



MINUTES OF THE FINANCE COMMITTEE

TUESDAY, JULY 26, 2022, 4:30 PM
Virtual Meeting. Public may join via Zoom.
Immediately following Personnel.

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, Brian Johnson, Bill Galvin, Jesse Brunette

Also present: Mayor Eric Genrich, Ald. Steven Campbell, Ald. Melinda Eck, Ald. Jennifer Grant, Ald. Bill Morgan, Ald. Mark Steuer, Police Chief Chris Davis, Resiliency Coordinator Melissa Schmitz, Parks Director Dan Ditscheit, Public Works Director Steve Grenier, Development Director Neil Stechschulte, Grant Administrator Susan House, Fire Chief David Litton, Finance Director Diana Ellenbecker, Assistant Finance Director Pam Manley and others.

C. APPROVAL OF THE AGENDA.

Moved by Ald. Bill Galvin, seconded by Ald. Jesse Brunette to approve.

Motion Passed.

Yes- Bill Galvin, Brian Johnson, Jesse Brunette, Jim Hutchison

D. APPROVAL OF MINUTES.

I. Approval of the Finance Committee minutes from the June 21, 2022 meeting.

Moved by Ald. Bill Galvin, seconded by Ald. Jesse Brunette to approve.

Motion Passed.

Yes- Bill Galvin, Brian Johnson, Jesse Brunette, Jim Hutchison

E. REGULAR BUSINESS.

1. For consideration with possible action to rescind personal property taxes for account #30003 Baker and Macarthur, Inc. for a total of \$84.32.

Moved by Ald. Bill Galvin, seconded by Ald. Jesse Brunette to approve.

Motion Passed.

Yes- Bill Galvin, Brian Johnson, Jesse Brunette, Jim Hutchison

2. Review the City of Green Bay's 10-33 program inventory.

Moved by Ald. Bill Galvin, seconded by Ald. Jesse Brunette to receive and place on file.

Motion Passed.

Yes- Bill Galvin, Brian Johnson, Jesse Brunette, Jim Hutchison

3. Consideration with possible action of approval on the purchase of two (2) Mercury Outboard Motors 250XL replacements for Police Boat 109.

Moved by Ald. Bill Galvin, seconded by Ald. Jesse Brunette to approve.

Motion Passed.

Yes- Bill Galvin, Brian Johnson, Jesse Brunette, Jim Hutchison

4. For consideration with possible action the acceptance of the City-wide Comprehensive Energy Planning/PCS Energy Innovation Grant of \$87,000 with a local match of \$56,000.

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

Motion Passed.

Yes- Bill Galvin, Brian Johnson, Jesse Brunette, Jim Hutchison

5. For consideration with possible action a budget amendment resolution to transfer up to \$100,000.00 from Contingency account to Parks department to allow ordering of materials and contracting out the necessary work to fix the damaged amenities within the park system from the June 15, 2022 storm.

Moved by Ald. Brian Johnson, seconded by Ald. Jesse Brunette to hold up to \$100,000 of contingency funds for the repairs, but hold the resolution until actual expenses are available.

Motion Passed.

Yes- Bill Galvin, Brian Johnson, Jesse Brunette, Jim Hutchison

6. Consideration with possible action on accepting an AmeriCorps Program Funding Grant for \$378,745 to implement the Green Bay Conservation Corps program.

Moved by Ald. Bill Galvin, seconded by Ald. Jim Hutchison to approve accepting the grant for 3yrs and obligating budget funds as the City's match.

Motion Passed.

Yes- Bill Galvin, Brian Johnson, Jesse Brunette, Jim Hutchison

7. For consideration with possible action to allocate the American Rescue Plan Act (ARPA) funding proposals.

Moved by Ald. Jesse Brunette, seconded by None to open the floor.

Motion Failed due to a lack of a second.

Moved by Ald. Bill Galvin, seconded by Ald. Brian Johnson to hold a special meeting on Tuesday, Aug. 16th @ 5:00pm.

Motion Passed.

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

8. A request by Ald. Jennifer Grant to the Finance Committee which states: "For disclosure (from staff) with discussion and possible action of all approved, proposed, and pending ARPA requests with dollar amounts attached."

Moved by Ald. Bill Galvin, seconded by Ald. Jesse Brunette to receive and place on file.

Motion Passed.

Yes- Bill Galvin, Brian Johnson, Jesse Brunette, Jim Hutchison

9. Report of the Claims Committee.

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

Moved by Ald. Bill Galvin, seconded by Ald. Jesse Brunette to receive and place on file.

Motion Passed.

Yes- Bill Galvin, Brian Johnson, Jesse Brunette, Jim Hutchison

F. INFORMATIONAL.

1. 2022 Contingency Account: \$184,297.00

2. The next Finance Committee meeting will be held on Tuesday, August 16, 2022 at 5:00 PM.

G. ADJOURNMENT.

Moved by Ald. Bill Galvin, seconded by Ald. Jesse Brunette to adjourn.

Motion Passed.

Yes- Bill Galvin, Brian Johnson, Jesse Brunette, Jim Hutchison

H. VERBATIM MINUTES.

- 6:13. Item B, roll call. Let the record reflect, Alder Johnson, Alder Galvin, Alder Brunette, and Alder Hutchison are present. I'll entertain a motion to approve the agenda.

- So moved.

- Second.

- A motion by Galvin, a second by Brunette. Is there any discussion? Seeing none, all those in favor say aye?

- [Alders] Aye.
- Those opposed? Motion carries. Item D approval of the .
- So moved.
- Second.
- We have a motion by Galvin, second by Brunette. Is there any discussion?
- [Alders] Aye.
- Opposed? Motion carries. Item E, regular business. Number one, for consideration with possible action to rescind personal property taxes for account number 30003, Incorporated, for a total of \$84.32. Staff?
- Motion to approve.
- All right.
- Second.
- We have a motion by Galvin, a second by Brunette. Any further discussion? Seeing none, all those in favor say aye?
- [Alders] Aye.
- Opposed? Motion carries. Item two, review of the City of Green Bay's 10-33 program inventory. Chief Davis, any commentary?
- No, there isn't a whole lot new here. So I would just be available to answer any questions any alders have.
- Motion to receive and place on file.
- Second.
- We have a motion by Galvin, a second by Brunette. Is there any further discussion? Seeing none, all those in favor say aye?
- [Alders] Aye.
- Opposed? Motion carries. Thank you, Chief. Number three, consideration with possible action of approval on the purchase of two Mercury outboard motors, 250XL replacements for Police Boat 109. Committee, do you need insight? Alder Galvin.

