



MINUTES OF THE AD HOC FACILITIES COMMITTEE

MONDAY, FEBRUARY 21, 2022, 10:00 AM
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.

Present: Eric Genrich, Barbara Dorff, Brian Johnson, Jesse Sharp, Garritt Bader, Chet Lamers, Ian Griffiths, Paul Martzke.

Also present: Finance Director Diana Ellenbecker, Public Works Director Steve Grenier, Parks Director Dan Ditscheit, Assistant City Attorney Lindsay Mather, Chief of Operations Joe Faulds, Police Chief Chris Davis and others.

C. APPROVAL OF THE AGENDA.

Moved by Ald. Brian Johnson, seconded by Ald. Barbara Dorff to approve the agenda.

Motion Passed.

Yes- Eric Genrich, Barbara Dorff, Brian Johnson, Jesse Sharp, Garritt Bader, Chet Lamers, Ian Griffiths, Paul Martzke

Moved by Ald. Brian Johnson, seconded by Ald. Barbara Dorff to reconsider the agenda.

Motion Passed.

Yes- Eric Genrich, Barbara Dorff, Brian Johnson, Jesse Sharp, Garritt Bader, Chet Lamers, Ian Griffiths, Paul Martzke

Moved by Ald. Brian Johnson, seconded by Chet Lamers to to move Item #1 & #2 of Regular Business to the bottom of the agenda..

Motion Passed.

Yes- Eric Genrich, Brian Johnson, Jesse Sharp, Garritt Bader, Chet Lamers, Ian Griffiths, Paul Martzke

Moved by Garritt Bader, seconded by Ald. Brian Johnson to approve the amended agenda.
Motion Passed.

Yes- Eric Genrich, Brian Johnson, Jesse Sharp, Garritt Bader, Chet Lamers, Ian Griffiths, Paul Martzke

D. REGULAR BUSINESS.

1. Consideration with possible action to appoint a Chair.

Moved by Ian Griffiths, seconded by Garritt Bader to approve Brian Johnson as Chair.
Motion Passed.

Yes- Eric Genrich, Brian Johnson, Jesse Sharp, Garritt Bader, Chet Lamers, Ian Griffiths, Paul Martzke

2. Consideration with possible action to appoint a Vice Chair.

Moved by Ald. Brian Johnson, seconded by Ian Griffiths to approve Paul Martzke as Vice Chair.
Motion Passed.

Yes- Eric Genrich, Brian Johnson, Jesse Sharp, Garritt Bader, Chet Lamers, Ian Griffiths, Paul Martzke

3. Communication by Ald. Johnson approved by Common Council on 6-1-2021 to approve the creation of an ad-hoc committee to assess the feasibility and necessity of a unified municipal building to include city hall, police, fire and municipal court and for the Committee to include appointees as selected by the Mayor with a least two city council members, a Mayors office representative, 4-5 community members and appropriate City department heads and to report out to Finance Committee.

Moved by Ald. Brian Johnson, seconded by Paul Martzke to receive and place on file.
Motion Passed.

Yes- Eric Genrich, Brian Johnson, Jesse Sharp, Garritt Bader, Chet Lamers, Ian Griffiths, Paul Martzke

4. Overview of the Berners Schober 2015 evaluation of City-owned facilities by Director of Public Works.

Moved by Ald. Brian Johnson, seconded by Paul Martzke to receive and place on file.
Motion Passed.

Yes- Eric Genrich, Brian Johnson, Jesse Sharp, Garritt Bader, Chet Lamers, Ian Griffiths, Paul Martzke

5. Overview of the current status of City Hall by Parks Director.

Moved by Ald. Brian Johnson, seconded by Garritt Bader to receive and place on file.
Motion Passed.

Yes- Eric Genrich, Brian Johnson, Jesse Sharp, Garritt Bader, Chet Lamers, Ian Griffiths, Paul Martzke

6. Overview of Bray Architects presentations.

Moved by Ald. Brian Johnson, seconded by Garritt Bader to receive and place on file.
Motion Passed.

Yes- Eric Genrich, Brian Johnson, Jesse Sharp, Garritt Bader, Chet Lamers, Ian Griffiths, Paul Martzke

7. Consideration with possible action the use of the remaining 2018 bonded money for Public Safety building analysis of \$34,361.60.

Moved by Paul Martzke, seconded by Garritt Bader to dedicate funds to update the studies related

to the City Hall, Police, Fire and Municipal Court buildings as well as review the operational costs of these buildings.

Motion Passed.

Yes- Eric Genrich, Brian Johnson, Jesse Sharp, Garritt Bader, Chet Lamers, Ian Griffiths, Paul Martzke

8. Determine next meeting date.

Moved by Ald. Brian Johnson, seconded by Garritt Bader to receive and place on file.

Motion Passed.

Yes- Eric Genrich, Brian Johnson, Jesse Sharp, Garritt Bader, Chet Lamers, Ian Griffiths, Paul Martzke

E. ADJOURNMENT.

Moved by Ald. Brian Johnson, seconded by Ian Griffiths to adjourn.

Motion Passed.

Yes- Eric Genrich, Brian Johnson, Jesse Sharp, Garritt Bader, Chet Lamers, Ian Griffiths, Paul Martzke

F. VERBATIM MINUTES.

- I will call to order the meeting of the Ad-Hoc Facilities Committee for Monday, February 21st, 2022. I believe we have six members present, but I'll do a roll call. Mayor Genrich is here, Ian Griffiths.

- Here.

- Paul Martzke.

- Here.

- Alder Barb Dorff.

- Here.

- Alder Brian Johnson.

- Here.

- Garritt Bader.

- Here.

- Jesse Sharp. And then Chet is also not here, but we'll keep the roll open, hoping that they join us shortly. I will entertain a motion to approve the agenda.

- So moved.

- So moved.

- Motion to approve-

- Seconded.

- Motion to approve the agenda made by Alder Johnson, seconded by Alder Dorff, all in favor, signify by saying aye.

- Aye.

- Aye.

- Aye.

- Aye.

- Opposed nay? The ayes have it, and the agenda has been approved. Now onto regular business, and before we get into the items, just wanna thank you all for joining us, especially our citizen members. We've got a tall order and promise a lot of weighty questions to attend to, so really appreciate our citizen attendance and the expertise that all of you bring to bear on some of these questions. So looking forward to a good discussion over the coming months, hopefully to bring forward some recommendations, both to our Finance Committee, as well as our common council. Also wanna- And looks like we have Chet joining us, so appreciate that. Thanks all also to our alders for their attendance and Alder Johnson for bringing this item, item number three forward, and then really that's the reason why we're here. We've kind of expanded the scope a bit to capture what Alder Johnson was trying to accomplish there, in item three, just understanding that we have a lot of facility needs across the city and felt like it made a lot of sense to expand the scope a bit, but also to capture the idea behind the alder's communication. I think there are a number of people in City Hall, including Director Grenier, for example, who have thought that it would make sense actually to have a facilities manager working for the City of Green Bay, I believe Alder Johnson has made similar point. I've had similar thoughts and so just don't want to overly narrow the scope of this discussion, we wanna capture the most important item in front of us, which is that item three, but wanna encourage folks on the committee to think broadly about what we think our needs are as a community, both as an organization and sort of the footprint that we occupy here in the City of Green Bay. So again, thanks to everyone for attending, we do have just about everyone on board here, but I think before we get to the first item there, maybe we can go around for some introductions. I don't know that we all know one another. So I'm mayor Eric Genrich, really glad to be part of this committee, and then I'll just kick things over to Ian Griffiths and maybe he can pass the baton from there.

- Ian Griffiths, Berners-Schober Associates, architects, engineers here in Green Bay been around since, not myself, but the company since 1898, been involved with the city for many of those years. And actually part of the packet that you see in front of you of the thousand pages came out of our office, so very familiar with the Green Bay city facilities. Over to you, Paul.

- Thank you, Ian, Paul Martzke, I'm President of Green Bay based Immel Construction, been working in Green Bay for about the last 25 years. In a past life I was actually the design architect for two facilities for the City of Green Bay, the Municipal Court and Fire Station number four and Immel consistently bids and hopes to construct facility projects for the city. So very much interested in what we're about to try and do here. I also am the Vice Chair of the city's Landmarks Commission, which deals with historic preservation efforts. So thank you, I'll turn it over to, how about Garritt Bader?

- Good morning, Garritt Bader, GB Real Estate Investments. My hope on being on this is to lend a little bit of real estate voice to some decision making that may be made where facilities should be located and how it makes sense, not only for that facility, but maybe even ones that would be moved or used differently as a result of this process, so look forward to being involved And I think things have shifted now, so let's go over to Brian, I guess. I dunno if you guys want to, but.

