



MINUTES OF THE FINANCE COMMITTEE

TUESDAY, MAY 24, 2022, 4:30 PM
Virtual Meeting. Public may join via Zoom.
Immediately following Personnel.
Amended

A. ZOOM MEETING INFORMATION.

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

B. ROLL CALL.

I. Members: Ald. Brian Johnson, Ald. Jesse Brunette, Ald. Bill Galvin & Ald. Jim Hutchison.

Present: Jim Hutchison, Bill Galvin, Brian Johnson, Excused: Jesse Brunette

Also present: Ald. Jennifer Grant, Ald. Mark Steuer, Public Works Director Steve Grenier, Interim Police Investigations Commander Gary Richgels, Grant Administrator Susan House, Police Chief Chris Davis, Planner Steph Hummel, Traffic Engineer David Hansen, Economic Development Director Neil Stechschulte, City Attorney Joanne Bungert, Chief of Operations Joe Faulds, Finance Director Diana Ellenbecker, Assistant Finance Director Pam Manley and others.

C. APPROVAL OF THE AGENDA.

Moved by Ald. Brian Johnson, seconded by Ald. Bill Galvin to amend the agenda moving Item #10 after Item #6.

Motion Passed.

Yes- Bill Galvin, Brian Johnson, Jim Hutchison

Moved by Ald. Bill Galvin, seconded by Ald. Jim Hutchison to approve as amended.

Motion Passed.

Yes- Bill Galvin, Brian Johnson, Jim Hutchison

D. APPROVAL OF MINUTES.

1. Approval of the Finance Committee minutes from the May 10, 2022 meeting.

Moved by Ald. Jim Hutchison, seconded by Ald. Bill Galvin to approve.

Motion Passed.

Yes- Bill Galvin, Brian Johnson, Jim Hutchison

E. REGULAR BUSINESS.

1. For consideration and possible action to rescind or refund personal property taxes for acct #30039 Baker and Macarthur, Inc. for a total of \$444.82.

Moved by Ald. Bill Galvin, seconded by Ald. Jim Hutchison to approve.

Motion Passed.

Yes- Bill Galvin, Brian Johnson, Jim Hutchison

2. For consideration with possible action on a report of the upgrade from High Pressure Sodium (HPS) to Light Emitting Diode (LED) street light financed by \$52,161.77 of 2021 carry-over funds.

Moved by Ald. Bill Galvin, seconded by Ald. Jim Hutchison to receive and place on file.

Motion Passed.

Yes- Bill Galvin, Brian Johnson, Jim Hutchison

3. For consideration with possible action on the award of the TrueNarc Analytical Instrument to Thermo Scientific Portable Analytical Instruments Inc. for \$31,804.02.

Moved by Ald. Bill Galvin, seconded by Ald. Jim Hutchison to approve.

Motion Passed.

Yes- Bill Galvin, Brian Johnson, Jim Hutchison

4. For consideration and possible action of accepting a State Harbor Patrol Grant of \$21,756 to reimburse 75% of the Marine Unit Board #109 sponson replacement.

Moved by Ald. Bill Galvin, seconded by Ald. Jim Hutchison to approve.

Motion Passed.

Yes- Bill Galvin, Brian Johnson, Jim Hutchison

5. For consideration with possible action the approval to purchase two chassis and remounts from Custom Fire Apparatus, Inc. for up to \$920,000.

Moved by Ald. Jim Hutchison, seconded by Ald. Bill Galvin to approve.

Motion Passed.

Yes- Bill Galvin, Brian Johnson, Jim Hutchison

6. For consideration with possible action the purchase of two Type I ambulances for \$565,092.75 from Jefferson Fire & Safety.

Moved by Ald. Bill Galvin, seconded by Ald. Jim Hutchison to approve.

Motion Passed.

Yes- Bill Galvin, Brian Johnson, Jim Hutchison

7. For consideration with possible action the use of American Rescue Plan Act (ARPA) allocation within the Capital Needs and Organization Priorities category for a total of \$148,100 to be used for

project #5-1-205 Police Department Fence.

Moved by Ald. Bill Galvin, seconded by Ald. Jim Hutchison to approve.

Motion Passed.

Yes- Bill Galvin, Brian Johnson, Jim Hutchison

8. For consideration with possible action the use of American Rescue Plan Act (ARPA) allocation within the Capital Needs and Organization Priorities category for a total of \$1,600,000.00 to be used for project #5-3-209 Pedestrian and Bike Plan project.

Moved by Ald. Bill Galvin, seconded by Ald. Jim Hutchison to approve \$1,600,000 of ARPA funds.

Motion Passed.

Yes- Bill Galvin, Jim Hutchison, No- Brian Johnson

9. Referred to staff, Law and Finance, to draft a policy revision for a vote in June by the full common. A request by Ald. Brunette to the Finance Committee which states: "To create a policy or amend an existing policy to prohibit or prevent city personnel from the offices of Clerk, Mayor, Law, Finance, and IT in soliciting, accepting, or using any donation in the form of money, grants, property, or personal services from an individual or a nongovernmental entity for the purpose of funding election-related expenses, voter education, voter outreach, or voter registration programs with the exceptions of compensation of poll workers, securing leases for polling locations, and PPE for voters and volunteers."

Moved by Ald. Bill Galvin, seconded by Ald. Brian Johnson to refer to staff including a report with bullet points explaining what the City did with the monies as it relates to voter education, outreach and registration. Was there any type of targeting done in these areas?

Motion Passed.

Yes- Bill Galvin, Brian Johnson, Jim Hutchison

10. A request by Ald. Brunette to the Finance Committee which states: "For staff to prepare a list of five to ten ideas for acceptable uses of remaining ARPA funds under each of the five already approved categories with the goal being a more holistic approach for allocating funds."

Moved by Ald. Brian Johnson, seconded by Ald. Bill Galvin to refer to staff until the June 21st Finance meeting for proposals that have been presented or held for possible consideration, and to place this item for discussion on the July 26th Finance agenda for consideration of additional ideas presented by staff and Council.

Motion Passed.

Yes- Bill Galvin, Brian Johnson, Jim Hutchison

F. INFORMATIONAL.

1. 2022 Contingency Account: \$200,000.00.

2. The next Finance Committee meeting will be held on Tuesday, June 21, 2022 at 4:30 PM.

G. ADJOURNMENT.

Moved by Ald. Bill Galvin, seconded by Ald. Jim Hutchison to adjourn.

Motion Passed.

Yes- Bill Galvin, Brian Johnson, Jim Hutchison

H. VERBATIM MINUTES.

- Two. Alder Galvin is present, Alder Hutchison is present, Alder Johnson is present. Entertain a motion to approve the agenda.

- So moved.

- Second.

- All right, we have a motion by Galvin, a second by Hutchison. I am gonna offer up an amendment and I'm gonna request that we move item number 10 after item six. And the reason I'm requesting that is if we're gonna talk about the ARPA allocation process, I think it makes sense to have that discussion before making votes on additional ARPA allocations.

- I'll second that.

- All right. So we have a motion by Johnson, a second by Galvin. Any further discussion on the amendment? Seeing none. All those in favor, say aye.

- Aye.

- Aye.

- Oppose, motion carries. Any additional discussion on approval on the amended agenda. If not, all those in favor, say aye.

- Aye.

- Aye.

- Oppose, motion carries. Entertain approval of minutes.

- So moved.

- Second.

- Motion by Hutchison a second by Galvin. Any discussion? Seeing none. All those in favor, say aye.

- Aye.

- Aye.

- Oppose, motion carries. Item E, regular business. Number one for consideration possible action to rescind or refund personal property taxes for account number 30039 Baker and MacArthur Inc for a total of 444.82.

- Motion approved.

- Any questions?

- No, I'm sorry.

- Second.

- All right. We got a motion by Galvin, second by Hutchinson. Any discussion? Seeing none, all those in favor say aye.

- Aye.

- Aye.

- Oppose, motion carries. Item two for consideration with possible action or report of the upgrade from High Pressure Sodium HPS, light emitting diode, LED streetlight financed by \$52,161.77 of 2021 carry-over funds. Director Grenier.

- Okay. Back on the March 8th meeting of the finance committee, the committee authorized the utilization of \$52,161.77 of 2021 carry-over funds to amend our budget for streetlight maintenance. The intent of that was to purchase LED streetlights to replace High Pressure Sodium street lights. And at that time, what we were projecting was that the payoff period, the return on investment was less than eight years in energy savings alone. Since that time, the Wisconsin Department of Transportation has updated their state purchasing contract. So we have revised numbers relative to the actual cost of the fixtures we are proposing to purchase. There's two individual fixture types, primarily the larger number of fixtures that we would be purchasing are what we refer to as a type B light, which is your segment lighting. There's also some type D lighting, which is a higher light output at intersections. The actual cost of fixtures are \$102 per fixture for the type B and \$174 for the type D. We went back and looked, entered those numbers into the original spreadsheet we had, which assumed to fix your cost of \$137 payback period in the four corridors that we originally had identified at averaging around eight years. The Velp avenue corridor is now at 3.7, military remains at 5.6. The Monroe avenue corridor will pay for itself in 5.3. And the main corridor will pay for itself in 0.9 years. So the payback period has shortened up because the cost of the pictures went down because the council had allocated the 52,000. We had money left over. With that money, we were able to purchase 35 additional fixtures that will be installed at the roundabout at... Well, not the roundabout, West Mason street from Hinkle street back to 141. And on Washington between Walnut and Maine, those additional 35 fixtures will save us approximately \$1,800 a year in streetlight electricity. So we're not expecting any action. I think appropriate action on this item would be to receive in place on file. But there are times I had a conversation with Director Ellenbecker about this. There are times that the committee and the council authorized staff to do things and you don't ever get a report back on successful projects. So we simply wanted to come back and report to you that the project was actually more successful than we had hoped, so that you had some feedback on that.