- Quick question. There were obviously no grants or anything else available for us to take advantage of with this?
- Yeah, we weren't able to find any, including the DNR money.
- All right.
- And it was in the budget, right?
- Yes.
- Okay. I'll entertain a motion.
- Motion to approve.
- Second.
- We have a motion by Galvin, a second by Brunette. Any further discussion? Seeing none, those in favor say aye?
- [Alders] Aye.
- Opposed? Motion carries. Item four, for consideration with possible action on the acceptance Citywide Comprehensive Energy Planning PCS Energy Innovation Grant of \$87,000, with a local match of \$56,000. I see Melissa Schmitz is on the line. Melissa, could you give us some insight?
- Sure, this grant was applied for in January, and it aligns with the city's goal of 100% clean energy and carbon neutrality by 2050. This is a goal that's been identified in the Sustainability Commission's work plans over the last several years. This grant is a collaboration between the City of Green Bay, the Water Utility, and Green Bay Metro Transit. So the matching funds are coming from Public Works, Transit, and the Water Utility, and \$1,000 match is coming from the Sisters of St. Francis of the Holy Cross as well. That makes up the 56,000 in the cash match. The whole grant itself, the grant funds will pay for the consultant to help the city work through the process of the comprehensive energy planning for reducing energy usage and cutting carbon emissions.
- Okay. Thank you. Committee, do you have any additional questions?
- Chairman? Melissa, what is the matching funds part? Are those tax dollars? I know it's Public Works, so it would probably have to be tax dollars, but for like Transit, I'm assuming that's more revenue based? Can you walk us through that part?
- I am not entirely sure. So the \$5,000 from the Transit will be in the form of a cash or in-kind labor, is how they identified their match. The same goes for the Water Utility. The Transit Commission did approve, they're not signed. Gets approved through Council, and the Mayor ultimately signs that grant agreement if it's approved. But Transit did run it through their commission, and it was approved last week to go forward with that, whether that's in the form of cash match or a combination of cash and in-kind labor.

- Sure. That's all. When I saw the matching funds, I was curious if that at some point we had to vote on funds to support this application to accept the grants. Okay. Thank you.
- Okay. I'll entertain 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?
- [Alders] Aye.
- Opposed? Motion carries. Item six, consideration with possible action on accepting AmeriCorps Program funding grant for \$378,745 to implement the Green Bay Conservation Corps Program.
- We skipped number five.
- Thank you, Alder Galvin. Item five, my fingers are . For consideration with possible action, a budget amendment resolution to transfer up to \$100,000 from Contingency Account to Parks Departments to allow the ordering materials and contracting out the necessary work to fix the damaged amenities within the park system from the June 15th, 2022 storm. Director Ditscheit.
- As you just mentioned, there was a pretty large storm that you're all aware of that happened on June 15th. We did have a considerable amount of damage in the parks. Most of the damage was downed trees due to the excessive wind. But we did have a considerable amount of fencing and playgrounds that were damaged also, in addition with some small electrical repairs, repairs that need to be done, where the power lines were knocked off of the shelters. So we don't have that money to repair these items in our budget currently. So we are requesting to use up to \$100,000 from the Contingency Fund so we can start contracting out some of this repair work. The first thing that we would focus on is our fencing repairs. We're at about, if I were to guess, about \$60,000 worth of fencing repairs that we have to contract out. And obviously, there's a lead time associated with that. So we would like to contract that work out soon, along with the playground equipment, 'cause there's a substantial lead time with ordering playground equipment. Now, we will be working with the City's Risk Management Division, to submit an insurance claim. And any money that we get out of that insurance claim would just then go back to reimburse the Contingency Fund when we get it. Now, we're not guaranteed that, we haven't submitted the claim yet, but tentative discussions that Risk Management has had with our insurance provider indicated that these are eligible expenses.
- Alder Brunette.
- Yeah. Thank you, Director Ditscheit. The backstop dollars seem, in my layman's opinion, it seems high. Was it the whole fence? Backstop, I'm assuming, is baseball diamond backstop? What's in there?
- Correct. these are baseball backstops. And you've seen those, they're pretty substantial fencing investments. So the posts are heavy-duty posts that are, I don't remember the height, but they're probably 20 feet up in the air. So there's also a considerable amount of footings that go along with

that, just to keep those in place. And of course the mesh has been damaged, in addition to not only only fence posts, but the supports. So we did reach out and we did get formal quotes. And depending on what happens at tonight's meeting, whether or not we can use the Contingency Fund, we do have this on the Parks Committee agenda for tomorrow night to actually seek approval to go ahead with the fence repairs. Obviously, that'll be contingent upon being allowed to use the Contingency Funds. But we did receive competitive quotes for this work.

- I know baseball season, at least for the youth baseball, it's near the end or is at the end. Is it impacting the ability to play or use the diamonds currently?

- Yes, they are. These facilities are used in the fall for fall sports. So right now we have three fields at Beaver Dam. Only one of them is playable now because of the damage. The other one that has extensive damage is the Perkins Baseball Field, which we only have one baseball field there. So that one is also heavily damaged. So this fence material on order, the better off we're gonna be and the less impact we'll have to the recreation programming.

- Is it youth and adult leagues in the fall?

- Yes, so the ones at are park leagues, park adult leagues, whereas the one at Perkins, I believe that that is a Babe Ruth League, which is a youth league.

- Yeah, that's too bad. Sad to hear. All right. Thank you.

- Alder Galvin, you had your hand up.

- Yeah, Director Ditscheit. I could've sworn at a previous meeting, I asked about fencing that had been taken down from other park facilities in Green Bay and whether that fencing could be reused. And if I remember correctly, East River Park had two complete ball diamonds dismantled. Did we not save the fencing, and the poles, and the backstops? Could some of that not be used, rehabbed for this?

- We save what we can, but usually with those baseball backstops, what we end up doing is we saw-cut the posts at the footing. And so we can use those posts for shorter fencing, but we can't necessarily reuse them for baseball backstop fencing again, because it's short the length of the footing.

- Sure, sure. So could we reuse some of that fencing for some of the fencing repairs that we need or is it all requiring long poles and that kind of stuff?

- For these base all new fencing, we don't have fencing that would be adequate for that, that we have in stockpile. Usually, like I said, we reuse those posts for shorter fence repairs.

- Okay, all right. Thank you.

- So Dan, I'm kind of, so this is being brought forward to us as a \$100,000 resolution, which would essentially transfer the funding from Contingency to the appropriate account that I assume is for repairs. And just correct me if I'm wrong, but if we adopt this resolution, that formally transfers that money back, like it just transfers it over to you, it's no longer available in Contingency. Is there a reason versus a reimbursement approach?

- I would defer to Director Ellenbecker on that.

- Yeah, and Director Ellenbecker, I'm gonna ask one more question so you can answer them both. Because the city is self-insured, don't we have like an account that we budget for every year that is intended for claims?

- Okay, I'm gonna answer your first one. We do not budget anything for claims for property damage. We do for general liability and we do it for some Workers Comp, but we do not for property damage. And so back to, as Director Ditscheit had said, our plan is to put a property claim in. There will be a deductible. and then any other reimbursements that we have would be offset. The reason why I marked it as up to, so this would allow the Director to request, as necessary, equipment. And then, I guess, through whatever the committee's wish would be, we certainly could report this back out after all his items have been purchased or toward the end of the year. We do not have to immediately do the budget amendment and transfer the funds. Number is. However, the reason why, at this point, we requested up to \$100,000. You could reduce that number. You could ask us to come back. But we just wanted to make sure that he had what he needed to order these pieces of equipment just so that that he could move forward. However, this would be, at least, it does obligate the dollars until we come back and give you a more revised number. So currently we're sitting at 184,000 left in our Contingency Fund. At this point, we would earmark about 100,000 for it until we came back and gave you a revised number.