- Sure, Brian Johnson, Alderman for the near West Side in pending the outcome of the April 5th election, that district, District 9, would also include, what's an affectionately referred to as the Sliver on the River on the East Side. So roughly, a big chunk of the downtown area and then my full-time job, Executive Director of. So

wide variety of backgrounds and experience, including small business ownerships, some real estate stuff. So with that, I guess, actually Alder Dorff, if you don't mind, I'm gonna refer to Jesse Sharp who just joined the call.

- I apologize for joining late. So I work for Schneider National, I lead up the shared financial services, been in Green Bay for a little over 20 years, and I know a few of you personally, so I'm glad to be here.

- He doesn't know the rules, he has to pick the next person.

- That was unfair.

- I didn't hear that part, so I joined.

- And you don't even know who's left, so I'm left and I think Chet is left.

- Right, go ahead, Barb.

- Okay, I'm Alder Barbara Dorff and I was appointed by Mayor Schmitt to the original Ad-hoc Facilities Commission. And then recently by Mayor Genrich, to this Ad-Hoc Facilities Commission. I don't wanna throw a gears here, but Alder Johnson and I are both on finance. Do we constitute a negative quorum?

- That's a fair question. I don't know if Attorney Bungert is with us this morning.

- [Man] I can go find out Mayor, I'll be right back.

- Okay, I'll continue then. And so I represent District 1, far, far, far East side, a very large land wise, the largest district. Used to be the Executive Director of Pupil Services for Green Bay Area Public Schools, in charge of school security and all kinds of other things. And I work with the school security, I guess, throughout the State of Wisconsin, in addition to doing my alder work. Thanks.

- Thanks Alder, and then I think our only remaining member is Chet Lamers, go ahead Chet.

- Good morning, everyone, my name is Chet Lamers, I currently work at NWTC in the role of Director of Facilities. I've been doing that for about 12 years, so my back background is in both architecture and urban planning. I helped to lead the technical college about five years ago through a major expansion referendum that included all different sectors, transportation, college of business, acquisition of property that we had previously rented. So I'm very excited to have been asked to be on the committee and glad to help move this project forward if that's the end conclusion. Good morning, everyone.

- Thanks for joining us Chet and thanks again, to everybody who's participated. 'Cause I think we all understand given those introductions, we're really blessed with a bunch of expertise offered by our citizen membership as well as our alders, so really appreciate the participation. So given the introductions that we, I think we can move along to an item one under regular business consideration with possible action to appoint a Chair. So I would-

- Mayor would you wanna approve the agenda first?

- We did.

- Okay, I apologize, thank you.

- Yep, no problem. So if there's anyone who's interested in serving as Chair, you can nominate yourself, or if you've asked somebody to do that, I would entertain those nominations as well.

- And everybody jump at once, huh?

- Right, and we could certainly have a discussion about what that would entail. If people have questions about the responsibilities of a Chair for a body like this.

- Mayor, my question would be, would it be best for the city to have whomever is the Chair possibly also be a resident of the City of Green Bay, which I am not, but I just bring that to the table, is there an advantage to thinking about it that way?

- Yeah, that's a good question. Obviously, with your role at NWTC, on the kind of the professional side of things, you have a big presence in the City of Green Bay. I don't know that that you'd be excluded from serving as Chair because your residence is outside of it, but certainly a good question.

- Mayor could someone, whether it's you or someone else maybe speak to, I think the alders here probably have a strong understanding of what Chairs typically do, but maybe for the benefit of others, just kinda talk about scope of responsibility.

- Yeah, absolutely, it's a good question. You know, first and foremost, the Chair's responsibility is to run the meeting. So to have some familiarity with Robert's rules, would be helpful, but that's not a necessary prerequisite, it's a pretty simple process, especially at the committee level. But that's the primary responsibility, in addition to that, the Chair would work with Diana as our finance director to put together our agendas prior to our meetings. So those would be the big responsibilities, ultimately, if this committee moves forward with some recommendations for the city that the Chair's in favor of, it would be helpful to have them involved in some of the advocacy work as well. But would defer to both Alders Johnson and Alder Dorff, if you have other details.

- Yeah, and I think you kind of hit on the head, right? To me, I think the workload is not substantially more as the Chair, it's really more of that parliamentarian, type of responsibility as sort of the gut feel that I had and I just wanted to verify that.

- I think Garritt hit on great, but I'm not gonna nominate anyone.

- He just turned his camera on, so that's what I would.

- And I was gonna say Chet's asking about residents sounded like a not it called me, but anyway. Can I make a suggestion that maybe I know we approved the agenda, can we maybe move these two items to the end and let everyone have a feel for what we really need to talk about and then see if the on itself at the end?

- Yeah, I think that's-

- Can I have a motion to reconsider the agenda?

- Second.

- Okay, motion has been made by Alder Johnson, seconded by Alder Dorff to reconsider the agenda. All in favor will signify by saying aye.

- [Panelists] Aye.

- Opposed nay? The ayes have it, the agenda's before us.

- Then I would motion to amend the agenda.

- Oh, sorry.

- Yeah, I'm just trying to pull Mr. Bader there suggested two items and I'm pulling up the agenda, I don't know what those two were.

- We can put item one and two at the foot of the calendar?

- Okay, so yeah, we'll put those right at the end. That's the motion.

- Alder Johnson has made a motion to amend the agenda, to put items one and two of regular business at the bottom of the agenda, is there a second?

- I can second.

- Seconded by Mr. Lamers. All in favor will signify by saying aye.

- [Panelists] Aye.

- Opposed nay? The ayes have it and the agenda has been amended. Entertain a motion to approve the agenda as amended.

- Motion to approve.

- Second.

- Motion to approve the agenda as amended by Mr. Bader, seconded by Alder Johnson, all in favor signify by saying, aye.

- [Panelists] Aye.

- Opposed nay? The ayes have it. And that has been approved. So onto item three under regular business. And this is the communication that I was referencing earlier, I'll just read through it so that everybody has an understanding of one of the reasons that we're here. So communication by Alder Johnson approved by common council on 6-1-2021 to approve the creation of an ad-hoc committee to assess the feasibility and necessity of a unified municipal building to include City Hall, police, fire, and municipal court, and for the committee to include appointees as selected by the Mayor with at least two City Council members. A mayor's office representative, four to five community members and appropriate city department heads, and to report out . This was your communication Alder Johnson, do you have any additional comments?

- Yeah, I'll just give a little bit of context, thank you, Mayor for that. So what really kind of started this for me was taking a look, City Council started doing a five year capital improvement plan. So rather than just looking at bonding requests, one year at a time, we were taking a look at five years at a time and what was potentially coming down the pike so that we could kind of better manage some of those expectations. And when the five year capital improvement plan came out, looking at the Parks Department, so for those not familiar, the Parks Department does oversee City Hall. And so there was I believe and I'm sure Director Ditscheit will talk about this when he gives his overview. But I believe there were about \$10 million worth of bonding requests for repairs to City Hall. And so recognizing that the Police Department has also had some conversations about a public safety building as Alder Dorff alluded to, she had served on a committee on that in the past as well. I think I saw it as an opportunity for us to have a holistic conversation about, hey, what if we combined the police department or public safety building with City Hall, use that \$10 million, leverage that in a slightly different way while still meeting our overall long-term facility needs. So I appreciate that the mayor and staff, have all also considered some of our other facilities, not in the communication, I think that's a smart approach.

It's a good time for us to even talk about staffing such as the facility manager, could that perhaps be a recommendation if it makes sense to come out of this body as well. But from my understanding, having talked to the previous Chief of Staff, Celine Jeffries, talking to Director Ellenbecker, and others, that there historically has not been a group of all represented department heads around this topic are certainly not in a public forum. So I just think it was a good opportunity for us to try this one more time, but bringing all of the needed experts to the table, including representatives from the public. So that was kind of the impetus behind this.

- Thanks Alder appreciate that background. And I do see, we have Attorney Mather here, who's probably gonna give us some unfortunate news related to quorum. So Attorney Mather, go ahead.

- Well with an introduction like that. Good morning, everyone. Yes, so I did consult with Claire Silverman at the League of Wisconsin Municipalities, just to double-check. But because there are issues that may end up before the Finance Committee at a future date, and there is an issue on this particular agenda that does specifically relate to the use of funds, which obviously would fall within the Finance Committee's purview. There is an issue with a negative quorum if we have two finance committee members here. So I would suggest that you defer by seniority and so-

- Oh no, no, please don't, please don't suggest that. Let me just say, first of all, I am so sorry that I didn't catch this before, because it was when the Mayor this morning said the word finance that it just impacted on my brain. So I was on the other Ad-Hoc Committee, this one was Alder Johnson's, I know I'm senior here, but Alder Johnson, do you want to be on this committee? I guess that's just what I think is fair, I don't know.

