



MINUTES OF THE JOINT FINANCE/PERSONNEL COMMITTEE

THURSDAY, NOVEMBER 3, 2022, 3:00 PM

In person at City Hall, Room 203.

Virtual attendance also available via Zoom.

A. ZOOM MEETING INSTRUCTIONS.

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

B. ROLL CALL.

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

Others Present: Mayor Eric Genrich, Ald. Jennifer Grant, Ald. Melinda Eck, Ald. Mark Steuer, Ald. Steven Campbell, Finance Director Diana Ellenbecker, Public Works Director Steve Grenier, City Attorney Joanne Bungert, Police Chief Chris Davis, Green Bay Metro Fire Chief David Litton, Community and Economic Development Director Neil Stechschulte, Parks Recreation and Forestry Director Dan Ditscheit, Green Bay Metro Transit Director Patricia Kiewiz, Chief of Operations Joseph Faulds, Deputy Finance Director Pam Manley, Asst. Fire Chief Rob Goplin, Asst. Fire Chief Ryan Gibbons, Police Department Business Manager Rick Jurkanis, Deputy Parks, Recreation and Forestry Director James Anderson, Community and Economic Development Deputy Director Cheryl Renier-Wigg, City Clerk Celestine Jeffreys, Chief of Staff Amaad Rivera-Wagner, Human Resources Manager Melanie Falk and others.

C. APPROVAL OF THE AGENDA.

Moved by Ald. Jesse Brunette, seconded by Ald. Jim Hutchison to approve the agenda.

Motion Passed.

Yes- Bill Galvin, Brian Johnson, Jesse Brunette, Jim Hutchison, No- None, Abstain- None.

D. APPROVAL OF MINUTES.

I. Approval of the Finance Committee minutes from the October 25, 2022 meeting.

Moved by Ald. Jesse Brunette, seconded by Ald. Jim Hutchison to approve the Finance and Personnel Committee minutes.

Motion Passed.

Yes- Bill Galvin, Brian Johnson, Jesse Brunette, Jim Hutchison, No- None, Abstain- None.

2. Approval of the Personnel Committee minutes from the October 25, 2022 meeting.

Mayor Eric Genrich presented a summary of his 2023 recommended budget.

E. REGULAR BUSINESS.

1. Consideration with possible action on the request for 2023 new positions and reclassifications. Recommendation to discuss during the individual departments 2023 budget approval.

Moved by Ald. Jesse Brunette, seconded by Ald. Jim Hutchison to receive and place on file.

Motion Passed.

Yes- Bill Galvin, Brian Johnson, Jesse Brunette, Jim Hutchison, No- None, Abstain- None.

2. Consideration with possible action the request to reclassify the Fire Administrative Assistant to Fire Finance Services Administrator not included in the 2023 budget.

Moved by Ald. Jesse Brunette, seconded by Ald. Jim Hutchison to receive and place on file.

Motion Passed.

Yes- Bill Galvin, Brian Johnson, Jesse Brunette, Jim Hutchison, No- None, Abstain- None.

F. REVIEW AND APPROVAL OF THE MAYOR'S RECOMMENDED 2023 BUDGET.

1. Common Council (page 23).

Moved by Ald. Jesse Brunette, seconded by Ald. Jim Hutchison to approve.

Motion Passed.

Yes- Bill Galvin, Brian Johnson, Jesse Brunette, Jim Hutchison, No- None, Abstain- None.

2. Mayor's Office (page 27).

Moved by Ald. Jim Hutchison, seconded by Ald. Jesse Brunette to approve.

Motion Passed.

Yes- Bill Galvin, Brian Johnson, Jesse Brunette, Jim Hutchison, No- None, Abstain- None.

3. Administrative Services (pages 36-39).

Moved by Ald. Jesse Brunette, seconded by Ald. Brian Johnson to reduce postage (line item #54005) by \$10,000.

Moved by Ald. Brian Johnson, seconded by Ald. Jesse Brunette to amend the motion to reduce the postage (line item #54005) from \$10,000 to \$5,000.

Motion passed.

Yes- Brian Johnson, Jesse Brunette, Jim Hutchison, No- Bill Galvin, Abstain- None.

Moved by Ald. Brian Johnson, seconded by Ald. Jesse Brunette to reduce postage by \$5,000.

Motion Passed.

Yes- Brian Johnson, Jesse Brunette, Jim Hutchison, No- Bill Galvin, Abstain- None.

Moved by Ald. Jim Hutchison, seconded by Ald. Brian Johnson to approve the Administrative Services budget as amended.

Motion Passed.

Yes- Brian Johnson, Jesse Brunette, Jim Hutchison, Bill Galvin, Abstain- None.

4. Information Technology and Equipment Replacement (pages 47-48).

Moved by Ald. Jim Hutchison, seconded by Ald. Brian Johnson to approve.

Motion Passed.

Yes- Bill Galvin, Brian Johnson, Jesse Brunette, Jim Hutchison, No- None, Abstain- None.

5. Law (pages 55-56).

The Committee may convene in closed session pursuant to Sections 19.85(1)(e), Wis. Stats., for purposes of deliberating or negotiating the sale of public properties, investing of public funds or conducting other specified public business as necessary for competitive or bargaining reasons. 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.

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. Jesse Brunette, seconded by Ald. Brian Johnson to maintain the current FTE status of the (2) Legal Assistants (.94 and .75).

Motion Failed.

Yes- Jesse Brunette, No- Bill Galvin, Brian Johnson, Jim Hutchison, Abstain- None.

Moved by Ald. Jim Hutchison, seconded by Ald. Brian Johnson to approve the Law Department budget.

Motion Passed.

Yes- Bill Galvin, Brian Johnson, Jim Hutchison, No- Jesse Brunette, Abstain- None.

6. Municipal Court (pages 61-62).

Moved by Ald. Jesse Brunette, seconded by Ald. Brian Johnson to eliminate line item #50003 Seasonal Salaries of \$4,000 to \$0 and eliminate line item #50501 Overtime of \$500 to \$0.

Motion Passed.

Yes- Bill Galvin, Brian Johnson, Jesse Brunette, Jim Hutchison, No- None, Abstain- None.

Moved by Ald. Jesse Brunette, seconded by Ald. Jim Hutchison to approve the Municipal Court budget as amended.

Motion passed.

Yes- Bill Galvin, Brian Johnson, Jesse Brunette, Jim Hutchison, No- None, Abstain- None.

7. Human Resources (pages 70-71).

Moved by Ald. Jesse Brunette, seconded by Ald. Brian Johnson to delay hiring the DE and I coordinator until July 1, 2023 with a savings of \$45,564.

Motion Failed.

Yes- Brian Johnson, Jesse Brunette, No- Bill Galvin, Jim Hutchison, Abstain- None.

Moved by Ald. Jim Hutchison, seconded by Ald. Bill Galvin to approve the Human Resources budget.

Motion Passed.

Yes- Bill Galvin, Brian Johnson, Jim Hutchison, No- Jesse Brunette, Abstain- None.

8. Community & Economic Development (83-85).

Moved by Ald. Jesse Brunette, seconded by none to keep the Public Arts Coordinator and Administrative Clerk as currently funded for a savings of \$74,958.

Motion failed for lack of a second.

Yes- None, No- None, Abstain- None.

Moved by Ald. Jesse Brunette, seconded by none to keep funding for Public Arts Coordinator as currently budgeted for a savings of \$17,897.

Motion failed for lack of a second.

Yes- None, No- None, Abstain- None.

Moved by Ald. Brian Johnson, seconded by Ald. Jesse Brunette to keep funding for the Administrative Clerk as currently budgeted for a savings of \$57,061.

Yes- None, No- None, Abstain- None.

Moved by Ald. Jesse Brunette, seconded by Ald. Brian Johnson to amend the previous motion to move 40% of the Administrative Clerk to the levy instead of 80% for a savings of \$28,531.

Motion Passed.

Yes- Brian Johnson, Jesse Brunette, Jim Hutchison, No- Bill Galvin, Abstain- None.

Moved by Ald. Jesse Brunette, seconded by Ald. Brian Johnson to move .4 of the Administrative Clerk to the levy instead of .8.

Motion Passed.

Yes- Brian Johnson, Jesse Brunette, Jim Hutchison, No- Bill Galvin, Abstain- None.

Moved by Ald. Brian Johnson, seconded by Ald. Jim Hutchison to approve the Community and Economic Development budget as amended.

Motion Passed.

Yes- Bill Galvin, Brian Johnson, Jesse Brunette, Jim Hutchison, No- None, Abstain- None.

9. Police Department (pages 95-98).

Moved by Ald. Jesse Brunette, seconded by Ald. Brian Johnson to allocate one half of the body camera cost using ARPA funding.

Motion Failed.

Yes- Jesse Brunette, No- Bill Galvin, Brian Johnson, Jim Hutchison, Abstain- None.

Moved by Ald. Jim Hutchison, seconded by Ald. Brian Johnson to approve the Police Department budget as submitted.

Motion Passed.

Yes- Bill Galvin, Brian Johnson, Jim Hutchison, No- Jesse Brunette, Abstain- None.

10. Fire Department.

General Fund (pages 106-109)

Allouez (pages 110-111)

Bellevue (pages 186-187)

Moved by Ald. Jesse Brunette, seconded by none to allocate \$250,000 from loss revenue of ARPA funds toward any applicable budget line item.

Motion failed due to lack of a second.

Yes- None, No- None, Abstain- None.

Moved by Ald. Jim Hutchison, seconded by Ald. Brian Johnson to approve the reclassification of the Fire Department Administrative Assistant. Cost: \$4,334

Motion Passed.

Yes- Bill Galvin, Brian Johnson, Jim Hutchison, No- Jesse Brunette, Abstain- None.

Moved by Ald. Bill Galvin, seconded by Ald. Jim Hutchison to approve the Fire Department budget as amended.

Motion Passed.

Yes- Bill Galvin, Brian Johnson, Jim Hutchison, No- Jesse Brunette, Abstain- None.

11. Department of Public Works includes Engineering, Operations, Traffic and Equipment Replacement (pages-118-122).

Moved by Ald. Jesse Brunette, seconded by none to use ARPA funds for any line item that would allow for this.

Motion failed due to lack of a second.

Yes- None, No- None, Abstain- None.

Moved by Ald. Bill Galvin, seconded by Ald. Jim Hutchison to approve the Public Works budget.

Motion Passed.

Yes- Bill Galvin, Brian Johnson, Jim Hutchison, No- Jesse Brunette, Abstain- None.

12. Parks, Recreation & Forestry and Equipment Replacement (pages 137-140).

Moved by Ald. Brian Johnson, seconded by Ald. Jim Hutchison to add \$202,995 to the Seasonal Salary line item #50003.

Motion Passed.

Yes- Bill Galvin, Brian Johnson, Jim Hutchison, No- Jesse Brunette, Abstain- None.

Moved by Ald. Jesse Brunette, seconded by Ald. Brian Johnson to hold on the reclassification of the Park Supervisor to Recreational Manager for a savings of \$2,827.

Motion Passed.

Yes- Bill Galvin, Brian Johnson, Jesse Brunette, No- Jim Hutchison, Abstain- None.

Moved by Ald. Brian Johnson, seconded by Ald. Jesse Brunette to use \$43,868 of unrestricted ARPA

funds to counter the additional seasonal salaries.

Yes- None, No- None, Abstain- None.

Moved by Ald. Brian Johnson, seconded by Ald. Jim Hutchison to reduce seasonal salaries by \$43,868.

Motion Passed.

Yes- Bill Galvin, Brian Johnson, Jim Hutchison, No- Jesse Brunette, Abstain- None.

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

Motion Passed.

Yes- Bill Galvin, Brian Johnson, Jesse Brunette, Jim Hutchison, No- None, Abstain- None.

13. Miscellaneous (page 145).

Moved by Ald. Jim Hutchison, seconded by Ald. Brian Johnson to approve.

Motion Passed.

Yes- Bill Galvin, Brian Johnson, Jesse Brunette, Jim Hutchison, No- None, Abstain- None.

14. Special Revenue Funds (pages 160-187).

Moved by Ald. Brian Johnson, seconded by Ald. Jim Hutchison to increase line item #54061 from \$112,500 to \$152,500 and decrease line item #55305 from \$2,250,000 to \$2,210,000.

Motion Passed.

Yes- Bill Galvin, Brian Johnson, Jesse Brunette, Jim Hutchison, No- None, Abstain- None.

Moved by Ald. Brian Johnson, seconded by Ald. Bill Galvin to create account #50003 for \$43,868 for seasonal Park salaries using unrestricted loss revenue ARPA funds.

Motion Passed.

Yes- Bill Galvin, Brian Johnson, Jesse Brunette, Jim Hutchison, No- None, Abstain- None.

Moved by Ald. Jim Hutchison, seconded by Ald. Brian Johnson to approve as amended.

Motion Passed.

Yes- Bill Galvin, Brian Johnson, Jesse Brunette, Jim Hutchison, No- None, Abstain- None.

15. Debt Service Fund (pages 189-191).

Moved by Ald. Bill Galvin, seconded by Ald. Brian Johnson to approve.

Motion Passed.

Yes- Bill Galvin, Brian Johnson, Jesse Brunette, Jim Hutchison, No- None, Abstain- None.

16. Capital Projects Funds (pages 193-238).

Moved by Ald. Jim Hutchison, seconded by Ald. Jesse Brunette to approve.

Motion Passed.

Yes- Bill Galvin, Brian Johnson, Jesse Brunette, Jim Hutchison, No- None, Abstain- None.

17. Internal Service Funds (pages 256-258).

Moved by Ald. Brian Johnson, seconded by Ald. Jesse Brunette to approve.

Motion Passed.

Yes- Bill Galvin, Brian Johnson, Jesse Brunette, Jim Hutchison, No- None, Abstain- None.

G. REGULAR BUSINESS CONTINUED.

1. For consideration with possible action the approval to award the marketing and branding Initiative to North Star Place Branding + Marketing for the sum of \$101,000. Held from the 9/20/2022 Common Council meeting.

Moved by Ald. Brian Johnson, seconded by Ald. Bill Galvin to hold until we apply for a grant and receive a determination letter. This will give staff time to prepare.

Motion Passed.

Yes- Bill Galvin, Brian Johnson, Jesse Brunette, Jim Hutchison, No- None, Abstain- None.

2. Consideration with possible action an amendment to the five-year Axon agreement fully executed Dec 2020.

Moved by Ald. Jim Hutchison, seconded by Ald. Jesse Brunette to advance without a recommendation.

Motion Passed.

Yes- Bill Galvin, Brian Johnson, Jesse Brunette, Jim Hutchison, No- None, Abstain- None.

H. INFORMATIONAL.

1. Enterprise Transit (pages 244-249).

2. 2022 Contingency Account: \$184,297.00; unobligated is \$57,297.00

Finance Director Ellenbecker provided a recap as follows:

At the time the budget was completed, the mill rate was at \$7.84

When the budget went to print, the mill rate was at \$7.78

As a result of the changes made at committee, the mill rate is at \$7.80

\$122,603 was added back to the budget. This maximizes the City's expenditure restraint, but still falls under the levy limit.

I. ADJOURNMENT.

Moved by Ald. Jim Hutchison, seconded by Ald. Jesse Brunette to adjourn.

Motion Passed.

Yes- Bill Galvin, Brian Johnson, Jesse Brunette, Jim Hutchison, No- None, Abstain- None.

J. VERBATIM MINUTES.

- Okay, I call the meeting to order, 3:01 PM. Let the record reflect Alder Hutchison is present, Alder Brunette is present, Alder Johnson is present, Alder Galvin is present via Zoom. I'll entertain a motion for the approval of the agenda.

- [Jesse] Move to approve.

- [Jim] Second.

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

- [Alders] Aye.

- Opposed? Motion carries. I'll entertain a motion to approve the minutes.

- So moved.

- Second.

- We have a motion by Brunette, a second by Hutchison. Any discussion? Actually we have two items here. Sorry, I missed that. Let's entertain a motion to take up both items with one roll call vote. Actually, do we have to do that? Can we just take the agenda item? The whole thing, right?

- That's the way to do it.

- Yeah. So we have Brunette and Hutchison. Any discussion?

- [Bill] I can't hear anything.

- Let's take up the whole report. All right, seeing no discussion, all those in favor say aye?

- [Alders] Aye.

- Opposed? Motion carries. Item EI. Consideration with possible action on the request for 2023 New Positions and Reclassifications. Recommendation to discuss during the individual department's 2023 budget approval. Mayor, when did you want to do your overview?

- [Eric] I can hop up there now if you want?

- All right, why don't we, yeah, why don't we do that, 'cause this...

- [Joseph] I'll maybe dispense maybe these two, and then we'll...

- I was thinking, some of this kind of ties into the budget discussion. So Mayor, why don't you go right now.

- [Eric] All right, well good afternoon, everybody. It's nice to be back in the Chambers for our budget meeting. It's been a few years, so good to see everybody. I have the same presentation that I offered last Thursday night, so I won't belabor a lot of this, but just wanted to do the overview again so that we could all sort of be on the same page going into the discussion. There we go. Yeah, so to start things off with the item that's probably of most interest to residents in the community. Just wanted to note the fact that the mill rate here is being reduced dramatically from 9.80 to 7.84. Actually, I think it'll be a bit lower than that. Director Ellenbecker can walk us through, but the long and short of it is it's a reduction of at least 20% than where we were at coming into it. The biggest reason for that, of course, is, as everybody in this room is probably familiar, but the biggest reason is for the citywide

reevaluation that took place for the first time in 18 years. So a lot of changes because of that time lag. I had the opportunity to talk to some folks from the City of Milwaukee and Milwaukee County yesterday. They do a reevaluation from the city's perspective every two years. The City of Madison does one on an annual basis, I believe. And this Council, back in 2018, and I think, passed a policy to recommend a reevaluation no more than every five years. So I just want to add my support to that policy. 18 years is far too long. And as a result, people saw some pretty dramatic changes. But as I said, that allows for a dramatic reduction in the mill rate as well. Also to note from this budget, the inclusion of body worn cameras for the first time into the city's annual spending plan. This is something that was supported by the Green Bay Packers for the first year, and we really appreciate that support. And last year we did fund it with some ARPA resources. This time we are including it, at least from the proposed point of view, into the operating budget. We also have the addition of seven firefighters to the Metro Fire Department. Really because of the explosion of overtime costs associated with some changes in the demography of the department. We've got a much younger force now. People starting families and using some time as a result. And because of how contracts are written, this has required a lot of use of overtime. So what we've suggested here is the addition of some new firefighters to reduce what would otherwise be some big increases in overtime spending. And then last but not least, this is the first full year of our Green Bay Conservation Corps. Alder Grant, and our families, and I, and a bunch of other folks, were out at Red Smith just this past Saturday, cutting down some buckthorn with the Corps. So they're doing some great work. I think they've identified 75 acres across the city where they'd like to do some of this work. And this Council has already approved the acceptance of that grant, but just noting that this would be the first full year of the Corps being in place. Just reiterating, the largest expense that we have as far as the city is concerned, is for Public Safety, so for our Police and Fire. So this budget continues a commitment to Public Safety that we've demonstrated over the last several years. We've increased the number of funded police officers from 180 to 187. And because of the work of the Chief and the entire team over there, we're getting, I think, pretty darn close to actually having a full roster of 187 officers. I mentioned the seven additional firefighters. There have been a few in past budgets added to that table as well. And then just making the point that we continue the regional partnership that we have here from the city's point of view with Bellevue and the Village of Allouez, Allouez having Fire and EMS from Green Bay Metro Fire for several years now, Bellevue having Fire. And our hope I think is to extend EMS services as well to that village. I mentioned the seven firefighters to reduce OT, Conservation Corps. One additional note is the addition of the park maintenance worker. We previously had some neighborhood enhancement funds dedicated to the maintenance of properties that have been acquired by the RDA and the city over the last 20 odd years or so, that those funds have run dry. And so we either needed to contract out for those services or to employ some additional workers to take care of it in-house. It made more sense based on our calculation from the administration's point of view to do that with an additional park maintenance worker. So just wanted to note that additional employee. Conservation Corps, just a few additional details here. Total expense is \$465,000, but the bulk of that, 75% of it, is actually covered by the federal government, \$387,000. So I personally think this is a good model potentially to be expanded to other programs within the Parks Department. In addition to that, hopefully some other departments might be able to take advantage of this program that's offered at the federal level and run at the state level to provide services in a more cost effective way for residents. A lot of numbers on this one, but just giving you a sense of the percentage changes for some of our different departments. Elections is the largest change there, with the exception of capital equipment, but a significant reduction in elections because of the fact that we're going into an odd year. We've got a bunch of elections this year, much fewer in the next year. And then, like I said, the capital equipment going in the other direction just demonstrates the fact that we've added, in addition to body worn cameras, some lease payments for

fleet vehicles and some laptops and a few other things, recognizing that those expenses are not things that you would want to be borrowing for. And so have taken the step of including them in the operating budget, just giving folks a sense of how things break out, by department, as I said, Police and Fire taking up the bulk of our spending here within the city, but then DPW and Parks, Rec and Forestry after them. And then this just kind of notes the fact that we are really a service oriented organization. The bulk of the spending is to employ people to provide the vital services that we do to our residents. So you see here, 46% of the entire budget for salaries, close to 19% for benefits. And then here, just calling out a few of the increased costs that you'll see in this budget. Between regular salaries, new positions, reclasses, and the 3% COLA, that's about \$2 million in increased expenses. Fuel, which has jumped up for everybody, 877,000 next year. 85,000 additional dollars for natural gas. Wisconsin Retirement System, on the employer side of things, an added cost of \$863,000. As I mentioned last Thursday, we are very blessed in the State of Wisconsin to have a fully funded retirement system. But the downside of that is we gotta pay for that every year. And so that's an additional cost for us, and for all local units of government, with the exception of Milwaukee. Equipment in the operating budget, I touched on, that's being brought in. That increased debt service payments. The Capital Improvement Plan has expanded every year, especially in recent years, so the debt service associated with those borrowing decisions have increased as well. Bridge maintenance, another thing that was in capital budget being brought into operating for sort of obvious reasons, since that's an annual expense. Additional costs for OT within the Police Department. Some legal expenses. And then an increase in the Contingency Fund. Is that going to 250 or?

- [Diana] It's going to 250.

- [Eric] Going to 250 from 200, which is just a good thing to be doing from a budgeting point of view. Some increases in revenues. I believe there's been a discussion of some of these at the Parks Committee, but a number of permits and fees increased. Increase in interest revenue to the tune of 280,000. Increase in EMS fees of 600,000. And then an estimated increase in hotel room tax, the city's portion of that, in the neighborhood of \$100,000. And then this one I jokingly said is dedicated to Alder Scannell, 'cause it's something that he notes every year, just asking the question of how do we compare to some of the other larger communities in the state of Wisconsin. Obviously you see Racine there, the mill rate proposed is over 13. Madison a bit lower than ours, because of some of the property values down there that are significant. Kenosha, again, significantly higher. Milwaukee, Appleton actually a bit higher than where we're at as well. And then this is just a slide kind of talking about levy limits here that we have to live within. So just based on net new construction, we'd be able to add 300, roughly \$300,000 to our expenses on the levy. And then if you factor in all of the adjustments that we're able to take, that gives you the balance, or the additional 7.5 that we're able to spend. And this all operates within the Expenditure Restraint Program, which is a state program that encourages local units of government to keep their spending in check. It's a calculation that includes CPI, as well as net new construction. And so we are living within that. That's true I think of most municipalities in the state, but not all anymore. Some are actually foregoing that Expenditure Restraint payment, which in our case is about one and a half million dollars I believe. So we are staying within that, which is a very good thing. There's a little over \$100,000 in wiggle room in this proposed budget. And then this one just kind of talks about property valuation going back roughly a decade. So it shows the assessed property values and equalized values. So significant growth, especially in the last few years. So from an equalized perspective, over \$9 billion, with a B, assessed just under that. And then the city tax rate you'll see was increasing gradually over the last few years. It drops pretty dramatically here because of that revaluation. And then this slide just kind of talks about how the different taxing jurisdictions interact with one another. So Green Bay Schools is the

largest proportion, at roughly 43%. And then we've got the County and NWTC as well. I think the city's around, is it 39%? And then this one I've included I think every year that I've brought forward a budget, just to demonstrate the fact that if our shared revenue payments and some other payments that we receive from the state government had kept pace with inflation going back 20 years, we'd receive roughly two times of what we're getting right now. So if it had kept pace with inflation, we'd be getting another \$24 million from the state of Wisconsin. And so when you think about the fact that our budget overall is about 124 million, that's about a fifth of all of our spending, if those payments had kept pace with inflation. So that's all I got. Happy to answer any questions for Council at this time, or as we move through the budget.

- Mayor, just a couple things. Maybe not necessarily questions, but in observation, if you will. One of the things that this council asked you to do, and I just wanted to acknowledge it and appreciate it, is that we wanted to see more of those capital projects being expensed for. So things that we buy on a rotation or every year, instead of bonding for that. That's something we talked about in the last council. I think that message has come through. Because when I look at this, of course there's the growth in expenses, which isn't as important to me because there's oftentimes revenue tied to that. It's the growth in the levy that I look at. And that's the six million. Well, we're shifting a million, roughly, this is the time for us to do that, because Expenditure Restraint is allowing us to do it with the Inflation Index. So I appreciate that you did that. I also want to acknowledge that we had the growth in debt service payments. And again, we have to remember that this council is the one that made the decision to say, "You know what, we're not gonna bond 10 years for a three year squad car", so that means our repayment is higher. So that's another thing that contributes to that. And then of course, there are the one time expenses, like fuel, the legal fees, the contribution to the Wisconsin Retirement. So when I kind of add those up, we're really looking at a spending proposal that's about three million more than what we've seen in the past. And of course what makes up that three million? And you provided that, right? We're looking at, whether it's salary increases for staff or increases in some other areas. But to me it's a nut that can be cracked and we can talk about, and I'm sure there'll be many proposals that give and take on some different things. But I just kind of wanted to give maybe a little bit of additional overview on that. And I did ask Director Ellenbecker to send the entire council some information about levy limits and Expenditure Restraint, and the importance of that, those two items as it relates to this discussion. 'Cause I'll admit, even my first year, I didn't quite fully grasp it. Heck, in my fifth year, I don't know that I always get it. But it's a really important consideration when we're doing this because our costs are going up just like everybody else. And if we don't take advantage of the Expenditure Restraint and the inflation indicator that's within that formula, we're not gonna be able to raise it next year or the year after or the year after. And then we end up in a structural deficit, much like we did when one time sales tax money was used from Lambeau Field, and we're still paying for that today. And that's what puts us sometimes in these tight positions. And whether we like it or not, the slide that shows the reduction in shared revenue, it's an intentional decision by the state to say, "We want property taxes to pay for these things", and the state's not going to do it. That's been the shift. So you can't hold things steady. I look back at the last 20 years, and I did an index for inflation, this budget is almost the same as it was 20 years ago, yet we saw a significant reduction in shared revenue. So that's why we can't be as aggressive with roads and some of the other things that we do. And I think that warrants a discussion. There was a really good article in the Press-Gazette today that talked about that, and Milwaukee's efforts, to where they came up here and visited, I think Mayor with you and some of our other state leaders. So I just kind of wanted to add some additional context around the discussion that we're gonna have here today, and appreciate the overview here of what you've proposed.