- Okay, and the reason I ask the question, of course, is hypothetically the repairs come in at 80,000, well, if we pass this resolution, we've given Dan 100. And so now if we run short on Contingency, now we're gonna have to pass another resolution to claw back that 20,000, potentially, in that hypothetical situation, right, to get it back? And so that's why I'm wondering why we don't just do this as a kind of a reimbursement process?

- Well, at this point, he is looking for at least the funding to go order his items. We could certainly do this, again, what we are going to do is, the budget amendment can be completed after all the actuals are in and any net of any claim. Of course, we would have to make some estimates if it's not completed by 12/31 of 2022, but it can be handled several different ways. We just need to make sure we give him the permission, if the committee, and the Park Committee, will allow him to go and order these supplies. So there's, like I said, a couple things, this would be on the high end. I'm not sure if Director Ditscheit was sure if he had all the estimates or all the quotes yet in, and that's why we went higher than the 74,000 details that he currently has in front of you. But it can be a couple options. Like I said, we can come back. We would not lock in, and that's why I meant to do up to 100,000. So we would lock it what it came out to exactly. We wouldn't be giving him extra to use for something that wasn't needed for this project.

- Yeah, and that's kind of where I was going with that is, I'd like to restrict it to the . If something new emerges, let us know. Opportunity to preserve the Contingency to have the maximum amount of flexibility for the city. I think that's always better.

- Mm hm.

- So I'm okay with kind of restricting. Without the resolution right now, it sounds like that's an option, right?

- Yes.

- And then allowing us to pass the resolution at a later date when we have more tangible numbers.

- Yes.

- And I will say that we are ready to go ahead and proceed with purchasing \$59,016 worth of fencing improvements. So that we've already gotten quotes on and that's what's going to Parks Committee tomorrow for approval.

- Sure. And I'm okay, again, Dan, I'm okay with sort of holding the 100,000 knowing that that number could fluctuate. But just waiting on the resolution until we have actual numbers from all the repairs. Is that an appropriate action, Diana?

- Yes.

- Okay. Committee, any further discussion? Otherwise, I'll make that motion. I would move to hold \$100,000 for the purposes of the repairs in items listed in Director Ditscheit's report and also hold the resolution until actual numbers are available.

- Second.

- That's a motion by Johnson, and a second by Brunette. Is there any further discussion? Seeing none, all those in favor say aye?

- [Alders] Aye.

- Opposed? Motion carries. Item six, consideration with possible action, on accepting an AmeriCorps Program Funding Grant of \$378,745 to implement the Green Bay Conservation Corps Program. Director Ditscheit, is that you again?

- Yes, that would be me. So I'll give a brief summary. There is an attachment in the agenda packet, which goes over exactly what I'm gonna talk about right now. But if you recall, last year in the fall of 2021, the city received an AmeriCorps State Planning Grant in the amount of \$65,613 for a full-time Conservation Corps Coordinator position for one year. And the intent of that position was to put all the planning together and apply for a second grant to actually implement the program. And so that is what that individual did. We did hire a person who, over the past nine months or so, to put together a program proposal and to apply for the second grant. And we are happy to announce that we did receive a second grant and it's an implementation grant from the AmeriCorps State Planning Program. And so this second grant will actually provide funding to actually implement it. So it'll pay for funding that Conservation Corps Coordinator position for an additional three years. It will also fund hiring six full-time members for the next three years, which in essence are crew leaders. And it will also fund hiring 15 seasonal positions for the next three years. And those 15 seasonal positions would only occur in the summer months when a lot of the construction and maintenance work would occur. In addition, the grant will fund a lot of the materials and supplies that are necessary to actually implement it. So it's not just staffing costs, it's actually all of the costs associated to run this program. So what this amounts to is, the program, to run for a one year period, is \$499,152 for

everything that I just described to you. Of that, we received a grant that will fund \$378,745 each year for the next three years. So the city would have to come up with an additional \$120,407 as a match to the grant. And so if you look at the actual memo that I put together, it does give a budget breakdown of what our match would be required for the rest of the 2022 year, and also what we would have to budget for 2023, if we were to approve this grant. Now the grant runs from September through August. So it's not a calendar year grant. AmeriCorps has their own funding cycle. So actually this grant kicks into gear at the beginning of September, if we accept the grant, which is great, 'cause we would look at hiring individuals as quickly as we can to get those six full-time members and get moving on this process. So the impact to the 2022 budget, there really is none. So we do have enough money that we allocated in our 2022 budget to take us through the end of the calendar year, if we were to accept the grant. And the budget is all kind of broken down in that memo. When we're looking into the 2023 budget, again, like I mentioned before, to fund it for the entire year in 2023, the city would have to come up with a \$120,407 match. Of that, only \$67,315 will have to be added to the budget. So the rest of the money, of that 120,000, is either in-kind matches or additional grant money we've received, or we did receive a 10,000 in-kind contribution from the Baird Creek Preservation Foundation to do some work in the greenways next year. And then finally, we allocate budget to fund the coordinator position. That money will just carry over into our budget in 2023. So it's not an add to the budget, it's already in there from 2022, if that makes sense. So for a very little cost adding to our budget. of only 67,000, just over that, we're getting all of those employees, all of those man hours, to do various programs within the parks. And so what we anticipate that this program will fund in the first year alone would be improving three miles of trail, restoring 75 acres of habitat, inventorying over 100 acres of park, working with volunteer groups to do several different volunteer projects throughout the parks and greenways. And then in addition, there'll be a minimum of four educational programs that the public will be invited to. So we're getting a lot of benefit for this program for very little investment in city funds. And I would highly recommend that we approve this grant. But I'd be happy to answer any other questions you might have.

- Dan, what's the Additional ARPA Math Replacement? Is that a misspelling? Is it supposed to be match?

- Yes, that would be a typo. Yes, I apologize.

- And the reason I'm laughing is 'cause that's how it was in the AmeriCorps letter, but then the typo carried over into our document. So it was contagious, apparently. But regardless, okay, so it's a match replacement, but what does that mean?

- So what that means is they, the ARPA, the AmeriCorps Program had a little extra funding available. So they provided us an extra grant of \$10,000 above and beyond the 378,000. So in essence, it's extra grant dollars that they received in funding for ARPA funds, but it's grant funding that they provided to us. So we split that in between the two years. 2022, we'll use half of that \$10,000, and then in 2023, we would use the other half.

- Okay. Thank you. And I just wanted to verify if that was a requirement of some type of ARPA activity on our end.

- No, there's no requirement on our end.

- Great, thank you. Committee? Alder Brunette.

- Thank you, Director Ditscheit. Obviously \$67,000, it's . Getting a return on the investment through the program, but that's no small amount of money. So as you look into the 2023 budget, is there cutbacks in other areas? Are you going to be presenting a budget to the Mayor that includes this and all other expenses that we had in 2022?

- Well, our budget that is going to be proposed in 2023 will be an increase in the budget of \$67,315. The rest, like I mentioned, is gonna come in in-kind matches and other opportunities that we've received, such as the donation from the Baird Creek Preservation Foundation. So we will not be reducing other services within the parks to run this program. I guess how I'm looking at it is, we received 378,000 in grant dollars to implement this program. Although you're right, the 67,000 is no small feat when budgets are tight, getting a considerable amount of money to offset the \$500,000 expense that it's going to cost . Grant dollars that are available.