- Well, could it maybe even a point of order for Attorney Mather on this as well, is the issue because of item number seven, related to the finance committee decision. And if that is the case, is it possible for just one of us to abstain from that vote?

- So it's not a matter of just not voting on the issue, it's actually even discussing the issue together.

- Shit, I was hoping I could just stay on as a member, nonvoting member, I was gonna offer that, but now, I can't even discuss it?

- But we do that with every other committee. How is this different?

- Just maybe not as a named member, I mean, I guess to get around it, we could appoint another alder instead. And I need to apologize 'cause I'm the one that made the appointments. And so just felt given Alder Dorff's background and expertise, it made sense to have her along with Alder Johnson. Director Grenier seeking recognition?

- Thank you, Assistant City Attorney Mather, we do have the standard language at the end of the agenda, indicating that please take notice that a majority or quorum of the common council will attend this ad hoc committee and will constitute a meeting of the common council for purposes of discussion and information gathering relative to the agenda. Could we amend that statement to simply also include the finance committee by name at future meetings, thereby avoiding this?

- Good question.

- I think Steve missed his calling as an attorney.

- Please don't suggest that to him Alder. Let me actually look into that, I don't wanna give you a definite answer right now, I need to look at that language a little bit more closely, but that's definitely something that I can look into, I just don't wanna give you a straight yes or no right now without looking into it a little bit more.

- I believe we may have used that on similar types of issues in the past 'cause the intent is to make sure that we are providing public notice, that we may have a group that could be constituting, a quorum of either the common council or the committee in providing proper public. It's not that it's prohibited, we need to be able to provide proper public notice, which we may not have done for this meeting. But again, I think we have used that language or some derivative there of on prior similar types of issues in order to get the city protected.

- Alder Dorff.

- And then to be safe, could I just please abstain from all votes today? I mean, I'm sorry, I made some motions and such, but see if Alder Johnson and I go and join improvement services, which we do and we talk and we give our opinions and you know what, there's six of us there, we're a negative quorum for counsel when six people are there. So I would be happy to just pull back from my vote today with that help Attorney Mather?

- So that language, that Director Grenier just pointed out at the end of the agenda that actually addresses the circumstance where two of you may attend another standing committee and there may be six of you, so then there's a negative quorum. But it's a little bit different here because you guys happen to be on the same standing committee. And unfortunately, so up until now, you weren't aware that there was a quorum issue. So now that you've been made aware of, really the only way to... Are you guys gonna lose quorum if one of them leaves? I think really the only way to address it for today is for one of you to leave this meeting. 'Cause as I said before, just discussing any of the items, is a problem as far as open meetings goes.

- Okay, but I shouldn't have to leave 'cause any other alder could just join the meeting. I shouldn't discuss, I shouldn't say a word, but I shouldn't have to leave. 'Cause I could turn off my video, but I am an alder, I'm allowed to come to this meeting.

- Except that we have this negative quorum issue.

- But as a voting member, yep, or just take me off right now and I'll be part of the committee and come to every meeting, vote me off the island. I'm still gonna give my expertise and my experience to this committee. But you can vote me off the island right now and I'll just stay, then I'm okay.

- I understand what you're saying, I don't have a great answer for you right at this moment. I am certainly going to look at the language that Director Grenier pointed out and figure out if there is a way that we can modify that to apply to the various standing committees. That's a very good point that the circumstance may arise anytime to people of the same standing committee attend any other standing committee or non-standing committee for that matter. So it's definitely something that I'm going to look into, however, at this moment, regardless of what I find out, that language isn't on the agenda. So at this moment, there's not anything that we can do to modify that. So I'm not saying in perpetuity, I'm just saying for today.

- Am I allowed to listen, but not be on as myself? Am I allowed to listen to what goes on today, so I have a grasp in case I am on it again? Am I allowed to listen?

- I would recommend that you leave, the meeting is being recorded so you can watch it later.

- Okay, I'll watch it later. See ya.

- Thanks, Alder Dorff, apologies for the complication here.

- That's okay, I brought it up.

- Yeah, glad you did. You obviously wanna be doing things the right way, so appreciate that.

- Thank you.

- And hopefully we'll see you at the next meeting in a different capacity or maybe in the same one, if we can get the language right.

- And I'll try, I will listen to this meeting before the next meeting, thank you.

- Thanks Alderman. Chief Faulds.

- I just wanna make sure we're clear on this, Attorney Mather, the language about the quorum is at the bottom of the agenda, right? Am I seeing that correctly? Okay, so I thought maybe you thought it was not there. Right, we're good.

- No, it's there, but it specifies just common council, it doesn't directly address any individual committee. And that's the issue that we have here is that both alders are on the Finance Committee.

- Gotcha.

- Thank you.

- Yeah.

- All right, well, a lot of parliamentary fun, especially for our citizen members today, apologies for that. Any additional discussion on item three on Alder Johnson's communication? Any questions for him or thoughts that others wanna share?

- Mayor, I just wanna be in compliance, I guess, if Alder exiting the meeting because of that, do we have to reconsider anything that she's motioned or seconded?

- Yeah, that's probably a fair question. Director Ellenbecker do you have her recorded on any of those votes? I can't recall.

- Yes, I believe that she helped approve the agenda. I believe Alder Johnson made the motion and Alder Dorff seconded the agenda.

- Okay, but actually that was the original agenda, but then we reconsidered it and actually the reconsideration was Garritt Bader and Brian Johnson.

- Okay, so we should be okay?

- I think so.

- Okay, thanks and thanks for that question, Alder Johnson. Any more discussion on item three?

- A motion to receive and place on file.

- Entertain a second.

- Second.

- Second.

- Alder Johnson makes a motion to receive and place on file item D three, that was seconded by Mr. Martzke. All in favor, signify by saying, aye.

- [Panelists] Aye.

- Nay? The ayes have it, and we are onto item four, over view of the Berners Schober 2015 evaluation of city owned facilities by Director of Public Works, Steve Grenier. Director Grenier.

- Okay, thank you. Back in 2014, Department of Public Works had a number of projects at our East and West facilities and needed to prioritize those facility needs. So we sought bonding money through the, I believe 2014 bond issue, to complete a facilities evaluation for our East and West side garages. As we were preparing the scope for that, received outreach, I think we contact police fire parks who have the majority of the other city owned facilities, identified what we were doing, and it was later determined that the funding we had sought was enough to get a comprehensive building evaluation for all city owned facilities. So we contracted with Berners Schober Associates, who's been a longtime partner of the city to complete a facilities evaluation on all city facilities. Copies of those reports that were completed in 2015 by Berners Schober Associates are included as part of the packet. And as you can see what BSA looked at was a variety of different activities, such as the electrical system, mechanical system, structural building envelope. The intent was to provide low, medium, and high priority repairs that needed to be completed. And since the original preparation of those documents in 2015, all departments have been using those documents as a guide for completing both maintenance and capital repair projects on their facilities. A couple of years ago, the finance department began development of a forward-looking five year capital improvements program and departments have been forwarding projects that were developed out of the Berners Schober billing evaluation studies as part to their capital improvement program. But what we don't have, we still have each department kinda operating independently of each other, submitting individual projects. It has long been the position of the Department of Public Works that a facilities management division needs to exist under city government that can prioritize the building needs across a variety of different buildings, citywide, and would have the responsibility and oversight for both maintenance and capital projects.

- Any comments from the committee or questions for Director Grenier? Understanding this is a very lengthy document and we weren't expecting everyone to have read it before our first meeting.

- Mayor is this intended to be the basis for everything going forward? Not to say you should throw the baby out with the bath water, but is this the foundation of what we're gonna be starting from?

- Well, I think at least from my point of view, it made sense to present all this to the committee. One discussion that I was interested in having at this meeting, maybe down the line, was a question of Director Grenier and others in the city, whether or not there are areas of this analysis that are in need and real need of updating? There's some big gaps in what's been presented or if we still feel pretty confident in the information that's been provided. So that's kinda way that I was looking at things.

- Was that a question Mayor?

- Yeah.

- I don't know if Mr. Bader wants a respond at all, but on that point, I would ask that question of you Director Grenier if you have any kind of broad thoughts on the document.

- I think the document is still valid. If we look at the document and check the boxes as it were for projects that have been completed since the document was published. However, given the fact that we last completed the document in 2015, that is seven years, I would suggest that the document be revisited and updated.

- I think the main reason why I asked was for everyone on this committee to understand, or maybe at least appreciate, is the focus largely police fire possible, City Hall building, or is it looking holistic at many of the

other facilities that were just referenced that Steve talked about that obviously would not be in such a facility like that. Are there two focuses or how are we gonna be prioritizing our time in this committee?