- Director Grenier, if I could make a suggestion. I know the light fixtures on Washington street in particular were called out. I don't know offhand if some of those were also in the Olde main district, but can you please consult with those respective bids? I know obviously light fixtures are switched out here in the Broadway district and I don't think they're appropriate fixtures for historic downtown. And so I think it's important that we have in districts where design standards matter. I think it's important that we have those open conversations with our business improvement districts and that stretch of Washington street is a really important one. And I think it's important that we have fixtures that make sense for urban areas. I'm not gonna make a motion to request that or anything, just to a courtesy. If you could please reach out to them and have that conversation.

- We can do that, but that's not what this is about. This is for the upper level street lighting, not the back fixture, pedestrian lighting.

- Yep. I understand that. I mean, I've been to a lot of historic downtowns all across the country, lighting matters. And I think that's an important dialogue that we engage in. So again, all I'm asking is that you just

please reach out to them, have a conversation about their plans and intents. We've had this conversation with community and economic development as well about the importance of a master design plan for street scape for our entire downtown corridor, whether it's Broadway, downtown or olde main. I think it's something that we have to move towards if we wanna get our downtown into a different level in terms of how people experience that space from design standard.

- Well, we've had that conversation with OBI and DGBI already and they ask that the...

- When?

- Within the past couple of months, when we asked them about redoing the pedestrian level lighting to get rid of the acorn fixtures on main street that keep getting hit by semis. It wasn't in the context of DGBI, it was in the context of OMSI relative to their pedestrian level fixtures. That conversation spawned additional conversation with them to identify that the upper level street lighting is a standard and that standard we are using on all city owned poles, being a cutoff fixture that's LED. Now pedestrian back fixtures, that's where economic development has talked about potentially allowing BIDs to have some individuality. But the upper level fixture even out in the legends district is intended to be the same fixture throughout.

- Yeah, and again, we're not gonna solve that problem today. I guess I'm not necessarily in the same camp as you perhaps, and that's okay, but we're not gonna solve that challenge today. But it is I think an important conversation that we have to have.

- Okay.

- So really this is just to report out. So you need to receive and place on file.

- That is correct.

- Okay.

- So moved.

- Second.

- We have a motion by Galvin, a second by Hutchison. Any discussion? Seeing none, all those in favor, say aye.

- Aye.

- Aye.

- All those opposed? Motion carries. Item number three. Consideration of possible action in the award of the TrueNarc Analytical Instrument to Thermo Scientific Portable Analytical Instruments Inc for \$31,804.02. It was laid out in the packet. Are there any questions, alders?

- Yep.

- Go ahead Alder Galvin.

- Obviously this is to analyze drugs taken during criminal investigations. Are we doing this because it's taking so long for the state to get back to us or because will this be usable in court or only as probable cause to then send it to the state to get analyzed?

- This particular machine hasn't been to the level of the state crime lab yet. It will be cheaper to do this rather than continually to buy the test poppers. The biggest benefit of this one is that it doesn't require officers to touch the narcotics. With the opioids and the fentanyl, it uses technology that's above my head, but it uses that you don't have to take out a sample, open the package early once it fits the criteria of the drugs that this tests. And it's just safer for them. It's quicker when you're not buying the test properly can still go to the state crime lab or be required by the district attorney's office. But the biggest thing is the safety side of thing. We saw this grant last year when the opioid crisis continued to rise and the state offered some grants, we wrote for it and it was approved.

- So if an officer pulls Joe Schmo over on a traffic stop, finds something suspicious, will he have to bring it into the station then and test it there or because if we're not using the poppers anymore, I mean, those of you could almost bring out to the scene and use. Is this how you see it happening?

- Good question. It is portable. It'll be stored at the station 'cause it's an expensive piece of equipment. But rather than coming across, we'll say a traditional, we'll say marijuana. It can still test for that or if it's got different things with it. But one, it is portable, but two, it can be used for that, absolutely. I know that the initial talks on it were known investigations where we reason to believe they have fentanyl, they have opioid type drugs, they're having it there. So it can quickly be tested and depending what you come across 'cause it's got hundreds of thousands of different drugs listed in its library. You may find that you're dealing with even some more nastier material where you call a timeout back off and then call in a hazmat type response team.

- Sure.

- We're getting 12 people trained per contract. How does the compensation work for their salaries? Is this coming out of, like if they're on off time and that kind of stuff. Is that come out of the PDs budget or is there other funding for that?

- That one, I don't necessarily have an answer to. I know that the drug task force and the drug task forces around the state have had that and trained their people to use it. My ideal spot is to kind of get a trainer with this. They're a very cop friendly organization. And if we could get an internal trainer that could train more, certainly our evidence people, those we could utilize that have already been trained with a drug task force that have returned to the police department. So we've kind of got some automatic people already trained to kind of get started that work a couple different shifts.

- All right. Well actually you just answered my second question 'cause I was gonna say it's enough to cover all three shifts. What with vacations and everything else that goes on.

- Yes, sir.

- Sounds like a great tool. I mean obviously the risk officers has been increasing. There's been a few incidents, I know. So yeah, everything we can do to make their lives more secure. This seems like a very small investment.

- Yes sir. And it's all covered by the grant. We just need--

- Exactly.

- Purchase and get reimbursed. So we're really excited for it.

- Good, good. It sounds good.

- Thank you.

- Thank you. Thank you.

- Is that a motion Alder Galvin?

- I have another question.

- Oh yeah, go ahead.

- I noticed that there's a packet that looks like there's 100 tests included for \$600. Is there an estimate of how many tests we're gonna run with this?

- I don't have that data, but what I did know when I talked to some trained personnel is I was under the impression that not everyone needs that. So maybe it depends on what packaging it's in because certain colored packaging, like say for whatever reason, they start using black garbage bags, that it can't get through or penetrate. And then we've used that. I know that we have not gone completely crazy with the budget with the fentanyl or opioid type testers. So we're definitely dealing with it, but it's not one that we're having to go to you all and ask for more money because we're running out of the testing strips or testing kits.

- Okay.

- We just test the drug.

- Okay. Thank you. Okay.

- Okay. So we had a motion by Alder Galvin. Alder you ready to second, okay. Any discussion? Seeing none, all those in favor say aye. Opposed, motion carries. Item number four, for consideration of possible action of accepting a state Harbor patrol grant of \$21,756 to reimburse 75% of the Marine unit board number 109. I don't even know how to say this word. Sponson replacement. Sponson, sponson. You could tell I'm not a boater. Is there any questions on this one?

- No.

- Alder Galvin.

- More of a statement. I was made aware of this issue with a long time ago and I thought it was taken care of. I'm actually happy to see it's being taken care of, but letting that boat go six years beyond the recommended replacement time, it'd be like letting someone go out in a squad car in a high speed chase without maintenancing that car for several years. And I'm glad we're getting it done, but I hope next time we can find a fixed someway, budget wise or grant wise much sooner 'cause these guys, in my opinion were at risk if they were out there this along past the changeover time. But I'm happy to see with it. We've gotten it and that it's not gonna be that we're getting some help with getting it done. So thank you.

- All right. So I think I heard.

- Yes.

- Second by Hutchison. Any further discussion? Seeing none, all those in favor, say aye.

- Aye.

- Aye.

- Oppose, motion carries. Item five for considerations possible action. The approval to purchase two new chassis and remounts from Custom Fire Apparatus Inc for up to \$920,000. This is funding that was previously

approved through the bond request. We've got more sticky, tangible numbers in the packet. Any questions for staff? This is really just to approve the purchase, I presume. Do we get a motion?

- I'll move.

- Move to approve.

- We have a motion by Hutchison and a second by Galvin. Any further discussion? Seeing none, all those in favor, say aye.

- Aye.

- Oppose, motion carries. Item six, for consideration of possible action. The purchased of two type one ambulances for \$565,092. 75 from Jefferson fire and safety, same situation as item five. Any discussion alders?

- Motion to approve.

- Second.

- We have motion by Galvin, second by Hutchison. Any discussion? Seeing none, all those in favor, say aye.

- Aye.

- Oppose, motion carries. All right. We're gonna jump down to item 10. A request by Alder Burnette to the finance committee, which states for staff to prepare a list of five to 10 ideas for acceptable uses of remaining our funds and each of the five already approved categories with the goal being a more holistic approach for allocating funds. Obviously Alder Brunette is not here. I did talk to him earlier today and he requested that we simply referred this to staff. If he was here tonight, that was going to be his motion. But I would certainly open it up to discussion from alders. Alder Galvin.

- I guess that's been kind of a concern at least of mine. And I think some other alders that we've been getting some of these recommendations from staff for funding for projects. And it's felt to me kinda like we get a few here, we get a few there. And I guess I would like to have seen, or if this comes to fruition, we will have all the ideas kind of put together in buckets that we can see so we can do our own research and see if maybe there's some we wanna move to the head of the list or the bottom of the list or see if there's something that can be... It gives us a little bit more of an idea of what we're spending and how we're spending it on the different projects. So I'm interested in seeing what we can come up with. I'm not sure we've had input from staff. We've had input from Alders. We've had input from the public. I'm not sure if there's gonna be any new ideas out there, but we can put everything on just one big list. Take a look at. I think that'll help a lot of us as we make our up our minds and approve or disapprove as we move forward.

- I agree with Alder Galvin. One thing that's a little bit frustrating though. On our last meeting, we went through these ARPA requests and they were pretty well vetted. And I think there were teams of people who had worked on these things. And I think there were well put together and they weren't something just thrown together. They were actually, it looked like they had been planned and they were put together and ready to go. I know there's this notion that things get to this city of Green Bay and then they get stalled. And then I watched us as a common council do exactly that in our last common council where we stalled these things and maybe justly, but we did stall them. And it kind of was frustrating for me because I saw businesses going. People were asked what businesses were lined up, but they were asking what businesses were lined up to go to some of these items where there was no money yet. And the city hadn't even approved it yet, being used as a reason why we shouldn't do it because there's no bit. It was kind of a vicious circle. So I totally agree with getting everything on a spreadsheet or in a list that we can all look at. But at the same time, it's a little fighting that we aren't going on some of these things that make total sense to do, especially when we're talking about

people purchasing properties and homes, and they need this relatively now because things are changing month by month. And what's appropriate now may not be appropriate in three months when we finally approve some of these things. So I guess I tend to say, if we want to look at everything, maybe we should look at those things that have been vetted and approve those or a portion of those six remaining and some of these new ones and then not keep everything for the end. I'm just concerned that we're missing opportunities by more or less pushing these down the road. That's my concern.