- [Eric] Yeah, appreciate those comments. And like I said, if people have questions, I'll of course be hanging out for the rest of the meeting. So feel free to fire away.

- Yeah, go ahead. Sorry, I got to, and the name's on here are I think wrong. So let me .

- [Melinda] I'm in Randy's spot.

- That, I think is, are you?

- [Melinda] No, that's what, I moved.

- [Diana] That's 'cause we already slid him down. That would be...

- I I, 10-

- Stevens probably where-

- Nope.

- Campbell?

- Nope.

- It's Campbell.

- [Brian] Nope.

- Oh, if you do that-

- [Brian] I'm just gonna keep going until we get there. All right.

- All right. Well, whatever. I can talk loud enough. It is just simple. Is it possible that we can get a copy of what, I know some of it is in here, but I didn't see all of it. So if we could get a copy of everything that you shared, that would be great.

- [Eric] Yep, no problem.

- That's it. Thank you.

- [Brian] Okay. And Alder Steuer.

- Thank you, Chair. Mayor, I was gonna ask, the state has this \$4.3 billion surplus this year, and I know you've talked about that in the past, about how the city can benefit from something like that. Is there any hope or anything at all with the city getting involved in that? And is there a timeframe on that? Or can we even think about that for this year's budget?

- [Eric] Yeah. Well, hope springs eternal. Certainly.

- Yeah, okay.

- Even when you're talking about the state legislature. But yesterday, Representative Macco said we're likely to be looking at \$6 billion. The number that is public right now is 4.3 billion, but it could be going as high as \$6 billion. So yeah, I'm absolutely hoping that the state leaders will get pretty creative about how they support local government. The way that they do that, though, is with their biennial budget process, which will begin in February. So there's not much hope of anything being done for this, for our budget cycle.

- [Mark] Right. But that's still in the works?

- Yeah.

- Okay, thank you.

- [Brian] Okay. Any other questions for the Mayor?

- All right. Thanks, again.

- Thank you, Mayor.

- You bet.

- Okay, with that we'll move on to item E1. Consideration with possible action on the request for 2023 New Positions and Reclassifications. Recommendations to discuss during the individual department's 2023 budget approval. Do we want to take these one at a time?

- [Joseph] Alder Johnson, .

- Yep, you're gonna take them all? Yep.

- Typically what we do is we put these up front so everyone's aware of what the new positions and reclassifications are, but we can take them up during each department discussion if you want to handle it that way. So you're not approving them with this item, but it'll be, I guess, contingent upon approval in the budget when you talk about each department. That might make more sense to talk about.

- [Brian] Committee, how do you-

- It's up to you, how the Committee wants to handle it.

- [Brian] Yeah. Committee, how do you want to handle it? Alder Brunette?

- Yeah. Thank you, Chairman. We would need to be reminded. So Mr. Faulds, if you could just let us know, because one thing that we have done at different times, different councils I've been part of, is we kind of make the \$100 cut, \$200 cut, \$1,000 cut. And we could be here all day the way I see it if we're gonna make a substantial cut in what has been proposed, one of the things that we're gonna have to do is make substantial cuts. And one of the things that we could do is some of the proposed

increases in salaries and reclassifications and additions to hours for some of these positions, we really should consider them one by one to see how it fits within the organizational priorities. So I would most certainly agree that it should be discussed at the moment of that department report, but we just need to be reminded so we don't overlook something.

- Okay.

- Yep.

- [Brian] Can you do that?

- [Joseph] Yeah, that's what we did last year as well. I think right off the bat we talked about new positions and reclassifications in the department.

- Okay. Mayor, I have a whole new appreciation for this running this thing while the meeting's going on. Okay, so then, I don't know, I guess what do we do with that? Just any questions on any specific positions in there? Otherwise I guess we'll receive and place on file.

- Yeah.

- Is that good?

- [Jesse] As long as we're discussing it at the-

- Right.

- [Jesse] Motion to receive and place and file.

- [Jim] Second.

- All right. We have a motion by Brunette, second by Hutchison. Any further discussion? Any questions? Seeing none, all those in favor say aye?

- [Alders] Aye.

- Opposed? Motion carries. All right, item number two. Hey, Mike, how do I turn back to the Zoom? Do I hit Send Live again? On the bottom screen? So that I can see if there are people on Zoom that want to speak?

- [Joseph] Yeah, I guess I could. Alder Johnson, I guess I could let you know too. I have that on my screen.

- Perfect. All right. I'll count on you for that. Thank you, Joe. Item two, consideration with possible action on the request to reclassify the Fire Administrative Assistant to Fire Finance Services Administrator, not included in the 2023 budget.

- [Jesse] Motion to receive and place on file.

- [Jim] Second.

- All right, we have a motion by Brunette, a second by Hutchison. Any further discussion? Seeing none, all those in favor say aye?

- [Alders] Aye.

- Opposed? Motion carries. We'll move on to FI, Common Council, page 23. Anything here to be discussed? If not, we'll entertain a motion. It's probably the leanest of the chapters.

- [Jesse] I don't have anything. Oh, I do, I do.

- Yep. Alder Brunette.

- Yeah. Thank you, Chairman. One thing that the Council may remember is I put forward a proposal for a legislative assistant or some similar position to assist city council. And I had an exchange emails with Director Faulds, and I believe Attorney Bungert, and perhaps Director Ellenbecker. And I just decided not to pursue that, given some of the growth in the city budget, I didn't think it was an appropriate time to entertain the idea of adding staff to city council. There's also issues with who that person would report to. So I'm just willing to let that die a death right now. That's all.

- [Brian] Okay. Any other discussion? If not we'll entertain a motion.

- Move to approve.

- [Jim] Second.

- [Brian] We have a motion by Brunette, a second by Hutchison. Any further discussion? All right, all those in favor say aye?

- [Alders] Aye.

- Opposed? Motion carries. Item two, Mayor's Office, page 27. Do we have any questions? Alder Brunette?

- Yeah, a question for the Mayor, Director Faulds, I'm not sure who, but I remember last year when we made the decision to change, reclassify the HR Director to Chief of Operations, there was some conversation at that time that the Chief of Staff position would kind of be developed into a different classification or different role. I believe that it was consideration for a director of, like a communications director. Do you have an update on that? Was that considered this time around when you created this budget?

- Yeah, Thanks for the question, Alder Brunette. No, I don't think it was considered in terms of totally changing the job description for Chief of Staff, there is, though, acknowledgement that the principle duties for that position are outward facing. They are focused on communications and policy making, whereas Chief of Operations is really focused internally, by and large, on the organization itself.

- Do you believe that the current duties of the Chief of Staff is outward facing? Because there's also that Community Liaison, which is from my understanding, outward facing as well?

- Mm hm.

- Thoughts on that?

- Yeah, like I said, the biggest responsibilities are communications related and policy making. So that the policy making stuff is kind of a combination of inward and outward focused. But Community Liaison is by and large focused on working with alders and departments and constituents directly on some of those concerns that we hear from residents.

- [Jesse] Okay, thank you.

- Okay, any other questions? Alder Brunette.

- More process related. Now obviously there's a consideration for a salary increase of 3% for all non-union employees. That would take effect on October 1st, I believe. So if we were to approve each department, each step of the way, are we going to be able to revisit that salary increase? Whether we change it to make it more or less? How do we do that?

- [Brian] Director Ellenbecker, I'm gonna, do you mind if I go to you for that? Or if it's Attorney Bungert? Because there's a couple things I think, fuel that's spread out, for example, across a lot of departments. How do we address that on a higher level? Who wants to answer that?

- I can speak to that. Yes. If at any point you decide to change the 3%, it would probably affect every one of these budget line items. Either move it forward, backwards, or change the percentage. And same thing with fuel. If let's say at some point you say we use the same assumption across the board, and if somehow we decide that maybe we take it all down a certain percent or up a certain percent, it would affect every department. We'll have to look to the Attorney whether or not, would we have to reopen every one of the departments once it's been approved? I'm not sure how that would work.

- [Brian] Perhaps Attorney Bungert, even if there's a direction, in terms of how we would handle that at the next meeting? If it's easier to do that way by publishing something on the agenda that says we can do that. But let me figure out how to find you. Okay.

- Yep. I think I'm on. So if wages and salaries are approved per department, and those wages and salaries assume a 3% increase for the last few months of the 2023 year, and then that wage increase is adjusted, we'd have to go back and adjust those amendments per department, because you're making a change across the board. So if that fundamental assumption changes, then it changes everything else that that assumption, that is calculated based on that assumption.

- Okay, so perhaps Alder Brunette, what I would do is, just a recommendation. Obviously we're gonna hash through this today as a committee and get answers to our questions. There'll be an opportunity at the next meeting to make motions and adjustments like that. And then perhaps we could post it on the agenda to allow for us to take up, as an example, employee salaries just with one item. Can we do that?

- For all departments?

- Correct.

- [Joanne] I believe you would be able to do that. I'm not seeing any-

- I'm just thinking about how do we streamline that so that it's-

- I'm not sure.

- [Brian] Not so painful to open up 20 things. Right?

- Right.

- [Brian] Mayor.

- Just a process suggestion. I think we'd be able to go back to previous budgets, last year's budget or the one prior to that, where there was discussion about, in that case I think it was 2 versus 1%, and just see how that was handled. But I recall it being done just with one motion. I don't think we went back and adjusted things.

- [Brian] All right. Okay. To me, Robert's Rules is designed to create efficiency, and if it doesn't do that, suspend the rules and do it our own way. Right? Alder Brunette?

- Yeah. I just want to clarify what I'm getting at, because as proposed, 3% in October, I exchanged some emails with Director Ellenbecker. I was just curious in different scenarios, say if we're really trying to, in order to pass it on a majority vote of the council, maybe we consider what 2% increase would look like effective July 1st? Or maybe 3% effective December 1st? Or 1% effective January 1st. There are different scenarios that I think we should be apprised to, and what that financial impact is, because that is rather substantial, and there was an increase of \$2 million, according to the Mayor's presentation in salary. And I know that a quarter of that would, more than a quarter of that, would be for the proposed firefighter positions. So if we're looking to really get to a point that a majority of the council could approve the budget, I'm being very assumptive, making assumptions here of course, but that would be good to know.

- [Brian] Okay, Alder Brunette, I would maybe just suggest, if you've got some scenarios, that perhaps you could send to Director Ellenbecker before the next council meeting?

- I think I did. Are you still working on-

- [Brian] Oh, you've already sent them?

- Are they still? Oh, that list of questions I gave you, I think I, you were gonna direct that to Director Faulds, but I don't remember seeing anything on that.

- I did respond to that.

- That part?

- [Diana] All your questions yesterday afternoon.
- Okay. All right.
- So the question, do you want an answer on what the percent-
- [Jesse] If you don't mind.
- What we had calculated is that the 3% starts in October 1st to the December 31st, 2023. The 3% comes out to roughly \$195,000. And this is for the General Fund only, and that would be about \$65,000 per month. Or if you flip it the other way, what's 1%? 1% of it would be about \$65,000. Yeah, right. Divided by three.
- Three.
- [Jesse] Yeah. Go ahead.
- So yeah, so whether you were to reduce the percentage or move it months up or move it months back, it's about \$65,000 for the full 3% moving it by month. I apologize if you did not get that email.
- [Jesse] I did get the email. Maybe I just overlooked that part. I gave you a lot and so I appreciate, she turned it around very quickly. I just happened not to catch that part, so thank you.
- Mm hm.
- [Brian] Okay.
- Thank you, Pam.
- [Brian] Alder Eck.
- Okay, so I know what you're talking about, the 3% overall and then I'm on the Park Committee, so we were in there for the seasonal, it was 10% proposed? Correct? So that's different than this?
- Correct.
- Yeah.
- Okay.
- [Brian] Yeah, I think Alderman is talking about all positions that are not part of a bargaining unit, that that 3% applies to them, but seasonal park workers are outside of that.
- Oh, okay. All right. Thank you.
- [Brian] Okay, Alder Steuer.

- Thank you, Chair. This might be a loaded question in a sense, but over time, well with the 3%, we've talked about the fact that the higher paid positions, 3% is much, much more that they get versus people below in that sense. So is there a way that that's ever separated out? Or is it you take the whole ball of wax? That if you get a 3%, everybody's included, or has it ever been talked about to be split differently? Because the folks at the top make much more.

- [Brian] So yeah, I'm gonna, Chief Faulds, you probably have more expertise in that area.

- Sure. I do believe that may have been done once in the past. I don't know what year that was. I would recommend not doing that. I think the first thing that comes to mind is when you separate, let's say higher pay positions get a lower increase than lower paying jobs, you're gonna create what's called compression. So the positions that'll get the 3% increase will creep up and maybe even some of them might even surpass some of the positions that might be supervisors. So I think that's something we want to avoid. Also I think it just isn't very good for employee morale to kind of separate between what would typically be supervisors versus people who don't supervise, when we look at those positions. So I think overall it's not a good idea to do that. And I guess lastly, it's possible you could run into maybe discrimination issues based upon who you're giving the pay raise to versus who you're not.

- [Mark] Didn't really mean to stir the hornets nest. It was more or less just an observation, and I understand all those other points that you made, but I just needed to hear it. So thank you.

- [Brian] And I should have brought more lemonades for this. All right.

- Director Faulds, this is related to this committee, the department report, 'cause there are positions in this budget that obviously would get a pay increase. Do you know if there is any case law to suggest that there would be a discrimination accusation or lawsuit? Is there anything that has ever come up with the Wisconsin Municipalities?

- So I guess when I made that comment was, when you're giving different pay to different employees, you could look at things like age, gender, race, things like that, that's what I'm thinking of. The legitimate purpose is kind of difficult to, I guess, defend in that situation, 'cause you're just across board making that decision. So I'm not saying that it would happen, but it's something that possibly could be, a lawsuit could be filed. So that's what I'm getting at.

- Yeah, I definitely don't want to discriminate based on any protected classes, but income level's not a protected class, at least as far as I'm knowledgeable of.

- I don't believe it is. What I'm saying is, if you had a certain class, in positions that were getting a stipend, and then you had certain classes that were getting a 3% increase, an argument could be made that it was based upon that versus what the intention was of the common council. That's what I'm saying.

- Okay, so a scenario, and I suggested this in the past, and Alder Steuer is correct, the lower end of the pay scale for city workers, if they get a 3%, I understand compression, but if you have a 3% pay increase for someone making \$20 an hour versus a 3% for a city employee making \$50 an hour, I know it's a salary, so for the sake of comparison, \$20 by 50, that person on the higher end just will keep making more and more. And what I attempted in the past would be that we do a 3%, or at that

time a 2% or 1% on the first \$60,000 that a person makes. So if any city employee makes over \$60,000 a year, that their pay increase would be 1,800. That way, I know what you're saying with morale, but there are some of our city employees, say like the laborers of the city, snow plow, they all work hard, so I know that, but that will allow us to reward all city employees, but kind of cap it. Is there anything illegal about that? And it's relevant here because we have a city employee in the Mayor's Office, who the 2023 budget impact would be 71,888, so technically my question is relevant to this particular issue.

- Yeah, I understand what what you're asking. And I guess I don't want to get bogged down on potential lawsuits or not. I guess what I would just say is, I think the compression issue is a big deal to think about. I also think it's important to remember that we, I think, pride ourselves at the city in developing and growing our employees, professionally and personally. So when you have someone at entry level that may want to move into a supervisor role, and they start seeing that the common council isn't giving the same type of pay increase to them, it might kind of deter someone to want to move up and improve themselves, I guess, professionally. So, I don't want to get into the weeds of is that illegal. I'm just saying there's potentially, it's possible you could have a discrimination action filed, but ultimately it's up to the common council if you want to cap it at 60,000, if that's what you want to do. So that's just my thought on that.

- [Jesse] Okay, thank you.

- Okay. And Alder Brunette, I know you mentioned, tried to tie it back to the item. I just wanted to at least share that I'm gonna offer a lot of leeway, because I think there's a lot of things in this budget that go across multiple departments, so you don't have to feel like we can only talk about the Mayor's Office right now. Alder Hutchison.

- Yeah, I understand the notion behind this. But coming from engineering degree and that type of thing, I know there's an issue of turnover. And I hate to see someone in the Engineering Department who's above the limit having issues with the fact they're only gonna make something lesser than someone below them, because I come from that world, and that happens all the time in private business, and it's never a good thing for those, and especially if they're keen and good workers. I understand the concept of trying to bring the bottom up, but you have to be also looking at those performers who really outshine and protect them. And there's no way to really protect them in a municipality except give them the pay step or maybe some other way. I don't know if we give any individual employees bonuses? I don't think so. Has that ever been done? Has it been done?

- [Brian] Not to my knowledge.

- Okay. So I just, we have to be aware, it's money. It's all money. We're talking about money. But this is the time to be smart, very smart. And we have to make smart decisions. but also try to well round it. And that's my comment.

- [Brian] Okay. We've got Alder Grant.

- Just for clarification, don't we have raises, though, based on performance? It's just at a different amount on top of this?

- Yeah. So what I can explain is how our compensation plan works is we have a hybrid model where we have a step increase, it's from step one to step seven, which is usually about a two, two and a quarter percent increase between each step. And that's based upon a performance evaluation. If someone's meeting expectations, they get a step increase. And then once step seven is hit, step seven is what's called the control point, which is at 100% of the market. And then you get into what's called the performance range. When you're in the performance range, if you're a non-exempt or hourly employee, you'll get a 1% increase if you meet expectations. And then for exempt employees, you can get a 1% increase if you are above expectations or one and a half percent if you're exceptional. So that's where the increase comes in for based on performance. And then we have on top of that the COLA, the cost of living increase, that usually occurs in October of each year. So that's how our compensation plan works.

- [Jennifer] And that answers my questions on this.

- Yep.

- [Brian] Yeah, good question though, 'cause it's slightly different than a bonus.

- Yeah.

- But it's still something-

- [Jennifer] But it is based on performance So there is something like that, I guess, is why I bring that point up.

- [Brian] Yep. Good point. Mayor.

- Thanks, Chair. Just a quick point, especially for new alders. We did provide a \$500 stipend for all employees across the board, irrespective of salary or wages earlier on in 2022. So just to acknowledge that that was done.

- [Brian] Okay, thank you. Okay, any other questions on the Mayor's budget?

- [Bill] Alder Johnson?

- Speak. I was looking for a microphone. I'm, uh, that doesn't have one.

- [Bill] I clicked on the button to speak, and I don't know if that's working or not, but... I guess I express the same concerns as Alder Hutchison. We're going down that same slippery slope as we've done every year, where I understand trying to save money, but we're trying to save money at the cost of our most vulnerable employees, the ones that can't bargain for themselves, the ones that are left out there as unprotected employees, so to speak. I have a road project in my district that is not gonna be done this year, money was bonded for and it was set to go, because we couldn't hire staff at the salary we were paying or offering. I had the constituents asking why the crosswalks are not painted this year. And Director Grenier told me they could not get part-time staff to apply for the jobs. Now it's, I understand, as a country, we have an inflation issue going on, but we're not gonna help ourselves as we try to provide services to this community if we're going to cut off our nose to spite our face. And to go after the ones that aren't protected, that have no bargaining rights, to me,

just doesn't seem the right way to go about doing it. We need to find, if we really need these cuts, we need to find them some other way than affecting how much money people take home at the end of the day, after offering the community eight hours of work per day. Thank you.

- Alder Brunette.

- Yeah. Thank you. And I don't always make a habit of responding. I just want to make it clear I'm not, I'm not intending to go after anyone. I hope that Alder knows that it wasn't meant to imply that. I was just looking at different scenarios, that if we are at a point where we need to approve a budget, that we're mindful. And so, yeah, it's not that I'm looking to go after anyone or anything like that. I'm hoping that's not what he was implying.

- Yeah, and I think the opposite could be said as well, which is you can go the other end on that spectrum, if there's room in the budget.

- Definitely.

- Okay. Any other discussions? Okay. And if not, we'll entertain a motion.

- Move to approve.

- Second.

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

- [Alders] Aye.

- Opposed? Motion carries. All right. Onto item three, Administrative Services, pages 36 to 39. Do we have any questions? If not, otherwise I'll fire off a couple. Director Ellenbecker. I just had two questions. One is, I'm looking at the Hotel/Motel Room Tax. I know we're bumping that up to five and a quarter. I'm curious how that aligns with pre-pandemic numbers?

- I can start, I know Pam's looking up some information also. Yeah, we moved it up to \$525,000 for the 2023 budget. We did have 425 in last year's budget. We are looking year to date, We are-

- 2019.

- We are currently at... We are currently at 494,000 year to date for 2022. 2021 we were at at \$406,000. And 2019 was at-

- 471.

- 471,000. So pre pandemic was about 471.

- [Brian] Okay. And this is really the revenue source that we use to pay off the KI Bonds, right? Or is that a little different?

- This is different.

- Okay.

- For room tax, there is, if you're staying in a hotel in the city of Green Bay, you get a 10% room tax. 2% gets taken right off the top, goes to the CVB. That leaves 8%. Of that 8%, the City of Green Bay gets 4% of that 8%. That comes into this fund. The remaining balance of that 8% then goes into a trust and that helps pay for the large facilities in the city of Green Bay, and the surrounding municipalities, it helps pay for the KI Convention Center, the original convention center, it helps pay for the Resch Center, it helps pay for the KI Convention expansion, and it also pays for the Expo Hall.

- [Brian] So this 4% is really unrestricted in the sense that it can, it applies to, the budget can be used in any way that we see fit?

- Correct.

- [Brian] Okay. Good. So it's really kind of bouncing back into those pre pandemic numbers it sounds like?

- Yes.

- [Brian] All right. Okay, good.

- It's actually above.

- [Brian] And then the other question that I just had was related to the postage. Now I presume this includes Clerk's Office and still reflects just a growing number of absentee ballots being mailed. Is there anything else? Because I, of course we came back and asked for some funding out of contingency. I just want to make sure that we don't run into that situation again. Is that what that's kind of reflecting?

- Correct, yeah. 2/20/22 we had requested \$80,000. 2022 actuals, there were several items that were missed in the budget. Absentees had gone up. We had a large mailing for the re-eval that was missed.

- That's the other thing.

- And then there's been two, actually in the course of this year, there'll be three price increases in postage. Usage is up. And so next year's expectation is that we would need about 110,000 to cover basically more absentees and to cover the postage increases.

- [Brian] Okay. That's all I had. Alder Brunette.

- Yeah. Thank you, Chairman. That was my line of questioning too. Now what is the rate increase? What is the rate now to end the year, will be, and versus what do you propose, what do you think it will be in 2023?

- We don't have any rate increases built in specifically for 2023. Just that there was an increase, there has been two rate increases, if not three since the time we put the 2022 budget together. So it

would've been fall of 2021, there has been three postage increases since. So if you're comparing year over year, that is-

- Oh, I see.

- We did not anticipate any in the next year. But that is always a possibility.

- Yeah. And we, that was a, gosh, I don't want to be offensive, but that was a substantial error in the last budget. Not pointing any fingers, but we had \$80,000 budgeted, and the actual, to date, at least from the budget book being printed, it was \$154,000, give or take. So we under-budgeted \$74,000 to date.

- [Diana] Correct. There were several things that happened within that.

- The reassessment and the absentee. So to that point, though, with the absentee ballots, when you go from say 80,000 to 110,000, which is the proposed change, obviously we won't have the reassessment letters go out,

- Correct.

- Right. But we only have a spring primary, a nonpartisan primary, and then of course the mayor's election or school board. There's only two elections.

- Correct.

- So how do... Please, I'm not trying to seem like I'm putting you on the hot seat here, but why would we anticipate such a higher demand for absentee ballots for two relatively low turnout elections compared to the fall election?

- The third item is there just has been more mailing in general. We've had more certified mailing. So that was part of another item that goes out of here, is all certified mailing. As we continue to increase our sidewalk program, all sidewalk letters, assessments, go out certified, that we saw an increase in 2022 because of the certified. That was a driver.

- [Brian] Thanks, Galvin. Sidewalks?

- Yes.

- [Brian] Just making sure he is awake.

- [Jesse] Yeah. And for the year ending this year, we voted down using contingency. So that would just come from what exactly? Have you determined that?

- At this point we went through, we verified there was a couple, like a couple thousand dollars that can be redirected to another account within that department. But what happens is, we are looking to keep Administrative Services within budget, which is, it's really by function, and as long as it stays within function, and that we stay under budget, we wouldn't have to ask for a budget amendment. So that is our goal to try to keep admin in a total, to be able to cover this overage in postage.

- So 2021, the actual postage was 78,847. And those were, again, two spring elections, and then we're going up to 110, which I understand there will be more mailings for the reason you stated. But could we potentially reduce that to \$100,000? Cut it by 10,000? Would you be comfortable with that?

- [Diana] What I'm gonna say is, when we built the 2021 actual, the '21 budget, we didn't have as many absentees at that point. Let me back up, actually, the election budget covered, the election grant covered over \$50,000 worth of absentees.

- All of the absentees.

- All of the absentees?

- [Pam] All of the absentees were covered by the grant.

- All the postage of the absentees. So you're not seeing that, those actuals in 2021.

- Correct.

- So early, in-person absentee voting, we don't mail a ballot. We would only mail ballots for those who, and maybe Clerk Jeffreys can kind of clarify, just, I don't see the need. I'm no expert, but I just don't see the need to expand our mail budget for potentially absentee ballots when it may be possible people prefer to vote in person going forward.

- [Brian] Clerk Jeffreys?

- Yes, thank you, Alder Brunette. So again, keeping in mind that the sidewalk program has gone from, my office handles a lot of that, from 40 or 50 sidewalks to 700. So that's quite a lot. And that's all certified mail. Now through the excellent work of our IT Director and our Print Shop Coordinator, we've brought down some of those certified mail costs, and also streamlined the process for the office. I also want you to keep in mind that absentee balloting has gone down in percentage since 2021, since I've taken over the Clerk's Office. So back in February and April of '21, we were at 50, 55% of absentee ballots for those elections. But the elections are higher turnout. So we had a higher turnout in August, had a higher turnout in April, and I anticipate we'll have a higher turnout in November. So even though the percentage of absentee ballots is likely to be a third this time, that right now we're looking at, we have 10,000 applications out. Now, some of those are in-person absentee, which of course is not by mail. And our pieces, as Director Ellenbecker had alluded to, the cost of mail went up twice this year. So not laying this all at the feet of absentee ballots, there are lots of other things going on. We have, and anytime, not just absentee balloting, but of course we had a census, which means we needed to change polling locations, which means that we needed to postcard all those parcels within those changed polling location areas. I don't anticipate many changes in 2023-24, but that's another thing, again, not laying that at the feet of absentee ballots. But then there are other costs that are associated with the postage rates.

- Is there any city led effort to get people signed up for permanent absentee status?

- [Celestine] No.