- Yeah, I think from at least from my point of view, we want that focus to be on the original communication, certainly. But if this is an opportunity to take another look at this analysis and make sure that we have everything covered and updated. Like Director Grenier said, seven years is a long time, especially in this world, especially given some of the changes that we've seen recently with supply chain challenges and other things. So I would also invite, Mr. Griffiths, and sort, Mr. Martzke to weigh in on some of those questions and what they think about the validity of this document and what you think maybe, some of the biggest weaknesses might be given its age.

- Yes, certainly it was a snapshot in time. It was the facilities as they were seven years ago, for those items that may have been, for example, five years past their useful life at that point are now five plus seven years past their useful life. And so some of those issues that were identified as maybe tolerable, maybe more pressing today. And so I think as the city looks to upgrade their buildings, I think it does need to be done in a comprehensive manner. This is an individual building by building analysis, it is not a citywide analysis of potential chess moves within it. And so I think the basis of the commission and for what's been put forth is more of the chess move piece. But I see this document as a foundational document to kind of address the magnitude of what is needed at each of these facilities, whether that's a facility that's either gonna be acquired or a facility that's gonna be removed from the list, or what the operational costs are in some of these as well, because not only are these maintenance items and ongoing costs, but we should also be considering what the longterm operational costs of these facilities are as well. And that type of information is not what was commissioned in this document and is not included in that. If that provides a little insight into it?

- Yeah, that's very helpful. Any others have comments or questions?

- Ian, from your perspective, when you look at something like this, is it easier to modify this report?

- I would say it's probably easier to modify, my guess is that as we go through this, it would be, I'm not sure the magnitude of the items that have been dealt with that were high priority. If maybe just a quick analysis of that would maybe steer me one way or another, but my gut reaction would be that there was a tremendous amount of legwork that was done for this document, visiting each building with mechanical engineers, electrical engineers, plumbing, fire protection, as well as architectural and structural. So to have that all revisited would be a challenge or it's certainly possible, but that's a lot of leg work.

- And really, again, one of the original reasons why I asked was trying to understand a timeframe for what results are expected of us and by when to perform certain actions. Ian just brought up a good point, which is what facilities are moving versus which ones aren't. There may be many that need work, the focus of this is a little bit more, again, selfishly kinda real estate play of what needs to move maybe to different locations, i.e, police department, possible fire combination, that sort of thing. There's more the focus of this committee versus some of those other facilities on the spreadsheet we saw which all maybe need work, but aren't something that would move from the land on which they're currently residing.

- Yeah, certainly some of those buildings are park shelters and less consequential buildings. And it's likely that those haven't changed a whole lot, but I certainly know like sixth floor, City Hall was remodeled in the last couple of years. And so there are changes there, but I also know that there are infrastructure elements at City Hall that addresses yet. So maybe we take the largest parts and pieces of these chess pieces and kind of define which buildings are higher priority. And maybe that scope of work could be a little smaller and a little faster.

- Good thoughts. Others with questions or comments on this item?

- Whether it's now Mayor or later, I would make a motion at some point that the focus of the committee be geared towards those major buildings or the ones that have the potential to move or largely relocate here at some point.

- Yeah, and I don't know if, and we have item seven here, which relates to the funding, that's at our disposal, arguably supplemented with other funds, whether they be federal or internal to the city. But I think we could have that discussion down at item seven, but I'm open to the discussion right now as well. Okay, so not seeing other comments here, I think it would make sense to maybe move along at this time to a presentation item five, which is an overview of the current status of City Hall by our Parks Director, Dan Ditscheit.

- , action just to dispense of the previous item, just move to receive and place on file.

- Yep, very well, we have a second for that?

- Second.

- Alder Johnson makes motion to receive and place on file item four, seconded by Mr. Martzke. All in favor signify by saying aye.

- [Panelists] Aye.

- Opposed nay?

- The ayes have it, Director Ditscheit.

- Yeah, so if you look at the agenda packet pages 969 to 974, that focus is a little bit more on City Hall, and the report that BSA did in 2015 as it relates to City Hall. And then the very last page on 974 is a more detailed analysis of that report that we've done recently with more detailed budgetary estimates of some of that work along with a proposed phasing plan. So to step back a little bit in that report, what it states is that the majority of the electrical and mechanical and roof are very old. So the building was built in the 1950s, those elements have not been replaced since, other than probably the roof has been replaced in that timeline but the major electrical components and mechanical components have not been replaced. The only thing that's been done in City Hall with major renovations is we replaced the elevators a few years ago and we did a major renovation to the sixth floor. The renovation to the sixth floor was more kind of office space restructuring and cosmetics improvements. It wasn't looking at the HVAC in any great detail or electrical. So we're at the point right now where it's an old building with very old mechanical and electrical systems where it's to the point where we really have to start making some decisions as a city, what do we wanna do with those? A lot of these components cannot be replaced anymore, we've been repairing them year to year as needed, but if we have any major catastrophes to either the mechanical or electrical, I think it's fair to say that City Hall would be down for months, potentially, depending on what happens, 'cause these fixes they're not cheap fixes, and by the time you bid out the work and order the materials and do the installation, it'd be problematic to run City Hall. So some of the bigger issues that need to be done is roof replacement. That in that report from 2015 said it should be replaced in three to five years, it hasn't been replaced yet. If you look at that last page of proposed fixes, you can see that that's kind of in year two and it's shown as \$810,000 to replace that roof. The other major need is replacing electrical. So right now, much of the electrical doesn't meet current code, and so we can't replace like for like. We'd have to do everything different from how it is now, if we have a major failure. So right now the transformers are in the basement and one of the utility rooms. By code those transformers have to be outside of City Hall and show a cost there of 1.5 million to upgrade the electrical. So not only does that move the transformers to outside of City Hall, but it also upgrades our power system infrastructure so that we can support our key emergency servers. So if the power goes down, we're able to retain service for emergency situations as far as our servers go. In addition, that would also be replacing our diesel generator, which is years old, so right now that generator is ancient. And then finally we would replace all of the main panels and subpanels in the basement along with all the disconnects, which is those would also be replaced. So

it's a lot of work that would be done, and it's a large cost of 1.5 million. Now, if we do plan for this, we can make these changes with very little disturbance to City Hall operations. So if you plan for it, you can phase it in such a way that we could keep City Hall open the majority of the time and still . But if you have a catastrophic failure, there's no way to phase that in, in any structured approach. And then the bigger expenses though, are all the mechanical expenses. And this would be the HVAC systems, the water boilers, the air units, anything like that. All of our units, as I mentioned, are original to the 1950s. It's hard to find replacement parts on the equipment we have and when they do fail, which it's a matter of time when it's going to fail, we can't replace like for like in these systems either, 'cause what we have right now does not meet current code. And so we have to do things very differently when we're replacing these systems. So one of the biggest code issues with the HVAC is the central portion of City Hall, which is a lot of the hallway space and also some of our interior office spaces that don't face the windows. None of those have air ducts, and so that does not meet current code, so there's no air returns, there's no venting in any of those buildings, and it's just currently reliant upon air circulation underneath the doors or when the doors are open, and that's how you have the filtration of the air system. And that just doesn't meet code now, so as part of this, one of the larger expenses is creating a big air duct throughout all six floors of City Hall where you can get proper ventilation to the entire building in all of the spaces. And then in addition, the boilers are currently in the basement, what's being proposed here is those would go on the roof in a new utility penthouse expansion. So utility work or I'm sorry, HVAC and mechanical work is roughly \$5 million based on these current estimates that you see in here. And so what we did recently is we worked with BSA to fine-tune the report from 2015. So we're pretty confident in the scope of work for the electrical upgrades. We show that in kinda year one of 1.5 million, but we would have to do additional exploration and engineering to design the mechanical systems. But we did a report in 2000 and we worked with BSA to kind of refine the scope of work to what you see here, but we're not really set with the final engineering of the mechanical and HVAC systems, but we are pretty set on the trickle modifications that would need to be made. So like I said, just to summarize real quickly, everything's very old in this building, it's out of date and it doesn't meet code. And it's just a matter of time when these facilities are going to fail. And if we plan for the replacements in a structured approach, we can do it with very little disruption. If we don't plan for it, it could be pretty severe if we have a problem.

- Thanks Director, questions or comments related to Director Ditscheit's presentation.

- Director D, do you know how many total square feet City Hall is, or maybe Ian, you might know that number?

- That's probably in the report, Paul, if you've read it.

- And I don't know that off the top of my head.

- I don't either actually, we can get the square footages that's easy, we can get a breakdown of every building.