- Thank you Alder. I think director Feltz had his hand raised. Oh sorry. Chief.

- Oh no, it's good. I'll be really quick and I'm sorry for jumping in here. But I just wanna make sure that the committee and Alder Burnette is aware that we were aware of the communication. And I think these items were put on here because there might be a timing issue with them. So we plan on the next June meeting to do exactly what was requested, but these, I think have more timing issues to it. So that's kind of why they're at this meeting.

- Okay. Thank you chief. Alder Galvin, if you could just hold for one moment.

- Sure. Alder Grant has her hand raised.

- Yeah, a few things. I understand these were planned and ready and time sensitive, but I think there's a difference to spending this unique opportunity wisely. When you're looking at a full budget, it's very smart to look at all of your options instead of quick spending. I reviewed the survey that was sent out to residents and a big chunk of it was a refund of taxpayer dollars. And I also saw a lot of complaints about roads, flooding and easy way to somewhat do that and serve all the residents is finding projects that would save local taxpayer dollars. These ARPA funds are federal taxpayer dollars, whether people realize that or not. So some projects have come to my attention that are going to need local taxpayer dollars coming up. And I see this as a unique opportunity to spend federal ARPA funds on some local projects that would give relief to taxpayer dollars, which again was a big response in the survey that we sent out. And I just don't know if we're necessarily paying attention to that survey. And again, now I have time and I do have some things that I'm putting together. Won't be presenting soon. So I just wanna make sure we're not rushing and it does not come around often. And I think we have to be very careful and wise on how we spend it.

- Alder Steuer, you had your hand raised.

- Yes. Thank you Chair. There was a couple things here. I had the opportunity to meet with Susan House today. I also met with Director Grenier, Director of Stechschulte and Wig, talked to and about ARPA funds and projects and things on that order. There were a number of things even that I talked to them about that came forward and I'm putting together a list myself as well. And that's why I'm thinking the short wait, I think is good. Not only for the new alders, but also for alders that have been here for a while because I would behoove alders, the directors and talk to them about projects and things that they think are important. We were looking and when I talked to Susan today, it seemed like it really, it came down to things like increasing jobs, improving neighborhoods and fighting crime. Those are kind of catchalls, but there's a lot of things that can fit in each one of those three categories. So I think that's important to kind of look at. I talked to director Wigg and Stechschulte and I think some of the programs that they have, some of the grants that they have, some of the different things with housing and all sorts of things that there's nuances with federal monies, state monies, local monies, a lot of it that's really, really hard to keep up with. And I think it's important that they're gonna send me a list of what they think is important as well. And I'm gonna look at that. So I think it's important to gather as much data as we can, get that down. And I would behoove each of the Alders to really reach out to the department heads, just to kind of finalize some of the requests that they have. I don't think it's bad that we've waited, but I agree with Alder Hutchinson that we have to move fairly quickly on this and I'm thinking that we can do that. So thank you.

- Thank you Alder Steuer. Alder Galvin.

- Thank you. I wasn't gonna mention it, but after listening to some of the comments, I think it was pretty self-evident that I was pretty frustrated at the last council meeting. We had a lot of items on the agenda that night. Luckily, somehow we were able to get 'em approved, but there are several that were not approved. I understand there's a learning curve for new alders, but if you're running for office and you've got something like 23 million in ARPA funds sitting there that was certainly talked about a while ago, educating yourself on these, especially as we're moving into council and we're looking for approval is what you were elected to do. And to put off some of these is we're gonna end up with the same thing as we've had before, where we lose projects or projects can't be done because we've waited too long. You're talking about trying to help people get a leg up and buy homes in our city to help our city improve itself. Interest rates are going up while we're delaying this. The ability for people with businesses waiting for help to either restart or move their businesses forward is being delayed. And if you ask them, getting loans from banks is difficult. The interest rates continue to rise. Really some items that were very, not talking a lot of money when you compare it to the overall package, we're doing nothing but slowing things down. And I think doing more harm than good. And that's why, you know, again, I approve of having everything put in a bucket, but to sit there and once again, stall things because we wanna make sure, well, unfortunately, a lot of this, we made sure before the election and those things were moving forward and we can't stop. If we gotta stop everything we're doing every two years because of an election, we're not doing the people that we work for, the people that voted for us, we're not doing them any good by stalling things. Thank you.

- Alder Grant.

- Just to let you know to Alderman Galvin, we received the form to submit a proposal two weeks ago as a new member. So it's not necessarily that we aren't paying attention include in, it's the process of coming up with proposal, meaning with department heads and submitting it. So I think that or necessarily stopping things, but again, the taxpayer dollars could potentially be used. Where are the proposals for flooding? Those are main concerns, crime. I'm just not seeing proposals that are coming to the table, in my opinion, that are top of prior that I've heard from. So that's why I don't think this is something wise to jump the gun on.

- And that's why it was pointed out at the meeting that there's a considerable amount of money that has not been allocated for anything. It's still out there waiting for other citizens, other alders to come forward with more ideas. If we had approved everything at that meeting, over half of the money that's been allocated to the city of Green Bay is still available for being allocated to specific projects. And that's why delaying these now seems kind of shortsighted to me. Thank you.

- Alder Steuer. Oh, sorry, Alder Grant. Do you wanna finish that?

- Just really quick. If I recall correctly, all of those combined though were 1.7 million. That's not a small chunk of change. And some of this stuff on the agenda tonight is also big. What was the one, 1.6 million? These aren't small things. So I think it's... I mean how much roads could be fixed with 1.6 million? How many sewer drains?

- And how many sewers and how many roads would ARPA laws allow us to fix. And I think you could ask Ms. House about that or director Ellenbecker, how many roads can we fix and follow the ARPA rules? How many sewers can we fix and follow the ARPA rules?

- Guys, I wanna make sure that we're staying on topic here. And the topic is whether or not to request staff for examples of projects in each bucket. So that's what's at a conversation here. Alder Grant, any additional comments?

- No, just I am meeting with Ms. House next week. So I'm working on my due diligence with that.

- Okay, Alder Steuer.

- Just to follow up on the comment, Alder Galvin brought up about a few of these things that were delayed. For example, we talked about the neighborhoods, neighborhood associations. We were talking about 150,000. Well, one of the things I talked about with staff today with Director Wig and Stechschulte was looking at the possibility of a halftime LTE position in the neighborhood association. They're a little weak in that area and I can come up with the reasons why I think that's important. So I would be adding actually let's say 50,000 to that request and I'm gonna be putting that in. So, I'm not necessarily here to say, well, we're gonna take that away and we're gonna stop that. I think part of it is looking at the issue and saying, "You know what, I think we can do a little bit better "after talking to the department heads." And I did do that today and I got a lot of ideas. And there are some things that maybe I didn't follow up as strongly in the past, but now I feel like I'm following up on that. So with that being said, I will do my due diligence and hopefully get done very shortly. Thank you.

- Yeah. Nate. Alder Hutchinson, go ahead.

- Okay. One final comment for me is some of the things we push back and I'm trying to address it as per item 10 for the staff to prepare. Some of the things we put a hold on where things that would directly affect property prices, taxes that would be paid by young home buyers, they indirectly address everything that is of concern. Taxes, building roads with the money that we get from the taxes and all those things, it's not roads, sewers, but it's an indirect thing. And so it would follow through with it with these new homes being built by the error bought by these people. So there's the direct way and indirect way. So I think we can get a few things a different way than directly if we look at some of these items. That's all. And the new ones that will be. I guess we wanna make a motion.

- I just like to comment really quickly too and if I recall correctly and this is of course really early in the process. At one time I was told staff alone were worth million dollars worth of ideas and of course, that didn't even include what was coming through the survey responses from our community. Recognizing that not all those ideas are gonna qualify, we know that. But if we had \$100 million worth of ideas being generated at the staff level and of course we're giving these piece meal, it's not giving us the holistic approach, I think that some of erase that point at the last meeting and I understood, there were some at the last council meeting that I supported 'cause I wanted to deploy those resources right away in our neighborhoods in particular, and others I was okay with holding in anticipation of this because I think when we talked last month, I felt like there were a lot of comments from all committee members that something about the process was a little bit disjointed. We wanted to see something better, but we didn't have an agenda item to really go down that path and talk about what a better process looks like. Now we have that opportunity. So I would support a referral, but the other piece that I want the committee to maybe weigh in on it's one thing to refer to staff and say come back with your ideas because you know, part of that prompts, of course, all of those ideas that might on paper right now that haven't come before us, it gives us the opportunity to see all of those ideas. But I also wanna make sure that every member of Council has sufficient time to properly contemplate the things that they would like to submit, so that way we don't end up in another delay a month or two from now. So if we wanna really look at this holistically, where everybody has ample time to submit proposals and ideas, but more importantly, give staff, Susan Alice in particular enough time to vet whether or not they're qualifying expenditures, what is an appropriate time frame look like. And Susan, if I could just look to you to maybe weigh in on that in terms of what do you think you would need to be able to vet out any submittals that might come your way?

- Thank you for allowing me to speak. I believe that June 21st deadline could be doable because I am meeting with my with already to the alders next week, so I'll have that list for senior leadership and they can pull their ideas and review the list that I provide them early in the month.

- What was that June 21st date? What...? I mean, is that just the finance meeting?

- Yes. The finance or Common Council,

- It's the next finance meeting.

- Okay.