- No. I didn't mean, you sound offended with the question. I'm not implying anything, I'm just saying-
- No.
- I'm just trying to understand, again, if we see the numbers going down, just trying to make peace with it in my head. So I'd make a motion to reduce the postage expense from 110,000 to 100,000 even.
- [Brian] I'll second for the sake of discussion. Director Ellenbecker, I know Alder Brunette asked you previously if you would be okay with that. Could you just respond to that?
- Based on our calculations, we believe, based on how much has come through in 2022, subtracting out the re-eval letters, subtracting out, anticipating similar sidewalk, anticipating similar again, the cost of some election ballots, some postcards, we did come up over \$100,000, so closer to the 110. I'm not sure, I do believe it's gonna be over 100,000 for 2023. We can certainly try to find ways to streamline it, knowing we have some time to look at it.
- [Brian] Look, I think we're gonna have to probably find ways to piece some things together here. If we already know we're gonna be at 100, but we don't know if we're gonna be at 110, Alder Brunette, I would, if you'd entertain 5,000, I could probably get on board with that.
- [Jesse] I'd be fine with that. Are we gonna vote this down then? Or should I amend the motion? Do you want to pull-
- [Brian] I would make a motion to amend, to turn that number to 5,000, that's my motion.
- [Jesse] I'll second that.
- [Brian] Motion by Johnson, second by Brunette. Any further discussion? Seeing none, oh, Alder Eck. Oh, sorry. Wrong. All the names on the board are different than where you guys are sitting.
- Yeah, I get it.
- That's what throws me off.
- So just two things. So I know with the sidewalk program there's been some changes, so there may be not as many letters, because of the changes in the requirements with the size of the divot and whatever having to be replaced. But also with the extended absentee early voting, do you think maybe that would make a change? I guess that's to Clerk Jeffreys.
- [Celestine] So which question?
- Not the sidewalks, but the extension of the early absentee voting, so there'd be less of a need for mailing out the absentee ballots. I'm just thinking maybe that would help, that would reduce the amount of postage.
- So those time periods for in-person absentee voting, we have no early, it's just in-person, absent voting.

- [Melinda] Yes. Right.

- So those periods are state mandated, and so I can't start them earlier. I could start them later. And of course, for every federal election it's 47 days. Absentee ballots go out 47 days ahead of the election for federal and 21 days ahead of the election for a local. So there really isn't, in-person absentee, I would say that right now I'm looking at the total absentee universe, in-person absentee probably comprises, at this point, 25%. So most people are either by mail absentee. We do have, of course, remember everyone who's voting overseas or Military, are all absentee voters. And then we have about 200 people, a little under 200 people, who are voting with special voting deputies. So there's really no way to adjust the in-person absentee period to somehow, and remember, let's always remember, there's a thing that's a cost and a human that's a cost. So if we have more in-person absentee voting, that means there's more labor cost.

- I just want to clear clarify. Thank you. But I was referring to that it had been expanded. Now I'm not suggesting expanding it more, but it has been expanded for these last, the primary.

- [Celestine] Oh, in terms of hours? Yes.

- Yes.

- So, right. Well, for general, November election, absolutely. But that's not a postage cost, that's a labor cost.

- Okay. I just thought there was less absentee ballots sent out because people were coming, you know what I mean?

- Sure.

- Right.

- Okay.

- Okay.

- [Brian] All right. Reminder for the committee, we are voting on the amendment, not necessarily the final reduction. So the amendment on the floor is to reduce 10,000 to 5,000. Any further discussion on the amendment? If not, all those in favor say aye?

- [Alders] Aye.

- [Brian] Opposed? Motion carries. So the motion on the floor now is to reduce postage by 5,000. Any further discussion on that item? Alder Steuer.

- Just one. When you make these changes, could you just mention the line item that they are, just to refresh?

- [Brian] Yep. So we are on 54005, Postage.

- Okay.

- Page 39.

- Right.

- Yes.

- Just for clarification. That's all.

- Okay.

- Thank you.

- [Brian] Okay, so Alder Brunette.

- Thank you. Director Ellenbecker, I'm assuming this would be you, but under the Assessor's Office obviously we went through a citywide reassessment, and we have four appraisers, and I know they do more than just residential appraisals. But do we have an, I hate to, this is, I don't want anyone in these positions to be alarmed that I'm attempting to cut any of these positions. I'm just trying to determine if there's a true need for them now that the reassessment is complete.

- [Brian] Alder Brunette, we're still on the postage item. Did you want to take that up separately?

- Oh, my apologies. I thought we voted on that.

- [Brian] No. We didn't take the final vote on the amended motion.

- Okay. My apologies.

- [Brian] Yep. So the motion on the floor is to reduce postage by 5,000. Any further discussion? Seeing none, all those in favor say aye?

- [Alders] Aye.

- [Brian] Opposed? Motion carries. So that final motion-

- Nay.

- [Brian] That final motion passes three to one. Okay, now, Alder Brunette, that item I believe you want to discuss.

- Yeah. Director Ellenbecker, did we add any appraiser positions through the last few years, or is this status quo for the last several years?

- We have not added any appraisers. We actually went down an appraiser, Appraiser III, about, I'm guessing, three to four years ago now, 'cause we were not able to fill that position. We recruited for

a long period of time, couldn't find a qualified Appraiser III, which really would handle most of our commercial. So at that point we increased our contractual with Forward Appraisal Services. So our current contract with Forward Appraisal and our four appraisers and assessor really maintain assessments. So that is why when we went out for reevaluation, we had to take out an additional contractual services, ended up being the same vendor, and that is, we added up to about \$340,000 to complete the year and a half or more, well, two plus years worth of re-eval. So we did not increase any in-house appraisers. We actually went down one about three years ago, and that has been, we have filled that with contractual.

- But these are the four in the budget book. Those are staffed by city employees.

- We have four City Appraisers and a City Assessor. And then we have contractual.

- So obviously we're assessing or reassessed at a very high inflationary period, and it is quite possible that property values could drop in the next year or so, especially during 2023. It's quite possible, with the Fed adjusting interest rates, again, money freezing up in the economy. Do you think, do you foresee some challenges coming up over the next six months to a year that these appraiser positions will be needed?

- Again, the current staff that we have is only doing maintenance on our current sales permits, current maintenance on our current values. I've already talked about, I actually threw out a recommendation to the Mayor and to Chief Faulds that within the next year I will be asking for either two new appraisers or I'm gonna be asking for additional contractual to do a re-eval, and to probably start that process within a year to two years. So at this point, they're just maintaining. This is, they're really nothing. This budget is to retain our current values. And again, in one to two years I'll be asking for more dollars to start thinking about the next re-eval.

- [Jesse] Okay. And maybe I didn't ask the question clearly. What I was attempting to get at is, if there's an increased demand, because I understand with the contracted services, that's an additional expense.

- Mm hm.

- [Jesse] Could some of these existing positions take on some of that workload that we would otherwise contract? But we'll worry about that in the future.

- Okay.

- [Jesse] But, so you're saying that the four positions are needed regardless?

- Yes.

- [Jesse] All right, thank you.

- [Brian] Okay. Any other questions, discussions on the, I don't know why I keep saying discussions. It's not plural.

- Discussions.

- [Brian] Any other discussion or questions on the Administrative Services budget? If not, we'll entertain a motion.

- [Jim] Move to approve.

- I'll second it. We have a motion by Hutchison, a second by Johnson. Any further discussion? Seeing none, all those in favor say aye?

- [Alders] Aye.

- Opposed? Motion carries. Item four. Information Technology and Equipment Replacement, pages 47 to 48. Director, or sorry, Chief Faulds.

- So this is a department where we do have a reclassification. It's called, I have to pull it up. So we have a Network Specialist right now that is housed in the Police Department. It's funded 75% by Police and 25% by IT, and we're reclassing it to an IT Security Specialist. This individual has gone through extensive training on cybersecurity, has already implemented citywide cybersecurity training for our employees. So obviously it's not a surprise that cybersecurity is a risk that continues to grow. So this position we feel would be able to do cybersecurity training and also monitoring and minimizing the risk for the city with that. So that's why we reclassified this position. The funding won't change with it, just kind of the responsibilities and the essential function. So if there's any questions on it, feel free to ask them. Then one, also, thing to note about the IT Department is we have two GIS Analysts, and there's also one reclass, that's for a Senior GIS analyst. Currently they're being funded two-thirds by Storm and Sanitary in DPW, and then the rest by DPW. We wanted to move that last third to IT, because those two positions, even though they'll be housed in DPW and primarily working on DPW projects, we want them to be funded by IT because they will ultimately be doing citywide projects. So that's just something to keep in mind. And that's an additional cost with IT, but it's transferring funds from DPW to IT.

- [Brian] Okay. Thank you, Chief Faulds. Any other questions? Alder Steuer.

- Thank you, Chair. I know we, with this IT Security Specialist position, I think it's important. but one of the things I'm gonna be looking at, and I think a lot of council members are looking at, are positions that might be shared with other departments. So, we're gonna be talking about the Safety Coordinator Position. It's a 50/50. The IT Security Specialist position is a 25 with that, 25% with IT, 75% with Police. The GIS Analyst with DPW and with IT as well. So with that in mind, I guess my question would be, do we have a list of a number of these positions, either proposed or in-house that are already being shared? It might be out there, but I would like to see something like that that would show some proactive efforts to save and streamline.

- [Brian] Okay, I'm gonna go to Chief Faulds for that.

- Yeah, I don't think those, there's a list out there, but I do believe in the budget book, for like each organizational chart, it would say if it's shared or not in the percentage with each department. But yes, that's something we're striving to do, is either share within departments or share with other governmental entities, or with even third parties. And one thing I want to add to, going back to the Security Specialist, is that we also, the insurance market has really upticked either the premium for

being insured for cybersecurity or the deductible on that. So in order to meet the standards that the insurance companies are asking for, are required, we really need someone to make sure that our organization's hitting those, otherwise we're gonna be spending more money either on the premium to be insured for cybersecurity or the deductible will be higher up.

- I guess a follow up question is, with this position, I can assume that the position was just this, it was taken care of in-house before. Is this something above and beyond added? A special position or qualification? Or was it handled in-house before?

- So I can start off and maybe Director Hronek can chime in. I believe the cybersecurity risk was shared across the board with the IT Department, and now I think that this individual has kind of taken the initiative to be trained on these issues on cyber security. So I'm not sure, Director Hronek, if that's correct?

- Yes, that is correct. And as you all know, you gave us a bunch of money through ARPA funding, and we will be purchasing several cybersecurity software modules that this individual will have to learn. They're very high technical software. And he's just taken a lead on it. And it's a position that's well sought after from other entities and it deserves this reclassification.

- [Mark] Thank you.

- All good, Steuer?

- That's it.

- Okay.

- Thank you.

- [Brian] Any other questions? If not we'll entertain a motion.

- [Jim] Move to to approve.

- [Brian] I'll second. We have a motion by Hutchison, a second by Johnson. Any further discussion? Seeing none, all those in favor say aye?

- [Alders] Aye.

- Any nays? Motion carries. All right. Item number five, Law, pages 55 to 56. There is one item on there that if necessary we can go into closed session. Are there any questions outside of that item? Alder Brunette?

- Yeah, thank you. I was gonna say, Mayor, but thank you, Chairman. Force of habit. One thing that I really think we need to examine, in regards to the budget, as I mentioned at the outset of the meeting, is to reduce larger chunks of dollars, if at all possible, when you look at the overall functioning and needs of the organization. And one thing that we have done the last few years is, we put a lot of resources in our Law Department rather from contracted services, which were needed in my opinion, which I supported, as well as adding an additional city, another attorney in the office. And

so when I look at reclassifying a legal assistant from a 0.94 to a 1.0 FTE, and then a reclass of legal assistants from 3/4 time FTE or 0.75, to 1.0 full FTE, if we were to vote down both of those changes that would save the city taxpayers \$24,000, especially given the fact that the Law Department's asking for additional contractual services, which we may discuss in closed session. So I guess, for the purpose of the council and those making the decisions, Attorney Bungert, what is the, is this a 100% actual need or is this something that you'd be able to do without, considering all the other resources of your department?

- Yes, thank you. No, I would definitely say that it's 100% an actual need. The increase of the two legal assistants to both full-time positions is essentially directly related to the fact that we have a significant influx in A, public records requests, from, and one of those full-time positions, or one of those almost full-time positions, I'm not sure what the actual hours are for that legal assistant, handles records requests primarily. And I think the numbers that I have, we've seen an increase over this last period, from July through August of over 106 more or additional records requests than we saw last year. So that's just an additional amount of work that one person is working on. And then obviously any overflow would be going to that additional legal assistant to, as that is not her only job duty, she also is assisting in other matters in the office. And as we have now been fully staffed since about spring this year, with everybody pretty much onboarded and trained, we are now anticipating fully utilizing our litigation attorney position a little bit more robustly and pursuing additional actions, collections actions, things of that nature. And our time and assistance of our paralegal will be kind of split between our outside counsel and our in-house attorney, meaning that some of her responsibilities would be flowing to the other legal assistant that we would bump up to a 40 hour work week.

- Thank you for that explanation. I really mean that. I know it's hard when we as a council try to understand. We don't manage staff so we don't know the ins and outs of the office, obviously like you do. But I think for the sake of the council, we have tough decisions ahead of us, and if we're gonna, at least my intent is to decrease the amount of taxes that the Mayor's budget's asking from taxpayers, you have to reduce some things, sometime, somewhere. And this is gonna require us to make tough decisions, and I guess I'm willing to make those, So I'm gonna make a motion to keep the legal assistant positions as they currently are for savings of \$24,370 Attorney Ellenbecker, I don't know if that's an accurate number, that's just, 'cause I know what the pay increase is, I'm not sure. But that's my motion.

- Okay. So the motion is to maintain the 0.94 spot. I'll second it for the sake of discussion. But I'm gonna, I should go back to Attorney Bungert. You talked a little bit, of course, about the increase in the open records requests, and a lot of those as we know are directly related to elections. God willing, that will someday go away, and then we're back to where, what we've done before. But you also mentioned that you are prioritizing maybe some things that have been tabled or shelved?

- [Joanne] Correct.

- Could you talk through that a little bit?

- So there have been a number of issues over the last several years requiring collections actions, collecting on invoices that haven't been paid, that just frankly we didn't have the staffing to be able to pursue such actions, filing actions, filing judgements for collection, things of that nature. Now that we're fully staffed with the majority of the legislative attorney responsibilities transferred over to the

new attorney, our litigation attorney can more precisely focus on those types of actions. But that will require additional support staff and paralegal staff support in preparing motions and pleadings, court filings and things of that nature. And accordingly, some of the paralegal's work will need to be picked up by the additional legal assistants that we have in the office. So more work obviously requires more, at least for the work to be done in a timely and efficient manner, requires more hours in the office.

- So recently we, this last session, we made some decisions to outsource some work from your department, because at the time you had the inability to kind of take those projects on.

- [Joseph] Mm hm.

- When you start to kind of forecast and think about what's coming up this coming year, are there other types of projects right now that you're intending to do in-house with that additional capacity that we would otherwise have to outsource?

- I'm not anticipating any significant projects that at this point we would need to outsource beyond specialized litigation, which is part of the increase in the legal expenses budget, for very specific matters, not general litigation, but two specific matters that we know or we can fairly anticipate will be occurring in 2023. But because of us being able to utilize, fully utilize our litigation attorney, and increasing the time for our support staff to be able to assist that attorney in those matters, we'll be able to not just cost save on not having to hire outside counsel to handle those matters, but also being able to bring back revenue into the city for invoices and other actions that we wouldn't be able to be able to collect on just via invoicing and TRIP collections, and things of that nature.

- [Brian] So I'm gonna cross over, I'm gonna take that point and cross over into a different department, but it's directly related.

- Sure.

- [Brian] And we were calling for a reduction in fine revenue collection.

- Mm hm.

- [Brian] But what I'm hearing from you is that we would anticipate collecting more if we had this capacity. Could you speak to that a little bit?

- Correct. So if I can pull up, if you bear just a moment with me. Just in the last few months we were able to, by focusing more efforts, and again this is just kind of the tip of the iceberg, as we were just starting to be able to focus on this midyear, towards the end of midyear, we were able to, and I'm not sure if Finance has this, have these numbers more readily. I'm just trying to look up numbers as to how much money we have collected.

- [Brian] Maybe rather than specific numbers. Could you help walk me through, you indicated that we're going to collect more, but we're budgeting to collect less. Help reconcile that for me.

- That I would defer, 'cause I'm not sure what that impact is, or if it's the same item that I'm speaking to.

- [Brian] Okay. Director Ellenbecker.

- So this wouldn't be revenue per se, this would be collecting on unpaid invoices or damages or costs that have been caused to city-

- [Brian] Oh, so not municipal citations necessarily?

- Correct.

- Okay. That explains it.

- So this would be, a car accident causes a stoplight to be damaged. We would send an invoice, that invoice goes unpaid. We didn't previously have staffing or infrastructure in place to be able to pursue those collection actions in court to be able to get payment on those invoices.

- [Brian] Okay. One final question for you. I presume you're at least mildly familiar with other law departments throughout the city. How do you feel the staffing in your law department comparatively speaks to compare, how does it look against others?

- Sure. In reviewing our staffing levels, particularly with my predecessor, former City Attorney Chavez, are in comparison to our population size, we really should be staffed at around 10 or 11, with at least two or three more attorneys and two or three more support staff positions, either paralegals or legal assistants. Just based on workload and our population size in comparison to other cities of our size, we're unfortunately on the lower end of staffing, which just affects turnaround time, timeliness, efficiency, things of that nature.

- [Brian] Okay, and the reason I ask this, because I've heard at least, I've been on council now for a little more than four years, I've consistently heard that message that we're understaffed in the Law Department. We haven't necessarily had that many lawyers, it seems like we have more than what we've had in the past, but I also recognize that the city's grown. It's not the same size as it used to be. So you would imagine that that would grow. But at the end of the day, I just boil it down to what's your workload and can you keep up with it?

- We are keeping up, but we fall behind quite frequently. I had good projections for turnaround of ordinances this year and unfortunately emergent and other priority issues come up and there's a lot of last minute issues that come up in local government and those are the things that we have to respond to immediately. Obviously the more robust our staffing is, the more apt we are to be able to continue on with those important projects that we want to continue see moving forward. But a lot of times when there's an emergent issue, it's all hands on deck, and I need to utilize all the attorneys I have on one particular issue or two particular issues at a time. So I think we're chugging along. But we definitely have not overcome our back load.

- [Brian] Okay. And Director Stechschulte's gonna give you some more development agreements I hope, to review

- Sure.

- [Brian] And then you can find another way to pay for that.

- Happy to see those.

- [Brian] Director Faulds.

- Yeah, I just want to chime in-

- Chief Faulds, sorry.

- That's okay. I just want to chime in with the legal assistant that's at 0.75 and moving to 1.0 full FTE. That position was to replace our Claims Administration that we were paying for through CVMIC to administer our claims. And that position greatly helps our Risk Division as well. So it's not in the budget that we share that position, but we kind of do informally. And that position really helps out with the Certificates of Insurance, where contractors are working on projects throughout the city and we have to then process those, that position's really been helping out with that. So that addition to move to the 1.0 FTE was to absorb those responsibilities and help out the Risk Division as well. So it wasn't just a legal function to add to the 40 hours a week.

- [Brian] Okay. We have Alder Steuer.

- Thank you, Chair. Well, I think initially before all the discussion here, I was kind of under the impression that we were catching up a little bit in Law, and it sounds like we still have other ways to go. I guess the question I had was, we've had a number of issues, things like on ethics, a number of communications that are still up in the air. I was gonna ask Attorney Bungert, do we have a list? I know that I've seen it in the past, a list of all of the various things that are on hold right now from council and from other departments per se. Do you have something that we can look at, that is, would be up to date as far as pending or things that we've been looking to do? I know you're working on ordinances and things like that, but where are we at, as far as the status of everything that's out there that you're working on?

- Sure, we do have a tracking mechanism, basically a spreadsheet that has all of the listed ordinances that have been referred from council to staff to work on, along with up to date status as to where research is or where drafting is, and priorities as far as emergency situations or things that expose the city to more liability rather than operational efficiency, for example. So we do have that. So that would be able to be shared.

- Sure, yes, that would be good. I don't know if you'd do it maybe quarterly?

- [Joanne] Mm hm.

- Or just maybe quarterly.

- Just an update.

- Just to keep the council up to date. And it is difficult for us, because like I said, we don't work in the office. Alder Brunette kind of brought that up too. We're relying on staff to really tell us what is

needed, what isn't. And I had the impression that you were catching up a little bit, but it sounds like you still have a little ways to go. So that's really the only comment I have. Thank you.

- [Brian] Okay. Any other discussion? Any questions?

- Chair?

- Alder Galvin, go ahead.

- This is for Attorney Bungert. How many projects are currently sitting and waiting to be done and how long have they been waiting?

- That would be a hard thing to estimate, just because we work on so many items. If my to-do list of-

- What would you say-

- Of 35 items in my notebook is any indication of all the things that are kind of swirling around on my agenda, that's kind of a glimpse. If you're talking ordinances specifically, we have Chapter 4 almost ready to be distributed to stakeholders for comment. We did send back our Ethics Ordinance to the outside group, Ethics.Org, for their review. And we have comments from staff for additional changes for the Massage Establishment License Ordinance to be handed off to a new outside counsel at Boardman Clark.

- Okay.

- And still in research phase and review with staff for the Special Events Ordinance. So it's all kind of happening all at the same time. A lot of spinning plates. But that's at least a snippet into the ordinance section of our workload.

- What would you say is the oldest item that's been waiting to be done?

- At least from my tenure, I would say Chapter 4. And that was your request Alder. I believe that was, I want to say about five years.

- Five years?

- Yes. And then second after that would be the Massage License Establishment Ordinance, yeah.

- And how much money have we spent hiring outside counsel to get jobs done? And an outside counsel we've hired because they have a specific training for law that our lawyers aren't really geared up to do? But how much have we spent to have outside counsel get us kind of caught up for doing things that our Law Office should be capable of doing, if they were staffed properly?

- I'm not sure I have those numbers in front of me. I can try and look that up.

- [Brian] Alder Galvin, do you need that exact number, or is that more so just to make a point?

- Not the exact number, but I guess I'm trying to get the point across is that, again, I understand. Looking at my tax bill, what it potentially could be this year, and it's gone up. But at the same time, to try and reduce or limit our Law Office when there's projects that have been waiting for as long as five years, five years. How many ethics complaints had to be adjudicated because we were waiting for changes in the ordinance that would've negated us even having to consider the complaints that have been filed? How much time? And how much more are we gonna be putting things on the shelf. Now I, for one, I agree with Alder Johnson. I hope to God all these open records requests for election related material, I hope everyone, eventually things get squared away so we don't need to have so much. But this is even before this came up with the election, open records requests, we've had stuff sitting on the shelf so long waiting to get done that it's embarrassing, and I'm not blaming the staff, they can only do so much. And that's my point. To try and look and reduce staff or limit the amount that we're doing with the staff we have, I think is, we need to look elsewhere. And I think at the very least, we should be thinking about adding on. I understand with the amount that the taxes are going up, not everyone's happy with that, but I can't see cutting, I can't see cutting or limiting any more than where they're at right now. Thank you.

- Okay, Any other questions? Alder Eck. There we go.

- Okay. So I think that kind of would make sense to be able to figure out, and I'm trying to look on the sheet here, is that under legal expenses, as far as the outside contractors we used, and how much that cost us, that would help to compare how much we've done that, to use outside services versus being able to have our own attorneys do it. Is it gonna save us money, cost us more, kind of be able to compare? Do you, Attorney Bungert, is that on here under that legal expenses, do you know?

- So the legal expenses do not just compromise outside counsel, they compromise our membership with the International Municipal Law Association Membership, which provides a significant amount of continuing legal education and training and resources and valuable resources to our staff, general and customary legal expenses, like interpreters, service of process, register of deeds, title searches, anytime there's any property transfer for the city, we have to pay for all those register of deeds costs, bar licensing dues for all of our attorneys, the republication fees for our Municipal Code. So every time our Code gets republished or amended through our ordinances, we pay all that out of legal expenses. If we need conflict counsel for our prosecutions, for example, if a city employee or family member of any of the city attorneys has a municipal citation that's going up for pre-trial, we have to get conflict counsel for that. And then anticipated litigation. So any kind of litigation that isn't under our insurance policy. For example, sewer backups are excluded under our policy and we have a property damage claim or a suit that's coming, we would pay for outside counsel to handle that kind of litigation, if we can't handle it in-house. So it's a lot of other expenditures, not just outside counsel and contract counsel.

- Okay, so you don't have like specifically what outside counsel would cost us separated out on this sheet?

- Correct, no.

- Okay. I'd be interested to find that out.

- [Brian] Yeah, perhaps Attorney Bungert, you could have that information for Alder Eck before the next week's meeting.

- Thank you.
- [Brian] Alder Steuer.
- Thank you, Chair. This may have been touched on already, Attorney Bungert, but line item 53021 Legal Expenses.
- [Joanne] Yes.
- Was that somewhat covered already? Or just the increase? It's a pretty hefty increase. And I think you may have touched on it, but could you just clarify that?
- [Brian] Alder Steuer, is it directly related to the motion on the floor?
- Probably not.
- [Brian] Okay, can we just hold on that then?
- All right.
- Yep, because that's-
- You're right.
- [Brian] What the closed session language is for too.
- All right.
- Okay.
- Sounds good. Thank you.
- [Brian] Okay, any further discussion on this particular motion, which is to basically not cut, but hold the positions, I think, at where they are, which is right now is proposed to go from 0.94 to 1.0, right?
- [Joanne] For one and then 0.75-
- [Brian] 0.75 to 1.0 on the other. Yep.
- Correct.
- [Brian] Okay. So that is the motion on the floor. All those in favor say aye?
- [Jesse] Aye.
- [Brian] Opposed? Nay.

- Nay.

- [Bill] No.

- [Brian] The motion fails one to three. Alder Steuer, you wanted to talk about that one item. Are you ready to go into closed session? Do you want to go in the closed session?

- Well, it would be nice to be able to see-

- [Brian] Yeah, we all know what that is. That's been shared with us, but do you want to talk about it? Or can you maybe hold until the next meeting? Unless you want to-

- I'd really like you to hold on that.

- Yeah.

- I could hold on that.

- [Brian] And again, if we gotta go into closed session we can, but-

- We will get the answer eventually on that, but I'm fine right now.

- Okay. Any other questions? Seeing none, I'll entertain a motion to approve that particular section.

- [Jim] Move to approve.

- I'll second. We have a motion by Hutchison, a second by Johnson. All those in favor say aye?

- [Jim] Aye.

- [Bill] Aye.

- Opposed?

- [Jesse] No.

- That motion passes three to one. We are now on Municipal Court, pages 61 to 62. Alders, any questions? Alder Brunette.

- [Jesse] Yeah, thank you, Chairman. Is the Municipal Judge here? I've never met the gentleman. Is he here? No. No, we have a new .

- [Eric] He does exist. I've met him.

- [Jesse] I've never seen him. Well I just, as a professional, is he here? No, no? Well, just as a professional courtesy, it would be nice if the Municipal Judge was here while we're discussing his budget. Just a comment.