- Paul for rough estimates, I think it's about 13,000 square feet per floor, I was playing with that this morning, so roughly multiply by six, not including your basement, of course, your HVAC penthouse.

- Now I do have just one more thing to add, and that is other renovations within City Hall. So throughout the years, various different departments have requested different renovations on their floors. And those renovations are not really taken into account in this current estimate of 6.5 million in repairs. So some of 'em are going to have to be considered sooner than later. So Director Grenier can probably speak to this, but probably the most important one that needs to be addressed sooner than later is some renovations to the third floor. So right now all of the computer cabling really needs to be replaced on the third floor. And I believe that estimate's around \$100,000 but I don't know, I'd have to check that for sure. That's because we have so many computer systems that need a lot of power. So right now it's very inadequate as far as our computer service on the third floor. In addition, they're running out of usable off staff office space. So there's a desire to renovate that meeting room in the third floor room 310 into additional office space for public works employees. So that really is a renovation we should be considering sooner than later, but then there's a lot of

other renovations that different floors have requests. And if you look at that last page on 974, I just listed a few of kinda the bigger ticket items as potentials but we haven't put any cost to those renovations and we haven't set any priorities to those renovations because I think we really do need to focus on the electrical and mechanical changes before we do some of these other large ticket renovations to the various floors.

- And Dan, are you interested in me showing the screen or you think that's fine?

- Yeah, I mean, if you have a report open up, otherwise I have that page 974 open on my screen where I could share that if you want.

- Yeah, I have it open.

- Okay.

- I guess just as a point of followup, the dollars that are in the report from 2015 were reflective of pricing at that time, and doesn't reflect the current bidding environment or current cost and availability of material. Certainly things like roofing and other things have gone up substantially and just finding people to do the work, let alone, being able to afford the work to have it done is a significant issue.

- Yeah, and in fact, these estimates that you see in front of you on this page, these were done last year, so it doesn't really reflect current bidding processes. So it is a lot more expensive now when we're bidding out work than it even was last year is what we're finding out.

- Correct.

- So the total cost, as you see there is \$6.5 million for electrical, mechanical and roof replacements, and doing all of those repairs and renovations in a five year window. Obviously those that number is gonna go up year to year and we'd have to modify those numbers accordingly. But if you scroll down a little bit, Diana, I just wanna point out some of those other renovations that have been discussed. And these are not an all-encompassing list of renovations, these are kind of some of the bigger ticket items that have been discussed. So talked already about the third floor renovations regarding public works needs. On the second floor, there's an interest to install a dedicated women's restroom because the council chamber is there. Right now there's a men's room, but there is not a women's room. So right now for the women's room, there's a single stall unisex bathroom on the other side of the hallway and that is currently the women's room, which isn't desirable for large City Council meetings. And then a couple other ones is there's a desire to potentially consider moving some of the services on the first floor, up to the fourth floor. We have a large area of the fourth floor that is vacant right now in office space, and so there's a desire to potentially move the assessor's office, finance department and purchasing department into that vacant office space. Obviously we'd have to do major renovation to the fourth floor to accommodate that, but then what that does, is it frees up a lot of room on the first floor. And by doing that, you could possibly move Muni Court into the first floor and create a large meeting room so that people don't have to go on the elevators to just come to a standard meeting. I don't think the intent is to move City Council to the first floor, but it could be just for any sort of large public meeting, could then meet on the first floor of City Hall instead of having to go to other parts of the building. So those are some of the bigger ticket items, but there's a lot of small renovations that various departments have asked for. And they're real needs, just things are old.

- Hey, Dan, you referenced those six floor renovations a few years back, do you any idea what those cost and is that just a very rough guideline for what different floors, but maybe need, even if it's more cosmetic and not so much operational.

- So when the renovation of the sixth floor was done, it was about a million dollars for the renovation. I don't think that included the architectural work, I think that was the cost for the renovations, but that was three, four or five years ago. And I'm sure that number has gone up drastically since then. The other thing I wanna

point out with the roof is we do have a lot of leaks in that roof. And I think the year that they did those renovations to the sixth floor shortly thereafter, they had a lot of ceiling panels that had a lot of water stains from leaks in the roof. So we have repaired many of those water leaks, but per the report in 2015, that roof, it should have been replaced already, it's beyond its expected life expectancy. And so we do really have to make that a high priority so that we don't cause structural damage to that roof structure.

- I guess I would just interject here, if I can. I think it emphasizes the importance of the order in which things are done and the need to look comprehensively at this. Certainly the roof needs to be replaced, but if one of the options for the mechanical systems is to put the mechanical systems on the roof, which comes first? And what is that investment in that? And is one investment worth it? If that is a bigger chess movement in play, and I mean, certainly the items then that you brought forth regarding the electrical systems and a potential catastrophic failure are very real, the potential for that is high. And if it does, you have to design those systems, you have to procure those systems and you have to get 'em installed, and that's not gonna be easy in terms of timeline and the effect on City Hall, so certainly those are key items.

- Yeah, and in the first year, what we proposed in our CIP initially was to replace the electrical and then hire an engineer to design the mechanical, and then we had the roof replacement the following year. And that way we could design the mechanical, figure out how large of a penthouse structure we needed and actually take that into account when we replace the roof, so we're not replacing the roof twice.

- And I would just add to that, Ian, something that when we were contemplating this during the bond request last year, I'm a big believer in let's get all options on the table before we start narrowing down what the right decision is. And so if there is a hypothetical situation where we say what a new facility is really, what's in the best interest of the taxpayer, what would happen with the existing City Hall, and obviously that would likely come with a different use. So when you start looking at this electrical upgrade, is that the same process, no matter what the use is, or do things get altered a little bit, so just trying to kind of have that conversation as well.

- Yeah, absolutely. I mean, certainly if that building was, I don't know, turned into apartments or a different use, it would have a different electrical load and you may well do the HVAC in a different manner. So yeah, these are large scale decisions that should be addressed and identified, so that the investment that is made is a valid investment and will see some sort of return on it. If those systems haven't been replaced in 50 years, 60 years, then replacing them now only for the building to be a different use five years from now and have to be modified again, doesn't make any sense either.

- And on that point, if we were to authorize additional analysis and maybe heightened analysis of some of these key buildings, is it possible to really get a good handle on the feasibility of conversion or the marketability if the building is converted to a different use, is that something that's done commonly or a process that you're familiar with and open to any members?

- From my perspective, I'd say it's a perfect candidate for an RFP out to the broader real estate development community, here you go. Here's the building that we have it for the right proposal, \$1 it's yours, and let that other group largely do all the work that Ian was just referencing as maybe needed for that desired use.

- Yeah, I agree. I think part of the question becomes what is the timeline for a larger, broader picture and what are the timelines for need? I think those are key decisions that, I mean, if it's five years from now, you know what I mean? Design of a major municipal facility takes a lot of time and it's not something that wants to be rushed, it needs to be well thought through. And just like City Hall, a building that lasted or has lasted to this point 50, 60, 70 years. That's a good investment for the City of Green Bay for a building that has had very little investment in it since the day it was done. And so there's longevity there, there's also an aspect of sustainability within that, that it can be argued that I think that longevity is the best form of sustainability. So all of the embodied energy, all of those pieces that go into the construction of a building of that magnitude should be part of the picture as well.

- No, man, not to further complicate the discussion, but I think there needs to be an operational discussion as well. And Dan, you talked about some potential modifications to City Hall and I like that we're thinking that way, what could that potentially look like? And I think to broaden that scope a little bit, that if you are a user, a resident of our community coming to City Hall, how do you create a good user experience in taking into account what percentage of people come to City Hall for what purpose and how can you redesign that layout in a way that creates a good customer experience? And how could that potentially look in the existing facility versus a new one? So I think that operational piece is really important as well, once we look beyond just the facility needs.

- No, I would certainly agree with that, in addition though, I would also note that the nature of the way that work is done has changed pretty dramatically in the last two years as well. I mean, we're much more in-person than an organization kinda doing similar work in the private sector probably is right now, but still we're able to do a lot more remotely or are doing many more things remotely than we were pre-pandemic. So I think just in terms of operational questions that probably factors into.

- Yeah, this meeting's a great example of it.

- I was just going to add something that might be of interest. I was born and raised in the City of Kaukauna, and about maybe half a decade ago, they made the decision to raise several of their existing buildings in favor of building new. I was just trying to do some web searching to see what that project cost. Obviously smaller city, employees to try to house, but that project from my familiarity only really was a success because you were able to do something before you moved staff, and then you had the time to address some of these very difficult projects in existing buildings. So just might be something that would be worth looking at in terms of what their total cost was, 'cause it included a new fire station as part of a second phase to that project.