- Obviously the return on investment is large. I think we all value our public spaces and our parks and nature areas and where they can be preserved. We most certainly can do that. And when they can be enhanced for the public to enjoy, I'm all on board. I just, I think going ahead, looking at the 2023 budget, last year we added some forestry positions. And we had a emerald ash borer crisis. We still do in the city. That's a very large consideration. The staff at the pools, there's some reduced hours at pools in Bay Beach because of our inability to hire people. So maybe additional dollars and salaries might go a long way towards that. So it'll be an interesting budget year. I overall am supportive, and for the sake of the committee, who's also the Personnel Committee, this sort of output is kind of what I'm looking for, in regards to that, a diversity inclusion coordinator position, of the six year, \$70,000 of money we're kind of earmarking for future years, Director Ditscheit, to actual measurables that we're able to receive to the city for those dollars invested? So similar kind of mindset is what I was looking for. But thank you, Director Ditscheit.

- Yeah, and one thing I do want to mention is, we are seeking other grant opportunities . Three years, to offset our budget amount that we have to put in. I can't commit to those at this point at tonight's meeting. So right now I'm proposing we allocate 67,000 into next year's budget. But I will tell you that we did apply for a grant for \$20,000, and if we receive that, then at budget time, we could reduce the amount. But I don't want to guarantee that we're going to be able to receive them. So I think I gave you kind of worst case scenario, and if nothing else, the budget amount will be less, potentially, if some of these grants come to fruition.

- Yeah. And I'm excited. And this is a little off the track of the conversation, but Green Bay has a Conservation Corps Facebook group. So Director Ditscheit, if you kind of push that out, it might get more attention. I just, I happened to stumble across it, and I was if we can boost the numbers and people can see where these dollars are going, to invest in their neighborhood parks, that would be great.

- Director Ditscheit, one thing that I noticed in here, and recognizing that obviously the member living allowance is an important piece of the program between the prorated 2022 year and the 2023 year, we're probably right around \$340,000. It's a substantial amount of money that obviously is contributing to the overall expense of the program. I know I met with Ms. Otto a couple weeks ago. We talked about this a little bit. Have we kind of started to uncover maybe some alternatives or options when it comes to how we provide housing for this particular program?

- Well, we are ones. We've met with several community members to see what options are available, but how this program runs is, AmeriCorps doesn't, they fund a living allowance and not necessarily an hourly rate. And so it's really up to the members to determine where they're going to live and how they utilize that living allowance.

- Oh, okay. Yeah, yeah. Sorry, Dan. I was looking at that thinking it was housing.

- Nope.

- Okay, so that's--

- In that sense, it's a paycheck that they're going to receive that they can .

- Yep. Okay. Yeah, that's my mistake, I thought there was kind of a housing allowance column separately. Okay. Any other questions from the committee? I'll entertain a motion?

- Motion to approve.

- I'll second that.

- Director Ellenbecker?

- Yeah, Director Ditscheit and I had talked earlier today. There's two requests that we want you to consider when you're doing the motion. One, this is a one year contract with AmeriCorps. And so Director Ditscheit was wondering whether or not you would be willing to kind of accept all three years, as long as the funding doesn't change, so we don't have to come back for the next two years, or we can do it for this one year, and then second again. I just want to remind, in that motion, we have to make sure that it does state that we are obligating some 2023 money, 'cause if we accept the grant, we have to make sure that that money is in the '23 budget.

- I'm supportive of obligating it moving forward. We directed the grant. We approved the grant funding to hire the staff person to go get this money and they got it. And it would seem silly to me that we wouldn't support it. Alder Brunette.

- Yeah. Every budget year is different. So if we are basically approving this going, we're not saying that we can't cut the Parks Department budget in another area if the budget year is tight, or cut another department's budget. It gives us some flexibility. But we're affirming, by saying, yes, this is an organizational priority, that we're committing to it matching funds, in order to receive the benefits. So I agree with you, Alder.

- Very few strategic priorities come back every year. You make a commitment to them for three years oftentimes. Okay. So, forgive me, who made that motion?

- I think you did.

- Alder Galvin.

- Alder Galvin did?

- Alder Galvin, are you okay with your motion reflecting the commitment?

- Yep.

- All three years? Okay.

- Absolutely.

- And who had the second on that? Brunette, I think you did, are you good with that?

- Yes, sir.

- Okay. Is there any further discussion? All right, seeing none, all those in favor say aye?

- [Alders] Aye.

- Opposed? Motion carries. Okay. Item seven, for consideration with possible action to allocate the American Rescue Plan Act, ARPA funding proposals. Okay. So I want to, Director Ellenbecker and I talked a little bit today about this. Recognizing that you may recall that when we kind of set up this process, we asked alders to have their requests in by July 15th. I think that there might have been a misunderstanding about what constitutes appropriate vetting, maybe. I know for one that I was under the impression that if we submitted by July 15th that it would be vetted internally and available for discussion action at tonight's meeting. As we can see from the report, every, almost every single alder request was a refer back to staff. And so when we talk about how Council gave the directive to slow the process down a bit so that we can be more holistic in our evaluation of all possible proposals that are coming forward to us, and we're gonna open this up for a little bit of discussion, but I wanted us to initially focus on a process discussion, appropriate process for us to fairly consider all proposals that have been presented to us. And as the agenda report shows tonight, there are some recommendations from staff that are ready for an action by this body, and then others that come from members of council that are all being suggested to refer back to staff. Of course, this committee, and subsequently council, could override those recommendations. But I want us to be sure that we're thinking about process before we start kind of firing off on individual requests. So I just kind of wanted to make that statement ahead of any possible discussion, if we want to, again, give every proposal kind of fair consideration. So Alder Galvin.

- And to go along with that, after looking through it and seeing that a lot of this has been referred to staff, and I remember you, Alder Johnson, saying, some of these proposals could actually be financed maybe through a combination of grant, ARPA dollars, city tax dollars, or other dollars that are out there. And that's why I think before we get into the meat of this, I'd rather see this whole thing get sent back to staff to have them vet it and put their input into it, because like the \$25,000 for the study for the fire department buildings. There actually may be money out there for that, that we don't have to spend ARPA dollars on. And so I think if we do that, we'll have, I think, more information, better information, to make a better decision about how to move forward with the request. So I would recommend or make a motion that we hold this, all of this, until the staff can vet it and go through it.

- And if I could just, actually, I'll second that Alder Galvin, again, just for discussion purposes. Director Ellenbecker, one thing I did ask her to do was to reach out to our department heads and inquire if there is anything on this list that is time sensitive that would warrant an action tonight. Director Ellenbecker, did you get any feedback on that?

- Yes, I put it out this afternoon, so I'm not sure every department head had a chance to respond. But the two items that came back that had some time sensitive is, our IT Director came back in some cybersecurity upgrades. We really are looking and pushing to get some upgrades done by the end of this year. And that is really for insurance purposes. If we upgrade our cybersecurity that might reduce some in insurance costs, is an item that is in there from Director Hronek, and I think it was 217. And then the other one just, it was from Clerk Jeffreys, and she said it's not earth shattering urgent, but however, there are some things, based on a timeline, she wanted to get some items translated. She wanted to get first and then the license by March 1st. But again, though, that's not as urgent. So those are the two responses that I had received.