- [Eric] A question.
- Mayor.
- And we can certainly alert the judge and his staff to the timing of the final budget meeting, if they're, for some reason not aware, but we can make sure that somebody's here for the final budget.
- I appreciate that. Thank you.
- The final budget meeting.
- [Brian] Okay. Alder Hutchison.
- Yeah, I'm unfamiliar with some of these line items. But what is the board of, and it's cut off, prisoner.
- [Brian] Director Ellenbecker, you want to field that? You want to try? Somebody else want to try?
- [Mark] Just type the number in.
- It's number 53007. And it's an \$85,000 line item.
- Yeah, I can attempt it. Yes, it's on the bottom of page 61, Board of Prisoners. That is a cost of, I do believe it's for the county to house our prisoners that maybe our city can't house, that we have another facility house our prisoners.
- [Bill] Excuse me, Chair?
- [Brian] Alder Galvin will probably know. Go ahead, Alder Galvin.
- Would that be the Turnkey Fee? Every time the City of Green Bay incarcerates someone in the County Jail, they charge us a nightly Turnkey Fee. I think at one time when I was still in the department it was like \$40 a night.
- Is that?
- Sure. Maybe.
- We are gonna confirm that. The Brown County Jail is who we do pay on a monthly basis.
- Okay.
- We are looking up an invoice to see, to confirm what Alder said, what the rate is now per night. But that's what the cost is.
- Okay. We never know how many are going to be, how high the bill's going to be. It just depends upon each month, the situation, and how many are taken into the jail.

- Okay, so we're seeing a reduction in that, so few prisoners next year, which is, that's good.
- It's not opening.
- 5,000 of them.
- Any other questions, Alder?
- Well then, I'm not quite sure where this building is. I see there's electric and natural gas and water and sewer. I'm assuming it's a standalone building?
- Yes.
- Okay. And so they're just paying the bill?
- Correct. It is a standalone building. It is right on Adams Street?
- Adams.
- It's right, it's just a couple blocks from here. It's on the same block as the Police Station.
- No, it's behind.
- It's kind of right past their parking lot.
- Oh, it's on Jefferson maybe?
- Same block.
- Yeah.
- Okay. And is it shared with any other thing or is it just only the Municipal?
- I can try to answer that. Really it is just a Municipal Court, but in the basement it houses the Police Department's Training Facility and Workout Center.
- Okay. Okay.
- This is one of the buildings, Alder Hutchison, that our Ad Hoc Facilities Committee is also evaluating.
- Okay. Thank you.
- Okay. Alder Brunette?
- Yeah. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Now there were a couple of things, and this is why I wish the Municipal Judge was here. Attorney Bungert touched on it briefly, I believe, with the ordinance violations. I noticed that we're looking to reduce the revenue received by \$150,000. Could you

explain why that, like is there a philosophical change? Is there just a change of direction, some economic issues? Can you just put me to peace?

- [Brian] Yeah, I'm thinking that might be more Chief, Chief Davis perhaps?

- Yeah, whoever.

- Sure. So I think this is a combination of a couple of factors. One is it's very difficult to predict from year to year how much revenue we're going to get in citations. We do know that just with increased call load and with how busy our officers are, that the trend has been downward, I think over the last couple of years, in self-initiated activity, which is where a lot of this revenue would come from. And then with recent changes to the penalty or the, I'm trying to come up with the right word for it, the forfeiture for user quantities of marijuana, I think that's where this reduction comes from. But I always, I will take this opportunity, like a broken record, to caution us against relying too much on citation revenue because the purpose of citations is to change behavior and not to generate revenue.

- Yeah, and one of the other things I would point out, and this is sometimes the disadvantage of the percentage change. I believe that's calculated on the revised budget. Either the revised budget or the original budget, my point is is that obviously we have 2022 actuals and 2022 projections that are probably a little bit stronger indicators sometimes, especially for something like this. And obviously those items we're still showing that next year we would collect more than where our 2022 projection is landing.

- Okay.

- It's a negative amount.

- [Jesse] Yeah, I got a question.

- Yep, go ahead, Alder Brunette.

- Yeah, and I said I wasn't going to do this, because 500's not a lot, but why are we increasing \$500 for overtime? Why are we budgeting 500 period for overtime, where the last few years we haven't had a single dollar budgeted for overtime? Any idea?

- [Brian] I don't even know who to direct that to.

- That's fine. And then the other thing too is seasonal salaries, the projection for 2022 is 4,000, whereas 2021 actual was 225, and then 2022 actual was 450. So we're kind of surging in that area by a rather large number based on previous years. I just don't understand. Anyone?

- I can attempt to talk to those items. Seasonal salaries I believe is when they have a fill in judge, when they have to, a fill-in judge would, when the current judge is on vacation or for some reason cannot fill their duties, at that point they will hire a fill-in judge to fill in for the day, fill in for the week. That would go through the seasonal salary line.

- [Jesse] Now, Municipal Court, is that monthly, bi-weekly? How often does the Municipal Judge preside?

- I'm not sure if our Attorney can answer that. I believe it's a couple days a week.

- [Joanne] Yeah. It's just a few days a week.

- [Jesse] Yeah. And it's an elected position, so I believe it's a 0.5 FTE, like \$50,000 budgeted, give or take, even more. I just, man, that to have someone preside over court cases, municipal fines and whatnot, and to still have to hire somebody in his absence, I just, I'm gonna make a motion to eliminate seasonal salaries to zero and overtime to zero. And then if the Municipal Judge questions that it would be great to hear from him prior to the full budget meeting.

- [Brian] All right. I'll second that. Yeah, and I recall, we did this a couple of budgets ago, based on Judge Hanson's recommendation at the time. I think we went from 0.6-

- [Diana] 0.65 to 0.5.

- 0.65 to 0.5. So I'd be curious to know, and of course our current judge can have the opportunity to come to the next council meeting, if that reduction is why the seasonal, we're realizing we need that. But if Judge Hanson said we didn't need it, and we're not using it, because I'm looking at the actual, and I don't know what, it's still well below that 4,000.

- [Diana] Yeah, as you can see, year to date we are at \$450 this year. Last year they spent \$225. So there is a small usage. So bringing it down 4,000 really stops them from not even ever having a chance to hire someone to fill in for the judge.

- Yeah, that's a bit. When you say it that way, we can't ever do it.

- [Diana] You don't have a budget for it.

- Yeah. Maybe, I think it does make sense perhaps to leave a little something in there. But here's what I'm gonna do. Let's just, I'm not gonna worry with an amendment. I think this is going to be talked about at the next meeting.

- Yeah.

- And if the judge wants to come in and defend that he can do that and then we can modify it then.

- Yeah, I agree.

- Okay.

- [Jesse] I think we're reasonable.

- So are there any other questions? Any further discussion? Alder Grant.

- And I apologize if this is something that should wait until they're present, but can anyone explain the dip in the salary in 2022 where it's high in 2021, low in 2022, and then high for projected this year? Or do you want me to wait till next week?

- [Brian] Are you referring to the regular salaries?
- Regular. Yep.
- [Brian] Yeah, the 2022 actual, that dip, is typically I think through the end of August. Is that right?
- Yeah.
- This may be through September, but that's really only reflective of year to date when this report was ran, which would've been probably sometime in September or October.
- [Brian] Okay. So the motion on the floor right now. So if there's questions related to the motion?
- It can wait.
- Okay.
- [Diana] Can I add one more comment.
- [Brian] Yeah.
- And Pam just brought it my attention. When you look at that line item of regular salaries, look at the line items below. Any expenses that are in overtime, vacation, holiday, personal, funeral, and sick. Those all need to be added up and go into the regular salary to compare to a budget. We budget for the gross salary, but we don't break it out by the type of leave. So the 150 does look low, but you have another 12 or so of a thousand below it. So it's really closer to 165, again, but that is only about 10 months worth of actuals.
- And just to further clarify that, Director Ellenbecker, that's because we budget for the full salary but then we allocate it out after, once we know what it actually is? Is that correct?
- As they take it as the-
- Right.
- [Diana] We don't know what kind of leave they would be taking.
- Yeah.
- Correct.
- I remember that learning curve my first year as well.
- [Diana] Thank you.
- Okay, any further questions on the motion? And the motion, again, just to restate is to eliminate seasonal salaries from 4,000 to zero and overtime, was overtime in that motion?

- 500 to zero.
- Yep, from 500 to zero. Any further discussion? Seeing none, all those in favor say aye?
- [Alders] Aye.
- Opposed? Motion carries. All right, any further discussion on this budget? Alder Eck.
- Okay. And I'm noticing it and I think it really applies to each area, where I'm noticing where it says the 2023 rate and then the 2023 budget impact. But it would be helpful if we could add what the current rate is and see the difference. That would be helpful to have all of that information. So that's, I guess, a request is, if we could have the information on all of these in 2022, 2021. Up on the budget analysis it has the 2021 actual and all of that, all the way up to current, and then for 2023 proposed. It just would be, I guess I would feel like we would be able to compare to see what the changes are.
- I'm not sure I follow. Are you talking percentage columns? Is that what you're asking?
- Where it's got the salary summary rate, say on like page 63 and I think it's for each area, where there's that rate, summary rate, and it only has, it says the FTE budgeted hours, and then the 12/31/2023 rate and then the 2023 budget impact. But if we had what this year's is, so we can see what the difference is.
- [Brian] So I think that's kind of like a future budget book request.
- Yeah.
- Right?
- I just think it would be a piece of information that would be helpful to be able to compare. 'Cause at the top you've got it all lumped in, under, like say regular salaries, we got the full amount, but then if we could have it broken down in the same way under, like Municipal Court judge, all of these, and it's in each position. But I'm just using that as an example. So I'm saying IT, all of those, have it on those salary summary rates.
- [Brian] Okay. I'm gonna go to Assistant Director Manley.
- Is that all right?
- Yeah, go ahead, please.
- [Brian] I saw you grabbing your microphone. So yeah.
- I do the salary and benefit projections, so I just want to explain. The reason we put the 12/31 rate is because everybody has different anniversary dates, and that's when people are allowed to move up the steps or when they're in the performance range, when they have the review, and have the opportunity to get increases. So it depends on, I guess, I don't know what day and time you'd want to put the current rate, because we actually build out the projection, then, to say, okay, at the end of

2022, where do we expect they're gonna be if they get their step increase, if they get the performance review increase, and then we built in a 3% increase. So there's a 3%, and the assumption that everybody will get their step increase, and anybody that's in performance range, we build in an assumption of 1% increase, that they're going to meet expectations or those that are salary would be above expectations.

- Okay.

- Does that help?

- [Melinda] It does, but I would maybe have it 12/31/22 then.

- So what we budgeted for 22?

- Yeah.

- Or what we're projecting out on that individual? 'Cause we also have people changing positions from one year to another. It's very complicated, that's why I want to make sure.

- [Melinda] Yeah, well is it, like if you're looking at say the Municipal Court ones, where it's the judge, administrator, and the clerks, is there, that would be difficult to do?

- [Pam] The judge won't, because it's an elected position. And we know what their salary's gonna be and they're not eligible for an increase throughout the year.

- Okay.

- The other positions, though, they are eligible for those changes.

- [Brian] And perhaps what I could do, 'cause it's not an item we can necessarily take action on today.

- [Melinda] Correct.

- [Brian] Could we maybe work on that? So that way you can get the information you want, if it's important for your budget vote. But if it's something related to the how we assemble the book for next year, I think, always, I think that's awesome to have that feedback.

- And it can certainly be something I can run outside of the budget book, too, to just provide you, if it's something that's, you're interested in.

- [Melinda] Okay. Yeah, I mean, if we just had, yeah, you know what, if we had last year's budget book, maybe that would help. So we can compare them.

- And I can get you last year's budget book.

- Thank you.

- Thank you.

- [Brian] Okay. Anything else, Alder Eck?
- That's it. Thank you.
- [Brian] Okay. Any other questions? All right. Otherwise, we'll entertain a motion.
- [Jesse] Move to approve.
- I have a motion by Alder Brunette.
- [Jim] Second.
- [Jesse] Move to approve as amended.
- As amended, yep. Second by Alder Hutchison. Any further discussion? Seeing none, all those in favor say aye?
- [Alders] Aye.
- Opposed? Motion carries. All right, we're moving on to Human Resources, number seven, pages 70 to 71. Alders? What is your pleasure? I just leave your microphone on all the time.
- Thank you. I'm trying, I'm trying my best. Director Faulds, if you could explain a little more about the new Safety Coordinator position. It looks like 50% of that will be covered by Workers' Comp and then the other 50% by Water. Am I to believe that's Water Utility? Yeah.
- [Joseph] Yes. Yes.
- That's no levy impact?
- [Brian] Oh sorry, I got distracted. There was a mouse over here.
- That's alright. So yes, that is 50% paid by the city through the Workers' Comp Fund and 50% through the Water Utility, and we are not increasing the Workers' Comp Fund. We're able to absorb that position for the 2023 budget.
- [Jesse] Where did the Water come from? Like does this position work on safety issues within the Green Bay Water Department?
- Yeah, so I think I really need to commend the Water Utility and the Risk Division for coming up with this idea, because I think there's a need from the city perspective to provide safety training for our employees, and also assessments of the work environment, to make sure it's a safe work environment for our city employees. The Water Utility has the same need as well. And the thought was, should we hire one for each or should we try and share a position that can help for both entities? So I think how we would view it is, the position's gonna work a few days at City Hall, on reporting to our risk manager, a couple of days at the Water Utility, reporting to the general manager. And there's gonna be overlap, I think when someone's working on a safety plan for Water

Utility and the City, there's gonna be overlap on what that plan's gonna look like. So I'm not sure if that answers your question, but that's how it came about. It's just a shared resource. We think the position can work for both entities and complete the projects for both at the same time.

- [Jesse] Is it a new position that will be posted and hired for?

- That is correct. Yeah. And one other thing to add too is, Water Utility and the City, we're both insured by CVMIC, and CVMIC provides a lot of safety trainings. I think there was times where maybe the City was contacting CVMIC for safety trainings and maybe Water Utility was also doing the same, and we weren't talking to each other. So I think this will help coordinate those efforts and probably also share resources and save time.

- [Jesse] Okay. And is it possible to have 100% or even 75% come from the Workers' Comp? And the reason, let me just explain why I'm questioning that, we've added quite a bit to the Stormwater Utility bills the last few years, different positions in Forestry, and of course the transfer of the Forestry budget, like 88% of over a million dollars. And I'm just getting a little leery of constantly adding money to the Water Utility bills. So can it be funded by a higher percentage from the Workers' Comp Fund?

- [Brian] So that's actually a different, the water bill is different than the other one, and the water is not seeing any increase this year. In the rates, right? I know the Water Utility's not doing any increase in their rates, but to clarify, that theirs is coming from the Water Utility, not from Storm Water.

- [Jesse] Okay. All right. Good clarification. But I guess the question still remains, can we use more from the Workers' Comp Fund or no, Director?

- So that's completely up to the Council. I think if, when we use more from the Workers' Comp Fund, the risk is that if you have more Workers' Comp claims, then that fund might have to be increased at some point. The hope of this position is that you have someone dedicated to improving the safe work environment of our employees, hopefully it can reduce Workers' Comp claims over time. So we're trying to, I guess, hedge our bets a little bit to not put too much in the Workers' Comp Fund, but that's a council decision.

- [Jesse] Sure, that seems reasonable, I'll let that, and that makes complete sense to me, obviously when it comes to safety. That's a good explanation. I do have another few questions, Chairman?

- Go ahead.

- [Jesse] But do you want anyone else to.

- Fire away, man.

- Yeah. One thing that, based on conversations we had last year, I'm talking position now, and not the people in the positions. We have a Chief of Operations that is a fairly well qualified person, or I should say the qualifications for the position is, it's important and obviously has a role within city government. But one thing that I had, kind of disappointed with the last year or so was that, when we approved that reclassification, I truly thought that position of Chief of Staff would transition to perhaps different roles. And the issue that I had then, and I ended up supporting it, I think I made a

motion to delay the hiring until like May, with the idea that the job description for the Chief of Staff position would be changed up a little bit. So I felt like the taxpayers were getting a better value for the dollars invested in that position. So we have a Chief of Operations being paid over \$127,000 and we have a Chief of Staff over \$71,000. Those to me are very similar titles. I don't know if the work overlaps, of course the person in the Chief of Operations, I've noticed more and more involved in city day to day administration, which is ideally as an organization what you would expect a Chief of Staff to do. And I'm saying things in a way that I hope's not offensive to any particular person. That's why I'm trying to use the positions. So what I would like to do, and what I would like to see is, the Chief of Operation position focus more on the HR role and so that we can look at that Diversity and Inclusion Coordinator position, which I believe will be transitioned to a workplace morale or I forget what, Workplace Culture position. If we delay that posting and hire that position in July, the person in the Chief of Operations should be able to slide a little more over to the HR management area and then the Chief of Staff position could take on some of the duties that the Chief of Operations has been taking on. And I think that the benefit would be to the taxpayer saving, if we delay hiring until July 1st, that we save the taxpayer about \$30,000 in salary, plus possible benefits and social security and all the other things. So I would like to make that motion, to delay hiring the Diversity and Inclusion Coordinator position to July 1st, 2023.

- [Brian] I'll second that.

- I know I'm laying out a bombshell here, so I'm sure people want to-

- [Brian] And I just want to get clarity on that, right, because you talked about a couple of things there, but your motion is really gonna be restricted to the one item, right?

- Yeah. And then it's up to-

- For now?

- Yeah, and it's seconded, so I'll speak to it, but the reason is, again, last year I supported it, but it didn't go the way that I thought it would go. And I just think that perhaps if, and I'm gonna be offensive when I say this, but I think the Mayor needs to really look at the classifications of these positions and really try to have some difference between the two. They're just such similar titles, and I think that the value to the taxpayer could be improved.

- [Brian] Okay. Is there any staff that want to respond to that? That one's kind of a little bit cut and dry. And obviously this is a position that is currently vacant, just for clarity's sake, for anyone that's unsure. Okay. Any further discussion?

- [Jim] I got a question.

- Alder Hutchison.

- Okay, so we're talking Chief of Staff, Chief of Operations, and we're dealing with that with a third, the third that has been delayed already. And it's not clear in my mind why delaying that till July, that position has nothing to do with Chief of Staff or Chief of Operations. It has everything to do with affecting where we sit as a city and city staff and city population, of cultures. We have an issue, we have an existing issue, we're imbalanced. We don't have enough people of culture working for the

City of Green Bay. And it looks to me like, I'm a new guy coming in, that like, "Who the hell cares?" And I'm surprised that that's the attitude, and you're using this position kind of like, "Let's just use this position to deal with these other two positions." It's an important position all by itself. And we should be dealing with it as a position by itself. And I'm frankly kind of, being a member of the Equal Rights Commission, we're like, "What's going on? Where's the emphasis on getting fairness across the board?" Okay? So I have an issue with this, this, where we're at right now.

- [Brian] Alder Brunette.

- Yeah, I'd be shocked and quite frankly disappointed if we don't already have fairness within City of Green Bay human resource practices. I don't believe that there is an issue of not being fair. I'm not suggesting eliminating the position. I'm just simply saying that the person in the role of Chief of Operations has been already doing quite a bit of work with the Equal Rights Commission, and has been doing quite a bit of work. And it's all about, as far as I'm concerned, looking at open positions, not just this one, but other open positions, that's why I made motions on some of the other ones before us, to look at how do we possibly save the taxpayer 30 to \$50,000 this year by still keeping it part of the table organization, but just transitioning some of the Chief of Operation role a little away from what that person has been doing to focus more on the human resource component of the position, because that position still is within the HR Department's table of organization. And then in the process, some of the duties that that role has been taking on should go back to a Chief of Staff position. At least that's been my experience in all the many years that I've been involved in city government and county elected positions. It was pretty simple. I know where it can kind of seem strange, but I just don't think that this went the way that it was proposed a year ago when we voted to make these changes. We shouldn't have a Chief of Operations making over 127,000 and a Chief of Staff making \$71,000 on top of a Mayor's position, who manages the entire organization at over \$100,000. That is a lot of dollars at the top of the organization, where in a very tough budget year, we can spread that out a little bit. And the person in the role of Chief of Operations is quite capable and quite good, given the legal background of the person in the role, that they should be able to still do good work in regards to workplace culture and diversity and inclusion efforts. So again, the overriding concern I've had, and the reason why I proposed holding the position earlier in the year was the expectation that we were going to be facing a very tough budget year. And that's what we're doing. We have a budget before us that's increasing taxes over \$6 million, and we need to cut that somehow. And if we don't make the tough decisions and cut a little bit here and there, taxpayers all throughout the city are gonna get tax bills in December and they're gonna think, "What in the heck is the City of Green Bay doing?" So I think my comments stand by themselves. Thank you.

- All right. So I just want to comment on this, because I know I did advocate for retaining this position the last time it was brought up, and I still stand behind that. But I'm also recognizing that we do have an open position here. I would not support this motion if it was to eliminate it completely. But delaying the hiring, I'll get on board with, and it's because, one is, I think we need to figure out how to incorporate the mission of that position, of the Equal Rights Commission, all throughout our organization, regardless of a position. Every department needs to know how to do this. We really do. And that position I think will help us accelerate that process. But I think Alder Brunette's right, in that this is, there are some other requests that I know are gonna come up yet here today that are probably more than what we have available. So, when you look at Expenditure Restraint, we were at a capacity of 122,000, and I know that there are some requests that are gonna come forward yet today that exceed that. And if even those can even be contemplated or considered, we have to find savings somewhere. And if we can do it in a way that, you know what, we're gonna pinch a little bit

here, but not completely eliminate the hiring of this position at a later date, I do think that we have to contemplate that. I think attrition is certainly one of the ways that you can achieve that, and obviously delayed hiring is another way to kind of achieve that. So I think Alder, was it Alder Grant that you had your hand raised?

- Yeah.

- Yeah.

- I don't know if it pays to just have a discussion. I guess I just want to understand your concern, Alder Hutchison, and no specific examples I guess that, issues that you see that our HR isn't capable of handling right now, I guess. I just want to understand the concern for the position. And we can probably talk outside of this too. So that's just my question.

- Well, I'd like to respond.

- Do you want to respond?

- I'll just keep it brief.

- Yep, you bet.

- It's a good question. You always ask good questions. So I wish I had the pamphlet in front of me that what that position did before she quit this last year. It goes across the board, having relations with municipal and other entities across the city with regard to culture of diversity and how to take people who don't have currently the ability to get in front of jobs and people hiring that need to. We're at 95% of Green Bay workers are white, okay? 95%. And it should be, if it were close to what's in the city, it'd be 75%. And so there's a whole culture missing. We've got 1/10th the amount of Latinx people hired, that if it would match the city, every, the 16 Latinx people would actually be among 160 Latinx people working in Green Bay. It's pretty far off. Okay? And yet there's no emphasis on, "Hey, we got an issue, we got an issue." And you would have that, you'd have a discussion not only within the city, you'd have it across the city in private, in different ways, with this position. That's what they were doing, that's what was getting done. And how you incorporate it into the matrix of city doing things, in each department, we should be doing that. I know the Police Department's gonna be big on this, 'cause they're heavily involved with that. Rightly so. The city should be concerned with that, rightly so. And it just seems to me it's pushed off to the side and pushed off to the side, and I think we should address it. And I'm gonna vote against this. But if it happens, I'm gonna be crazy if it gets pushed past beyond July. Okay? Thank you. Thanks for the question.

- [Brian] Director Ellenbecker, just so that everyone's fully knowledgeable on this. Do you have, because obviously there's the salary piece of this, but then there's the corresponding benefits. Do we know what the fiscal impact is on that? You've been through this before, I can tell.

- [Diana] Assistant Manley calculated a half year salary and benefits for this position. \$45,564.

- [Brian] Oh, sorry.

- [Diana] So a half year calculation or half year, it's estimated, 'cause remember, at the end of the year there's 3%, but again, and we don't know when the timing is, but roughly 50% of the salaries and benefits for this position is \$45,564.

- [Brian] Okay. Okay. Is there any further discussion?

- [Bill] Yeah, Director Ellenbecker.

- [Diana] Yes.

- How would that affect the mill rate? \$45,000?

- Yes, Thanks for asking. I did calculate that earlier today. For every \$82,500 that expenses go down or revenues go up, that changes the mill rate by one penny. So today, at this moment we've gone down \$9,500, and this 4,500 would still be less than about, about a half a cent so far, changes that have been recommended. But yeah, so about every 82,000 change would be a cent on the mill rate.

- So what one penny savings on the mill rate, how would that affect a house value, assessed at \$200,000?

- Give me a moment. I want to make sure I have my decimal in the right place.

- [Pam] I think so.

- Our first guess is \$2, but again, just want to run the calculator. We'll check into that. Can we come back to that?

- Yeah, Alder Galvin, they're calculating.

- I'm sorry, I didn't catch that.

- [Brian] They're calculating the number.

- All right, thank you.

- Maybe while there's some dead space, Alder Galvin, I would just kind of add in, and I appreciate why you're bringing up that point. For me, it's not necessarily about the mill rate impact, it's because as it stands right now, Expenditure Restraint only leaves us with the currently proposed budget, leaves us with 122,000 that we could still raise. And so if you look at, I'll just throw out the very tangible example. There's a discussion that's gonna come up about seasonal park employees and that's about a \$200,000 impact. So if we want to add that, right now we can't, because of Expenditure Restraint. So that means we would have to reduce somewhere in order to be able to do that. So I just wanted to at least kind of make it clear about the Expenditure Restraint discussion point, that it's not just about mill rate, that that piece could be part of the decision for a lot of folks around different things.

- Well, absolutely, and I guess maybe we should have had those discussions before tonight, or when they were being approved, to add those positions or that extra money to those seasonal positions. I

guess we have to weigh what's more important to the citizens of Green Bay. So I look forward to the further discussion.

- Okay. Yep. While that number's being calculated, I'm gonna go to Alder Eck.

- Okay. Yeah, so I just want to point out, we could go and and ask for that for each reduction, but I think it's more of a, it adds up over, as we reduce it, you know what I'm saying? Rather than focus on one reduction, but in the end what is our total reduction, because we know we need to do that in order to not have such a huge impact on the taxpayers. So I just want to point that out, that I think it would be hard for us to go, "Okay, well what is this impact? What is this one?" Each one individually rather we just have to look at it as a whole. That's my thoughts.

- [Brian] Okay. Director Ellenbecker?

- Yes, we have confirmed about a \$200,000 home. one cent change would be \$2. If you had \$100,000 home at one cents change, it would be \$1 for a full, for the city's portion of the tax bill.

- [Brian] Okay. Did you catch that Alder Galvin?

- [Bill] Yes. Thank you very much, Director Ellenbecker.

- [Brian] Okay. Mayor, I know you had your hand raised.

- Thanks, Chair. Yeah, I just want to make the point that from my point of view, this is obviously a vital position. Would love to hire it immediately. I understand the arguments that you made, Alder Johnson, especially with regard to making sure that we imbue this mission throughout the organization as a whole and certainly something that we will do. But I did just want to respond to the sort of like triple bank shot argument to get us here, which I think mischaracterized what I had said at the last budget meeting, I think what the Chief of Staff is doing and what our Chief of Operations is doing is exactly in keeping with what I pledged at that meeting. So if anybody's interested in going back and checking the tape, I would recommend that.