- But I think that's the heart of why we're meeting here, 'cause looking Dan, the information you had, let's say that number is really six and a half for urgent stuff and with current bidding and cost and all that, let's just say that's maybe seven and a half now. If you were to take your roughly a million dollars per floor and even say that's a million and a half for the same reasons, you're easily pushing north of 15 million to address and modernized City Hall. And at roughly 13,000 square feet of floor, Paul chime in, if you got a better number, but you apply any cost per square foot on that, you're starting to get pretty close where your mind can conceive the benefits of building new.

- When you add that... Sorry, Paul, go ahead.

- I was just gonna say that you've gotta study this item six for the replacement of the police station. And I think they valued that at about 35 million couple years ago when that study was completed. I mean, for the sake of discussion, I would just say double the number if you're gonna combine the facility. So you're looking yet a bonding request north of 75 million to do everything that's talked about. I think that's just off the cuff numbers of what you're really looking at.

- Yeah, and I think the merits of that, if you know that you need to invest that money either way whether it's in a unified building or otherwise, But then you look at City Hall and if you can bring that back onto the tax roles, through a private development by unifying the building, that's kind of the other piece that I've been thinking about.

- And then I'll add onto that, Brian, with the idea of Dan, what is your annual capital improvement project looking out 10 years? Because that's easy to forget about, there's a lot of, of money that's gonna just continue to have to be spent on a building. Not to say a brand new building has no ongoing operational cost, but it does reset the clock for at least a decade or two. And then the other thing that was going into my mind, and again, forgive me, I don't spend my days totally in public municipal government, but what other needs could the existing site for the City Hall help with the City of Green Bay? Does it become a site for housing assistance or

some other public need that that location serves itself well for? As Garritt suggested, you might find out through private development, what could be successful there as well.

- I think this has been a really good discussion, any other thoughts or questions on this one? Okay, I entertain a motion to receive and place on file.

- So moved.

- Second.

- A motion has been made by Alder Johnson to receive and place on file. This item, the overview of the current status of City Hall by our Parks Director, that was seconded by Mr. Bader, all in favor, signify by saying, aye.

- [Panelists] Aye.

- Opposed nay? The ayes have it, onto item six, overview of Bray Architect's presentations. Director, Ellenbecker, were you able to provide any kind of an overview of what was done here or?

- No, it's included in the packet and I do not have any representatives who are on the former group. Happens to be on page 978 of the packet, but back then there was a time the Steering Committee, that really Alder Lamers Chief of Staff, Celestine Jeffreys was on it. We had a captain and a commander from the Police Department, and we had a assistant fire chief on the team and also the judge from the Muni Court. And at that point they really went through, at that point, they used Bray Architects and just really went out and really did a spatial needs analysis, kind of if they could really have everything they wanted really kind of they went and looked at it. So again, this was back in '16 and '17 and they just really started the process of what it is, if they could have what they wanted, this is what they wanted, this is what they would need. And then they also went as far as trying to maybe find some locations within the City of Green Bay. What really put this one at pause was unfortunately, as they were moving forward, we weren't really at that point, we weren't at a point where we could start, we hadn't been planning to start building a public safety building so it really kind of got put on hold. We really didn't have the money to buy the lot at the time that they had recommended, and so it really kinda got put on hold. And so again, of course it was a funding thing that really slowed this one down, really hadn't been moving forward without thinking about the funding to go with. So I don't have much more to say on this, other than, like I said, there were two different presentations that went into the Finance Committee. And so I just attached the two documents, so you can kinda see what they were thinking at that point. There was a thought of maybe pleas, possibly fire administration, and then that was in, kind of out and then maybe whether or not Muni Court could be in and out. And so it was really something they were thinking about at, in '16 and '17.

- Right, well, thanks for that overview. And just to reiterate some of what Director Ellenbecker has said, and to reinforce what Alder Johnson said earlier, there's a lot of good work that was done by this group, but the key gap was that financing piece. And so I think it was maybe the first CIP that I was involved in, had to go to Finance Committee and say, hey, I'm not real comfortable just slotting this in given the fact that we don't have a good way to necessarily pay for this. And given what Mr. Martzke just said with the ballpark estimate of we're looking at 75 million plus, I think that really has to be a key point of the discussion of this committee is working with others or some other outfit with our finance team to identify a really solid financial path to incorporate these upgrades or renovations or complete reimagining's of how we do things with city government, because as it stands, I think everybody understands, municipal finance is a difficult concern these days. And when you're trying to factor in all of these additional costs, that's a real challenge for us. And then another thing, just to note of that prior discussion, the terminology has been public safety building, going back four or five years, whenever this discussion got going. I think it makes sense to reevaluate whether or not, we actually would benefit from combined police and fire in one facility. There's been recent discussion with Chief Litton and others within fire indicates that it might actually make more sense to include fire administration

adjacent to a new firehouse, which is certainly needed on the near west side of town. I think that's fire station three, that's a beautiful old historic structure, but not that well designed for modern firefighting necessarily. And then kind of connected to that, I would love to have a better understanding of how marketable that fire station would be for private development in addition to Fire Station 1, which currently houses just the fire administration. So just some thoughts on that prior work. Any additional?

- It would seem that there are some very complex financial analysis on the trade-offs between decisions that need to be done. I'm wondering, has anything like that been done to date? So as we think about build versus renovate, and then the ongoing expenses associated with each one of those, do we have any idea what that looks like?

- Director Ellenbecker.

- No, to date that has not been done.

- Okay.

- I think Jesse brings up a good point because if the idea is to possibly combine or bring together certain elements whatever those are, could that number that Paul talked about before, be different? If you're already combining something in, and it's a marginal, extra cost, a certain combination, but maybe not the rack rate that you would have with standalone facilities.

- Yeah, certainly there's an efficiency when you're bringing in one service to a building to affect multiple essentially tenants within that. So, yeah, I think there's an operational efficiency as well. I mean, and I think the other piece that should be looked at is what are the utility costs for some of these buildings? I mean, maybe City Halls, utility costs are not as high because it's not delivering the amount of air to each of the spaces that it needs to, or it may be the fact that there is no insulation in the outside wall, that it is an uncomfortable building to be in because all heat is escaping out the windows or at the wall. So I think, there's a whole other included in the study that was done by our office in 2015. That was purely the parts and pieces, and it doesn't address the operational piece of that. And I think that is a huge factor, vision, as this comes together, that can't be just left to one side that needs to be part of the analysis.

- Diana, I'm curious 'cause the Mayor brought it up, referring some of this to Ellis for analysis as well. I mean, if this group were to move forward and able to get some numbers around here's the cost to construct, here's the cost to renovate, you kinda create multiple scenarios. Does Ellis do that type of analysis where they can say, here are the different public financing mechanisms you have and here's the outcome that makes the most sense. For example, if you put some of these properties back on the tax roll, that's new increment, you could create a TID and borrow against that, some of it could be levy supported. There's some value left to opportunity zones, although that may not be there by the time you can put a shovel in the ground around unless Congress acts. But my point is that there are options there, right? You could have a private developer build something and lease where we have an option to purchase. I'm just kinda curious if that's the type of analysis that Ellis can do for us?

- Yes, it has. Yes, I believe, we would certainly get a scope of services if we were gonna go out to contract with them. However, at a very, very high level for the last two years, I have been telling them as we work through debt and levy limits that we have this public safety building or municipal building, whatever we wanna call it, it's on the horizon, it needs something that we need to consider. And so that is certainly something that they can do, they would look at, they've made recommendations they know 'cause as they look at our debt structure, they also look at when are kids gonna close or what other kind of new funding sources you have and they would be able to structure something out. Again, I mean that would be we have to have more tax increment coming in so that we could pay for the larger debt service. I mean that would be the preferred way to pay for a large building as this. So I would at this point, yes, and I believe that is a service they've already offered up, but I certainly can reach out to them after this meeting and again, give them if they could just even

gimme like not a quota, maybe some kind of some background on what kind of services they do offer, I certainly can get that. But at this point I do believe that that's something that they would be very interested in since they already work with our current debt, they already know our current budgeting, our current equalized value, levy limits. I think they certainly would be able to help us out for this process.

- Thank you.

- And I would be particularly interested in the difference between the capital investment that would be needed versus the ongoing operational expenses of those older buildings. And to Alderman Johnson's point, the potential offsets that could be out there when you transition from one building to another.

- Any other discussion on this item? Alder Johnson?

- No, I was just gonna move to receive and place in file if there's no other questions.

- Motion to receive and place on file made by Alder Johnson.

- Second.

- Seconded by Mr. Bader, all in favor will signify by saying aye.