- Okay, so I'd like, I know many, if not just about every department is on the call, as well as the Mayor. I'd certainly want to open it up to any further feedback there. None. Okay. We've got some, oh, sorry, Director Grenier's got his hand up. Director Grenier.

- I don't know that it necessarily is a critical time issue, but one of the items I have discussed with Alder Grant that was put forward is a match for \$250,000 out of the storm water area, that would be used out on County Trunk A, which is Nicolet Drive near the former Eagles Club. That's a cooperative project we are working on with Brown County. Brown County, earlier this year, committed \$500,000 worth of ARPA funding to complete that project out on County Trunk A, but that commitment of funds was contingent upon City of Green Bay contributing \$250,000 for that project. So again, it's not that it's a critical timing issue, but Brown County is holding up on finalizing the design and bidding that project out until the City of Green Bay has committed the funding. So that's why we did talk to Alder Grant and put a proposal in for that 250. So I just wanted to, again, it's not timely in the fact that we need you to make an answer tonight, but there is a timeliness aspect to it.

- Thank you, Director Grenier. Director Stechschulte.

- Yes. Just one item. Alder Brunette forwarded a request, possibly, for a stormwater improvement at East Town Mall. That project is currently underway and is under some obligations there. I think we were thinking about referring, staff was looking at, we have a line item under stormwater green infrastructure and climate resilience for a million-dollar grant program for private, large scale stormwater needs to catalyze development. We think that would probably be the most appropriate place for that project to be funded. The project is underway at this point and probably needs to be addressed one way or the other probably fairly quickly. So that project is already under development. And if this was something we'd be able to do, we'd need to communicate that to the developer and have them get an application in.

- Okay. Alder Grant, I see your hand up, but I just want to make sure staff can comment on time sensitivity first. So any other feedback from staff members? Okay, Alder Grant.

- Just a couple of things, about the study that we requested, the 25,000. Is there a faster way to find out if there's a grant for that? Because that study is gonna take about, I believe Chief Litton, and I apologize, you said about two months to complete? I thought he was on. Oh, yep.

- Yeah. Sorry about that. I was having some problems with my. The study itself will take somewhere between eight and 10 weeks, as I have been told.

- So our second proposal is kind of held up on that. I understand our council probably can't make an educated decision on the second one without knowing that study. A lot of other moving parts with the Ad Hoc Committee with that. I also think with a lot of our proposals as council members, it might be helpful for the staff to hear what we've looked into, the research we've done. We have some people here tonight speaking on a project that we have, because we've partnered up and we may know more information, or have a little bit of an insight as to prioritizing or what all needs to go into the project. So I think it would help hearing from council members, as well, on theirs.

- And I think one of the things that I, after talking with Director Ellenbecker, one of the things I think we're trying to avoid is that we go through kind of, we talk about every single item that's proposed here, even though we're not ready to take action on it, and then it comes back potentially, and then we'd do the same thing all over again. And so we're trying to be a little bit sensitive to how that process gets handled when a lot of this information may be incomplete yet because staff hasn't thoroughly vetted it yet. But again, it's kind of up to the will of the committee here, I guess, how you'd like to proceed.

- Unless it's really time sensitive, I would prefer to wait on the proposals. If we start piecemealing them out again, then we're just right back to where we were this spring, when we started talking about this.

- I agree. And to put some type of a grade or some way to look at these numbers. I know there's one number of \$9 million, which kind of totally affects across the board, the money we have, and if we're actually gonna consider that project, that affects a lot of projects. So I think we've gotta go through a thought step to get to making these decisions for sure, yep.

- Alder Brunette, you had raised your hand.

- Yeah. I'm glad we did this. There are a lot of really, really good projects that are being proposed. There's a couple of park related ones, Alderman Campbell has one. And a lot of economic development sort of projects. I have a few in my district that I proposed. So I'm not comfortable elevating one over another. I do trust that staff would look at all of them in a very unbiased way and give their honest opinion as to which ones are valid, or which ones have other funding sources that could perhaps be attached to them. But I would, though, Mr. Chairman, want to open the floor just to hear from interested people, if they are attending this meeting. Now perhaps, we're not going to, they're gonna be speaking about specific projects, but I don't think it does any harm hearing them out, since they've signed into the meeting.

- Alder Eck.

- Yes. If there's gonna be a process, what it's being graded on, all of the, I know that Susan House had sent us something with a grading scale on that and how that's gonna be done. It just, I think we need

to look at the economic impact and on our city as a whole. And so I'd like that to be taken into consideration and brought back with specifics on how it's gonna be chosen. Otherwise, I guess I don't, it's hard for me to feel comfortable with sending it all to staff and seem like it's being, they're given the decision making process. I guess that's my concern.

- Okay. Mayor Genrich.

- I just want to echo some of the comments, in terms of the quality of the projects, by and large, submitted by alders, list, by and large, and will generate some good discussion. Just to, I guess, to take on the elephant in the room a little bit, the \$9 million is not something that we're capable of doing. The only eligible category that that could come out of would be the revenue loss category, and we've already spent down below \$9 million. 9 million is also kind of a back of the envelope number that's been arrived at. So it just would not, in my opinion, be a prudent decision for our council, at any point, to use ARPA dollars in that amount for this purpose. On the other hand, I do think this engineering or space needs analysis for the combination of Stations 3 and 1 has a lot of merit, so I would like to move forward with that, if committee and council are interested in doing that. And then finally, I would just, I would encourage, I guess, council to take a look at the recommendations. Like you said, Chair Johnson, by and large, requests coming from alders, have a refer to staff recommendation, but that's also true of some of the, ironically I guess, some of the recommendations coming through or proposals coming through from staff, just recognizing that there's some work that needs to be done on a number of these. So, my preference would be for us not to just keep kicking the can, especially housing programs that have been put forward, and were proposed by staff several months ago now at this point. So would love to see some decisions being made on some of that stuff in the near future.

- Alder Grant.

- I was under the understanding that we could split between capital and crime prevention and neighborhood enhancement, since most fire stations are in the middle of neighborhoods and do bring assets to the neighborhoods.

- Yeah. I think it would be a stretch under the federal rules that we're living under, that we haven't chosen, but we're living under. ARPA, with the exception of some of the infrastructural categories, like stormwater and broadband, we really need to follow specific rules. And so you need to identify a disproportionately impacted neighborhood, for example, within maybe a qualified census tract, which factors in, but also how what you're doing here is going to benefit a community that was impacted by COVID. So I don't know exactly how you can make that argument for a new fire station.

- Okay. And I think, before we go down the rabbit hole of sort of talking about individual proposals that are within the full report, I think maybe I'd like to still stay at a high level and talk about the process first, with how we'd like to proceed with this. Now, there still is a motion that was made and seconded by Alder Galvin to hold these. Alder Galvin.

- Yeah, when I made that motion, and maybe there's a misunderstanding with, I'm not asking staff to vet our suggestions here and then make a decision on whether it should move forward or not. What I'm asking staff to do, with their knowledge base, and their ability to work within the City Hall, to say, do we even need to use ARPA dollars on this proposal? Can this proposal be taken care of through tax dollars, grants, state or federal programs, things like that? Or could we make it actually work, but

save some ARPA dollars, because we can combine different funding sources. And that's all I'm looking for from staff. I think it still comes down to the Council who are gonna be making the decisions on what moves forward and what doesn't. So that's all I'm asking for from staff. They have the knowledge. They know the inner workings of this stuff. They're able to check and see, will it qualify for ARPA, or would the federal government not be happy if we tried to use it for ARPA? So that's all I'm asking for, with having staff to vet these proposals.