- Okay. Any other questions? Okay. Seeing none, the motion on the floor is to delay hire until July 1st. All those in favor say aye?

- Aye.

- Aye.

- Opposed?

- No.

- No.

- Alder Galvin, I didn't catch you?

- [Bill] I said no.

- Okay, so there's a two to two vote, so that fails for lack of a majority. Chief Faulds, is a question regarding Contractual Services 53001 on page 71. That's obviously a steep increase from 2021 actual, and then to the budget, I guess, what comprises that category?

- Yep, that's, so the \$25,000 that is increased is from the ResourceX contract that we have, the platform for our priority based budgeting. There's other things in there for our MSDS I believe it is, Material Safety Data Sheet. That is a software program that houses all that data for all of the departments throughout the city. We also just have Contractual Services for legal expenses that's in there. And there might be one more that I'm missing. But the only increase to this one, oh, excuse me, then there's also, we outsource for FMLA assistance. So the only increase is a \$25,000, which is for ResourceX. That's why that's in there.

- [Brian] Okay. What legal resources are we budgeting for that our Law Department can't handle?

- So it's usually employment matters. So it goes through like the discrimination matters, usually labor negotiation. Those costs are much more than we have for labor costs, excuse me, labor negotiation costs, are much more than we budget. So we typically either bill that to Police and Fire when we have those negotiations, or Transit. That's really what it comes down to. And it's going back to what I think Attorney Bungert was saying is, there's only so much capacity in the Law Department, and I think one thing we do to help out the Law Department is we use these contractual services to kind of take off employment law matters from their plate, but we obviously coordinate with them and discuss what's going on when we handle those matters.

- [Brian] Okay. So really the biggest chunk of the increase is software subscription?

- That's what it is, yep.

- [Brian] Not necessarily, and again, if you take the literal translation of it, it doesn't line up.

- Mm hm.

- [Brian] Okay. Any other questions on this particular item? I can tell you, Alder Steuer, that at this point we are at \$9,500 that has been removed, yes. Yep.

- [Mark] Keep us up to date on it.

- [Brian] Okay. All right. I just need to entertain a motion then on this report.

- [Jim] Move to approve.

- [Bill] Second.

- [Brian] We have a motion by Hutchison, a second by Galvin. All those in favor say aye?

- Aye.

- Aye.

- [Bill] Aye.

- Opposed?

- No.

- [Brian] That motion carries three to one. Community and Economic Development.

- And Alder Johnson, I can start with this one. We have a couple of positions to talk about here. Just bear with me. So we have in here the reclassifications for the Electrical Inspectors and the Plumbing Inspectors. What we did was we created a progression for those two, and that's just to help with development for our employees and to, I guess, recognize employees that have experience. So what we did was we reclassified those two positions. The responsibilities are in the packet. We also did a market analysis for the Building Inspectors, and then a market analysis for our Commercial Inspector as well. So you'll see a change to the wages for all the inspectors across the spectrum, the Building Inspectors, Electrical, Plumbing, and Commercial Building Inspector. And then there's also just a couple of changes with how the positions are being funded. The Public Arts Coordinator, 0.25 of it is moving from the Community Development Block Grant Fund to the levy. And then there's 0.8 FTE of the Admin Clerk that is moving to levy, that is moving from the Community Development Block Grant Fund.

- [Brian] Okay. I think, perhaps we could cut Director Stechschulte's position in half if he shortens up this written report. All right. Alder Brunette, did you have your hand raised?

- Yeah, just I need a little more explanation on the moving the 0.25 FTE and the 0.80 FTE to tax levy, which I'm not obviously entirely opposed to the concept, but I just want to know, did funding dry up from the Community Development Block Grant, or are there other funding mechanisms we could utilize to make up that difference?

- [Brian] Director Stechschulte.

- [Neil] Thank you, Alders. Specifically this position, as we're going through it, kind of basically, is it not on?

- [Brian] Sorry, I gave Cheryl a promotion. Let me move over.

- There we go. Thank you, Alders. Essentially these positions, in terms of kind of internally auditing our hours on how staff's being spent, in terms of kind of discussing these with our CDBG administrator, finding that the hours being allocated towards CDBG eligible projects versus just general city projects was not lining up essentially with the allocations that are currently in place. We've had conversations with, certainly with Director Ellenbecker and other folks, as well, in terms of their concern is that, if there was an audit, a federal audit essentially of our CDBG funds, that the hours being allocated for these positions would not necessarily line up with the current positions. They have been spending more additional time on general city efforts in both cases. So we're trying to kind of adjust those to get them a little closer to that allocation. I think in some cases, Alder Brunette, we were looking at the possibility of certainly looking into some specific areas. There could be for, like the Public Arts Coordinator, on a project by project basis, the ability maybe to take

advantage of TIF funding upon occasion. We also have, at the RDA, within the last couple years, I think just prior to me starting the position, has established the kind of the 1% allocation for projects that received TIF funding from the city, essentially to make a contribution towards public art. So if that program actually really gets going, I'd say in the near future, we would, ideal situation, that this position could be funded almost solely through that type of fund contribution from larger projects making those efforts in. But right now we're just simply trying to correct it to avoid being, kind of getting sideways with any federal CDBG or HUD rules, essentially, on those two positions.

- [Jesse] So you're not adding FTEs, you're just basically transferring how the positions are being paid for?

- That is correct.

- So one thing I guess I challenge you on a little bit is, a tough budget year. You know that. \$74,000, well close to \$75,000 will be on the tax levy, over the next, 'cause we're looking at the 2023 budget, over the next two months, is it possible that you could still allocate these positions to do things that would qualify for the Community Development Block Grant and find ways to be creative in how you can accomplish the Public Arts Coordinator's duties and the Administrative Clerk, with the existing staff that you have or perhaps other grant funds or working closely with our BID Districts or neighborhood associations.

- Potentially. Alder, I think that right now in terms of the, just the immediate concern is certainly just being in compliance with our federal guidelines on that. And it does appear that, certainly over, it has really kind of maybe not matched for some amount of time without actually going back and performing a very detailed audit on hours. So there, again, I think going forward, this would allow us certainly to investigate, like I said, we do really see the opportunity for the Arts fund being generated through TIF projects, by private development projects, to be a substantial funding source that could address that particular position for sure. I think in terms of the Administrative position, that position has simply just evolved to a point where it really is providing detailed support for our Plan Commission, for our EDA, for our RDA, doing a significant amount of counter work, in terms of responding to customers coming to the counter, for general planning and zoning inquiries. She's usually staffing our Plan Commission meetings. She is doing a considerable amount of work that is essentially tied directly to our levy operations related to planning and zoning. So there may be some possibilities, but I think that is certainly a more difficult position. I think there's definitely more opportunity in hopefully the short term on the Public Arts position, to utilize some of those funds coming in from development projects to help pay for that position.

- [Jesse] If we don't do this through the levy, would possible ARPA funds help with this year?

- Certainly there's some possibility, certainly, for the Arts for, and again, I think we just have to do some very careful work in terms of some of the eligible census tracts would overlap with the CDBG funded areas. So there might not be quite as much dollar for dollar ability to move some of those project works to those areas. Those areas may be somewhat overlapped between where ARPA eligible areas and CDBG eligible areas might be. But it's certainly something we could take a look at. There might be some ability to do that, but I think there would be some conflicts with essentially both those areas being the same geographies where eligible projects could happen.

- [Jesse] Sure. Now, it's hard. We don't manage staff. We set policy and we obviously vote and recommend the final approval of the budget. But I do think that the Director's a talented guy and a creative guy, in favor of saving the taxpayers nearly \$75,000 this year, and knowing that he has about a two month head start to find ways for those positions to do work that would qualify under the Community Development Block Grant so we don't get in trouble with compliance or regulations from other governments and funders. I would make a motion to keep those positions currently with the way that they're funded. The Public Arts Coordinator and the Administrative Clerk. And Director Ellenbecker, if you could get us the total amount that we would save the taxpayers, that would be great. It's not seconded, so. What's that? It's just the salary, not benefits or anything. Okay.

- Yeah, so its gonna, do you want to turn on my mic? That would be just adding up the two rows, moving the Public Arts Coordinator, when it says the total levy impact, that would be salary and wages, and anything that would go with that position. So it would be adding up the 17,897 and the 57,061 for a total of 74,958.

- [Brian] All right. So 17 and 57.

- Correct.

- [Brian] All right. Is there a second on that motion? All right, seeing none, it fails for lack of a second. Alder Brunette, did you want to try splitting those maybe?

- [Jesse] Yeah, I would make a motion to keep the funding for the Public Arts Coordinator in the existing format.

- [Brian] Okay. Is there a second on that one? Okay, that one fails for lack of a second. Did you want to try the other?

- [Jesse] No. What's the point?

- [Brian] Because you might get a second on the second one.

- [Jesse] I would like to make a motion, well- I did say no, so I don't want to breach protocol, but if you'd be willing to make a motion or anyone else, I would gladly second it.

- [Brian] I would make a motion to keep the Administrative Clerk as is.

- [Jesse] I'll second that.

- [Brian] Deputy Director Renier-Wigg would like to speak. So go ahead.

- Okay, so here's the challenge with that. Through probably the last five years that clerk position is now doing levy work, Plan Commission, Board of Appeals, EDA, Inspection counter work, because we've been outsourcing Block Grant, it's bottom line. So if you continue, if you say let's find something for her to do for Block Grant, someone else has gotta pick up all of the levy stuff she's doing now, which we would not have the capacity to do that with our current admin staff. So that's how we've morphed into this position. Of the two positions, this is the one that is more critical that

should be paid on the levy. 'Cause really the majority of the work she's doing is levy work and not Block Grant.

- [Brian] The majority. But how much?

- I would say 100. I think we could do 80/20, because some of the Block Grant goes through Redevelopment Authority, and that's why we went 80/20 on that position.

- [Brian] Alder Brunette you had?

- Well I was gonna say, instead of moving 80, it's your motion, but I would be interested in even moving 50. And again, we don't manage staff, but, man, it's such a tough budget year. Something's got to give. We can't go to the taxpayer and say, "Well, it is what it is." We have to be creative in how we manage our people and our resources, and I'm not the expert of all the departments, but if that means challenging our highly paid professionals to find ways to reorganize their staff and give us job descriptions over the next few months or a year, in order to accomplish that, we really need to challenge them to do that. So it's your motion, Chairman.

- [Brian] Well, we can take an, the motion's on the floor, but we can take an amendment.

- Okay, I'd like to amend the motion to move 50%, let's do 40%, move 40% of Administrative Clerk to the levy instead of 80%.

- [Brian] I'll second that.

- Financial impact?

- [Brian] Yeah. Is there a financial impact on that, Director Ellenbecker?

- [Diana] It would be 28,531, which would be half of just moving 0.4 FTE. So you're not moving half of a position, you're moving 0.4 FTE?

- That's right. That's correct.

- [Brian] And I'm sorry, what was that amount again?

- [Diana] \$28,531.

- [Brian] Okay, so the motion, there's an amendment, a motion for an amendment on the floor, to change the original motion from 80% down to 40%.

- [Diana] It's not percent.

- FTE.

- Or, I'm sorry, FTE. Yeah.

- Yeah.

- [Brian] Okay. Is there any further discussion on that item, on the amendment? Seeing none, all those in favor say aye?

- Aye.

- Aye.

- [Brian] Opposed?

- [Bill] No.

- [Brian] Okay, that motion passes three to one. So the motion on the floor right now is 0.4 FTE. Is there any further discussion on that? Seeing none, all those in favor say aye?

- Aye.

- Aye.

- [Jim] Aye.

- [Brian] Opposed?

- [Bill] No.

- [Brian] That motion passes three to one. Okay. I'm gonna, a question for Director Stechschulte. Let's talk about land sales. So we have 150,000 budgeted in here right now. I've talked about this for years, that I think the city owns a lot of land that would be nice to get back on the tax roll. Obviously with buildings on it is even better. Could we get some feedback from you on kinda what you might have in the queue, what things are looking at, do you have the ability to transition more of that more quickly?

- If anyone has a crystal ball on what the economy's gonna do in the next six to 12 months, I'd be more than happy to hear their excitement, and then how that would go. That being said, we do have several potential prospects kind of being looked at, I think, in terms of both commercial and industrial development. Certainly with the opening of the Grandview Industrial Park, I think we've got some significant prospects we're looking at, right there is at least two or three items that we're having active discussions on possibly there. I think in terms of other more housing oriented sites, we found, at least in recent years since I've been here and coming through the pandemic, that in terms of affordable housing projects, we've had generally had to either severely discount or donate the land to the project. There are some ways I think to creatively address that. Certainly if it's in a TIF district we can hopefully use, there is the possibility of actually requiring a land sale and then getting the city paid back, hopefully, then eventually through either TID proceeds or other, an alternative revenue on those. So if we aggressively pursued those avenues, which I think we would be doing anyway, there's a potential for that number to be higher. But again, it's...

- [Brian] Speculation.

- It's speculation a little bit at some point.

- [Brian] Director Ellenbecker, I'm gonna go to you on this one. And the Mayor and I talked about this a little bit beforehand, but, obviously, if a motion were to pass on this, to increase land sales, the Expenditure Restraint really does not get impacted. It's just the levy limits that are impacted, right?

- Correct.

- [Brian] And can you speak a little bit to how those two numbers correlate when we're going through this process?

- Sure. Expenditure Restraint is based only on budgeted expenses. So through a calculation of net new construction and a CPI, it allows the city to go up this percentage calculation. It came up to be exactly 8% with the combination of that calculation. So it gets to take last year's budgeted expenses and allows the city to go up at exactly 8% of expenses. So any change to reduction to expenses or changes to expenses will affect that limit. As the Mayor had said earlier, the city came close to maximizing the Expenditure Restraint, but allowed about \$122,000 still of wiggle room to add additional expenses or make some changes today. We went down now \$30,000, so you went from 122 to probably about \$160,000 available room in the Expenditure Restraint. So no change in revenues. That will not change at all your Expenditure Restraint. Your levy limit is really, truly your expenses minus any revenues that come into the city equals your levy. And that is how much you have to tax your constituents. So the levy limit takes your last, your levy takes into consideration, any net new construction, it allows you a capacity to take your levy up. It also takes into consideration any change within your TIDs, terminations, changes, that gives you a new levy amount. And then you also have an option to make a debt adjustment and that will get you up to what you can take as a levy, a levy, you could allow to levy your constituents. So again-

- [Brian] Where are we at in terms of what is allowed versus where we're at?

- For levy limit?

- [Brian] Yep, 'cause you talked about the 122,000 in Expenditure Restraint side. I'm just curious what kind of buffer we have on the levy limit side?

- Correct. It's 160,634 on Expenditure Restraint side. And on the levy limit side, we have, basically you have the capacity of the amount of debt levy that is in your budget. So at this point, our levy for debt is \$10,019,000. At this point we're taking an adjustment of 7.5 million, so you have a capacity of about 2.5 million yet to play for a levy limit.

- [Brian] Oh gosh, I didn't realize the gap was that big.

- Yes.

- [Brian] I thought it was much more close. I thought it was closer. And of course my concern was if we did, hypothetically, eat into what's left for Expenditure Restraint, I didn't want us to run into a problem with the levy limit.

- Okay. And if you have any more specific questions, our representative from Elhers was gonna be online if you had any questions on levy limits or Expenditure Restraints or-
- [Brian] Yeah. Recognizing that gap's bigger than I thought, I'm good leaving it where it is. So sorry to waste everyone's time.
- [Mark] It's educational.
- [Brian] It's educational. Well that's half the battle, right?
- It's good to know.
- The more you know.
- [Jim] I've got a question.
- Yes. Alder Hutchison.
- On line 53001 Contractual Services. Why such a big bump up?
- [Neil] Two main reasons there. I'll just take a moment to find them. Is it on here?
- [Brian] Two, turn tables and a-
- There we go. Thank you, Alder Hutchison. Essentially we have two main areas that we're adding some dollars to the budget on. Regarding Professional Services and Contractual. One is primarily for when we have areas where we're either looking to, in this case, we usually sell some property or acquire some property, there's usually some several bits of technical work that we need to have done. Those could include anything from getting a surveyor to do a land division, a survey, a wetland delineation, an environmental phase one, those sort of technical reports that kind of generally need to go along with a property, a real estate transfer, either to or from the city. We didn't really have a budgeted line item for that when I came on. So last year we didn't have anything in the budget that was there, so we kind of stole from our marketing budget, but that did limit, severely limit, our marketing that we did, to do that, in order to get that land transferred. Certainly in this case that was largely related to the Carnivore project, several of the expenses we had in '22. Obviously we knew that was a great project, happy to spend that money on a sure thing rather than just going out and trying to use marketing for those. Okay, but in terms of going forward, we are gonna have, like I said, probably additional property we're gonna try to move out in that area. Now there's a TIF established now, so those will probably be TIF eligible expenditures now going forward. But in cases where we do have property that is not in a TIF, we'd like to have some budget available to make sure we can do those things and move quickly on those properties when that opportunity rises.
- Okay, and how, because if you look at the 2022 actual and what you're proposing, it's double. So you expect that, to spend that much?
- Absolutely, especially in light of the increased land sales, the conversation we were just having, I think that those, it is very likely that those funds will be expended, absolutely.

- [Jim] Okay, thank you.
- And there's which wasn't on that line.
- [Brian] Okay.
- That's right.
- [Brian] Any other questions? Going once, going twice. I'll entertain a motion. I make a motion to approve this report. Is there a second?
- [Jim] Second.
- [Brian] We have a second. Motion by Johnson, second by Hutchison. Any further discussion?
- [Jesse] As amended?
- [Brian] Yep.
- [Jim] Yep.
- [Brian] As amended. Any further discussion? Seeing none, all those in favor say aye?
- [Alders] Aye.
- [Brian] Opposed? Motion carries. How are you guys hanging in? Doing okay yet? We got a big one coming up. A couple of big ones. Do you need a break?
- Break.
- It'd be good to have a-
- [Brian] Yeah, all right. We're gonna adjourn for five minutes.
- [Jim] Thank you.
- [Brian] Okay. I don't know, do we have to call this back to order? We were off at break. And back at it again. Next up is the Police Department, pages 95 to 98. So, Alders, do we have any questions for our Chief?
- [Jesse] Yeah.
- We'll start with Alder Brunette.
- Chief, you weren't here at the time, I don't believe, with the Packer donation for the body cameras, and I know we're not, we can't borrow for the body cameras, nor am I suggesting we do that. But over half a million dollars for tax levy for body cameras is pretty substantial. Is there a way, maybe for Director Ellenbecker, this might be a better question for you, that we can use a ARPA allocation for

part or the entirety of the body cameras this year? Has it been discussed? Is it possible? I'm not trying to pin anyone down.

- [Brian] Chief Davis, you want to take that one first?

- Just know what our options are.

- I'm sure anything is possible. This is something that, for every Police Department, pretty much has become part of the ongoing cost of running a Police Department. So for individual years, obviously there are different ways that we can structure the finances for this project, but eventually this just needs to become something that we get accustomed to having as part of the regular budget. And so the discussions that we've had and just realizing that there are lots of different ways to use ARPA money, we felt like this is the year to just do the inevitable and put it into the budget.

- [Jesse] Sure. That's fair. Is it possible, Director Ellenbecker? Per grant requirements and whatnot?

- Yes, for sure. If we were using Lost Revenue, that would absolutely be allowable. And there also is the other category of Neighborhood and Crime Prevention that is always another possibility.

- [Jesse] Sure. And we did it last year. So it wouldn't be like uncharted territory. I get what the Chief is saying. Chief, now, as we move forward, do you anticipate like a continuation, obviously we're not gonna get rid of body cameras, but is this about half a million per year? Or is there gonna be a downgrade in the amount that you need to budget once you have the equipment in hand?

- That's not how it works. The equipment doesn't belong to the city. The way this-

- It's a lease, that's right.

- Program works is it's a lease arrangement, effectively. That's probably a better way of doing it, given how expensive that equipment is, how rapidly it evolves and becomes obsolete. The vendor basically absorbs all of that headache and we just pay a fee to be able to use the service for the storage of the video, all of that is managed for us. Having seen some of these programs elsewhere, I'm convinced that is by far the best business case. But I don't anticipate that cost ever going down. I'm sure, like everything else, it will go up.

- [Jesse] What's the exact dollar of this budget? 500 and what?

- [Diana] 526,000.

- [Jesse] Right.

- [Chris] Yeah, that sounds about right.

- I can get you the exact number.

- [Jesse] Yeah, I guess...

- Yeah, it's not an, it's a substantial, and I don't know if this will be seconded even, but it's a substantial hit to do it all in one year, and I'm definitely in favor, 'cause really we have few options, especially when ARPA expires or we spend it down. But I'd like to make a motion to allocate for half of the budgeted body camera expenditure from ARPA.

- [Brian] I'll second for the sake of discussion, but then I'm gonna explain why it's a bad motion. With all due respect, Alder Brunette.

- [Jesse] No, that's fine.

- You're good if I speak on it?

- [Jesse] I said some things that might have been offensive to people. So what's good for me is what's good for others. Go ahead.

- Well, so the reason I seconded it, though, is so that, Robert's Rules, we can actually open the floor and have the discussion. So this to me is reminiscent of several years ago when we had a million dollars of surplus sales tax from the Packers and it was used to plug a deficit in the budget. And then what it does is it creates that structural deficit that then you have to figure out how to pay for that the following year. And of course with Expenditure Restraint, it limits your ability, then, to recoup that the following year. And so my fear here is that we're taking something that we know is an annual expense, it's going to be an annual expense, unless this council's going to vote and say we're getting rid of body cams. And I'm not seeing an appetite for that right now, though I don't want to speak for council, of course. I think body cams are good. I think it took a lot to get here. I think we have to figure out, to Chief's point, how to absorb this into our budget and figure out how to pay for it. If we use one source as a one time funding to either subsidize or pay for it in full, this is really the proverbial kicking the can down the road and it's gonna put us in a much more difficult spot in subsequent years and give us a lot less flexibility with how the Mayor, and subsequently council, needs to make decisions to cover other unanticipated expenses or wage growth or inflationary growth in all those areas. So, that's, I at least wanted to have the opportunity to explain and that's why I seconded it, that I do think this creates that structural deficit that is much, much harder to recover from. So Alder Brunette, if you could just wait, 'cause Alder Steuer had his hand up.

- Chair, I just wanted to follow up on what you said. You're talking about this one time is 500,000. Is that what we're looking at roughly?

- [Brian] I think Alder Brunette's is half of that.

- Half, right.

- Half.

- But I guess what I'm saying is that for next year's budget you're looking at what, what are we looking at for year after year after year with this item? It sounds like it's gonna be an ongoing expense. So if that's just gonna be the part of how we operate, that's fine. But I just, I need to wrap my mind around that to make sure that year after year are we gonna be doing the same thing?

- [Brian] Yeah, I'll go back to Chief for a further explanation on that.

- Sure. We're locked in at this price through the, I think it's the fifth year of the program, and then, we'll have to go back to the vendor and see what price they give us beyond that for a successor agreement. Experience dictates that that will not be a lower price than what we have today. I think it's reasonable for us to anticipate the cost of this program increasing, along with everything else over time.

- But those numbers right now, can you just give me just a rough estimate what they are? You're talking about 500,000 this year?

- It is, with some adds that we need to make, that I know are later on the agenda. It's about a \$575,000 a year program right now, I think. I would defer to the Finance Office for the exact number.

- [Mark] Okay.

- [Brian] I'm getting a head nod from Assistant Director Manley. Or is that a head nod to turn on the mic? Hot mic, hot mic. Got it.

- [Mark] I'm fine for now.

- The contract itself, we have locked in a five year contract. You are in year 3 of \$526,110.75. In year four and year five we are contractually obligated for 547,710.75, that's for year four, and five, again, 547,710.75. And then as Chief had addressed, later in this agenda, he is asking for potentially an amendment to those numbers.

- [Brian] So at this point it's an operating expense? Alder Brunette, I think you wanted to speak again.

- Well, yeah, I don't think the motion's gonna pass. I don't want to spend too much time on this, but for the sake of the council, the other members here, Chief, what other allocations are you considering for ARPA? Do you have anything for the Crime Prevention/Neighborhood area?

- Yes. There's, not to get too far ahead of ourselves, but we're anticipating a proposal for contingency funded over-hire authorization for 2023, to help us with trying to smooth out future hiring shocks. We're about to get close to full staffing. And with the 12 to 18 month lead time that it takes between when we hire someone and when they're fully deployable, that's what drives a lot of our staffing shortages. And so, we anticipate a proposal for you to address that, and then we still have, we anticipate a proposal for an Office of Violence Prevention that we've been talking about for a while.

- [Jesse] Yep, okay. Thank you. That's all. Obviously I still support the motion.

- Okay, I'm gonna go to-

- Chair?

- [Brian] One second, Alder Galvin. I'm gonna go to Alder Grant.

- So I'm gonna be the unpopular opinion here, and I actually wish that we could allocate more to ARPA, to be honest with you. A big complaint I get from constituents is that we did not use a lot of

ARPA funds to benefit local tax dollars being spent. And I understand your kicking the can down the road comment, but, I think we do need to allow a softer blow to our community members, because the reassessment is going to be an adjustment. And what this will do is, it'll be an adjustment with the new mill rate and then another slow or small amount increase next year, if that has to fall into the budget. So I think we do need to be respectful of that, and I think that's kind of the goal behind this motion. I would actually support more money going to ARPA.

- [Brian] Alder Grant, I think you had your hand up too? Right?

- Eck.

- [Brian] I'm sorry.

- It's okay.

- Yeah.

- Yeah, I actually was gonna basically say exactly what she did, so I withdraw my motion to talk.

- [Brian] Okay. And then Alder Galvin.

- Thank you. Director Ellenbecker, are all the ARPA funds dedicated to projects or other things right now? Is there any money that's just left sitting on the shelf that we haven't used or dedicated to anything?

- As of the Council Meeting on August 16th, that was the last time we allocated ARPA dollars, the full allocation of 22,500. Prior to that meeting we had allocated about 7.8 million. We allocated another 11.4, leaving a 3.2 million balance of ARPA. But however, we do know that there were quite a few items that were referred to staff, which would actually use up all those dollars. But approved by council there is remaining just over a million dollars in the Lost Revenue, 580,000 in the affordable, 940 in the crime and neighborhood, and then about 675,000 in arts, again, for about 3.2 million. But that does not take into consideration any of them that we referred to staff or put on hold.

- Okay. Alder Brunette, where do you propose taking the \$500,000 of ARPA money from?

- It's actually only half of that, Alder Galvin, \$260,000. And I would propose taking it from the existing balance, available balance in the Crime Prevention area.