- [Panelists] Aye. have it. And now we're down to item seven, consideration with possible action for the use of the remaining 2018 bonded money for public safety building in \$34,361.60. So wanted to put this on the agenda as our only potential action item, principally so that the Ad-Hoc Facilities Committee was aware of these resources that have kind of been left over from that 2018 analysis of a public safety building. I don't know that this would cover the entirety of an updated analysis of what we were thinking earlier. And as I said previously, I think there is the potential to supplement this with American Rescue Plan Act knowledge, if that's the intent of this committee and the intent of council. This is a clear organizational need and we do have a significant pot of money that's dedicated for those kinds of investigations and purposes. So interested in just having a discussion about how we could put these resources to use and or potentially supplementing it with additional dollars.

- So my gut tells me that there really wouldn't be an action we take today, as you alluded to mayor and maybe a hold is appropriate, just so that we know and understand that funding is there. I think the first step would be building out some type of scope of an RFP in terms of what we really wanna see.

- Right, I think, one potential action would be to refer this item to staff and directing them to bring back some elements of a financial strategy as we were just discussing as well as an analysis that speaks to some of those operational needs, as well as significant capital costs that we're talking about.

- So I could certainly support a referral. I'm just trying to think obviously if the intent is to come back to the next meeting with staff's recommendation and then the committee here could kinda weigh in on that recommendation, provide additional input.

- That's what I was thinking, yes.

- Okay, okay.

- Any other comments from committee members on that question or potential action?

- Yeah, what was going through my mind is, again, from an outsider's perspective, the fact that today's packet is almost a thousand pages long shows that we do, when I say we, the city has commission studies to understand the scope and the extent of the project. But I think I agree with Alderman Johnson's concept of let's lay out a

roadmap so that we don't continue to just spin our wheels and we end up just knowing what's wrong with our buildings and maybe not having a way to put it into any meaningful action. And that please understand that comment is not intended to be negative towards any one person, but there is a little bit of, it seems to me like the problem gets to be so large and there's just such a complex solution, it stagnates. So I would support asking staff, okay, what are our bonding options or what are our options for what we could maybe afford and some unique thoughts on structure. But then I would also go down the path of, and maybe what are the pieces of the strategy that need to get put out. And maybe it's a couple of RFPs, one on the financial side and the other one that could be on kind of a master planning side.

- I propose maybe a real overly simple goal for next time, which is if, back to my earlier comments of trying to understand what does this committee want to achieve, and what's our focus be? It seems like the focus should really be City Hall, police facility, fire facility, and whether those are all combined or separate or partly combined or whatever. I would love to know that A, that's what we think we should be focusing our time on. And then B, for next time, the respect of overseers of those efforts in the past to at least give us a brief executive summary, if you will, of here's what we've done so far, here's what would need to be re-reviewed or restudied. And then we can analyze that next time and say here's our three buckets, here's where we need to go from where we've been. I think long before we even talk about what our different financing vehicles, that's obviously important, but I like to first know where we're really starting from. And I would take the value, the opinion of those folks very seriously.

- Yeah, I think that a good point, although, especially with regard to the police station, not a whole heck of a lot has been done. So there's not that much information to share on that front, fire administration would be a similar answer, the municipal court sort of status quo. We've heard from our Parks Director on City Hall, so that's my only point on that front.

- Do we know from place and fire, if the needs have marketably changed or the physical conditions have notably noted, what am I trying to say? And really deteriorated most of my speech here since the most recent reports were done?

- I would just say generally the police station is in rough shape, in need of some significant upgrades. Chief Davis can certainly . Definitely need some new carpet on the second floor, that was my most recent observation, but Chief Davis feel free.

- Yeah, I mean, obviously it hasn't gotten any better. I haven't seen this report, so I don't know how to compare what we have now, but I would just say there's a couple issues where that have probably gotten worse. One is structural, the roof, for example, we've gotta spend almost \$200,000 now repairing the roof. And it all has to be replaced because there are 80 to a hundred spots, so it's actually cheaper to replace it than it would be to patch all those. But the other thing for our facility that we've noticed that I think has changed probably since this report, because just in the last few years, we've started in the profession to rethink what we use our facilities for. This facility definitely represents like a 1960s way of thinking about police facilities. There's no community space in it, no connection to other things. I think there is a trend and a good one, in my opinion of co-locating police facilities with things like parks or affordable housing developments or things like that to integrate 'em into the community better rather than making them this kind of standoffish thing that's on its own. Hopefully that's helpful to the discussion.

- Yep.

- Curious if others have additional thoughts, obviously I think the easiest motion here is to refer to staff and then we can bring back maybe a few different options for the committee to mull over.

- Are you looking for a motion for something right now?

- Yeah, if someone's interested in offering one, yeah.

- I guess a motion got set a moment ago to have this committee's focus centered on those primary facilities, City Hall, police, fire, and have an executive summary or brief report, whatever, back by next time we meet that says, here are the existing reports, were they reviewed and what is the next steps from those reports.

- Eric can I suggest you amend your motion to include the Municipal Court as well?

- Absolutely, so amended.

- And like I said, that certainly makes sense to me. You could sort of say, that's what we did here, that's my only concern is it doesn't seem to me that this is really moving the ball too much forward. I mean, we can work within that and maybe offer a few proactive items related to that scope, but that's my only comment.

- Well, and maybe to what Dan talked about earlier, City Hall, maybe there's not much need that regard other than some updating a cost for certain things that Ian had talked about earlier in the meeting. Fire to your comments before Mayor, maybe there's not a lot needed there, but with police, what the chief just said, maybe that's is that the one item that takes maybe a little more immediate refreshing or another look to see exactly what is desired compared to the Bray analysis?

- Yeah, I don't think it would take that much to look at those buildings and identify what's been done, what hasn't been done and put some increased costs to those. I think that would at least give us a starting point that, okay, this is reflective of today, and not reflective of 2015, and from there we can make decisions. I think the financial analysis piece is a big part of this, this is great discussion, but if there's no way to finance this, then that's gonna be a challenge.

- And beyond just financing it, you might be able to finance it, but maybe you shouldn't finance it. Maybe you should never ever, just because you can finance, it doesn't mean you should.

- Sure, absolutely.

- But yeah, I think that there's been a lot of really good points about why you may want to do one option or the other, but I think to fully understand the decision, you need to understand what are the cost trade-offs of one decision versus the other. And it doesn't have to be perfect, but we gotta get in the ballpark.

- Absolutely. Other thoughts on that motion. Okay, Mr. Bader made that, do you wanna restate that, Mr. Bader, just so we have it?

- Sure, to focus this committee's scope on the primary billings of City Hall, police, fire, and municipal court, and to receive back a brief summary of where the most recent reports was needed next, whether refinements to some of those numbers are needed, so we know our base scope of each building for the next meeting.

- Okay, and are you that's broad enough to encompass a potential financial analysis or some of those questions that Alder Johnson and Director Ellenbecker and others had gotten into?

- Well, my gut says no only because if the idea of possible combining could happen, we were saying, and you have cost savings from combining different facilities, can we even know what you can combine if you don't know, in a case of specifically fire, the Chief's comments just a moment ago, how that looks like. So if you would need say roughly 80,000 square feet of new City Hall using current square footages, is the cost per square foot to build that more 250 versus 350, if you're gonna combine with something. I don't know what you can estimate that right now until we have a better idea on what the individual needs for those uses are, and then what could be combined.

- Well, you do know your cost right now and an estimate of what those repairs would be in the future. You can put estimates just like you just did right now, 250 to 350 on understanding what the expense would be for the alternative.

- I guess I would suggest that maybe that'd be a separate motion, then, the financing part of things, if the physical needs is one part, is then the financial capacity possibilities a second, maybe that would include current utilities that came up before current utility usage, current operating expenses data.

- Yeah, I mean, this kind of a legalistic question. We've got one item here that has consideration with possible action. So I think we'd probably need to kind of encompass what we're trying to do with one motion related to this item.

- So the motion is also for staff to present the utility operation financing estimates that think both Jesse and Ian and some respect Paul had referenced, I'm fine with that . I feel like the motion is growing here, but somebody held pair down what they would like-

- Yeah, I think from a parliamentary perspective, I think the Mayor's right. You have one agenda item, so you have one opportunity really to have one motion that captures everything. And so what I would recommend is a motion that refers this to staff and then bullet point, each item that you want staff to work on.

- Can I ask a question of item seven, or is that item stating that there's 34,000 in remaining funds to be used from the 2018?

- Correct.

- So that's not a lot of money, but it might be enough to get the respective consultants to go back and do a quick review of the documents they've already given us and provide us that update. You have Bray that did the police study, it might be as simple as saying you did this in 2018, what do you feel the dollar amounts are in 2022 or '23. If we narrow down the scope to the four buildings that Garritt mentioned in his proposed motion, that might be enough money to ask Berners Schober to simply go back and review those four buildings and update that portion of the facility study, so you bring that up to date, and then you'd have the groundwork of understanding that the four existing facilities need X amount of items and the recommendation for a new police facility is X amount of dollars.