- So if I'm not mistaken, Alder Galvin, I think that's already outlined in the report. And each item specifically directs back to which provision within the ARPA guidelines that relates to.

- Exactly.

- So I think that work's been done. But the refer to staff, and I don't want to speak for staff, my understanding though, is that it's giving each respective department head the opportunity to vet the idea or any missing information that needs to be brought forward yet for it to be properly considered.

- Exactly. Exactly.

- Okay. Mayor, you had your hand raised, is that still up from last, or is that new?

- Yeah, I guess just one final comment, which I would love if the committee were to essentially adopt the recommendations that are outlined in the report. That accomplishes the bulk of, I think, what we're talking about here, with the exception of a couple of items there. So this enables for the process to continue moving forward. A lot of the referrals to staff will enable alders to work directly with directors on fine tuning some of the proposals that were brought forward, and still demonstrate some forward momentum on these proposals.

- Alder Grant.

- Thanks. I thought staff was supposed to be working with us when we submitted the proposals, if they didn't qualify. That's what we talked about in June, we asked for that. A little surprised when I heard from Ms. House that our thing would qualify, and now I'm hearing it's not, 'cause I thought that's what we were supposed to be doing over the last two months.

- Okay. Alder Brunette, you've got a half a hand raised.

- I'm not sure, but I saw Ms. House turned her camera on, so I would love to hear her opinion on it. I guess my concern with, I'll preface it by saying this, my concern is if we approve what staff recommends now, that takes a pretty substantial amount of money from dollars toward projects, and that includes perhaps, the fire station project. So I know Ms. House might be in an uncomfortable position here, but if you could advise the committee, if at all, if parts or whole of the 9 million for a fire station will qualify under existing ARPA rules?

- Thank you, Alders. The fire station project is an eligible item under the ARPA regulations pending a study that shows that the cost of repair, cost of the building, the return on investment, all of that has been done, prior to building, and that it is a community type building and that you are meeting all of the code requirements, et cetera. So it is an approved project. However, it depends on the alders

which . And that as far as the weighted scale that the Alder was talking about, I don't suggest that we move forward with that because of the way your meetings run. It would be very difficult to have the alders weight them, the clerk or somebody score them, average them, and then get the information back to you. So I suggest that you don't go in that direction.

- Director Ellenbecker, I'm asking this of you because you're the staff liaison for our committee, and you might have knowledge of this. I think back to maybe a comparable process, . It's identical, with the stadium tax refunds. How did that process look? And I say comparable because you have sort of pool of money and a lot of ideas that probably cost more than the available funds available. So how did that process unfold?

- Yes, that was a while back. That was probably in 2014, if not '15, 'cause I think, so that was a few years back. But what happened is there was a proposal, there was like a grant proposal program that anyone who wanted to have a portion of that money, they could submit a proposal. And then I believe there was a committee of five members that went through each item, and then they made the recommendation to the committee and council on which, out of those items, that they were willing, 'cause the max was a million dollars, and yes, there was more proposals than a million dollars. So it ended up being a small committee that took on and reviewed all of the on what these dollars were going to be, how they should have been spent. So I don't know all the details exactly how that small committee made the decision, but there were some proposals that did not get any money. There were some proposals that got about 50% of what they requested. But there was really like a proposal, grant proposal process that people had to submit, and there was a dedicated time that information had to be in by and at that point then a decision was made. But again, I was not on the team at the time. I know our finance director and then I'm not sure who else was on the team at the time to evaluate the program projects.

- So ultimately, though, there was a subcommittee that worked on grading these things?

- Yes.

- Yeah, that did the busy work. Alder Galvin.

- Yeah, I was on that committee with two other alders, the Finance Director. I'm not sure who else. I think there was five or six of us. We sat down, had a couple of meetings. We went through all the proposals, and like Director Ellenbecker said, we made proposals from that to council, and then council voted it up or down.

- Did you have a rubric?

- Yes we did. I remember one was, because it was tax dollars, we were looking to try and put the money towards things that we thought would enhance the city, that would bring in more monies back to the community.

- Okay. And again, I think it's just insightful, to contemplate our process here today. Alder Campbell.

- Well, I just raised my hand a while here, but I think between Director Ellenbecker and Alder Galvin here, it kind of clarified a lot of it. So let me just clarify that the stuff that was said approved by staff in the different categories was by this small group, and what would make up the group and how would

they present it to council then? Or would we break into a little more of organized committee along with that so that we don't have to bring it all to the council meeting or come back to the committee. So I guess that some of the questions, I think, were answered on the process.

- Yeah. And I think right now we don't have a group. I just kind of wanted to understand a little bit, historically, how the sales tax one worked. I think for all intents and purposes, we could look at the Finance Committee of four people, who comprise council as the group.

- Well then back to my question, then.

- Mm hm.

- Some of the stuff that went through the list said approved or preliminarily approved. Who was all involved in that process?

- City council, The full city council had to approve the ones that are labeled as green. And that may have occurred prior to your election.

- Oh, okay. That's. Some of it, yes, looked fairly new, so without information on it. So I guess, if that process worked, I would be in full support of moving forward toward that and maybe trying to get, I don't know if per sides of the city or district and kind of having everybody involved in the process a little bit, say in a subcommittee or whatever like that. I think that's what we're trying to discuss here. And I'd be in favor for that.

- Okay. Alder Eck.

- Okay, I don't know what, there was like some loud noise. I don't know if everybody's hearing that or just me, but. Okay, two things. One, if we did have a committee like that, it would be great to have it be, consist of, if it was non-biased members, maybe, that don't have some projects proposed. But the second part that I want to request, we, Alder Grant and I, had submitted some backup documentation to go with our request, and we did not see it in the packet, which we can add to a future packet for a committee that would be deciding. But we did have a few speakers to just to share with us. Would it be a possibility, just because they are on this particular Zoom meeting, to have a chance to have a couple minutes to share?

- Yeah, and I still want to talk about process first, before we start drilling down an individual projects. Otherwise I'm afraid this conversation's gonna get away from us. So, I guess it's kind of up to the prerogative of the committee, if that's what they want to do. But I think without understanding what our process is going to be, we're kind of opening up Pandora's box there a little bit.

- I agree. I understand these people have been here. They've been here for a while waiting to speak. But if we open the door here for your proposal, then we might as well get everyone else in the line and just start vetting everything right here and get ready for a very long night. Again, that's why I'm really hoping we'll just cut this quick here, get it back to staff, have them put their input into it, get it back to our committee or another subcommittee, if that's what everybody wants to do. But like Alder Johnson said, it's hard to start talking about individual projects without having some kind of set way of doing it, and fair vetting by council.