- Okay. And I guess, based on Alder Johnson reminded me, that one of my first years as an alder, I voted to take a million dollars of that excess Stadium Tax money and offset raising taxes. And that is probably one of the biggest things I've done that I rue to this day, that I did that, because it was after that, just as Alder Johnson explained, that I realized by not raising the taxes when we needed to raise the taxes, we set the taxpayers in a hole that made it very difficult for the city to come out of. And it's part of the problem that we are facing today with our budget, is that we're still trying to make up for money that we should have raised back many years ago. And we never did. We took money from savings accounts. We sold land. And that's money that you can't replace every year. And so how do we replace it when the time comes? How do we raise taxes? Every year is a tough tax year. Every year I've been an alder, that's all I hear, is every year is a tough tax year. If this year is a tough tax

year, then what was last year? And the year before and the year before? We have to take care of our city, and that costs money. And I can't see robbing Peter to pay Paul to get this done. So I'm not in favor of taking ARPA money and using it for stuff that we need to learn to be responsible and budget for. Thank you.

- Okay. Any further discussion on this item?

- [Jim] I just have a question.

- Yep, Alder Hutchison has a question.

- How many units are there? How many cameras actually are there?

- [Brian] Chief.

- Should be about... When it is all done and when we have added what we need to, 'cause we are a little, or excuse me, no, I think we're fine on cameras. It's tasers I'm thinking of. It should be about... And the short answer is we have 187 sworn employees, all of whom are obligated to use body worn cameras at one time or another, so it's in the neighborhood of that.

- [Jim] Okay.

- I'm not sure exactly how many it is, but I can find that out and get back to you.

- Okay. That's fine. I just needed an approximate number. And I would suggest it might be prudent, at this point in time, we have a couple years left on this lease agreement, that we maybe start looking around, because I think of all things, optics has undergone a generation of getting better and better and better, there may be, if we can get it cheaper, I don't know. Just an idea. But thank you for the number.

- [Chris] There is one, just to, there is more in this program than just body worn cameras. We have 190 of them, by the way.

- 190, okay.

- [Chris] Which includes some spares. This also includes our taser program, which the vendor for that uses the same business model these days, for tasers. And so if you, who knows what will be available from other vendors when the time comes.

- In two years, yeah.

- [Chris] But it's more complicated than just body worn cameras.

- Okay, good. Thank you.

- [Brian] Okay. Alder Steuer.

- Thank you, Chair. Chief, I just, maybe to follow up on that, you said there's 190 cameras. Now is that one for each officer or are there some that can stay in the building and not have to wear them? Just explain that, like who is actually utilizing these, the people that are out in the street, et cetera?

- Normally you want every sworn member of the department to have one. The way this works is the camera is assigned to the individual, and that has to do with the way the video footage is stored. And so you log the camera to the individual, and then it knows when you put it back in the dock who to say where the footage came from and the online storage for the data. A big part of this actually is the data storage. The cameras themselves, cameras are cheap. Where they get you is the data storage. And there are, I don't even know how to describe how much data that is that we have, and we have unlimited data storage. But it just, it doesn't work well, 'cause we asked this question, it doesn't work well to just have generic cameras that anybody can check out. And then you get into situations like Packer games, where most of the department is working that day and needs to have one in some public facing assignment. You can run out of those cameras pretty quick.

- Okay.

- Good?

- [Mark] Thank you.

- Okay, Director Stechschulte, Vanilla Tootsie Rolls, surprisingly good. Any other discussion? Okay. All those in favor of the motion say aye?

- [Jesse] Aye.

- Opposed? Nay.

- Nay.

- [Bill] Nay.

- My motion fails one to three. Alder Brunette, you have the floor again, if you have anything else?

- Not for the Police, but I do want to ask the Chief a question. Obviously morale in the department over the last couple years, of things happening throughout the nation, and we've all, as a council, the previous council, this council, all have been very supportive of the Police and we understand the extremely tough work your department does, as do all of our departments, but Police is a little different given some of the social pressures facing. But do you feel good about this budget? Is there anything the council can do to support you differently? Anything that you would have liked to have seen in this budget that maybe didn't make it before us?

- Well I've never met the director of any city department who would, with a straight face, say that they have all the resources that they ever need. But I would say taking into account the big picture of where the city is, are there things that we could add and that we could make good use of? Of course, those things exist in every department. But when you look at the big picture and the balancing act that we worked with the Mayor's Office to strike, as all of your department heads, I think this is, we

can certainly work with this, and we'll use what we have to provide the best public safety service that we can for the city.

- [Jesse] Did you figure out a solution internally regarding that humane officer situation, where one specific officer has, as I recall, you had mentioned CSI or CSO or whatever that position is, like trying to alleviate some of the demands of that position?

- Yeah, we have not found a solution to the problem, at least that looks like having a dedicated professional staff person. What we're gonna have to do is stick with the plan that we have now, that we use our community service officers to backfill that work where they can. Obviously there's a challenge there, because there's a lot of turnover among the CSOs. And certainly we will try to have less turnover and keep those positions filled to take some of the pressure off. But that is one of those trade offs that we have to make in coming up with a budget. I wouldn't feel comfortable realigning any sworn resources for that at this point. And our professional staff resources, and you look at the professional staff positions that we have, we're pretty lean. So I'm not able to identify anything that I would be able to realign there. So like I said, that, and then we, those are services that sworn patrol officers can provide if they need to. And so really it's just a matter of making sure all of our sworn officers work in patrol and our CSOs have the knowledge and the tools that they need to deal with animal issues and we make it work.

- Yeah, and as you remember, I kind of brought that forward, kicked around the idea of a civilian type position. I know that there's an advantage of having an officer respond to such calls, but I think it was referred to staff for consideration. That was considered, right? It didn't just go into a black hole, you kind of considered it, given all the other demands of your department. You think that you can do the best that you can with the resources and other positions?

- Sure, yeah, like I said, that was the analysis, was can we realign sworn resources, obviously that's not a good idea at this point. And I don't have any other professional staff positions elsewhere that I can retool. Everything is pretty much being used for its highest and best use at this point. But it's not like the whole-

- You have may have already done and considered this, but consider some contractual services or some partnership with neighboring municipalities. 'Cause I think some, from what I've heard, some smaller municipalities on our borders have some sort of mutual agreement that they work together. I just, that's what I heard. But maybe you and I can talk about that outside of this meeting.

- Yeah, that's what you might be referring to is the arrangement that we have with the Sheriff's Office, where Brown County, the current Brown County Sheriff has exercised his authority under the state statutes to deputize all police officers in Brown County so that we can work with primary jurisdiction anywhere in Brown County. That's unusual in Wisconsin. But we enjoy that relationship with Brown County agencies. Typically, though, outside agencies will want to be reimbursed for regular services they provide. And what'll happen to you in those mutual aid situations, if you're the biggest city in that arrangement, you will be the net importer of those services, and you'll have those other agencies wanting you to bear their costs.

- [Jesse] And I'll let it go, 'cause I don't want to get into too much detail, but I wasn't speaking so much about police resources. I was talking to like a civilian level position, where let's just say in my district, a lot of raccoons and a lot of other smaller animals that I don't think it requires, in my

opinion, a sworn officer to respond. But if there's trained and certified and properly credentialed people on a civilian level to respond to those calls, that's really what I was getting after. But again, I don't want to, I brought it forward, and I just, I want to make sure that we consider the humane officer and the needs of that position, which I'm sure you have. So thank you, Chief.

- [Chris] Absolutely.

- Okay, Chief, just a couple questions for you. I noticed in your plan, but I don't necessarily see it reconciled in the org chart, which is expanding the Traffic Enforcement Unit from four officers to six. Are you using some of the traditionally budgeted uniformed officers for that role? Could you just talk us through that? Because we all talk about traffic.

- Yes. And if we are able to do that, that will be just existing, that'll be taken out of existing resources. We'll realign sworn officers from patrol, probably, to traffic. What that will depend on, though, is how quickly we are able to get enough officers who are currently in that initial training phase. We've got about 20 people who are in some part of the initial police officer training that takes a year to a year and a half before they're fully deployable. And I can't afford right now to take officers from patrol and put them in specialty assignments, because there aren't enough of them. But we've made, depending on how quickly we're able to get some of these new officers fully deployable, be able to realign some resources there. So we're not requesting additional resources to do that. That's just a goal for us, if we're able to get hired up to full strength and then get a bunch of those people fully deployable.

- Okay. Thank you. Okay, so I'm gonna ask maybe a slightly uncomfortable question. Not uncomfortable. But I'm looking at the budget for salaries. And I want to preface this by saying this is in no way a suggestion to say that we need to cut police. This is about having maybe more of an honest, transparent conversation of, we've budgeted, is it 186 sworn officers?

- 187.

- 187. And we've done that for several years now, and we've never filled them. How practical is it that we are going to have 187 sworn officers on January 1st and every single one of those positions is going to be full for the entire year? And then correlating that to the overtime fees, if in fact we do get up to being fully, all positions are filled, how necessary is it to have all of that overtime? And again, my desire is just to pass a budget that's truly reflective of what we think we can expect.

- Well, the good news, on the hiring front, is that we are close to getting to that full staffing. I know of six sworn vacancies we can anticipate in 2023. Like I mentioned earlier, after the budget process, we're gonna be coming to council with an ARPA request for contingency funded over-hire. The overtime number is related to your staffing number. Usually, and in our case, the biggest driver of overtime is getting up to minimum staffing levels on patrol. And that's not a discretionary thing. That's required in our contract. And it's the responsible thing to do, to make sure we have enough emergency services personnel at all times of the day. What happens is when you, then there are two different kinds of staffing crisis in policing these days. One is that you just don't have enough budgeted positions to meet your demand for service. We don't know if we're there, because we haven't gotten to full strength in those budgeted positions. The other one is having too many vacant positions, and then you have even less than you're budgeted for. We are coming out of that problem. I am optimistic that we're gonna stay closer to full strength going forward. We have a pretty good

applicant pool right now, and things are looking favorable there. Where we're going to have a problem, and in particular in this budget year is, when reaching minimum staffing levels in patrol is your main driver of overtime, you use salary savings from those vacant positions to cover that extra spending in overtime. And that's what we've done this year. When you're at full strength, but it's, again, if I wait until a police officer retires to hire their replacement, it's a year to 18 months typically before that new person, before I've actually hired their replacement, because of the lead time that it takes to train a police officer. So I still will have the demand for overtime to meet minimum staffing levels for much of 2023, because we've hired so many people, but I won't have that salary savings to cover the added overtime expense. To keep this from continuing to happen to us, one method of doing that is some sort of contingency funded over-hire authorization, where I can try to forecast what my hiring needs might be in the next budget year, based on what's happened in the past, what we know of how many people will be eligible to retire, and usually, what I've seen before, is that number is about 6% of your authorized sworn strength that you over-hire by. So if your goal is to be at 187 officers, because that's gonna meet your demand for service, you actually want, at any given time, to have 6% above that in sort of a training pool so that when that officer retires, you're not waiting a year and a half before you have their replacement, you have them right there ready to go.

- [Brian] Okay, so-

- Long-winded answer, but that's where ideally we should try to get to. And that's when your overtime costs will start to come down. Otherwise, we are going to keep having this problem.

- Okay. So I appreciate that explanation. And I hope you at least respect the question, because it's, again, we're, you've seen here up to this point, we've got, we're scrambling for crumbs, right? Let's cut \$500 here, and of course I'm looking at a \$17 million budget. Now I have zero interest in cutting the number of positions, but if we're practically not going to use the salary, you know what I mean? And that's obviously a big bucket there, and I just want to have a budget that authentically reflects what we're going to spend. And what I'm hearing from you is that, "Yep, we anticipate that this year."

- [Chris] Yes.

- And unlike Municipal Court, you're here to defend it. So .

- [Chris] Yes.

- And I didn't mean that a dig on Municipal Court so much that because of that, I'm not going to make a motion. So thank you. Director, Chief Faulds. How many times am I gonna call you director today?

- It's all good.

- All right.

- So I almost missed the reclass. There is one in the Police Department. We're reclassing a captain to a commander position, and I'll let Chief Davis kind of talk about that, the rationale behind it. But in the first page for item item number two, you'll see that the fiscal impact was about like 5,500. But then the memo from the Human Resources Department has a fiscal impact about \$12,916. And there's a discrepancy there. And I think the reason why there's a difference is because we are placing the, well the potential commander will be placed at the same step and pay grade that a recent

commander was just placed at. So that's why there was a difference between our calculation. But I think for next week, Finance and HR will have to give you the actual number and what that fiscal impact is.

- [Brian] Okay. Chief, did you want to add anything or does that encapsulate it?

- It does and I'm happy to, it's written in the memo, the rationale behind it, but I'm happy to answer any questions about that reclass.

- [Brian] Alder Hutchison, go ahead.

- Okay. I've got some questions on the line items.

- [Chris] Sure.

- 55140, which is on page 98. It looks like there's a significant, well there is a significant jump. And what would be the reason for that? And this is for Equipment Replacement, so there's obviously something you're replacing.

- Sure. There's a whole list of probably almost 30 items on here. Some big things that bump that number up. There's \$58,000 for something called a pit bumper, which is a wrap around bumper that goes on the front of a police car, like a marked police car. We use pursuit intervention and avoidance techniques, like boxing vehicles in, or the pursuit intervention technique maybe you've seen. The cars that we're using right now, we're doing about \$2,500 worth of damage at a time when we do that. So going forward we need to add these bumpers to the cars, which will save us a lot of money in damage in vehicles. We also, we're in the process, as you may know, we have a marine patrol, which has two boats. Both of those boats are getting pretty old, and in this year's budget, we're asking for about, there's \$64,000 worth of boat engines. There's a plotter and some electronics that they use for trying to rescue people out of rivers and the bay. And then some other things for boats that add up into the, math is not my strong point. About 80, that's about \$81,000 of it right there. There's \$52,000 of replacement body armor. Body armor has a usable life of five years. We have a couple of issues in our evidence section that are about \$50,000 worth. There's an exhaust system replacement for, and this is important these days as we see more fentanyl. They've gotta use almost like a fume hood to process some kinds of evidence. And so there's an exhaust system there. Then our evidence storage cabinets, where officers go and put evidence in that then goes into the property room, are nearing the end of their lives, which, if those are falling apart and can't be secured, obviously that's a problem. There is a request for some replacements for crime scene lights. That's a \$40,000 expense. And that's something that the forensics team uses to, that's like a UV light and different kinds of light that can find, especially body fluid evidence, which can be important in homicide scenes and things like that. About \$12,000 worth of security cameras for our facility. Those are at the end of their lives and not serving us very well. Another big one is \$10,000 worth of just network infrastructure that needs to be replaced at the end of its life. I can certainly share this detail sheet, but it is a lot of things like that.

- Okay. And that's fine, thank you. I just noticed in previous years there'd be an ask, and then the number that was actually spent was a lot less and it was consistent. There was an ask and then, like in 2022, the original was 291 and the actual, or I'm sorry, 2021, yeah, 140,000 against 291. And then the actual for 2022, the revised ask was 291,000 and the actual is 119. So there was consistently like less, but you're sounding like you have a list of things that are actually gonna be bought?

- Yeah. And sometimes that number will lag a little bit because we're in the process of purchases that haven't hit that-

- Right.

- Cost center yet. And I know, Director Ellenbecker probably has a lot better insight into that than me.

- [Jim] Oh I get it. Okay. And then the other line item is 56303, which is a couple down below that, data cards. And again, it's another one where there seems to be a big ask of 28,000 and then the actual was 2,000. So this budget, it's 28,000 again. Are you gonna spend 28,000 on data cards?

- So apparently what I'm being told is that this is related to cell phone expenses, and we issue, obviously, all the sworn members of the department a cell phone so people are able to get ahold of them. So our cell phone bills are pretty big. So this is related to cell phone expenses. And not only our cell phones, but our mobile data terminals in marked vehicles, and then laptops with air cards and those kind of things. Am I explaining that right?

- For this part, yeah.

- [Jim] Okay.

- [Rick] The expense was hitting the wrong-

- The expense was hitting the wrong account, and that's why, it looks like we need to true that up.

- [Jim] So it's actual, you're actually gonna spend that much?

- Yes.

- Okay, thank you.

- [Brian] Okay, we're gonna go to Alder Eck.

- Okay. So from what I'm understanding from Director Ellenbecker is that that actual is only to date and we still have the rest of the year. So I think in my mind I'm kind of not even looking at that column now because it, you know what I mean? Like it throws you off when it says actual, because it's not the actual, it's just right now, but we still have the rest of the year. Am I correct? Okay. But then if you look above at the cell phones, it's actually higher than what the original estimate. So they're kind of spending more in the cell phones. But again, that the actual is, we still have the rest of the year to go. So I just wanted to make that point, 'cause it is confusing when we look at actual, when it's not actual, it's just to date, I think maybe year to date would be a more accurate description.

- [Brian] Yep. Director Ellenbecker.

- Okay, a couple of comments. The column in between where it says 2022 projection, that is where the department has gone through and said how much they believe they are going to spend on the budget. So in many cases it looks the same as your budget, 'cause they do expect to spend it yet. And you're right, the actual column is just point in time, what had been spent. I guess what I want to add on the 55140 line, where it says the 2022 actuals of 119,000, the reason why there's over 100,000 there for the BearCat repair, that has not been spent yet. The BearCat is out for repair but it hasn't been spent yet. We know the dollars, it's already obligated. It's an encumbrance, that's going to spend the money, it actually may not come out until early next year. So some of it is, as the Chief had just mentioned, it's a delay. And then back to down farther also, where, as Rick and the Chief has said, there is something that we realize, as we're going through this budget, that there's some items in the cell phone line of 131,000 that needs to be reallocated to the data cards. So the data cards, next year's budget is more accurate. There's some things in the 131 that needs to go into the 2,233, so that will be closer to the 28,000, and then that will bring the cell line down a little bit. But to Alder Eck's point, this is only about 10 months worth of actuals.

- Okay. The one thing, and again, this is an actionable item, that I think would be helpful for all of us when we look at the actual columns, if we had what date that was. And of course that doesn't give us a crystal ball in terms of the cash flow projection for the balance of the year. But-

- Yeah. What I can tell you, this report automatically updates at the date of that report, so every time we run the report. So on the bottom it says the date was generated on 10/20. It's not a point in time. It's the day that this is run.

- It's as of that date?

- So I'm not asking it to say through September or, it's the date that it's run. So if I ran it again right now, the '22 column would be updated. It's the date that this report is run.

- Okay. That's good to know. It's very helpful. Thank you. Okay, any other questions on Police? I'll entertain a motion.

- [Jim] Move to approve.

- Second. We have a motion by Alder Hutchison, a second by Johnson. Alder Brunette.

- Yeah, and I just want the record to show that the reason I'm gonna vote no is because I really think we should use the body cameras, I've kind of done this with some of the other department budgets. I fully support the Police, 100%, but I think we're making a mistake, that's why I'm gonna vote no one on this one.

- [Brian] Okay. Appreciate that. I think we'd be making a mistake if we used it. But I still like you.

- It's government. We're never always gonna agree.

- [Brian] Of course not. Okay. All those in favor say aye?

- Aye.

- Aye.

- Aye.

- [Brian] Opposed?

- No.

- [Brian] Motion carries three to one. Okay, we are moving on to Fire Department, which has got a couple of different, General Fund, Allouez, and Bellevue. So are we, and I presume we're taking up all three here at the same time, Chief Faulds? I got it right that time.

- I can't answer that question, but I can talk about, I don't know if Diana, or Director Ellenbecker, do you want to answer that?

- [Diana] Yes, I would take them all together.

- [Brian] Okay. We're gonna take all three together. Chief Faulds.

- So you'll see that there is an addition of seven firefighters, and that was in hopes to reduce overtime. And that's reflected in the budget, that there is an actual reduction in overtime. And then there's also a reclassification. And that was item number two today. And that's where we're reclassifying the Administrative Assistant to the Financial Services Administrator position. The job description's outlined in the memo. And essentially what happened was it's a reclassification we've been working on for some time. It's supported by Human Resources Department and the Fire Department and we believe that it should be added to the budget and the reclassification should go through. And if there's any questions about the position, either Chief Litton or myself could answer those.

- [Brian] Alders? Is Chief Litton on the call or are we going to you guys?

- [David] Yeah, I'm on the call.

- All right, Chief Litton, I'm gonna ask you the same question I kind of directed at Chief Davis. So we're adding six new firefighters, or seven, I'm sorry, just to do the overtime saving. And of course there's the projection of where we think we're at. The savings is almost, relative to past budgets, the overtime savings is almost equivalent to the cost of the positions. Could you speak to that?

- Yeah, well I think that you've got, the data that you have there and data that I have here, and data after this last payroll. So we are trending this year currently to run at about \$1.8 million in overtime. And again, as I stated last year and provided a spreadsheet to the Finance Committee during this hearing, that's due to a number of reasons. Number one a labor agreement and the state laws. And so between family medical leave and the things that we have contained within our labor agreement that we've agreed to abide by, it's generating this amount of overtime. And I'll just say that, I think that, we've been trending over the last three or four years in this direction in the overtime expenses due to the fact that we've hired, I think in my tenure here, of nine and a half years, I think we've hired about 124 or 125 new employees. All of those employees coming in are obviously younger and many of them are starting to raise families when they come in. And so part of the issue here is that it

generates, they're taking time off to spend time with their child when the child is born, which is of course allowed under the Federal Family Medical Leave Act. And then there's the state provision to have a little bit of additional time on that, by using vacation time. So that's a part of it. Sick time within the contract itself. All the sick time that is generated or that is taken, we verify it's within the contract provisions. And so, we're just in that cycle right now where we have a younger workforce and they're using those kind of times, to take time off. I would tell you that we are, almost every day, so we start with a full shift, we allow nine people off. The contract in time. And then we'll have either three to four people off because of the Fair Labor Standards Act, which is a federal law, again, in order to reduce their hours down below the federally mandated maximum. And by the time we get down to that, if we have anybody call in sick, anybody that's using, that gets hurt on the job or off the job, every time we create an open position there, again, due to the labor agreement, we have to fill those positions because of our minimum staffing clause. So there's not any, in this projected \$1.8 million of overtime, there is no, we're not handing out overtime to anybody. It's, in fact, we're burning people out with all the overtime that people are working. Any given day right now, from March 15th in the calendar year through the end of the year, we're forcing two, three, four people to work. What that means is, is that we sent out an overtime notice at six o'clock in the morning when the sick time and when those issues arise, and if people are able to take the time they'll take it. If they are not, then we end up forcing the least senior person in the department to stay. And that creates issues with family care. They've got children and they've got provisions to get home. Their wife, most of the spouses are working at another job, at their own job. And so it creates tensions and problems for them in the childcare area. So when we put this budget together, I met with the Mayor and Chief Faulds and with Director Ellenbecker to, there's two options. We can either hire the additional seven positions, which will alleviate what we're projecting, about eight or \$900,000 on that overtime line. It's reduced back down to one million total. 1.9 million is what I project for next year into the overtime line. Looking at the lesser of two evils, by hiring the seven people we're at about, the savings between the hiring the seven people and going to the 1.9 million in overtime is just around \$300,000 in actual savings. That's what we project. So in that full discussion with the Mayor and his team and with the Finance Department, that was the option that I recommended. And that is what is before the Finance Committee at this point.

- Okay. Appreciate that explanation. Is there a plan, when you start, and of course, you may not be here Chief, you won't be, I think you're done at the end of the year. But is there a plan, some of those younger firefighters, perhaps, age out and we don't see as much FMLA, I would imagine, at that point become overstaffed?

- Absolutely, well, we won't be over, we certainly won't be, we won't be over. I think it's cyclical and I think that you're in, probably about a 15 year cycle right now. As I said, we've hired about 125 new employees in the last nine and a half years. We only have a total of 210, whatever it is on the line. There's 186 of them on the line. So that's two thirds of the department now that are, that's a younger group of people that are raising families and that's just human nature. It is what it is. There's nothing I can, you or I or anybody else in this room can do to control that. It's just the cycle that we're in. And I think we're in that cycle going forward 10 to 15 years. As far as your reference of me not being here next year, understand that I've always been fully invested in Green Bay. I continue to be fully invested, and I will continue to be fully invested right until the last second I walk out of the door at my office. So I don't make these recommendations lightly. I've never thought about, this is not my money, it's not the department's money, it's the taxpayer's money. We're always looking, trying to take the best option that we can. And so that's why we've made that recommendation.

- Sure. Now, and I didn't mean to suggest, Chief, that it wasn't a recommendation you'd have to live with, so much as it was a future decision, where you won't be here to talk about, when overtime perhaps starts to decline.

- Sure.

- Kind of how that works.

- And I think you have my staff that's sitting at the table there. They're well versed in all of this. They're gonna be here another 10 years. And so we've discussed this thing for the last seven years, those guys have been on my team, and they're well versed. And so they get to carry the baton going forward on these things.

- I don't know if they agree with you that they're gonna be here. Thank you, Chief, I appreciate the explanation.

- Sure.

- Any other questions? Alder Brunette?

- Yeah, thank you. In the spirit of kind of scrutinizing some of the budget, every department should be scrutinized, obviously, and Fire Department's no different. So with the clothing allowance, Chief, I noticed it's a rather substantial jump, about \$98,000 to \$145,000. Can you explain that? Is there a way that we can reduce that sum?

- No. So we've already, so at the end of the year we're gonna have 15 open positions. That's through, there's three open positions, and we have 12 retirements coming up. So that's 15 positions, if we add the seven, so that's 22 positions that have to have complete sets of uniforms, turnout, well that's not the clothing allowance, that doesn't affect that, but that's 22 complete sets of new hire uniforms. That's both spring and winter clothing, coats, and things of that nature. And that's where that.

- Okay. And kind of probably along the same lines, but maybe perhaps not, the furniture, and it says M-A-T-T-R-E, would that be mattresses? It's pretty substantial.

- It is, yeah. So that's one of the items, when we were putting together this budget, the Mayor and staff came back and said, "Hey, we've gotta do something here within the budgets." And so I think we ended up cutting out, and I think Diana will correct me, of course, if I'm wrong, somewhere around that area. But anyway, that's to replace about half of the mattresses that are in the stations. They are in bad repair. We had requested to do all of them. We settled on just doing half of them this year and putting half in for next year. And again those obviously are, they're used every day, 24/7, 365. And they, when you have different, it's not like sleeping on your mattress at home, because it kind of contours to your body. When you have three different shifts, three different people sleeping in those mattresses, they tend to get wore out a little faster. And so we're looking to replace half of them this year.

- Chief, kind of fill the council in on, do you believe that you'll be able to fill, if we go ahead with this, all seven positions by March? 'Cause I think it kicks in around March, that's when the budget, so you'll be, if approved, you'll be recruiting immediately? How does that work?

- Yes, we have an existing list with Chippewa Valley Technical College. We do have an existing list with Fox Valley Technical College. In fact, we've got interviews scheduled coming up here next week. And so we're confident that we will be able to hire all 22 positions by the second Monday in March.

- Okay. More of a question for Director Ellenbecker. Is there any ARPA funds that remain that could be allocated towards anything in the Fire Department budget?

- There's always the Lost Revenue section. Again, a lot of requests for that. At this moment, 1,000,033 is outstanding yet, of the Lost Revenue. I believe that's probably the only category that would qualify for those type of expenses.

- [Jesse] Any line item, though, on the budget that would qualify for the ARPA guidelines?