- Yeah, I like the sound of that.

- I concur.

- Well, now, whether or not you could get those respective consultants to update their stuff with that amount of money, I guess that would be the first step. And I don't know if the city's procurement process requires them to go out for an RFP or because you've already engaged those still technically be under contract, whatever, not sure how you facilitate that discussion, but.

- Yeah, that's a good question. I don't know, Director Ellenbecker, if you have any thoughts on that at all, or the motion that proposed.

- Just to answer your last point, I believe because we've already had them as we've already contracted, and this would be an update and be as architectural service. I don't believe we'd have to go for RFP, of course, I'll check with my procurement manager, but I think that that would be. And again, also to talk to Paul's point, yeah, again, 34,000 is not a lot of money legally available, that was really set aside by the council at one point to look at a public safety building analysis at that point. So again, it's not a lot, but it's money that's here, it's ready, it can be spent, it gives you a little bit of as a team to help move forward something. And then if we need more funding, as the Mayor said, maybe we go on tap our ARPA funds, but that certainly sounds like something that

we would be able to go forward and reach back out to Berners Schober to update those, at least those four buildings.

- Well, Director Ellenbecker, correct me if I'm wrong, but we could just forward that as a sole source request, right? And because if, I mean, quite frankly, if you were to take BSA's report here and give it to any other, they're gonna want to verify, validate they're redoing the whole study at that point anyway.

- Yep.

- Correct.

- Okay. The other question I guess I would have is, well, a point I would make is I would think you'd wanna hold back on ARPA funds until we have a sense of better direction, simply because if the way that we're headed is to an eventual RFP that discusses a potential replacement of these facilities, that's a bigger undertaking with obviously some additional consultant dollars needed. And then the last thing I guess I would ask is simply, is it a easy task to somehow create a projection or provide this committee with the information on what the city's bonding capacity could look like for a major capital project? If we say that this is a \$50 million project or a hundred dollar project or whatever those numbers are, can that be very quickly calculated so that we even know that there is capacity in the future to do this, because I think that would then help us frame the , if we only know that we have 50 million to work with, then potentially the project has to be looked at in a different way, whether it's a private sector partnership or some other financing, or maybe it's just scaled back.

- Well, that's a good question. I mean, one of the short answers is from a statutory perspective, we almost certainly have capacity to borrow, the kind of sums that we've talked about, whether or not that's a wise financial decision is really what we need to get into, but Director Ellenbecker, if you have any additional thoughts.

- No, and again, I think I would prefer to defer that over to Ellis and again, yes, look at our depth capacity, look at the long term, how many years could you bond this for? I mean, 'cause the useful life of building obviously should be, we might be able to bond this out for 40 years. So they would be able to help stagger that all out and give us better answers.

- Yeah, I'd concur with that. I think as not been in the finance piece of it and knowing what the capacities of the city are, any narrowing down of that would be helpful for me just to have a sense of magnitude and perspective on it, that would be very useful to frame these discussions going forward and how we might approach 'em.

- Great, so I think what I heard from Mr. Martzke was a motion to dedicate that remaining balance of \$34,361.60 to an update of the overviews that were presented today, is that correct?

- Specific to the four buildings that we mentioned previously, City Hall police...

- So technically, do you want me to withdraw my motion and let Paul's motion stand on the floor?

- Yeah, I don't think there was a second for your motion Garritt, so if you felt comfortable with Paul's motion, you could second it.

- Sure, I'll second Paul's motion.

- Additional discussion on that?

- I continue to agree with Ms. Ellenbecker's comment though about getting some analysis done on the operations side and I'm comfortable with it not, necessarily being at this juncture, but I think that's a very wise

thought because where my mind goes to, is if we know the capacity is there after some initial financial analytics are done, it starts to drive conversations about significant operation savings that you just can't even think about right now. A reception area that can direct you to three different locations in a building that currently you'd need three separate reception folks in three separate locations, snow removal services, it goes on and on. Obviously there's some additional impacts that happen when you consolidate locations together. But I think we may be surprised when we start to think about just the redundancy that we have to operate again, of no fault of anybody, it's just the reality of having disconnected services.

- Right, I think that's well said. Other comments on the motion? Seeing none all in favor will signify by saying aye.

- [Panelists] Aye.

- Opposed nay? And I'm sorry, Mr. Griffiths. Just thought it might be appropriate to make that . Fantastic, so the ayes have it, that motion is successful and then we've got, determining our next meeting date, roughly speaking, is this a decent time for people?

- How often is it anticipated that we need to, or want to meet?

- I mean, I would imagine we're gonna try to get back together as soon as possible, when these updates are ready. I think we're probably looking at a little bit of a time out here for a month or two or maybe more before that could be prepared, but I would defer to the experts on the call too, if they have an understanding of how quickly we could get back.

- I guess I can chime in on the architectural engineering side of things. I think if we had the opportunity to sit down with the public works and parks department to go through what has, and hasn't been done in some of these buildings, as well as the police and fire, then I think we could pretty quickly update those numbers and identify things that have changed in that document. I don't think it would take that much time and I think it can be done pretty economically.

- Okay, so not a super concrete answer for you, Mr. Bader, but I don't anticipate it being an every couple week kind of affair, especially right now, as we're gathering information.

- I think if we had a month now, you'd have more sufficient time to get our portion of the work done if that's the way it goes. And I, again, I don't own the finance piece of what that timeline might look like, but on the architectural engineering side, I would feel very comfortable within a month that we could get that update information out.

- Okay, and that's certainly what we could target from a scheduling point of view. We don't necessarily have to designate a particular time right now. I can ask Terry from my office to help coordinate our next meeting time. Just wanted to get a sense for whether or not, Monday mid morning is good, or if somebody really had .

- So long as it's around the 10 o'clock time, that's good, otherwise I have all of our weekly scheduling for staff and kind of our corporate meetings, first thing on a Monday. So if the first two hours can be kept open, that'd be great, and 10 o'clock onwards, I'm good.

- Okay.

- I would, second that meeting time is being pretty favorable.

- Moving back in half an hour. Go ahead.

- Thank you, same with me though. It may be better on not a Monday just from getting the week going, but I can be flexible as well, if this is a good time for everyone else to meet.
- I was just gonna say 10:30 is a little bit better for me, but I can do 10.
- Okay. All right, so I think we got a sense for what works for the committee. I'd entertain a motion to receive and place on file.
- So moved.
- Second.
- Motion to receive and place on file and item eight was made by Alder Johnson and seconded by Mr. Bader. All in favor, signify by saying, aye.
- Aye.
- Opposed nay? The ayes have it and now we need a Chair. Any volunteers?
- Those crickets are back.
- And I mean, it goes without saying that I'd be have happy to serve as Chair, if that's what you all are most comfortable with. Alder Johnson, obviously, is familiar with parliamentary procedure, could definitely do the job for us as well. So whatever that is, is fine.
- I'm gonna respectfully take myself out of the running. I got this little public market project that I'm through the goodness of being a board member, helping to guide and that's a limited bandwidth to do my formal life, so I will not be part of that.
- I guess I would be in same position where I'd rather focus time and energy and effort onto some of the thinking about it, as opposed to the running of it.
- I mean, if nobody else wants to do it, I mean, I would volunteer if it's just handling the parliamentary piece and engaging with staff a little bit, but if someone else from the committee preferred to take on that role, I would certainly defer as well. Turns out I'm not chairing any other committees at the moment, so it kinda...
- Sounds like Alder Johnson's looking for a nomination.
- I so nominate.
- Second.
- Mr. Griffiths nominates Alder Johnson to serve as Chair of our Ad-Hoc Facilities Committee, that was seconded by Mr. Bader. All in favor will signify by saying aye.
- [Panelists] Aye.
- Opposed nay? The ayes have it and then a successful Vice Chair. Really don't have to do anything if Brian skips town on us.
- I can take on the role of Vice Chair.
- All right, there we go.

- I nominate Paul.

- Alder Johnson nominates Mr. Martzke, seconded by Mr. Griffiths. Any discussion? All in favor, signify by saying aye.

- [Panelists] Aye.

- Opposed nay?

- The ayes have it. Adjournment, motion to adjourn? Motion to adjourn made by Alder Johnson, seconded by Mr. Griffiths all in favor, signify by saying aye.

- [Panelists] Aye.

- Opposed nay. The ayes have it, we're adjourned, thanks everybody sincerely for the discussion today, I think it was really valuable. Thank you.