- And I wonder, and I'm just gonna maybe throw this out as an idea. And again, I think the Finance Committee is perfectly equipped to serve as the subcommittee and then it's a publicly available meeting. The one thing I think would be useful, is there some type of . And I'll just throw this out there as a suggestion, if we held this until the next Finance Committee meeting, and then we had every project had an opportunity to be presented on, whether it's by the department chair or the alder that proposed it, every project gets a couple of minutes to be presented on, and then we leverage or apply that rubric. And then, 'cause at some point, guys, we're gonna have to slug it out. And to the Mayor's point, we can't keep kicking the can on this. So we're gonna have to slug it out. And the reality is, we could have \$75 million worth of requests for \$20 million. Not everyone's gonna make it. But we're gonna have to start doing that hard and dirty work. Alder Brunette.

- Yeah, we did that with the bonding request for the Capital Improvement Plan, just a few months ago, in fact. It got kind of messy, I know. There was a lot of bonding requests and we didn't want to approve a certain dollar amount. And we, I should say the Finance Committee, I was not a member of that body at the time, but they whittled it down and got it to an acceptable level that it passed the council. So I think there are two things to discuss here, the process, as you mentioned, Alderman Johnson, but I don't think it's ever inappropriate for a government body to hear from the public. This government belongs to the public. It was a noticed item. I get what everyone's saying, that maybe it could complicate things, but again, it is the public. This is their government. This is their government body deciding something that affects them greatly. So with that, having said that, I would like to make a motion to open the floor to hear from interested parties.

- Is there a second? All right. That motion fails for lack of a second. Director Ellenbecker.

- Yes, I just wanted to confirm what Alder Eck had just said. Yes, she did submit additional information for her, the \$9 million project. But this packet was so large, we did not put backup for any of the new items. So I just, I wanted everybody to know, there is additional backup for every single item that's in here. And so that's always an option, that we could certainly put a much bigger packet out, available somewhere where the alders can look at what additional information was submitted on every one of these items. They could also come in and look at the information. So I just want to throw that out there and just let them know that there was more information and again, on all of these items, especially if, what's in front of you is just a very summary portion. So that if that is the wish that of you to bring this packet, or some of this back, we have more information on all of these items.

- Okay. Mayor Genrich.

- Yeah. Thanks. A quick comment on process, and just something for you to consider, maybe a special meeting. I totally agree that Finance Committee itself is capable. But this agenda had a lot of items on it. I think inevitably many of the future meetings of Finance will have a number of items. It might make sense just to have a special meeting devoted to this question.

- I think that's a good suggestion. Okay. And Director Ellenbecker, too, I'm just gonna maybe call out the elephant in the room again, because it is the one project that has been brought up a number of times. And of course we have an Ad Hoc Facilities Committee that is currently doing a space needs analysis and evaluating all of our other facility conditions. I want to make sure those two things are happening in unison and not in separate silos. So can we get, and I don't want to get into that today,

but can we get a report back, maybe just an email, to the committee, to council, to let . Of that so that we can appropriately have that conversation together?

- Yes.

- Alder Eck.

- I know we talked about this at the award ceremony, at the fire station recently, that the study that the Ad Hoc Committee requested is different than the one that Alder Grant and I are looking for. And we do have Chief Litton on who could explain that, the differences, just for the clarification.

- Yeah. And look, real basically, you're looking to find a site. The Ad Hoc Facilities Committee is trying to prioritize what investments need to be made in all of our facilities. So I think it's just a cart and horse, and that's why I'd like to, before we even go down that path, I think it would be useful for us to have really up to date information from Director Ellenbecker on where the status is of that report, so that hopefully we can actually have that information available to us and have that conversation at the same time. Alder Brunette.

- Yeah, maybe for Ms. House to clarify, you had mentioned, in order for a potential fire department station to be considered for approval, that there would have to be some sort of study done ahead of time, what, a facility study or a location study?

- You would need to know basically a return on investment. A facilities type study.

- But not a location?

- No.

- Staff recommended a 25,000 study. What is that study recommendation?

- And if I refer to Chief Litton for input on that?

- Sure. Yes, that'd be great, Chairman.

- Thanks, Alders. The study that's been requested does two things. First of all, it looks at the space needs for combining both Station 1 and Station 3, not only for today, but 25 years into the future, that would be the first thing. And then the second thing it does is that it identifies locations, up to five, within Districts 3, where the station is currently located, optimum locations, thereby, it gives you the ability to look at it and say, this is something we could pursue or this is not acceptable whatsoever. So that's what that study would provide. And it's done very frequently when you're looking at public safety facilities.

- Chief Litton, do you have concerns that you're willing to share publicly regarding Station 1 and 3? I know you prepared a document. And for those council members who took the tour, we should, I mean, I took the tour. It does seem like the conditions are rather dire in 1 and 3.

- Yeah. Station 3 is a livable station. So the guys that are there, that station's 86 years old, and it is in disrepair. I don't think there's any salvaging of that station. But I also know that we can't put the cart

before the horse because we need to have the study. The study is the basis by which everything moves from. And again, without knowing how many square feet we need for that station, whether it's gonna be on one level, two levels, site analysis of how many acres might be needed. And then, when you start looking at it's a brownfield site, which has to be remediated, are there other sites that are available? Is there properties that have to be acquired and torn down? There's a lot of things that go into all of that. And so with this analysis, I do have a vendor in mind, somebody that we've worked with in the past and works all over the state on these kind of projects. I think that that is the genesis for moving anything forward. We, quite honestly, the number being bantered around at \$9 million, I'm not sure it's gonna be \$9 million. It could be less, it could be more, I'm not sure. And then until we get this report, I'm not gonna, I would be speculating at best.

- So this \$25,000 staff recommended study is what you just mentioned that that would take, that that would do the necessary legwork to take it one step further, is necessary.

- That would give the council the information needed to start making informed decisions going forward on how you're gonna replace Station 3. It's not a matter of, does it need to be re replaced? It's a matter of how, and when it can get replaced. And without the study, really, we're just spinning our wheels, I believe.

- All right. Thank you. Mr. Chairman, I don't want us to, I get the feeling that there are some people that don't want the station to happen. To allocate a 9 million, or less, as the Chief said, that's a big chunk of money. I don't want to just assume that it can't be done without digging in further, because the reality is, we, as a city government, are going to need to come with a solution quick, at some point. I took a tour, no expert, but the things that I saw are concerning. So if that means that instead of bonding down the line, and I get the process point, Chairman Johnson, that there's the Ad Hoc Facilities Committee, we just don't want to rush to approve a lot of these projects, although very worthy and necessary in a lot of cases, if that means we're gonna dilute all the available funds we have to tackle a very large project, like the fire station, which quite frankly, could be a legacy project. We can work something out and find a way, if that's what the city council decides. Those are my comments. Thank you.

- Okay, and I'm gonna reign this conversation back in, because there is a motion on the floor, and I want to have our comments on that, because otherwise we're dedicating too much time to one item on the agenda while not fairly servicing the other items on the agenda. And the motion on the floor right now is to hold this item until a future Finance Committee meeting. There was a second on it. That is the motion. Alder Galvin, I'm gonna . Because you said, hold until the next meeting, which is technically August 23rd. There was a suggestion to perhaps hold a special meeting. I think that's a worthy recommendation. Would you be open to that modification? You're muted. Sorry, I can't hear you.

- Yes. I would be open to that. And maybe if we could even schedule it a little bit earlier in the day, since, if we start vetting all this stuff, and we're gonna do it all in one meeting, I think it could be one heck of a long day.

