd, 2022, at 4:30 PM. That's kinda like, 0-2, 2-2, 2-0-2-2, you know, if you say that in numbers. Isn't that kind of cool? And that's the day of our meeting. All right. Anything else?

- I'm good.

- I'll entertain a motion to adjourn?

- So moved.

- Second.

- Second.

- Moved by Alder Galvin, second by Alder Corpus-Dax. All those in favor say aye?

- [Alders] Aye.

- Opposed nay? Motion carries. We are adjourned.

- Good night, all.

- Good night.

- Thank you.

- Have a good week.