- I mean, committee members, what do you think? I mean, is that mean that gives staff a couple weeks here, but then you know, I mean maybe some of the new alders that have felt a little bit disadvantaged in terms of being able to submit their requests as all their grants since you have spoken on this, do you think that's enough time? Yep, okay.

- When would I guess if we wanna present an idea, when then would we have to present it for the 21st meeting? When is it due for agenda?

- Just gonna jump in here a little bit. Typically the agenda gets put together the Thursday before so would be the 16th. And so the process, I mean I would shoot for a June 10th, probably the Friday the 10th. So that maybe by Monday that Susan can start rolling it up into the complete report. And then at that point it usually gets shared with the department heads and or the mayor's office for consideration after Susan has already gone through and gathers whether or not it's eligible and then what category it comes from. So I guess I would shoot for June 10th or Monday the 13th as by the 15th we really need it back in Susan hand if we're gonna move it forward, so should get it in the package for the 16th. And so that it would be available on the packet that goes out over the weekend and available for the finance meeting on the 21st, so 10th or 13th.

- Director Ellenbecker, some of the feedback at least that I've gotten from a couple alders is that if they've got something they want to submit, they wanna make sure it shows up and not that it goes through a filter and removed. So how can we ensure that that happens?

- I mean I guess it's really the wishes of your... That anything that is being submitted be brought back to the finance for consideration.

- Okay. And if something doesn't qualify, I think it's perfectly appropriate for staff to say it doesn't qualify, but I would also encourage staff to offer guidance. And what I mean by that is say it doesn't qualify, but if you structured it this way, it could. 'Cause sometimes things aren't always black and white.

- I'm assuming that there's gonna be some upfront the week, the couple days before the 10th if an alder is going to present, they should be talking with staff and have it presented in a right way that's acceptable by either. I don't think something should be submitted the first time on the 10th or 13th and expect to make an iron. It should be vetted with each alder or whoever, and then if it survives and it's put on the list.

- You know, Alder Hutchinson I get that. And this is what, honestly maybe June 21st makes me feel a little bit uneasy, because now I feel like we're being forced to make almost \$20 million worth of decisions in two weeks. So, the question really is, do we have to? Is the expectation that we're trying to allocate all of the available funding by then or a certain amount?

- Well, that's a great point and I guess my point is maybe we should phase it because we do have certain things that they're up, they're ready. We have certain things that haven't even been presented yet, but they'd be great and they wouldn't take too much to put forward. But maybe we should have a goal to have half the remaining money allocated quickly, and then the other half another month or something or two approach versus trying to get it all together now in two weeks. I agree with you that two weeks is not a lot of time to get the whole thing. Cut into a pie.

- Susan, could you provide a little insight for us now that the... For those that have been here, reminders good for those that are new, maybe it's the first time they're hearing this but the timeline. When do committees have to be made? When is the expenditure? Can you just kind of talk us through that?

- So we do have the funds through December 31st, 2024. At that point, all funds have to be obligated, meaning we have to show where every dollar is gonna be spent. We don't have to have it spent, we just have to have an obligation for every dollar. We have to have all of the money spent by 2026. So for an example, would be a construction project, or perhaps all that money isn't spent by 24, but it will be by 26.

- Oh, besides. One thing I think of interest rates, what are the other things that are rushing us to push some of these through? Because of interest rates are the only thing. I mean, that's a small percentage. I mean, they're not climbing by 3% every day. We have a year and a half with that date. I don't see why we have to have a three week deadline. I would push. I know we don't have a meeting now. What's the first meeting in July for finance? I apologize. I know there's no council. I'm so sorry I don't have it in front of me.

- So it's July 26. We'll have one finance in July, July 26, so that it's ready when the August 2nd council meeting comes around.

- So I don't think I can motion anything. I guess my proposal would be July 26th as the deadline and we vote stuff in August.

- Well, is there anything, Susan that is time sensitive that if we don't act on it now that we would lose the opportunity?

- The items like for example the items today, I put them on the agenda knowing that we did have this communication to address. I put them on the agenda because they were time sensitive for the project to get completed, otherwise we would have to wait a full year. So there I'm bringing those items right away.

- Okay, Alder Hutchinson.

- I guess... I'm a little bit concerned that we're gonna be pushing this way back and then because if we would clearly have a list in July that we can pick from, I can just see us getting balled up and not coming to a clear resolution because the bigger the list, the more decisions that are gonna have to be made as to what goes and what doesn't. And yet we have some really viable alternatives set up and I guess in my mind I guess I could see those dissipate, but there's a lot of good staff time that are already in those and they do make a lot of sense in terms of spending money in a way that does what we... That the monies were supposed to be used for. So, we're almost up delaying those, out of contention in a way. And I would see that as unfortunate. And that's just my view.

- Alder Galvin.

- I understand waiting on some things obviously, but we've got proposals that were set aside at the council and to go and help people buy homes. I talked about interest rates, but what about the businesses? How long do we keep telling business owners? Hey, wait another month, wait another month, wait another month. And then they're moving away. Storefronts are empty because how long are we gonna delay? We're looking at 1.6 for safer routes to school. Now that's a plan that was approved by this council years ago and the city just hasn't had the funds that move. Now we're looking at ARPA funds that could put in bus signals for children crossing streets, speed signs in school zones remind drivers to slow down, and these are things we can't wait till October, November, December to have them in place. It would be better for everybody involved in the safety of the children to have them in place by September when school starts. So like I said, some things can wait, but some things I think need to move forward. And like I said, there is money there for these things and still more that hasn't been allocated.

- Alder Steuer. You're on mute. You're muted, sir.

- Sorry about that. Thank you, chair. I think there are a lot of projects that each of us is alders have pet projects that we would like to see happen. But I do agree with the committee talk that a lot of it has been

vetted already. So after meeting with the department heads today and I'm gonna meet with one or two next week as well, I'm gonna lean heavily on kind of some of the things that they're bringing forward. And for the buck kind of stuff. So if we can utilize money wisely moving forward rather than just spending it on an item. Seeing the maximum benefit that we can get from this, I think that'll be important. So I'm gonna be leaning quite a bit on department heads and staff on this and I think we can do some good things. Thank you.

- But I guess the real question here is if we refer this to staff. The June meeting. Do you want it at the July meeting.

- Alder Johnson, is it something that you would want to look at? The list that's pending as of June 21st and then I'm going that there's additional items come through or do you wanna just wait? Like I said until July?

- I'm trying to recall what was the motion at council? A number of those items were held, but if I'm not mistaken. And I bold held until the next council meeting. which is what June 7th.

- June. Yes,

- Right. And so we don't have the authority to change that motion. So regardless of what we do here today, the agenda is on June 7th, right?

- I thought they were held on June 28, the second meeting in the June.

- Susan is right.

- They get help to June 28th.

- Correct.

- But I think they're the assumption then through finance, to be discussed and then it would end up back at the June 28th meeting at council.

- Okay, so here's what I'm thinking. Because we gotta get to a decision here. And I think there's the the opportunity here perhaps for a couple faces. Something you're seeing in other communities is proposals are being submitted. You've got a committee that's scoring them, you're prioritizing them even at the county level. They're taking everything holistically, and they're making decisions later. We just are kind of trying to decide on a process. It's kind of a really awkward situation. So I think what I'm inclined to say is let's for for those proposals that are out there, meaning that have been presented to us, whether they're held or about to be taken up, that perhaps, the June 21st meeting is when we re-evaluate those along with any other new proposals that staff is ready to present and then recognize that to give some alders adequate time to provide their recommendations or suggestions that we take up this discussion and issue again at the July finance meeting. Recognizing to just do and let's not be hasty and allocate all the funds. Does that make sense? It's both sides here. Those people that say we've got thorough work that's been put in and these items are ready to act on, but also giving those who wanna submit proposals time to do so. Is that a fair compromise? And of course the dilemma that you're gonna have for those proposals that are out there come June, if we say we're not gonna hold, we need to act. We don't wanna hold this. But if people still wanna see a more holistic approach, you face the unfortunate circumstance where your items might just be denied altogether. So just kind of keep that in the back of our minds. Alder Galvin, you're muted.

- I'll second that motion.

- Was that a motion?

- Sounded like it.

- Director Ellenbecker, can you summarize that?

- Within perfect--

- I'll define it. Move to refer this to staff and instead staff come June 21st meeting with a handful of recommendations, including items that were held for possible consideration and to place this item for discussion on the July 26. Finance agenda for consideration of additional ideas submitted by staff and council.

- Any discussion?

- Yeah, so that was the motion, Alder Galvin. I believe that was a second. So Alder Hutchison, go ahead.

- Would there be a chance to approve some items at that June finance meeting to go to county council?

- The way my motion is worded, yes.

- Okay, I'm sorry I missed that. Is there a need to establish a grading system? I mean, can we do that with this motion? Or it would be great to have a grading system, you brought it up and it would be great to be able to have a methodology to establish a grade for each alternative that's presented.

- We can add that to the motion and request staff.

- Okay, I would--

- Create a draft of a grading system.

- Yeah, I would amend the motion to include a grading system to allow us to review each alternative, to determine money saving safety, health, whatever. I'm sure there's grading systems out there for these alternatives. If staff could recommend one to us at that meeting also.

- Okay. Director Ellenbecker.

- Yeah. I just wanna kind of come back to when I kind of... I've gotten the impression a couple times. It feels like it is all ad hoc kind of that we're bringing in these items to you. And I mean, I kind of really, wasn't a big part of the ARPA request, but the game plan that was brought to the council was to take the total dollars, we put 'em in the buckets. And so that was approved by a council to have these \$10 million buckets one and a half, the three, 6 billion buckets. And at that point, then the next step was then to have the department heads out of each bucket kind of come back and bring proposals. And if you had an idea that chained to that bucket, then you'd work with that department head. So there was a process, there was some methodology. We took the total bucket, broke it down into smaller buckets. And at that point it was kind of given to the department heads to kind of move forward with projects they thought they needed or wanted for those buckets. Of course, the \$10 million bucket, which is the lost revenue, which roads can only be in that bucket 'cause that's not otherwise a qualified expense in this bucket. That one is a little more open that is really up for more consideration because that's a little wider. Almost anything almost can go in that bucket. So I kind of wanted to just bring that. That was kind of the methodology. There was methodology when it came to, it was kind of got broke it down in buckets, but just kind of wanted to remind that really for the two, I mean, the new alders are on, that was kind of our approach a year ago when we kind of brought this through.