- I don't believe that the Fire Department added too many one time items in this budget. Really, they're all operational and that's why we put them, those items are in there.

- Chief, you're the outgoing, I don't know if you're still the President of the Wisconsin Fire Chiefs Association. Are you aware of any other Fire Departments who have used ARPA funds? I know we earmarked about a million for property acquisition for 1 and 3, but any ideas?

- Again, I think that this goes along with the discussion that we've been having here throughout the evening about taking one time money and applying it to operational things. I will tell you that we put back into our Equipment Replacement line, for instance, we put our turnout gear back into the operating budget, which is where it belongs. It's gear that gets, we have to replace the gear every five years, the turnout gear that they wear into fires and for accidents and things of that nature. By code that has to be replaced every five years. So it goes frontline for five years. It has to be replaced every 10 years. Let me get this straight. But they have to have a second set. So, frontline, they wear it for the first five years and then it goes to their backup set for five years. So we have that rotational, because every time that they're involved in any kind of structure fire where smoke is involved or a vehicle fire, garbage fire, or even a field fire, anytime they get smoke on their equipment, they are required, because of the carcinogens and the cancer causing agents that are coming from that smoke, they are required to wash that gear. And so we have to have a second set. So that money has been taken back from the CIP, put it back into the operating budget this year, and that's gone back and forth over the last five years, in, out, in, out. This year it's back in the operating.

- Okay. I appreciate that. But I get the greater philosophical approach, but is there anything that we could allocate, kind of, if you were on the line for the Police Department, I said let's kind of slow walk our way up to this, and we have the ARPA funds and say if we made a motion, I don't even know if it'll be supported, of allocating \$200,000 of existing ARPA funds towards any applicable Fire Department line item, would that be something you'd be in support of, or you could find something consistent with ARPA that would qualify?

- Well, I think there's, I think within the budget, again, the Lost Revenue is a pretty wide open account. I think that's really the only section that the Fire Department falls into. We don't have the crime provision, Neighborhood Crime provision that they have for Police Department and other areas. I think the only area that we have is Lost Revenue. And I think you can plug absolutely anything

into that, into those holes. As to where, if it means making the budget whole, then of course I would be in favor of it. But again, that's not a department level decision, that's a policy decision.

- Okay. I'd like to make a motion to allocate \$250,000 of Lost Revenue category of ARPA towards any applicable or allowable budget line. And that should be referred to the Finance Director before the next meeting.

- [Brian] Is there a second? That motion fails for lack of a second.

- [Jim] A question?

- [Brian] Alder Hutchison.

- Okay, I noticed, there's a line item for Packer overtime. So the city funds the Fire Department personnel to be there for their games, is that right?

- Alder Hutchison, both the line item in the Police Department and in the Fire Department for Packer overtime is completely reimbursed 100% from the Packers.

- Oh that is? Okay.

- That's just a, there's a revenue and an expense line for that line item. So that's a zero cost item to taxpayers.

- Yeah, but if you look at the fee, line number 46225 Packer Overtime for 261,500.

- It matches.

- Yep, they match.

- [Jim] Okay, thank you very much. I'm learning.

- [Mark] It's a good question.

- [Brian] All right, any further discussion on the Fire Department budget? And again, this is a reminder, includes General Fund Allouez, and Bellevue.

- Wants to-

- [Brian] Alder Steuer.

- Thank you, Chair. I just talked to Director Ellenbecker a little bit, just looking at these seven new jobs, \$52,044 a piece times seven, coming out to 364,308. Those are salaries only, no benefits for 10 months. And I know Chief talked about the Fire Department, 1.8 million in overtime. I guess I'm just trying to get a handle on what that difference might be and if we could save, if there's any savings there at all? It sounds like, that we will be saving on overtime. So Chief, if you can just follow up on that.

- Alder Steuer, if I understood your question or your comment there, if we take the seven positions out of the salary line, then my request would be to raise the overtime line up, the total overtime line, which you have to, again, add Bellevue and Allouez together, they pay for that part of it, but the total request would go up to 1.9 million then.

- All right. I was not understanding that completely. But that helps. Thank you.

- Director Ellenbecker.

- I just want to add a little clarity to what Alder Steuer was talking. In the budget, on page, let me get to it. 112, bottom line, firefighters, seven of them at 52,044 each, Only, again, is because it is really 10 months worth of their salary, not benefits. So that's how we came up with the 300 some thousand dollars. What's missing is your benefits, and then there's also all the startup costs that would be needed. So when they were talking about it, can you scroll down one more, when they were talking about it, the full year impact of the seven firefighters would be about 757,000. A 10 month impact is about 613,000. So those are just pieces that he was seeing. So I wanted to show what the full impact would be for those seven firefighters and then the difference-

- [Mark] For 10 months?

- 613,000, and that again includes their full salary, benefits, and then all the necessary supplies for the firefighter.

- [David] So it's right at \$287,000 less than the 1.9 million I'd be asking for in the overtime line.

- Thank you. That's what I was looking for.

- [Brian] Okay, anything else Alder Steuer?

- [Mark] I think that'll do it. Thank you.

- [Brian] Okay. Any further questions on Green Bay, Allouez, or Bellevue? If not, we'll entertain a motion.

- One more.

- [Brian] Yep, go ahead.

- Go ahead.

- Sorry. I think if you're gonna add the reclassification, there probably needs to be a motion for that.

- [Brian] Have we done that with the other stuff?

- No, because those other reclassifications were already entered into the budget, and this one unfortunately was missed and was not added into the budget.

- [Brian] So we need two motions here?

- That's correct.
- [Brian] So why don't we start with reclassification because that would then become part of the budget. So is there a motion to approve the reclassification?
- [Mark] I'm just watching you chewing up there.
- [Brian] I know. I made a mistake when I ate it.
- [Brian] Traditional, not as good as the Vanilla.
- [Jim] Move to approve the reclassification.
- [Brian] Okay, we have a motion by Alder Hutchison. I'll second that. Any further discussion? Seeing none, all those in favor say aye?
- Aye.
- Aye.
- [Bill] Aye.
- [Brian] Opposed?
- [Jesse] No.
- [Brian] That motion passes three to one. And now we'll entertain a motion to approve the Fire Department budget.
- [Bill] Motion to approve.
- [Jim] Second.
- [Brian] We have a motion by Galvin, a second by Hutchison. Any further discussion? Alder Brunette?
- Yeah, same thing I'll say. I'm fully in support of the Fire Department. They do wonderful work. There's not a single person I would rather respond to an emergency at my house than the Green Bay, Allouez, or Bellevue Fire Department. But it's a rather substantial increase, which I'm in support of the seven new positions, because it helps alleviate the overtime crisis we're facing. And I do think that we should allocate at least a quarter million dollars of ARPA towards something, towards capital, towards the Lost Revenue, or something. We're missing a great opportunity. We have kind of, my opinion, spent ARPA dollars on some real not as important things as potentially saving taxpayers a quarter of a million dollars from a very heavy tax bill they're gonna be hit by. So yeah, I support the firefighters 100%, but I can't support a budget without some cut in the bottom line with ARPA dollars. Thank you.

- [Brian] Okay. Any further discussion? Seeing none, all those in favor say aye? Aye.

- Aye.

- Aye.

- Opposed?

- No.

- That motion passes three to one. All right. We are moving on to Department of Public Works including engineering operations, traffic and equipment replacement, pages 118 to 122.

- So Alder Johnson you have one reclass that we talked about, but it's with the GIS Analyst, and you have the reclass, the GIS Analyst Lead. Two-thirds is being paid out of Public Works, which is I believe the sanitary and storm funds. And then one-third is paid out of IT. And then you have moving the engineering aides and techs from 37-1/2 hours to 40 hours per week.

- [Brian] Okay. All of those are in the the budget, right? So we don't have to worry about that.

- Yeah. They're in the budget.

- Okay, thank you. Okay, Alders questions? Nobody's gonna make Grenier sweat? Director Grenier? Nope? Sorry, Alder Brunette.

- Yeah, I'm not gonna make Director Grenier sweat, I don't think, he's pretty unflappable. But one thing I'd like to ask him is, overall, can you give us a overview, 'cause obviously we have a lot of really important departments in our city government, Police, Fire, Public Works, Parks, but Public Works is one that, we hear it all the time in our districts, more roads, and I know that's a bonding discussion in the spring, but can you give us an overview of your budget? Is this going to move the needle on some of your bigger objectives that you have in your department? 'Cause there is a substantial increase in spending this year.

- There is a substantial increase. If you take a look, we're up a little over a million and a half, 1.7, somewhere in that neighborhood. Out of that I would call attention to line item 53001, Contractual Services, as we've been talking about multiple times this evening. Routine bridge inspections, \$203,850 was moved outta bonded for annual recurring items. That was consistent with discussions I've had with Director Ellenbecker. Materials and Supplies, line item 54001. If you were on the council last year, coming out of the 21-22 season for the '22 budget, we had a light winter that winter, and I had 5,500 ton of salt lying on the dock. And I told you during the '22 budget deliberations that we had a one time dip in our materials and supplies, and next year we would be going back to regular spending levels, that's what you're seeing there. The increase of \$288,850 represents the salt that we didn't have to buy for the previous budget. The largest mover on our budget this year is line item 54010, Gas, Oil, and Lube. We have an increase of \$623,000 in fuel, oil, and lube. About 90% of what we do on a daily basis is done with a very large truck that gets about four miles to the gallon. So we consume an inordinate amount of fuel every year. That's more than double our gas bill from one year to the next. Collectively, those three line items alone, which I really don't have a whole lot of control over, represent 1.11 million, almost 1.12 million of the increase that we have. Taking a look, net,

2022 to 2023, once you factor in additional revenues that we're looking at bringing in, our total increased net is \$1,458,442, or 9.1%. But subtracting out those three line items alone, everything else that we do, sanitation, fleet, buildings, street, engineering, traffic, and admin, we are only up \$343,092 or a 2.1% increase. That is as responsible a budget as I can deliver. The other thing that we've talked about is positions. When I had my first budget for the 2013 budget season, Department of Public Works staffed at 227 individuals. Over the last three budget cycles, in the Utility section, I've added seven individuals. I am currently staffed at 205. We have been as creative as we can. We were the department who brought in automated garbage collection. We started a top-down mandated stretching and loosening program with our operations staff to reduce injuries. That has drastically cut our Work Comp claims, and actually helped paid off the conversion from rear loaders to automated loaders. We've increased efficiencies with various tasks that we are responsible for, ranging anywhere from sewer cleaning to how we pick up leaves. So we have been, for the last 10 years, we have been challenging the box. This is my best estimate, and it is our bare minimum of what we expect.

- All right. I was on I & S, so I know the work you guys do. You do a wonderful job. I know that. Is there any possibility to use ARPA for anything in your budget?

- [Steve] And again, I would have to defer to Director Ellenbecker, I believe-

- Lost Revenue?

- [Steve] The only thing that it would be was Lost Revenue.

- Any particular budget line that sticks out as a possibility or? If I made a motion, which most likely will fail, but I'm still gonna do it, would you be able to figure out a line to use ARPA funds for?

- We had some one time changes. Again, your fuel went up, we moved some items from what used to be bonding. We...

- [Jesse] I'll take you off the hot seat. It's gonna fail anyways, so, but I'd still like to make a motion to use \$250,000 of Lost Revenue line of ARPA for any item on the Public Works budget that would be allowed.

- [Brian] Is there a second for that motion? Seeing none, that motion fails for lack of a second. Anything else, Alder Brunette?

- No.

- [Brian] Nope? Okay. Any other questions? Alder Steuer.

- Thank you, Chair. Director Grenier, I wonder if you could just speak a little bit to the monies that might be with the Capital Improvement Program, but you had mentioned that you saved a number of, quite a bit of money by not bonding for it, and including it in your operational budget. Does that make sense? Can you talk to that a little bit?

- Again, there's \$203,850 that's spread over three different line items that are specifically dedicated towards bridge maintenance and bridge inspection that are done every year. They are routine maintenance items. And in consultation with Director Ellenbecker and the Mayor's Office, we did

make that move to pull those out. Those historically have been bonded for, so we've been paying 20 years worth of interest on those funds. We moved them into the operating budget.

- [Mark] I just wanted to give you kudos on that, that it's refreshing to look at departments looking at getting things not bonded and bringing it back in the operating budget, and it sounds like you haven't increased it a whole lot, so I appreciate your efforts. Thank you.

- [Brian] Okay. Any further discussion? Alder Hutchison?

- Yeah, I just have a couple questions. The soil and gravel and sand, is that just generally used wherever? It's \$20,000 plus.

- Predominantly that sand is the sand that we use for sanding residential routes during the winter. That's traction sand during snowplow events.

- [Jim] Okay. Okay, and then I'm trying to find a line item for, like I know you're gonna be in the process of upgrading your design standards or the ones you use for like erosion control and that type of thing. We had a discussion on this.

- All that's done internally. That's just staff effort. So it's included in our base salaries.

- So there's no buying any already developed text or programs?

- At this point, no. We've already made a partial investment, and that was done for the '22 budget. And I think what you're referring to maybe, the Certification Program, through the American Public Works Association that we had talked about. We're in the first phase of that, which is a self-assessment. So we've made the initial investment in the software necessary to complete that portion of it. Once we complete that assessment and we submit those results to APWA, then we have to make a decision as to whether or not we're going to pursue full accreditation through APWA. At that point, we'll have to make that decision, 'cause that's going to be about a 20 to \$25,000 effort. But we don't anticipate that in '23.

- [Jim] Okay, thank you very much.

- [Brian] Did you have your hand raised, Jesse?

- Yeah.

- Alder Brunette?

- Director Grenier, before I forget, the reclass for Engineering Aides and Techs, it says 14. That's the number of positions, right?

- [Steve] Yes, total.

- Yeah, and I talked to the Mayor, Director Faulds, and Director Ellenbecker about this, that basically brings all of those positions in line with a full 40 hour work week.

- Correct. They are currently on a 37-1/2 hour work week. What I'm about to tell you is gonna 'cause you all to cringe.

- [Jesse] I've gotten myself in trouble when I say that sort of thing. The techs definitely have a need with program expansion. What we're doing, we have more projects coming in than we have historically, so we are doing more projects for other departments as well. As a result, our technicians, technician is a grade above an aide, but below the engineers, they are capable of running programs as opposed to inspecting projects, if that makes sense to you. So our sidewalk program is under a technician. As the programs have expanded, the technicians have found that there is not enough hours in the day. Rather than hiring another body at 37-1/2, we'd like to take the existing staff we have, bring them up to 40 hour work weeks, and see if that will plug the gap. The aides, during the winter, the aides help with numerous tasks, but their primary task is actually the drafting that goes along with project design for projects we're gonna bid out in the spring. And then during the warm weather months, those aides serve as our construction inspection arm. The part where you're going to cringe is the difference between the 37-1/2 hours and the 40 hour standard work week, and then all subsequent overtime of which they accrue quite a bit, has historically been paid for out of the road construction bonded funds. It's a project cost. That cost is directly associated with the road that's being resurfaced or reconstructed. So legitimately it can be spread out over the 20 year lifespan of the road. But we're paying bonded money for salaries and overtime for those folks. This gets that, at least the 40, the two and a half hours to get them back up to 40, back in the operating budget.

- [Jesse] Yeah, and I've said far more cringe worthy things today, so you're just fine.

- Well, for me, that's pretty cringe worthy.

- No, no. And I appreciate that you being so forthright with that, because that was my concern. I support it for the reasons you stated. But if you go from 37-1/2 to 40, then obviously anything over 40, you lose two and a half hours of a cushion. But if you said that they're gonna go likely over into overtime anyways and you have already been paying that from bonded money, then basically you're getting an extra two and a half hours per week over 14 positions. So there might be less of a hit in overtime.

- [Steve] Correct.

- Okay. All right. Thank you.

- [Brian] We're gonna go with Alder Eck. Got it.

- Got it. Okay. All right, so I just want to clarify, so if we're doing that, then will that, it will go into the operating budget and not be bonded for, just to clarify, that's what you were saying, right?

- Correct. Those two and a half hours worth of wages will not be part of the bonded money anymore. It'll be part of the operating budget.

- [Melinda] Okay. I just want to make sure I clarify that.

- Yep.

- Thank you.
- [Brian] And then we are gonna go to Alder Scannell, on the board.
- [Melinda] Oh.
- [Brian] I thought you'd enjoy that.
- Do I have to act like him?
- Please, no.
- Have you got a joke?
- Well, I have some jokes, but I don't know. Thank you, Chair. Anyway, I fully support this. I know for a long time these positions have been at 37-1/2 hours. It's been kind of a point of contention, I think, for a number of folks, and I really think this is important. So kudos to the department for doing that. Thank you very much. You'll have to wait for a joke.
- [Brian] Thank you, Alder Steuer. Any other questions? If not, we'll entertain a motion.
- [Bill] Motion to approve.
- [Jim] Second.
- I have a motion by Alder Galvin, a second by Alder Hutchison, to approve Public Works and all of the other entities. Any further discussion? Seeing none, all those in favor say aye?
- Aye.
- Aye.
- [Brian] Opposed?
- [Jesse] No.
- [Brian] That motion carries three to one. Okay, we are onto Parks, Recreation, Forestry, and Equipment Replacement. All right, Director Ditscheit, I'm gonna put you in the hot seat right away. Let's talk about the thing everybody wants to talk about, seasonal salaries.
- Seasonal salaries. Yes, I'd love to talk about that. If you go to your agenda packet, I did include a memo, along with a few spreadsheets, giving you a little more detailed information as far as what our seasonal salaries are for 2022. What was in the Mayor's proposed budget, which was a 10% increase for all seasonal salaries, and then also what staff originally proposed for seasonal salaries, which was a 25 to 30% increase to all seasonal salaries. And then there's a third spreadsheet there showing a comparison of municipalities in the area and what their current pay plans are. So it has all the information there relevant to the discussion. But in essence, the reason that the Parks Department requested a 25 to 30% increase was to be competitive with surrounding communities. So if you look

at that spreadsheet, you'll see that if we go with a 10% increase, which is a generous increase compared to past increases we've gotten, you'll see that we are dramatically lower than all surrounding communities for almost all of our positions. That will have a direct impact with how we operate our Recreation Division, our Parks, et cetera. As all of you have known for the last two to three years, we've had extreme struggles filling our seasonal positions, and it's across the board. So it's not just lifeguards, it's not just the park, the summer park playground program, it also goes into our maintenance staff and our forestry staff. So we have seasonal positions there. For maintenance staff, last year we were, or this year we were only able to hire about 25% of what we had budgeted. That made a difference on how we mowed our lawns and the complaints that came in from the public. And then in addition, as many of you are aware, we had 16 summer playground programs budgeted for, we only had enough seasonal positions to fill 11 of those sites, which had a direct impact for the neighborhoods that that program services. And then in regards to the pools, we did the best we could with the lifeguards we had. Our 2022 pay plan was pretty low, and it was very difficult to hire lifeguards, and also attendants, to run the registers and cash registers. So although we were able to open the two aquatic centers, we were not able to open all of the amenities within the aquatic centers. So many days the pool was open, but we weren't able to have the slide open, 'cause we didn't have the lifeguards and the attendants. So that is the reasoning and the justification for our proposal of 25 to 30% increase. When you take a look at the memo, it gives you kind of a budget impact. So just to summarize, with the 10% increase that's included in the budget, that increased the seasonal salaries by approximately \$122,000. And then if you were to look at implementing the staff's recommended proposed wage rates of 25 to 30%, that number increases to 325,000 approximately. So it's a difference of about \$200,000 between what's in the current budget versus what is in the staff's proposed recommendations to include in the budget. And just to give everyone a perspective, for every dollar that you increase the seasonal wage rates for all park employees, or all park seasonal employees, sorry, it's about a \$90,000 increase to the budget. That's fairly close to that. So in summary, that's kind of where we're at with it. I guess the other thing to point out is the numbers that I gave you do not include Bay Beach. Bay Beach has its own separate account. It is run on its own. All expenses and revenues are in that budget, and the general levy is not affected by the numbers that I just told you. So therefore the salaries and the increases to the budget are not reflected in those numbers.

- [Brian] Okay. Thanks for the overview. I think everybody agrees, we want to see our parks fully staffed, and we want to see these programs up and running. In your professional opinion, is this the best option, the best solution to ensure that our parks are fully staffed?

- In my opinion, it is. We did do a bonus system this year. And the bonus system had minimal impacts, and we only gave bonuses to certain employees in the seasonal pay scale. So if we want to have any chance to open our facilities, we have to be very comparable and not be that much off from the other surrounding communities. De Pere has two pools. We heard from the lifeguards this year that De Pere pays a lot more. So why would we come work for you? Our employees are telling us that, and we've heard it on a number of occasions across the board with various different positions. So it's not just lifeguards. I used that as an example. And so the more comparable we are to surrounding communities, the better chance we're gonna have to fill those positions. Is it gonna be the answer to guarantee that we're gonna open all three pools or run all 16 summer playground programs? I still can't guarantee that. We're still competing with the market outside of municipalities. We're competing with companies like Walmart and Kwik Trip and things like that, which are even paying more for certain positions than what we're proposing here. But if we can't be at least be comparable to the municipalities, we're gonna struggle. And if, I realize that there's a large budget

impact, and if the decision is to keep it at 10% or raise it accordingly, or even lower it accordingly, there just has to be a realistic expectation of what we can do to run our facilities and staff them. So, the information's there. I can't guarantee we're gonna fill all the positions, but it sure will help.

- [Brian] Okay. So, and I get that, right? And I think it would be very difficult to put you on the spot and say, if we do this for you, will all those spots be filled? So instead of asking you to make that pledge, I'm going to say, hey, I'm going to make the motion. I'm going to say, fill those spots. We really want to get our parks open. We want full access for the public. To me, this is a core service, a core responsibility. We have to figure out how to do that. I'm going to encourage the rest of our Finance Committee to figure out a way to fully fund this request so that we can give you the tools and resources to do it. But what I want to make sure is that we're not just giving an unnecessary pay bump to people that were gonna come back anyway and then not have any impact on recruiting new people. You know what I mean? So like, I think it's really, really important that if we make this investment that those spots get filled. And if you need additional support, additional resources besides just the pay increase, same conversation we had with Clerk Jeffreys when we said, "What do you need to manage the successful election?" I'm gonna maybe say the same thing to you. "What do we need to get these parks open? Let us know." And I think you're gonna see more members of council than not kind of stand up and say, "We're willing to get behind you and help you." But I think we all want to see results, of course, if we do that. So with that, I would make a motion, I can't recall the exact number, 202,2000?

- I can give you the exact-

- A couple of extra dollars.

- Yeah, it's 202 plus a little bit more.

- [Brian] Okay. So my motion is 202,000 plus a little bit more. And I know that this is beyond what we're allowed right now with Expenditure Restraint, so the expectation is, if this passes, and we don't know if it will yet, but if it does, that we're gonna have to right-size it on the other end. So do we know what the exact number is?

- Yeah, I can tell you in just a-

- [Brian] Diana won't accept plus a little bit more. And right now, if my math is right, we have, before we hit our limit, we have \$160,031. Is that right? It's pretty close.

- [Diana] 156,300

- [Brian] Oh, because we did a reclass.

- [Diana] We did a reclass for Fire and added dollars. So four-thousand, three-hundred .

- [Brian] Okay, so, sorry, what was that? We're at 156?

- [Diana] 156,300.

- [Brian] Okay. And the exact number, Dan, you're looking at?

- Yeah, it's 202,995.

- [Brian] 995. Okay. So that is my motion. Is there a second?

- [Jim] Second.

- [Brian] Okay, so there's a motion by Johnson, second by Alder Hutchison. Alder Brunette?

- Yeah. Chairman, I love the idea. I really do. I think we underpaid the folks last year. I tried to increase it and we did. We were successful. I think it's a shame that, wonderful Colburn Park, we spent a lot of resources revamping and improving it to remain empty. And we have a, I know Bay Beach is a little different, but we have park programs that were not fully staffed. The Kiddie Carnival didn't have the number of parks involved like they had been, and so it's a quality of life issue. But I'm just perplexed by it, and I don't mean to sound, in this in an offensive way, but where in the world are we gonna get the money from? Like every suggestion, save maybe one or two that I came up with was voted down. So I just don't, unless you have a way to fund this, I can't support it. I love the idea, but where's the money coming from?

- [Brian] Yep. And I'm happy to respond to that.

- Yes sir.

- So I think one of the most clumsy things about our budget process is that we have to take this department by department. And then, you get all the way through it, and you're like, "Gosh, we don't have any funding left to do this and we really want to do this, but we've already approved everything else." So this is, to me, the purpose of committee. You go through it, you take that first pass, and I would fully anticipate that there would be votes that could be changed or there could be new motions that would be brought forward at the final meeting that would allow us to retroactively look at some things. I wish we could just say, "You know what, we're gonna look at the budget as a whole and take it all up with one vote." But the reality is that's not how it works. So this is me saying, you know what, I prioritize Parks. And even though that there's not enough gap in there right now, I am happy to take a look back at things that we've already approved. And I think the most responsible way to do that is probably at the full council meeting.

- Okay. Thank you. I appreciate that. I guess when you look at a recreational facility, we spent quite a bit of ARPA on Bay Beach, and this is a situation where kids in our community need to access and adults, everyone, but mostly kids, need to access our Parks Programs and our swimming pools and our Parkie Programs, and our Bay Beach. So I guess the question is, this is a perfect case, where allocating ARPA dollars, if allowed, to fund this increase if it's just a one year thing, and then next year we can figure it out. But is that permissible, Director Ellenbecker? This won't necessarily create a, if it's a temporary thing, with seasonal help, it won't necessarily create a structural deficit, like some of the other things would have?

- [Diana] I guess would you be looking to reduce their wages in future years?

- Well, it would be like a one time allocation, like this year and then hopefully, you would have to reduce it unless the, whatever the budget would look like next year. But I'd be more willing to look

at it as a one-off thing, a one-year thing, knowing that children in our community were not able to utilize the recreational facilities like they should. I'd be willing to make that concession this year and then figure out next year, 'cause you can't leave Colburn Park and some of these other pools closed the way that they have been the last few years. It's not right.

- [Brian] Were you looking for a response from Director Ellenbecker?

- Oh yeah, if I could?

- One more time, what was your original question?

- So there was a-

- I apologize, I was-

- [Jesse] A rant there. So I apologize. With ARPA, Lost Revenue, can we do a one-time disbursement from ARPA to increase the wages temporarily this year-

- [Diana] Yes.

- Without any like, it could be a mechanism to say, one year Lost revenue and then we'll worry about next year when we worry about next year.

- Yep, that would be similar to the other requests that you have asked, yes.

- [Jesse] Yeah. There you go.

- [Brian] Okay. Alder Eck.

- Okay, so, in looking at, oh, sorry, I'm not on, am I? Okay, in looking at the seasonal salaries, this would be a question for Director Ditscheit, so the actual, well, I'm sorry, projected amount for 2022 is a bit less than the budget you asked for. Is that because we weren't able to fill the seasonal positions, and secondary question, could that roll over into 2023? The excess that was budgeted?

- I guess I would defer to Director Ellenbecker, whether or not we can take any savings from this year and direct it towards next year. I guess what was the second part of that question?