- Well, I think if we started it at a reasonable, I wouldn't get too much into the workday, because I want to make sure that any alder who wants to participate has that ability.

- Absolutely.

- So I agree it's gonna take a few hours, but that's no different than what we're doing tonight.
- True.
- Make a recommendation on a date. How much time do we need to properly vet the recommendations that are in the report?
- Again, we can also supply additional information, put it in some kind of packet available. What additional information we have, we could put in a packet that's available for the alders, or we could send it out, distribute it. And as Chief Faulds had said, earlier in Personnel, there's that opportunity of August 9th that would be scheduled. That would be two weeks out from now. And then two weeks before the next Finance Committee meeting. If staff could do that, I think there's opinions back with that, that if anything needs to be held or further discussed, that we can do it on August 23rd, and still be completed before our next. Right? Okay. Alder Galvin, would you be agreeable, as part of your motion, hold for a special meeting on August 9th?
- Yes.
- And then can we keep 4:30, like these other meetings are?
- If you can promise me I'll be in bed by midnight.
- I promise nothing. But I will accept your modification. Okay, is there any discussion specifically related to the motion? Alder Brunette.
- No, was it seconded, Alderman?
- Yep.
- It was. Okay. Well, I'm gonna try again. We have discussed the process. We've kind of made a motion. I like to make a motion to open the floor. I mean, for God's sake, we're not a communist system. This is an open government. People should be able to--
- I take offense to that.
- Well, come on.
- And actually--
- Come on.
- Okay guys, hold up, hold up. I'm gonna rule that motion out of order, because it was already made and failed.
- Okay. Bad form, guys. You've gotta hear from the public.
- That's process. That's process. Alder Hutchison.

- One thing I think might be helpful is, at the next meeting and it may amend this motion or not, is have a specific list of those projects that should be determined right away and the reasons why. We have a list of three or four with reasons why. It would be good to look at those projects that need that quick turn. And so it just, and if we are going about approving it, going to council with it, it may narrow the scope a little bit, but it would also get these things going if they need to go. That's what I would say.

- Yeah. The other recommendation, Alder Hutchinson, in addition to that, is again, I would request each person who is requesting those items, be prepared to speak to them at that meeting, and for those who would like to speak as champions of those respective proposals. I think that's the appropriate time where we can handle everybody at the same time on all of their projects, in fairness, in equity. I think to have those folks come in and speak to us. Alder Steuer.

- Thank you, Chair. Unless I'm wrong on this, isn't there a primary election on that day? August 9th.

- Yeah. Sorry, that's what I was gonna bring up.

- So I think that would be a bad idea to have it on that day. That's just my opinion.

- I agree, 'cause I'm a poll worker.

- Have it on the 16th, the next Tuesday.

- That would work.

- Yep, I can do that. Alder Brunette?

- It would have to start at 5:00 for my schedule.

- I can do 5:00. 30 minutes to me isn't gonna break the bank. Okay, Alder Galvin, you're good?

- Yep.

- Alder Hutchinson, can we do that? Tuesday, the 16th. Okay that's...

- That can work.

- Okay. And then Director Ellenbecker, obviously contingent on the outcome of this vote, could you please send out a communication to the entire council notifying them that this will take place?

- Yes. So right now we're looking at August 16th at 5:00 PM?

- Correct. Any further discussion on the motion? Alder Brunette.

- I support the concept. I'm gonna be voting no, because we're not hearing from the public to hear what their opinions are in the matter. So I can't in good conscience vote for the motion, even though I approve it. Thank you.

- Okay. Any further discussion? Seeing none, all those in favor say aye, Alder Eck, yep.
- Okay. So before you make the vote, I just want to clarify, are you saying that all of the proposed things will come back and be able to be fully discussed? Or are you proposing that whittled down and then brought back? I just want to clarify before you vote on that.
- No, I'm proposing that all of the items that are in the report, including a couple that didn't meet the deadline, that Director Ellenbecker and I talked about earlier today, all of those will appear on the report and we will be available to discuss each one. I'll talk with Director Ellenbecker a little bit about how to set that agenda. It's all one big item, or each item individually, but we'll be able to have a full conversation on all items.
- Okay, thank you.
- Alder Grant.
- Will you allow open floor then, so I can let the people know that showed up tonight?
- Yep. I think that's the best way to do it, because then we're hearing from everybody at the same time. So I would definitely, it would be my intent that we ought to open the floor at that time for each item. Okay. Democracy's messy sometimes, that's for sure. All right. Any further discussion? Seeing none, all those in favor say aye?
- Aye.
- Aye.
- Aye. Opposed?
- No.
- That motion passes three to one. Item number eight, a request by Alder Jennifer Grant to the Finance Committee, which states, "For disclosure, "from staff, with discussion and possible action "of all approved, proposed, and pending ARPA requests, "with dollar amounts attached." Alder Grant, would you like to speak to that?
- The prior one kind of covered that. The only thing that I wanted just a little bit more possible elaboration on is because some of these items were approved, but money either hasn't been spent or whatnot, is there any leeway, because as other proposals. different priorities and projects may have been sitting out there and not whatnot. So that was the only thing I wanted added.
- Okay. Do you need any specific information from staff at this time or do you feel comfortable?
- Can we just have that before we start the Finance meeting, so we know how much, if there's any leeway. If it's a million dollars even, just because if a project comes at something, I think as you're voting, to keep in the back of your mind.

- Yep. Understood. Okay. Director Ellenbecker, can we .
- Sorry, you're looking for potentially another column or another bit of information, just to say really the status where we at are at, on these items?
- What's been spent, I know some have grants, and have all of the grants actually been applied for or have none, and the full amount is still sitting there? Maybe we can reduce some projects that haven't shown interest so far, but have been sitting out there for five months. Do you know what I mean?
- So again, kind of basically a status of where we're at, if it's already been spent, if it's been obligated, if no action has happened at this point, kind of an extra column of the status?
- That would be great. Thank you.
- I think that's doable.
- Thank you.
- Okay. Discussion on this item? If not, I would look for a motion.
- Motion to approve.
- Or receive and place on file.
- Motion to file.
- Yeah.
- Yeah, and I'll second that.
- All right. We have a motion by Galvin, a second by Brunette. Any further discussion? Seeing none, all those in favor say aye?
- [Alders] Aye.
- Opposed? Motion carries. Item number nine. Report of the Claims Committee. Anything here that we need to pull out, or can we act on this?
- I think a motion to receive and place on file.
- I'll second that.
- All right. We have a motion by Galvin, a second by Brunette. Is there any discussion? Seeing none, all those in favor say aye?
- [Alders] Aye.

- Any opposed? Motion carries. F, Informational 2022 Contingency Account, \$184,297, notwithstanding the earlier motion that we took today. The next Finance Committee meeting will now be held on Tuesday, August 16th at 4:30 PM.
- 5:00.
- 5:00.
- 5:00 PM. Thank you. I'll entertain a motion to adjourn.
- Motion to adjourn.
- Second.
- We have a motion by Galvin, a second by Brunette. Any discussion? Seeing none, all those in favor say aye?
- [Alders] Aye.
- Any opposed? Motion carries. Thank you, everybody.
- Thank you.