- Okay, well then thank you. That's very informative. Maybe then we refer these alternatives to the appropriate department head to evaluate and come back. Would that make sense for the new projects that come at us in June?

- Yeah. I think part of the struggle admittedly that I'm having and perhaps some of the other alders is that as policy makers, we're not really involved. Meaning that we're being given an option and tell us yes or no. And we're not being involved in this holistic approach for us to really evaluate kind of the highest apps in our community. So, I appreciate that background Director Ellenbecker, but I think that's where some of the pushback maybe is coming in right now, is that a lot of members of council wanna have a little bit more engagement with understanding all of our options.

- Okay. So I just think that maybe that's where a little bit of the communication gap is. It was kind of, I think we left it, oh, you guys helped pick the buckets. You approve the buckets. Now we're coming back with projects within the bucket. So certainly you can change in any way the methodology or how we bring. And again, I think your recommendation is projects that have been submitted that haven't been brought to you. There's new ones that are gonna be coming. We certainly can bring you some kinda list of items that have been on hold that are in the works that are on . Bring that back to you on June 21st. And then at that point you have a little more holistic look on what's out there and at that point, then you can decide what your next steps are.

- Okay. So I'm gonna go back to Alder Hutchison, did you still want staff to?

- Well, that kind of cuts across everything they've been doing and it's... I guess if we have the list of projects that will be in June that would help us see how much would be left or maybe we're over the limit. And then we could start knowing that we'd have to bring it down. I guess it all depends on what the list looks like in June, if we need a grading system or not. I'd hate to have to develop something that's never used. So I guess as I'm talking out loud, maybe we can look at that in June because we really don't have a lot of time to develop a grading system and use it by June. But maybe as a help, if there is a grading system. Well, I guess we could each look out and see if there is a grading system that we could maybe recommend maybe if it comes down to push versus shove with these projects that overrun the amount that we allowed in each bucket.

- Alder Steuer, you had your hand raised.

- Yes. Thank you, chair. What was I gonna put this? Is there a way that we maybe Susan House could talk about this or Director Ellenbecker, as far as having some kind of a spreadsheet or that kind of would list each of these items that have already been spoken for. Also, what's left over, et cetera. Just some kind of a graphic that we could all take a look at. I don't know if that's something that's been requested or if that's already part of the process, but I always like to look at graphics at least to something simple, straightforward, just kind of showing what's there, what's been spent, if we're on a timeframe, you could have it set all the way out to 2024 if you wanted to. I don't know. That's just one of my thoughts.

- This isn't graphic by any means, but if you on page 65 of the 65 page packet, it just gives you numbers. But it'll tell you where we are as of to date as of the day that buckets, it'll tell you how on the page 64 talks about the 23 million, how it was allocated into the five different buckets shows you what has already been approved. And then on page 65, now it same numbers, but now allocated into the different buckets and how much is remaining in each bucket. Not graphical by any means. We certainly can throw a graph and or chart on it, but we did want to give you at least a recap of these do not include any of the items that have been held and it does not subtract anything that was requested today. These are all dollars that have been obligated. And so those are--

- And I think that's a good thing, having that, but I'm just wondering, even with those buckets, there might be several projects that fall within that. So it would be kind of nice to see a breakdown of that as well over time when the money is allocated. Is that possible? Maybe Susan knows.

- On the city webpage under the mayor, there's ARPA funds, the ARPA funding category. You can click on that and you can see a couple of different graphics of where the money has been spent or where it's been allocated already. And we have approved so far. I update it once a month with our IT staff.

- Okay, all right. That's good know.

- Okay. So we have the motion on the table. Susan, one other thing, just kind of more informational. It doesn't have to be part of the motion, but as I gave that example before about the dollar volume of requests that I had heard staff was discussing, if even you could come back with information along the lines, just to give us some perspective of the magnitude of some of the items being discussed. I think it would be very helpful for us.

- Okay.

- I can do that.

- Great. Thank you. Okay. So we have the motion, we have the second. Is there any further discussion? Seeing none, all those in favor say aye.

- Aye.

- Aye.

- Opposed. Motion carries. All right, we are onto item seven for considerations possible action. The use of American Rescue Plan Act allocation within the capital needs and organization priorities category for a total of \$148,100 to be used for project number 5-1-205 Police Department Fence.

- Alder Galvin.

- Seeing as I'm wheeler, then the chief and Kevin work. That fence has been long overdue. Going back into history, we had squad cars set on fire in the back parking lot right next to the building. We've had people escape the building and escape the area while in custody. We've had certain individuals within our community putting our department under surveillance. Seeing when our SWAT team was preparing to go out on drug raid and then tipping off the people we were gonna raid. We've had officers cars continuously vandalized. I could go on and on with all the problems our city and our department have experience because we do not have a secure parking lot. Department of Public Works has some secure parking lots. The Water Department has a secure parking lot and yet the Police Department does not. We're leaving ourselves wide open. People could infiltrate our building. And in fact, they have infiltrated our building in the past. So this fence is long, long overdue. I think it's something that should have been done when that place was built.

- All right. Director Ellenbecker I'm just gonna ask you a question. And of course chief, if you wanna weigh in, I want you to have that opportunity. But Director Ellenbecker, when is the ad hoc facilities committee slated to reconvene? And the reason I'm asking, of course my stomach is a little uneasy authorizing a quarter of a million dollars for a fence when we're literally in the middle of a process to determine our long term facilities need. So can you just give me some insight on when that group is ready to reconvene?

- The expectation would be sometime in June. I believe they've reached out to BSA and asked them to update a quote. Yeah, not a quote, update some information that they had provided for us five plus years ago. And so we don't have that information back. So I think the assumption was it'd be early, probably mid-June when that next meeting would come around.

- Okay, Chief Davis, did you wanna provide any commentary?

- Yeah, thanks. You know, I would echo what Alder Galvin says and frankly, this project is already delayed even just in the time that I've been here because we've had to go through... I will spare you all of the complexities of dealing with this issue, but you realize there are some ideas out there potentially to replace that facility at some point. Right now that's about a 75 million expense to replace that facility. And so the reason why we're

bringing this up right now is relatively low chances that we're going to be able to replace it at any time soon. And also the fact that this is something that at least two sides of it along the streets could be used in a new facility construction on that same footprint. But this is just to be Frank about it, a pretty safety issue that we have, and also potentially an area of liability exposure to the city. If something happens to one of our employees and we have been having this conversation for a while, I wanna stay in my lane and not pretend I work for the city attorney's office, but I am. This is a pretty high for us from a employee safety standpoint.

- Alders, do you have any other questions?

- No, I just like to point out, I met the chief a week or two ago just to meet and greet, and I accidentally drove their parking lot 'cause you can just drive right through it. And I realized, oh my gosh, I'm in the police department's parking lot. And I was kind of like, there should be a fence. So the other question then, which is gonna be very relevant to the next item as well, which is we just had a discussion about holding APER requests, referring them to staff. So as a committee, we're gonna have to make a decision here if we want this to come back with the other proposals or if this is something you wanna advance to full city council with a recommendation right now. So it's open Alder Galvin.

- And I'm trying to remember and Director Ellenbecker, maybe you can help me, but out of this 140, wasn't 100,000 allocated by bonding or something?

- Yeah. If you look on the report page, actually the full quote that I think our DPW put together is actually 248,000 for this fence. So we did bond 100,000. It's still sitting in a. And so the 148 that they're asking is really the remaining balance of the full estimate for this fence. And I do believe when I talked to the chief just the other day, the reason why this is as Susan House has said that this is the timeliness is, I guess I'll let chief answer it as like, if we don't approve it now, it potentially waits another year if I remember that right based on the timing of getting the bids and quotes and I'm not sure exactly why. I could let the chief talk to that, but that is one of the reasons why it came on today 'cause obviously we knew this whole discussion is but 10 was on this list. And so the only two items that came on this list were things that potentially had a like a type.

- Chief Davis.

- Yeah. That's exactly right. We can't because they have to dig in the ground to plant where the fence posts go. That can't happen once it freezes. And so we're up against the clock when the weather gets bad. And our plan originally to account for that had been to do all of the prep work for this over the winter and actually to have started construction on this by now, So we are already behind. So it is gonna be tight no matter what for us to get a contractor and get everything going. And any further delays, I can't guarantee you that we can have this project done by the end of the year, which means it waits until next spring.

- Alder Steuer.

- Thank you Chair. Well like Director Ellenbecker said, we've already bonded 100,000 for this. I've heard the comments about the safety issues and driving through and et cetera from Alder Galvin and also Alder Hutchinson. I would vote for this right now if I'm not on the committee, but if this goes to council as is, I would support it. Thank you.

- Alder Galvin.

- I would also just make a comment. I remember reading up on this when we were studying this like 100 years ago. Actually the chiefs of police organizations recommendations for best practices is not a simple fence because it can still be driven through with the right kind of vehicle. Actually what they cement brick walls with consent wire and the whole nine yards kind of turning it into a militaristic fort if you will. But again, when you think about all the evidence that is stored at that building, if someone were to damage that and destroy all that evidence or even some of that evidence, the cases that we could lose, the potential damage, the potential

damage for injury or loss of life. If a fence can prevent that, then... And like Alder Grant was talking about, are we using the money wisely? Well it looks like we're trying to divvy it up. Some of it is gonna be taken on by the local taxpayers through bonding and some of it's gonna be taken on the backs of the taxpayers federally. I think this was a wise use of the money, spreading it out so to speak as was to ask for. But I think it kind of hits all the buttons that some of the new alders are asking for. Thank you.

- Do we have a motion?

- Motion to approve.

- Second.

- A motion by Galvin, a second by Hutchison. Any further discussion. Seeing none, all those in favor say aye.

- Aye.

- Aye.

- Oppose. Motion carries. Item number eight for considerations possible action the use of American Rescue Plan Act. Allocation within the capital needs and organization priorities category for a total of \$1,600,000 to be used for project number 5-3-209, pedestrian and bike plan project. Alder Galvin.

- I'm on the committee helped out with the studies that were done several years.

- Alder Galvin.

- The safe routes to school committee. And it was quite a lengthy process that was done over quite a period of time with quite a few people involved with it. And then some very smart people put all this stuff together with best practice recommendations. If you hear 1.6 seems like a lot of money, but every school has been screaming and crying for more protection for their children to and from schools. I mean the children being hit by cars and near misses, people complaining about motorists. They want police out there that we can't provide to do enforcement action. And if you look at the list of schools, almost every school in the city of Green Bay, something out of this, which will hopefully make children walking to and from school safer. So again in the timeliness, so it'll delay too long. I mean, this has to be put out for bids, the construction and everything has to be done. By the time it gets kicked in, we're in the winter already. And maybe it won't be done till next year. Granted what's a year, right. We've been waiting for how long? But if it's predictable, it's preventable. And I think this is a good use of our ARPA funds because we've been asking for these crossing aids in the past and there just isn't the money for it. Thank you.

- Alder Steuer.

- Thank you chair. Alder Galvin, I was gonna ask you when you were doing your studies, I don't know how many schools there are in Green Bay, there's quite a few. But it seems like that some of these safety procedures were what are at some of the schools, but not all of 'em. We're looking at doing all of the schools, correct.

- I mean, I can't say if 100% of the schools are gonna be getting some kind of aid. These are the schools that were documented without color than that risk list. The most that risk at top, and then they scaled on down to the bottom. So we're trying to get as many schools as possible to put in either the speed sign or they're crossing aids. And so I guess obviously we have some people here. Ms. Hummel or Dave Hansen who maybe answer some more of those questions for you.

- Yeah, in fact, maybe what I'll do alders before we start talking on the issue, I'd like to make sure staff has an opportunity to speak to the item. So I see Susan House has her hand raised, go ahead.

- I was just going to add that we took in the request, I did put in the request for 1.6. However, we probably will not be using all of that. The staff has been working with other municipalities, Green Bay school district to try to get their portion of the request funded by them. So the school district request would be funded by the school district. These roads, those items funded by the county. If we look at the neighborhoods close to the Oneida nation, maybe we could request Oneida nation to fund those. So the whole project does cost 1.6, but we are not asking for that. We would be looking to probably move this forward in phases. David Hanson and Stephanie Hummel will be able to provide the specifics on that.

- Sure. I had of course, over prepared and had an entire presentation already, but we definitely don't need to do that since Alder Galvin teed up my project very well. This plan was approved in 2019 by city council and has since had implementation done through our working group. So that's where this request is coming from. Dave and I will sit on that working group. We have Alders, we have school district reps. We have other staff, we have community experts. There's a lot of people in the entire goal to be to implement the plan. So for the past two years, we've been working on what we call our low hanging fruit. Things that are really easy to knock off, repainting roads to make bike lanes, doing some programming with our nonprofit partners. And this is a great opportunity because we don't get this kind of funding for many of our plans, but specifically for our bike and pedestrian plans. There's not a budget allocated to it. It's not a line item in anyone's budget. We just add them piecemeal as projects come around. But specifically for something like rapid flashing beacons, there's not a pool of money that has ever been associated with that sort of thing. It's just been as needed as requested for projects. So, Dave, I think that we can just skip ahead all the way down to the request themselves. We have a lot of information about crash data, how many crashes we're having. And that's a high number. It's been on the rise throughout the entire country, through our state, through our county and through our local agencies. So what we want to do is propose the addition of the rectangular, rapid flashing beacons, which if you don't know what those are, if they are things that are by our hospital and Webster avenue. 35 in place within the city where this request is for 64 additional ones. So Dave, if you wanna pull up some of the graphics and the maps to show this would be throughout the entirety of the city. So all older districts would be touched and it would be throughout the whole of the school district that's within the city of Green Bay. So there is a high amount of usage with all different types of users, because there'd be for pedestrians who solely use crosswalks, it's for people who would be utilizing the schools nearby, for people who are trying to get from community base to community base. So it does impact many people there.

- Yeah. Actually, I cannot share my screen. It says host has disabled screen sharing. So any of the graphics that we have, we're not able to show.

- Just a moment. We can get you access too.

- Thank you. In the meantime, we can go over some of the data with the rapid flashing beacons. They do have a 47% crash reduction rate and they have over 90% of the time people use them correctly and they stop and they let the pedestrians cross at those intersections or at those crosswalks. This is probably the highest efficacy rate that you'll see on this type of feature. There are many other things that people can employ, and the plan does have recommendations for a variety of different infrastructure things. However, these have the highest efficacy rate, and we think that they would be the most useful spend here to try to get the highest amount of reduction in crashes. All right, go ahead, Dave.

- All right. So just a little bit more detail on the project. We're looking at 64 RFBs combined with high visibility or high vis crosswalk. So just like the picture shows, this is what we call a continental marking. It's well known in the industry that this has a very high compliance rate with motorists to yielded pedestrians. You combine that already with the numbers that Stephanie had already described relative to crash reduction, almost 50% and almost 100% yielding rate. I mean, these devices when they first came out were almost looked upon. I mean, it's very revolutionary. And we do have five of these systems in place right now in the city, but we really

wanna be able to make best use of this safe walk and bike plan, which is where many of these are derived from. And then also in addition, what we did for some of the selection criteria was for any of the trail crossings at collector and arterial streets, where those would be located. And also there's many locations that have been scrutinized by either the public or perhaps there are safety issues with them. And this would be a great opportunity then to apply this technology and be able to see the results. Now, another component to this is the actual application itself for the high vis crosswalks. Probably about six to eight months ago we started looking at what it would cost to hire a contractor to do this type of work. And quite frankly, we're quite surprised at how high those costs are. So we actually started looking into doing this ourselves. As many of you know, we have a sign shop. Our sign shop also does pavement marking, and all the pavement markings that you see in our city streets are actually done by public work staff. So we had some discussions with them, talked with some contractors and came up with this MMA painting machine. Now MMA is the actual material. Right now we use a water based paint. You'll see on some of the larger projects that we do through the state, we'll use an epoxy paint. This is called methylphenidate, and it's a ultra durable material. Get between five and 10 years actually out of these markings, which is outstanding. I mean, there really isn't another product out there like this. So that was pretty much the selection criteria for the RFPs. But I'll do is I'm going to... Another application and hopefully everyone can see this. This is a Google earth image of the city of Green Bay. And you'll see red dots.

- David's still on the PowerPoint.

- Oh, it is. Let me see if I can, I'll do a stop share and then oops. Share to... Here we go. So you'll see, this is the entire city and it's pretty evenly distributed equity was safe walk and bike plan that was approved in 2019 by common council. And so you can see it's quite distributed. So for example, any of the red dots that you'll see, that would be what we call our three pole system that would be established on our major arterials that have divided roadways, so they have medians. And then these other locations that are in blue would be a two pole system, meaning that there is no median. There is no divided way. And these devices simply would be on either side of the roadway. So in some that's really project, I guess I'll call it project number one. Now we do have locations that we can share with you. I mean, we have 64 of 'em in the print. I'll be honest with you. It just was really not all that legible to put into our point presentation. And I will share it with anyone that would request it. And as a matter of fact, we did talk about this at the last traffic bike in PED commission meeting. And they did highly support the proposal at hand. They thought it was a very good idea and certainly went met the objectives at least of that commission. So project one, this comes in at a total of when you sub total the project itself. And this also includes curb ramps too. So if there's any non ADA style curb ramps, we would upgrade them to ADA standards and add the detectable warning fields. This is those truncated dome that you'll see that are used for the visually disabled. And so there there's a lot of work going in, at least on the infrastructure level. We're looking at about 834,000 total on that. I added 15 percentage. That's gonna be roughly 125,000. That's standard on all of our project estimates. And then adding in the high visibility. Excuse me, vis marking machine, which includes the paint, which include that in there. So this is roughly 60,000 and some change on that. And it's a two gun system. It's pretty much state of the art. So when you add all that up, we're looking at 1.018 million. Now that's project one. Now for the sake of time, I will move over to project number two. And since I have you on this screen, I'm just going to actually add those locations in. So what you see, I guess the color is appropriate in the fluorescent yellow green. What we are proposing to do is install driver feedback signs and school LED blinker signs. It's really kind of a two in one combination system that everyone has seen the school speed limit, 15 mile an hour signs, but we would do is LED blinker signs. So if the sign itself looks the same, we just add in the blinker element to it. And then below it would be the driver feedback sign, which is the your speed and it's blank until someone starts to speed then it shows them what speed that they're driving. Obviously you can set thresholds on this, maybe you don't want it to flash right at 15, maybe at 20, just to catch the excessive speeders. But the criteria used in this was, we obviously looked at every school. And if that school had a collector or an arterial street that bordered the school for one of these systems. The neat thing about this is although we don't have any systems like this in place, now we do have some blinker systems at various schools. Kennedy Elementary is one of them, Howell Elementary is another one of them. These are legacy systems, they're very old. They're very hard to maintain. As a matter of fact, we're looking at actually removing them and replacing them with these systems. Obviously we don't have any

sort of connectivity to what system would be, what we call a blink link system. I mean, if the lowest bidder who would be the provider that we've been working with on this, and there are others, and we would obviously competitively did this, would be to have a cloud based system so that we can do not only all the programming from our offices or from our shops, but we'll be able to also troubleshoot too. We'll get alerts when say a certain blinker is out. And right now, I mean, all we really do is we rely on staff going by and reporting it to us, or we get members of the public that will report 'em to us. So at least we'll be proactive in that way. We'll know when systems are down, we have problems. And the way that we'll power 'em in a very sustainable way. We are proposals. So we will have no public set or anything like that. So it'll keep costs down. Battery technology keeps getting better and better, and I'm very confident in the type of powering that we'll have for such a system. Just to break it down on the blinker sign system project, we are looking at 32 locations. And like I said, we looked at every school that would be in the city proper. So a number of sign assemblies would be 66. So we're hitting 32 schools and 66 of these sign assemblies cost would be \$503,250, engineering contingency, 75,500 for a total of \$578,738. So just in a nutshell, I guess in closing, what I really wanna do is just kind of emphasize. I know that there was some discussion on these buckets and the federal categories for ARPA money. And we believe that this project actually knocks off two of those check boxes. One is in response to a health emergency. No, this isn't COVID, this isn't anything of a pandemic nature, but I can tell you this. I ran some numbers on our crashes with bikes, bicyclist, I should say and pedestrians. And over the last five years, when it comes down to bicyclists, we've had 57 crashes. Two of those were fatalities and we had 55 injuries. Now injuries would, can be... These are what I would consider serious injuries. This isn't just a little scrape or anything like that. The numbers would be much higher if I did that. Capacitating injuries and non capacitating, but certainly no like sent to the hospital, may have been on crutches for a while that kind of an injury. So 57 crashes, two fatalities, 55 injuries over the last five years. Over to the next category of pedestrian. The numbers are actually higher. And when I say higher, we're talking two to two and a half times higher. So a number of crashes was 135 crashes over the last five years resulting in four fatalities and 139 injuries. In my opinion, I'm a traffic engineer. I may be biased on this, to me, that's a health crisis. That number should be zero. And this isn't not only amounting to a lot of financial burden, but there's a lot of mental health causes of people and a lot of strife and everything in this community. And this is a health emergency in my . The other category would be negative impacts to tourism and hospitality. I think if we... I mean, I just read that we are a number three city by U.S. news and world report, and that's great, but I think we should strive for number two and number one, because I think we can make this accessory friendly, much more bike friendly. I mean, we have, we've done a lot over the last couple of years. We've had bike lanes from downtown all the way to bay beach, got the first buffer bike lanes in. These are all things right out of the plant, kind of low hanging fruit as I call it sometimes. But we're exhausted of those now and now we're looking at something big. This community's been asking for it ever since I started here 16 years ago. This is, I guess you'd say very dear to me as a professional to see this project through. So with that, I believe that pretty much summarizes it. And I'm sure you have questions for either Stephanie or myself.

- Oh, I did just wanna reiterate that this was kind of a group effort, 'cause we have members of the police department, DPW and CED all within this working group. And this working group would be the ones who would be facilitating the project phase in follow up. So we know that education has to be a part of this. You don't just bombard a city with this many new features and not educate them on how to use them properly. So it'd be the working group who would go through with education pieces and with enforcement. We would use Frogger to our advantage to do them at these new locations. We would use the yields here neighbor campaign that Wellow was using. So it isn't just up to city staff to do a lot of this facilitation, a lot of this follow up. We have an entire working group to back us, which I think is really special about this project. Concerning the school district, they had a meeting last night where they are anticipating putting \$1.3 million to referendum in November for a portion of this type of work. So we thought it would be best to continue with the request for the 1.6 in case the referendum fails. 'Cause we do feel this project is very necessary for the city. However, there is definitely some wiggle room here as far as how you would like to do the project allocation. What you feel is the most fair way to do that, in a way that the other partners who would be available. However, we would have to wait until the referendum show exactly how much they will be able to allocate. So that's just more background on the funding piece of that puzzle.

- Alder Galvin.

- Maybe this is for Susan, a city were to approve 1.6 million, but the proposal from the school board was approved that referendum. Could we then pull back some of that money for other projects?

- Correct. So let's say we approve 1.6 million and really only use 1 million. I would request that this the remaining funds be unobligated to that project and bring forward another project.

- Okay. Thank you.

- So I think Susan, you mentioned this, I presume the only way the school district is looking at this is by referendum. I mean, are they looking at any other funding source?

- I'm not sure if they're looking at other... They did receive ARPA funds and they... I did not talk to the . I believe it was through the CED area that talked to the school district that they were moving this towards a referendum.

- Okay, and then you also mentioned the tribe, Oneida tribe. Was there any discussion with them?

- I have not had any discussion. I'm not sure if either the directors kind of respond.

- Director Stechschulte.

- Oh, I'm aware that there have been some preliminary conversation just about some general improvements with the nation. And I think this was one of the items that was mentioned and I think they expressed an interest, but I don't believe there's been a formal commitment at this point. But I do believe they would be interested in having additional conversations on this.

- Okay.

- Agreed. I think they were looking to see some of the more specific locations and with the impact would be to their community. But I definitely think that they're at the table.

- Alders. Steuer.

- Thank you, chair. Well, with the tribe being interested, I presume they would just be within their reservation boundary limits. So I would think that would be District 12, but that is that, am I correct in assuming that? Frank. Most likely older I think yeah. And there may be a couple of areas that are adjacent to to some of their facilities that may be in this in the city but not in the nation that would still directly accessible areas. But I believe I believe a majority there's areas would be directly influencing their territory, yes.

- So I guess there's no guess as far as how many of those spots there would be compared to the entire project. No idea. So I can speculate. That's fine. Thank you.

- Thank you, Galvin.

- Alder Steuer, I would say that they have three sisters and they have a couple other areas where they own a lot of homes, residential homes where the children are going to MLK, they're going to MacArthur, they're going to Southwest and also Lombardi Middle School, just to name a few. So I could see where they've got not only schools with their children, but they have many residents living within the city of Green Bay that are in those areas. I mean I know that their PD does work within the city too. So I could see where at least on that area within all the way down the Taylor Street where they would probably have some interest in at least seeing what our proposal is.

- Thank you.

- So. First off, I just want to commend staff. I mean, this is a really good presentation, thorough, in depth. Backed by data which I really like and you can tell it was really thought out and a lot of work was put into this. Just, maybe 2/2 bits of feedback. One is I think we just had a very lengthy debate about the multitude of our requests in front of us right now and holding to talk about those decisions that are June meeting and then subsequently at a future meeting. So that weighs on my mind. And in of course, if this committee can do what it wants, we can make that recommendation referral to full City Council. My hunch would be, though, that regardless of what we do here today. My hunch would be that it's gonna get held in favor of seeing that process through. The second point why I asked about discussions related to school district and the Oneida nation is because if we go ahead and authorize this 1.6 million, you've really taken off the table any incentive for people to be a partner because the funding is there now. And so what I would prefer to see is maybe some conversations first with those organizations to see how we can collaboratively partner on a funding mechanism where all three parties could come together and present. I'm just curious if that level of dialogue has occurred at all with staff in those respective entities.

- I think. I'm sorry.

- I just I could just real quick. Alder Johnson is might you know might just brief very brief conversation with the Mayor this afternoon, was that this hasn't been to build approach. The point where obviously the school district is comfortable enough with including it in their referendum and actually including a substantial amount obviously of what of what was being proposed. I guess if there was, if there's something, at least this point would certainly add. Maybe recommend committing to 300,000. Perhaps at this point and then leaving that other. Kind of to be determined based on what those other partners might do. So that would be kind of kind of committing our share, I guess and kind of in context of what you were proposing, maybe--

- Just to clarify again.

- Yeah, that would open the possibilities until those other entities then to baby step up and come to the table and if those don't come through, then there would be an opportunity then to allocate those additional funds in the future.

- Okay. And so just for clarity's sake again, the school district referendum was proposing 1.3 of this 1.6. Is that correct?

- Yeah, I believe that.

- Yes, it would be. It's 1.3 based on this request. So initially they had said maybe they were just interested in doing the driver feedback signs that worth in this school district 'cause obviously those are all school signs. They seem to have up their request. So they're very excited. That's the impression that I get about it. So I don't think that this would be any sort of like a bait and switch sort of situation. However, I do see the need to protect our resource. So if there's something that you wanted to be more formalized, I don't know that we would be able to do that because it is based on referendum that it seems to be the only funding option that they gave us as far as the school district is concerned. I don't know if there's any form of an agreement that could be made, but I agree with Director Stechschulte's statement that at minimum the 300,000 would be the minimum that we would need to commit to see this project through.

- So hypothetically, if let's say this group, the Council ultimately authorizes 300,000 and the referendum fails, would you use that 300,000 to maybe target higher risk areas or what kind of strategy would you have in that scenario?

- Sure. I think Dave could probably speak a little more eloquently to this. The prioritization is based off of the Safewalk plan, but also off of crash data. And then community feedback. So I think that we would have to adjust our plan of action instead of doing phasing more of like a across the board or in certain areas that works already being done, it would be selecting the however many locations that we could fill with that money to make sure we're getting the most bang for our buck as far as crash reduction is concerned. So I don't think we'd be as equitable across the school district. It would have to be based probably more on crash data, but I'll let Dave continue.

- Yeah. No, that's a great question. I can tell you that at \$300,000, this project takes a significant hit. We're going to probably get into a prioritization discussion and my guess is that we may upset some people that they're not gonna be included. And I think equity is something that we need to pay great attention to in this project and 300,000... One of the things I wanna go back on in in my discussion was the engineering and contingencies. Once we start, I mean you could take 85% of \$300 and that's gonna give you pretty much what your materials cost would be. So we're not gonna be able to really do a lot then with that. And like I said, we will have to prioritize. So I probably refer back to Susan's statement earlier. I would rather and I understand Alder Johnson with the negotiation card relative to funding participation, but I would rather see full funding and then cut back once we get some 'cause at this point in time, we've already heard a commitment from the school district that they're willing to chip in 1.3. That's a lot of money, but it is pending a referendum approval. So I mean we've got a huge swing here. I would say either you're for the project or you're not for the project. So I just think that if we just do little bits of it, we may end up upsetting more people than pleasing.

- I make a motion that we push forward with the 1.6. We know that the schools, if it passes, we'll pick up 1.3. They've already committed to that. I don't see how they could talk their way out of that. Certainly, if you wanna hold off to see if the tribe will kick in, if the school referendum fails. But I think this project affects every Alderman district that we have. Multiple places, multiple locations. It's something that I don't know about the other alders, but I've been hearing since even before I got elected. The first meeting I went to was that Alder Leopold after a dog had been hit crossing the road. And I mean, that was even before I was elected. And there was a lot of discussion about safety for children. And since I've been elected, it's how school, it's Leonardo da Vinci. I mean, you name it. There's very few schools that aren't affected by this unless they're in, like, a nestled in, like Eisenhower. It's right in the middle of a residential area. There's nothing but residential streets all around it. But a lot of stop signs. So I haven't heard anything from them, but other than that I think this is a win for the city. This is something where as the other elders have said, I mean, how do we get the most out of this? And I think just the statement that if we go for 300,000, you're only gonna affect one or two schools at most. And you ought to hear the human cry when everyone thinks their schools being left out. I mean, these parents, they're crazy about their kids safety. And you can't blame 'em. So I think we move forward with the 1.6. I think it sounds like we've pretty much got to guarantee if the referendum goes forward. We're gonna save 1.3 that we can reallocate, and if not, if we gotta spend 1.6, I really haven't seen a lot of projects that affect safety more than this does. And I mean, that's even with all the other PD proposals. This affects safety more than anything else I've seen so far. So that would be my motion that we move forward with the 1.6.

- I'm gonna second. Because there's two things I know that was very concerned about how many people are going to be affected by each project. And this project will virtually affect every family in Green Bay. And in a positive way, very positive and safety way. And also there's so many people that have been involved for a long time planning this. This is not like pulling something out of a hat. This has been on people's minds for a long time and they melded this together. This isn't the same as you know, other alternatives that were thinking about. I think this is relevant, it's safety issue. I think it does well for the city of Green Bay, it does well for the families, the children. I think it's well worth it going the full-bore 1.6. I think Alder Johnson's business acumen is coming through and I agree with them. But in the case of this municipal city, I think is well worth funding it and then getting reimbursed later. And I know we're gonna have to fight this out at the Common Council as well. Who knows what's gonna happen?

- So I had a motion from Alder Galvin. Elder Hutchinson, would you second that? I don't wanna be presumptuous.

- I second it. I seconded.

- Okay. Alder Steuer you had your hand raised?

- Yes, thank you chair. Through the discussion and talking with engineer Hanson today, he brought up some very good points that it strike check maps that we look at ARPA funds. The fact that it affects this entire city, we all have a number of schools in this district. My kids went to public school all. All three phases of public schools. They are done now but it doesn't matter. There's a lot of folks that have their children in schools yet. This is huge, especially when you talk about the number of pedestrians that have been injured and or killed as well as by bicyclists. And one of the things I was on the TBP committee when we changed the name to Transportation, Bike and Pedestrian Committee and I think we have to remember that pedestrians have the right of way and so do bicyclists. So we were more improved bike plan and all sorts of things, so making this a livable city quality of life issue etc. So you can talk about that as well. But I think that that's one of the things that comes through. But I think the safety issue is the number one. So at first Blush I support this as well. Then I realize from the council, but I think it's a good use. Thank you.

- Susan.

- I support the project. However, Alder Hutchison said a word that just made me. Red flag. He mentioned reimbursement. So if we are reimbursed, those dollars would then need to be spent on our book related projects. They would become ARPA dollars. Just first blush just mentioning this. So I'm not saying stop the project or anything like that, but possibly approving our portion coming back with the remainder if we don't get the 1.3 from the school or we don't get funding from any other municipalities. That is one of the options, but the reimbursement part kind of scared me for a second.

- Okay, I'm sorry to use that word. I meant the school district giving us money so that we can re apportion that portion of our fund. Thanks for that clarification though.

- Okay. I'm just gonna . I'm gonna pose the motion because I oppose the idea. I actually really liked the presentation. I love the content. I'm a huge proponent of safer communities. It's because I would favorite alternative motion and I'm outnumbered today and I get that and that's okay. I would just prefer to refer it for two reasons. The reasons I previously mentioned. One, more productive conversation, more tangible offers. Offers is probably a bad word, maybe more tangible direction from couple of our other partners. But then the second reason is again we just spent a long time discussing a process that was more holistic and so I would just prefer to see a referral only because then it can still be brought back and should be as part of that new process that we talked about. But if I'm outnumbered today, I'm okay with that. But at least just wanted to explain. I don't oppose the project, it's more about the process. So is there any further discussion?

- I understand what you're saying, Alder Johnson. I mean, this is obviously gonna get pulled at council level, but I'm just hoping that maybe we can convince enough alders that this is project worth moving forward with. I'm just very afraid, like 2019. We passed this and how many of these recommendations by this project that was put together as a city been able to move forward with since 2019?

- Well, and I appreciate that comment Alder Galvin, but that that same point can be made for what other projects are on the table right now that we're not even talking about. And I think that is the purpose of the holistic dialogue.

- gets pushed off too long. We'll be looking at years from now or not at all.

- I understand.

- And it'd be interesting to see what projects would beat this. I mean really this is kind of on the top of the heap. So I'm confident this will last a review. And that's why I'm pushing for it.

- Truth be told, I agree with you, but it's just more of another respect, I guess, to the discussion we had about the process.

- Sure, sure.

- Okay, all those in favor say aye.

- [All] Aye,

- Opposed. Just one. Motion carries. Item number nine, referred to staff. Refer to staff Law and Finance addressed the policy revisions for a vote in June by the full common, council, I presume. Request by Alder Burnette to the Finance Committee, which states created policy or amend an existing policy to prohibit or prevent city personnel from the office of clerk, Mayor, law, finance and IT is soliciting, accepting or using any donation in the form of money, grants, property or personal services from an individual or non-governmental entity for the purpose of funding election related expenses, voter education, voter outreach. Or voter registration programs, with the exceptions of compensation of poll workers, securing leases for polling locations and PPE for voters and volunteers. Attorney Bungert.

- Yes, good evening everyone. As you can see in the packet, we've presented kind of a working draft of what staff has presented thus far. I was able to discuss a little bit of the draft with Alder Burnette this afternoon and he understands that essentially through our work we realize that with the way that the grant policy is currently structured, it applies to government grants. So if we're putting in an exception for non- governmental grants, the logical thing is that we also have to create a review process for non-governmental grants outside of just ones that are focused for elections. But we have to do a little bit of research. Obviously the process for governmental grants for state and federal come with all sorts of different regulations that apply to the acceptance and use of such grants. So we need to do a little bit of research, whether we need those same type of regulations. But the goal is for it the process, to reflect the same way where staff for non-governmental grants that all those funding resources or allocations would still be coming to council for acceptance of such money. And then we did put in the exception at the bottom of the document referencing the item that Alder Brunette wanted to address specifically, which is basically prohibiting staff from soliciting election related funding, carving out basically limiting that exception to not apply to funding with respect to payment of poll worker salaries, securing polling locations and purchasing of equipment. One marked difference between the language that staff is proposing and the one that Alder Brunette had initially proposed in his communication is that it's not limited to specific departments. The grant policy in general applies to all city departments and so to be consistent with that and frankly, for it to have the reach, I think that Alder Brunette was looking for, it makes most sense for it to be citywide versus calling out specific departments. But just wanted to kind of bring this forward just so we were in line with the timeline that Alder Brunette had requested for finance this week and council in two weeks thereafter. So we are just hoping for the committee to refer this back to staff for continued work and drafting and we hope to have a final draft for the Committee on the 21st.

- Alder Galvin. I would make a motion then to refer this back to staff with three caveats. Alder Burnett is specifically targeting work done by the city with the donated money as it relates to voter education, voter outreach and registration. And if the city did do that, can we get a report when you make your presentation with those three. Who did we target? Did we target anyone specifically by race, culture, religion, economic background? And was there any kind of targeting done or was it in general just everybody with an address got some kind of information from the city. If it's a report of some sort with bullet points or whatever, nothing like it's gotta be a book, but just kind of explaining what the city did do with those monies as it relates to education, outreach and registration.

- Sure, I would probably refer that a little bit more to Director Ellenbecker and perhaps some input from Clerk Jeffreys as to the allocation of the grant money specifically with respect to those categories.

- Sure, absolutely. Anyway, that's my motion.

- I thought you had three caveats.

- Well, like the caveat. Well, I guess what I meant with each caveat there was one... He made mention of voter education. He made mention of voter outreach and he made mention of voter registration. So if one was handled by one and different department from the city or they were handled separately or as one mass group. Like make it one caveat or three, whichever would better...

- So I wanna be clear Alder Galvin. Is that part of your motion to direct staff to bring that data back. Do you wanna submit that as a separate communication? How do you wanna address that?

- I'd rather have the staff bring it back. I think one has to do with the other. They go hand in hand. I mean, if the city was specifically targeting certain groups, that's wrong. In my opinion we target everybody the same. We treat everybody the same. And so I guess I'd like to know if it ever you know is this even worth considering if it didn't even happen?

- To clarify Alder, you're seeking basically the allocation of kind of a summary of how those dollars were spent with respect to those three categories.

- Right.

- And in what ways if they were and what the context of that spending was.

- Exactly,

- Okay. Got it.

- Okay, we have a motion by Galvin. I'll second that, discussion. Seeing none, all those in favor say aye.

- Aye.

- Aye.

- Oppose, Motion carries. Item F informational number one, the 2022 contingency account stands at \$200,000. Item number two, the next Finance Committee meeting will be held Tuesday, June 21st at 4:30 p.m. Do we have a motion to adjourn?

- So moved.

- Second.

- We have a motion by Galvin, second by Hutchinson. Thanks to everybody for your very thoughtful dialogue tonight. All those favor say aye.

- Aye.

- Aye.

- Oppose, Motion carries. See you next time. Thank you...