- [Melinda] If it could roll over? If it was not filled because of the shortage of seasonal, 'cause there's a difference of what, oh gosh, I'm gonna have to do math here, say around just under 300,000. And I know we were unable to fill positions, so I'm wondering, if that's the case. And then could that amount be rolled over into the 2023 budget to go towards the seasonal?

- [Brian] Could we do that with a budget amendment resolution? And otherwise I think it just goes back to the General Fund, in which case then you could, in theory, just make a motion to go to the General Fund.

- [Melinda] Okay. Well, obviously I can't make that motion right now.

- [Brian] No, right. But broadly speaking. Yeah.

- Yes.

- [Brian] And maybe just, Director Ellenbecker, if you want to add anything else to that?

- Yes. At any point if there is a surplus by, in this function, that money could be used for a carryover, like you said, instead of having it fall into the fund balance, it could be a carryover, and carried over into the following year. Or if it moved to fund balance, you could still put in a resolution to use fund balance to pay for that.

- I do want to comment on that though.

- [Brian] Director Ditscheit.

- I guess the one thing that I would just want to point out there is, if you're just looking at this one line item, that might work. But if you're looking at the department budget as a whole, there were a lot of expenses that were higher this year that were over budget. Gas was up. Utilities were up. And so some of our other line items went up accordingly, just because of the market. And we have a business to run and we had to proceed with some of that stuff. So this one might have come under, but other line items might come over too. So it depends whether you're looking at the department as a whole or just this one particular line item.

- Okay. Do we know the end result of that? Okay. Bottom. So... If there's still a surplus, whatever is a surplus, that's what my recommendation would be, to apply it towards that seasonal raise.

- [Brian] Mm hm. Can I maybe just ask, just to kind of piggyback off this a little bit where, and I don't know if this is a question for Director Ellenbecker, maybe even Attorney Bungert, but we all know that the full council is gonna take a crack at this and have lots of questions yet too. Are we legally bound or required to pass a budget out of committee that is within the Expenditure Restraint limits that are required by law? Or is it theoretically possible to advance it, knowing that the full council has to shift some things? Has that ever been done before? I'm okay if you say, "Yeah, do whatever you want."

- [Diana] I would suggest that the committee would have a budget that could be approved at council without changes, but they would not be able to, 'cause then they'd be-

- Oh, she's turned off.

- [Brian] Yeah.

- I would, especially Expenditure Restraint, 'cause that is, that would be a recommendation from the committee if you were sending it to the council, that if they approve as is, that would mean we would not fall under Expenditure Restraint, which means you would end up giving money up in 2024 budget.

- [Brian] Yeah. And what I'm ultimately trying to figure out here is do we have to narrow that down today, or is it in theory something we could narrow down at the next meeting? And I'm still saying it without knowing if this motion will pass. I don't know.

- I don't know if it's been done before, but I guess this isn't the final decision. It's just a recommendation to the council. But that's really for the attorney. I don't know if she has another opinion on it.

- [Brian] What was that, Mayor?

- [Eric] I think Director Ellenbecker's right. This is not a final decision.

- [Brian] Mm hm.

- [Eric] And it's not a levy limit cap that you're running into either.

- Right.

- Right.

- [Eric] It's a program that you would lose money from ultimately if we don't get below it.

- [Steve] Exactly.

- [Brian] Right. 'Cause we'd still be within levy limit then. Yeah.

- Yes.

- [Brian] Now that I know what that number is. Okay. Okay. Good. I think that's a good enough clarification right now, but... Okay, so the motion on the floor right now-

- [Bill] Chair?

- [Brian] Yes, Alder Galvin. Go ahead.

- Just a quick question for Director. Are we gonna be, with this proposed add-on to the seasonal help, are we gonna go back up to 32 parks with Parkies, or is this still anticipated to stay at 16?

- The budget as presented with the 200,000 increase only includes 16 sites.

- Are there any plans to ever reopen the 16 parks that were closed?

- There are plans. We're looking at other alternative methods of funding it and maybe restructuring the program in total. So are there other grant opportunities out there? Is the program maybe slightly different than what it currently is? We're still exploring those options and we're hoping that in a future year we can come back with another proposal.

- [Bill] Okay, thank you.

- [Brian] Alder Hutchison.

- Can you give us an estimate of what the increase of income would be during the summer months, if the parks would've been fully staffed so we have something to compare what we're spending and what we're getting?

- I think the only way that I'd be able to truthfully answer that is just what our budgeted number was for 2022, is what our estimate was planning to be. So that's probably the clearest defined number I could give you. And so if you kinda look back at the budget... Okay, so if you look at the 2022 revised budget, it does show that we have a total expenses of \$8,804,000 budgeted. But our actual projection is about \$200,000 less. I'm sorry, I looked at expenses not revenue, I apologize. So if you look at the revenue, we had projected 1,125,000, and our projected number is roughly 850,000. So that's a difference of about 150, \$300,000 difference. That'd be the closest I could come to approximating that.

- [Jim] So we're spending 200,000 to get 300,000? Maybe? There's other incomes though? There's not?

- I can't really give-

- [Brian] I think it's just about getting the facilities open to be used by the public rather than shuttered.

- Well, right.

- Yeah.

- [Jim] There's that, but I'm just looking at the return on the dollar. It sounds like we're gonna spend a couple hundred thousand dollars extra and we're gonna get it back.

- [Brian] I think we get it back by having open facilities.

- [Jim] Well, right.

- [Brian] Anything else, Alder Hutchison?

- No.

- Sorry.

- [Jim] Thank you.

- [Brian] Alder Steuer.

- Thank you, Chair. This is my 11th kick at budget, on all of these things. And over the years, Parks Department has, I feel, has taken a hit on many different projects. They've been cut back on a number of different areas. This is a quality of life issue. And when you talk about pools and playgrounds and that, you can say, "Well how much does it cost?" This and that. That's all very important. But it's a quality of life issue. And one reason people live in Green Bay is not only for, I was gonna say the

climate, but... Part of the year. No, it just, it's the quality of life issue. And how do you put a number on that? So I think Council, I'm hoping Council will find a way to figure this out. So that's all.

- [Brian] Okay. Any other questions on this item? Discussion? All right. The motion on the floor is to add \$202,995 to the Seasonal Salary line. Right? Is that the right line?

- Yes.

- Yes, okay.

- [Dan] That's correct.

- [Brian] Alder Brunette.

- Yeah, I support it, but I'm gonna vote no, because you don't, in my opinion, you don't add something without coming up with a way to pay for it. And I don't think we have that. We're going to exceed our allowable levy limit in order to support this, where the committee has made hardly no cuts at all. So I, on principle, I just can't support it, unless there's a way for this to be paid for that's identified before we take the vote.

- [Brian] Okay. And I certainly appreciate that perspective. As I mentioned before, I think the intent is to go back and find those spots.

- Fair enough.

- And it's just, it's a clumsy process. Okay. If there's no further discussion, all those in favor say aye?

- [Alders] Aye.

- Opposed?

- No.

- I think that was three to one. Alder Galvin, was that a yes?

- Yes.

- Okay. Three to one. Motion carries. What else do we have on the Parks Department? Alder Brunette.

- Director Ditscheit, Mayor, Diana, whoever, can you explain the Conservation Corps. That is something that I have gotten a lot of comments from, and overall, and the concept I think is wonderful, improving our public spaces. It's innovative. It's using different levels of government working together and grant dollars, whatnot. Explain it overall briefly, but basically, the real question is, are we required, if the program can move forward, but are we required to add the staff that we're going to be adding or proposed through levy? Like can we still run the program with the allocations from the federal government and the grants that we received?

- Yes, I can answer that. So this was approved at Finance Committee about two, three months ago. We kind of went over the details there. I'll give you a real quick synopsis of how the budget is affected. So total expenses to run the program is 465,197. And then total revenues for it is 378,745. So the revenues for it is the grant dollar amount that was allocated towards this. So it's roughly for every \$1 the city spends, we get, three or \$4 back in grant money to fund the program. So total impact to the budget is \$86,425. For that \$86,000, what is included in the budget is seven full-time staff members working year round and 15 seasonal staff members working primarily in the summer months. Now, again, we're hopeful that we can find the seasonal staff to be in this program. If we can't, what we'll do is in future years, we'll reassess how many full-time staff members we have versus how many seasonal staff. This was our first stab at a budget for it and a staffing level. I will tell you that finding the seven full-time members was very easy. There was a lot of people lined up to volunteer for this program and enroll in it. So it's been very beneficial. Those costs are all kind of allocated in various different line items. So there's not one line item that you can look at that says Conservation Corps line item in the Parks budget. It's spread out through about 15 different line items. I can go through each one if you want, but like I said, it comes out to a total of \$86,000 added to our budget. Type of work that they're going to do. So they're going to do work that we've never had the staff to do before. And these are needs in the community that help-

- [Jesse] Director, could I just cut you off real quick. Are they hired though? They're already hired.

- Correct. We have seven full-time numbers already in place. So if we were to not continue with the program, we would be in violation of the grant contract.

- [Jesse] No, I don't, the reason I ask is, it is probably just a moot point. I want you to continue to explain it, but I just want to make sure it's clear. Like I'm not suggesting eliminating positions. I just wanted some clarity. So as you've kind of, I didn't mean to cut you off, but-

- Oh no, that's fine.

- Go ahead, sorry.

- Yeah, so the seven full-time members have already started. One is a coordinator position. So she's actually the one running it. I know many of you have met her already. She's been employed with the city for over a year now. But just recently, within the last month or two, we hired six full-time members to actually work on the crew and start doing the work. To give you an example of the type of work. Today they were at Colburn Park and they planted I believe 90 some trees. So if they wouldn't have done it, that would've fallen onto Forestry crews to do that work. And as you know, our Forestry crews are really backlogged with a lot of different things. Just this past Saturday they had a community event where I believe about 25 members of the public came and they helped cut buckthorn at Red Smith in the wooded area. So they're gonna continue to do projects like that. They've gone along the East River corridor and they've cut a lot of buckthorn in there. They're doing a lot of mapping in our parks right now, figuring out where the habitats are. One of the primary things that they're gonna be focusing on in the future is planting. So converting turf to natural planting so that we don't have to spend as much time mowing these areas. The other benefit that they're gonna do is trail maintenance. And that's really the one thing that we don't do at all. Our Park Maintenance staff just don't have the staffing capability to maintain our mountain bike trail systems to any capacity. So we rely on volunteers to do that. And it really hasn't been successful throughout the years. And now that that sport is becoming more and more popular, there's really a demand for the

city to really take the initiative to start managing those trails. And that's what this program will do. So there's a lot of benefits, a lot of things they're going to accomplish. The grant is funded for three years and we are expecting, or we're hopeful, that that grant will continue even beyond that.

- [Jesse] Yeah, we get a whole lot for \$86,000. So good job to you and the Mayor and his staff. I think it's a wonderful program. So I'm in support. I just think it needed to kind of be discussed in that way for the sake of the council and those watching. Thank you.

- [Brian] Alder Grant.

- I apologize. I just want clarification. We are required to spend the 465,000 in order to receive the 370,000?

- That's correct.

- Okay.

- So that's the maximum the grant will pay. So if we do end up spending less, we'll be reimbursed less. So it's a matching grant.

- [Jennifer] Okay. Thank you.

- [Brian] Not you, but the grant.

- [Jennifer] Thanks.

- Oh, it's like Randy's here. Okay. I'm gonna make, are there any other discussion items on here? Alder Brunette.

- For the sake of being consistent, mostly I would like to make a motion to hold on the reclassification of the park, to basically hold the position to a Park Recreation Supervisor instead of Manager, with the savings of \$2,827.

- [Brian] I'll second that for the sake of discussion. And then if it's okay with you, Alder Brunette, I'm gonna move that over to Director Ditscheit for some comments on that.

- Yeah, go for it.

- Sure. So I'll give you a little bit of history and kind of what we're trying to accomplish with this. So currently we have three recreation supervisors. They're all at the same level. And what we're proposing here is to take one of those positions and promote that person to a recreation manager. So the benefits that will come out of that is, in this case, what we're proposing to do is take our Aquatics Recreation Supervisor, and she would then go into the management position. And right now a lot of her time is spent doing kind of the day to day pool stuff. And so what we're planning on doing is diverting some of those kind of mundane duties or easier duties to a seasonal position. And that will free up her time to kind of look at the division as a whole. So what she's going to be looking at is looking at our recreation programming. Which programs are successful? Which ones need to be kind of revisited and revamped to make them current and really excitable to the public? In addition, she'll

be doing more promotional things, so doing more marketing, getting people interested in our recreation programming. What happened through COVID is a lot of our programming suffered, primarily because people were afraid to participate in the programs. And now that that fear is kind of passing, a lot of our programs are still not to where they were prior to COVID, and so we really want to get them back up, get the community interested and excited to recreate in our parks again. So this position will do a lot of legwork in trying to accomplish that goal. And then finally what this position will be doing is taking a more active role in finding sponsorships. So that's one place that we've been lacking for the last couple of years. So this person will be going out and helping to find additional sponsorships to run our programs, which will then have a financial impact to the budget. And right now that work isn't getting done. So there's a lot of benefits to doing that. There's a minimal cost of, like right around \$2,700, and that is a little bit of a background behind that position.

- I guess maybe, I'm just gonna follow up with a question on that. I know that we have the Deputy Director in your department now, but isn't that what he did?

- To a certain degree. That's what he did do and that's what he's currently doing. He is kind of going in a lot of different directions right now. He really isn't, in the past it's always been the recreation supervisors who have done the legwork on finding the sponsorships. It hasn't been the Deputy Director, or previously the recreation superintendent. It's always fell on the supervisor positions. And what's happening, especially with aquatics, is she used to be able to do a lot of different roles with a lot of different programs. But because so much of her time is spent just trying to find staffing and run the pools and kind of doing the day to day stuff, she really doesn't have much time to do anything else. And so part of this is to give her the flexibility to do something else, and then really take it to the next level too with promoting these programs also.

- So then who's gonna do that work?

- [Dan] In regards to what?

- If you take her off the day to day, who's gonna do that work then?

- [Dan] We're gonna do that with seasonal, aquatics coordinator position.

- Okay. Okay. Any other questions? All right, seeing no other questions, all those in favor of the motion say aye?

- Aye.

- Aye.

- [Bill] Aye.

- Opposed

- No.

- All right. That motion passes three to one. I am going to, what was the fiscal impact on that one?
26?

- 2827.

- 2827. Is that with fringe?

- [Jesse] That's just what was in the, yeah.

- Okay, then I am going to make a motion, I just need to calculator here real quick, because part of me doesn't feel all that great about sending a budget to the council that they in theory have to do something to, or risk losing over a million dollars, a million and a half, if I recall correctly. So I'm gonna make a motion to use \$43,868 of unrestricted ARPA to kind of, I guess, counter the addition of the Seasonal Salaries.

- [Jesse] Did I hear that correct?

- You did. But I won't-

- I'll second that.

- So a motion by Johnson, a second by Brunette. But I will also say that I think the spike in salaries is directly related to some of the workforce shortages we're seeing as a direct result of COVID. So to me there's a strong correlation there.

- [Jesse] Fair enough.

- Is there any discussion on that motion?

- [Jim] Could you explain that please?

- Yeah, so right now we are \$43,868 short of the maximum amount that Expenditure Restraint would allow us to pass a budget without losing that incentive from the state.

- [Jim] Okay.

- So the use of the ARPA funds is meant to cover that shortage, so that in theory, if we pass the budget right now, we would not lose, and we wouldn't have to make additional cuts elsewhere. So the reality is it's either we're gonna cut 43,868 somewhere, or we're going to plug it. Director Ellenbecker.

- Okay. We're talking expenses versus revenues. So right now your expenses are over by \$43,868.

- [Brian] Oh, so the expense really does need to be cut, we can't just pay for it with ARPA. So it's a levy limit issue.

- You would have to take them out of your budget and move it to to another, you couldn't leave it in here and just put extra revenue in, you would actually have to remove 43,868 out of it.

- [Brian] But if we pay for it with ARPA, doesn't it in theory remove?

- If you take it out of the General Fund and budget for it in the ARPA fund, that would work.
- Yes.
- But we can't simply add the revenue.
- [Brian] But it has to be a separate proposal, is what you're saying?
- The 218 Fund is in this budget as well. So you could just ask to cut these expenses from the General Fund and budget for them in this other fund. It's a special revenue fund within this budget book.
- [Brian] Okay. So we can do that?
- Yes.
- [Brian] Explain that again. I'm gonna turn your mic on so that everybody understands it. 'Cause I don't know what the heck you just said, but it sounds good to me.
- So the reason that we have the ARPA funds in a separate fund is so we don't run into these Expenditure Restraint issues. If all of a sudden we get \$23 million of new revenue and we start budgeting for all these expenses, we'd be way over Expenditure Restraint. So we put the ARPA funds in a separate special revenue fund, which is in this budget book. And so any expenses that you want to pay for with ARPA funds, I recommend that you take them out of your General Fund and budget for them in that ARPA fund. Does that help?
- [Brian] It does. So basically, and I just, to restate it maybe a slightly different way, if we now make a motion to reduce Seasonal Salaries by 43,868 and then when that item comes up in the budget book, we add it.
- Yes.
- [Brian] Now does that give the Parks Department, then, all the authority and flexibility that they need to basically bring that back over?
- They would just spend it right out of that fund.
- [Brian] Yeah. There's not gonna be another action of council required at a future date?
- No.
- [Brian] Okay. So right now, then, I guess the appropriate motion would be to reduce Seasonal Salaries by 43,868?
- Yes.
- [Brian] And then we'll bring that other one up later.

- And then I'll let you know when we get to the other fund.
- [Brian] Okay, so that is my motion then. Do you want to second that?
- [Jesse] No, I'm not gonna second that.
- [Jim] I'll second it.
- [Brian] Okay. That's the only way we're gonna be able to get to use ARPA for it.
- No worries.
- You change your mind?
- [Jesse] Well, if it changes to 250,000, then I'll talk. No. Just joking. No, go ahead. We're good. Just go for it.
- [Brian] All right, well there's a second by Hutchison, so. So Alder Steuer, you had your hand raised.
- Yeah, maybe a point of clarification, either with the committee or with Diana. So with this money going to the General Fund, is that it? We're looking at kind of an even number? You're looking at a strict number that would make it just zero?
- [Brian] That's what I'm trying to do. Yes.
- Are you comfortable with that? Do we need a little more wiggle room just in case? Or is zero fine?
- [Brian] I think the likelihood, Alder Steuer, is that we are going to-
- Fight over.
- [Brian] Tear this thing apart again.
- Right, you just want to get it to the point.
- [Brian] But this allows us to advance, notwithstanding any other changes that might be made. Right?
- All right.
- [Brian] Today yet. But this allows us to advance a budget that in theory could be passed by council, whereas the other one could not without a significant fiscal impact.
- I'm good with that.
- Yeah. Okay.
- Thanks.

- [Brian] Alder Eck.

- So another I guess clarification. So this is with going with the proposed original increase in seasonal salaries that Director Ditscheit proposed, correct?

- Correct.

- Okay.

- It's to counterbalance it.

- Okay.

- [Brian] So that we can stay within state law.

- Okay. Thank you.

- [Brian] Okay. There's a motion on the floor.

- Hold it, Mr. Chair?

- Yep. More clarification?

- I guess I apologize. I have to go back to the item, when you, did you or did you not approve the Parks Recreational Supervisor moving to Recreational Manager?

- [Jesse] My motion was to hold it.

- Yep.

- Was to hold it?

- Yep.

- Okay, thank you.

- [Brian] Okay. Was that it?

- Yes.

- Okay.

- I just wanted to make sure, 'cause that is obviously built into your .

- [Brian] It did. Yep. So thank you. Okay. Any other questions? If not, all those in favor say aye?

- Aye.

- Aye.

- [Bill] Aye.

- Opposed?

- No.

- [Brian] Three to one, that passes. Okay. Any other discussion on the Parks Department budget? All right. I'll entertain a motion to approve as amended.

- [Bill] So moved.

- [Jim] Second.

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

- [Alders] Aye.

- [Brian] Opposed? That motion carries. Miscellaneous, page, and Assistant Director Manley, you're gonna let me know when that item comes up, right? Okay. Miscellaneous, page 145. I'm not gonna make a motion today. I may change my mind when we come to council, but there is one bucket that I just want to call attention to, and that's the Community Support bucket. That amount used to be larger in the past. For those not familiar, this is kind of what helps us with maybe one time events or certain things that come into our community and it's budgeted at 15,000, which is holding steady, But, as many of you know, we saw, you all saw the headlines with Art Street leaving. Headlines right now with Rock the Dock moving to De Pere. And we have to have some honest conversations about why are these events moving out of Green Bay? And I will tell you, as someone who works in this field, it's because of the cost to do events in Green Bay. This is a place where we can offset that. I don't feel comfortable making a motion just at this moment. And I may change my mind when we head into the full council meeting, But if we want to sort of stop that hemorrhage and retain those quality of life amenities here in our community, this is, really services, especially those, like first time events, or like events that, I think of like Tall Ships, right? That would maybe come in every four years or something. I'm sure the Mayor's Office could probably provide a little bit more detail on the programs that have used that in the past. But I think it's a worthwhile discussion, whether it happens during budget or another time, to really kind of wrap our arms around why we're missing or losing some of these really critical events to our community. Alder Grant.

- I want to clarify a little bit, when you talked about it costs too much for them to do the event here. What are the costs that we're competing with? Why are we more expensive?

- [Brian] Street closures, fire, police, right? All the things that are practically necessary a lot of times to do these events, but other communities find different ways to subsidize that. We do that too, through this fund, but this fund is not large enough compared to what some of the other communities are doing. So really this ends up being like a lot of times an internal transfer. So instead of an event organizer, for example, paying Public Works \$1,000 to close the street, this fund will pay

Public Works to make them whole for the service they provided. But the 15,000 just isn't enough to, to a lot of times bring those event costs down to a level where it makes it worthwhile for an event organizer to stay here. And that's why they get kind of courted to sometimes other communities.

- Have we made sure our expenses are in line with other communities to close the roads? That's a fee that is decided here. Are we keeping up with that?

- [Brian] I don't know that we've ever done an apples to apples, and it'd be a better question for staff, but I know staff probably charges what the hourly rate is for what it costs. So, yeah.

- Okay.

- [Brian] Alder Eck.

- Okay, so with the improvements that are gonna be made to Leicht Park, and possibly the Rail Yard, or those areas, then I would think that there would be less road closures because it can be contained within Leicht Park's property. So maybe that would be something that would increase the inflow of those events coming into Green Bay because of that?

- [Brian] So road closures aren't the only expense.

- Just as an example.

- [Brian] Yeah, event permits and security and all that stuff. And part of that equation, not that I want to create a big issue about this today, because I'm not gonna make a motion, but it's I think it's maybe even a full evaluation of the types of services we require for events compared to other communities. I think that's just kind of a very transparent conversation we can have.

- Okay. Well I just know that's coming, so I'm excited about it, actually.

- [Brian] Yeah, and I think, quite frankly, I think it's probably best suited for a communication for us to just talk about as a council separately out of budget. But I also wanted to point it out that this is the fund that we can use to offset some of that. So if anyone on this body wanted to do that now, it would likely be the time. But, if we're looking at just a holistic evaluation of that process, I think that's probably better suited for a committee down the road.

- Okay.

- [Brian] Mayor.

- Just real quickly, not necessarily on Community Support, but since you named those two particular events, I would just encourage people to probably talk to Downtown Green Bay. There's a lot of nuance to event planning and they could probably tell you the full story on both of those instances.

- [Brian] Sure. Okay. Any other discussion on this particular proposal? Miscellaneous. Okay. If not, we'll entertain a motion.

- [Jim] Move to approve.

- I'll second that.
- Second.
- [Brian] We have a motion by Hutchison, a second by Johnson. Any further discussion? Seeing none, all those in favor say aye?
- [Alders] Aye.
- [Brian] Opposed? Motion carries. Okay. Okay, now we're gonna move on to Special Revenue Funds, page 160-187.
- [Melinda] Miscellaneous?
- [Brian] That was just Miscellaneous that we just took up.
- [Melinda] Oh, I've got it now. General?
- [Brian] Nope, I think that's just the consolidation, right, of all the accounts? The General Fund totals?
- [Diana] Correct.
- [Brian] Yep. Okay, so right now we're, again, pages 160 to 187. Is there any items here that you wish to discuss? I don't think I had any. Nope. Anybody else? Director Grenier.
- We could just as easily have handled it with a budget amendment after we pass the budget, but why not pass something that's accurate, as you've talked about plenty of times before. If you'd go to page 183 please. That's the Wheel Tax Fund. After we prepared our initial budget estimates and placed them in, staff reported back to me that with the escalating cost of asphalt, that the number we have in for 54061 is about \$40,000 low. Now this is a zero sum game with this fund. So Department of Public Works requests that 54061 be increased from 112,500 to 152,500, and then 55305 would correspondingly be decreased by the same amount, from 2,250,000 to 2,210,000.
- [Brian] Okay. I would make that motion.
- [Jim] Second.
- [Brian] So there's a motion by Johnson, a second by Hutchison. And as you said, it's a zero sum game. It doesn't affect, 'cause this is a special fund, right? What is this?
- That's correct. The Wheel Tax.
- Just the Wheel Tax one? Yeah. Okay. Director Ellenbecker.
- I just want to explain for those who have seen the budget book before, this book looks a little bit different than we've done in the past. One, we have revenues on the same page as the expenses for

those departments to consolidate the book more. And then you also are seeing new sections in here. We have these now Special Revenue Funds. Historically we've had, the 100 on top of the fund, the 100s is your General Fund. And then when you get you 200s, your Special Revenue Funds. Historically in the past we used to put 201 Sanitary, 202 Parking, 205 Storm, and we would put 214 Bay Beach in here. But that is to add 208, which is your Transit Operating. Those are the only five Special Revenue Funds we used to put in this book. We have now shown you all Special Revenue Funds that the city has open funds. You would also have always seen them in our annual comprehensive book at the end of the year. The reason why the change is, per state statute, you should be reflecting and showing a budget for all your funds, not just ones that are levy supported. So that is why you're seeing a change in the book. The only things I would note is that Fund 208, which is on page-

- 173.

- On page 170.

- Three.

- 173, thank you. That is the only 200 fund that is levy supported, that has some levy in it. And that is our Transit. Their budget is somewhere in the eight million range and the city puts 1,248,000 toward their budget. This has been the same amount that we put toward their budget, probably historically for about three to four years or more. So I just want to bring that to your attention.

- [Brian] Okay.

- And then, as Deputy Assistant Finance Director Pam Manley would like to talk about the Fund 218, which is on page one-

- 84 and 85.

- 184 and 185. This is where you would be adding the \$43,000 to. This is the, we call it COVID, because that is the original grant of fund, that fund that we were using. So it is still some grants related to COVID. This is where our ARPA is in this budget. So this is where you would add the additional \$43,868 as an expenditure, and you're removing it out of your operating budget.

- [Brian] Okay. Any questions on that?

- Is that more confusing?

- [Brian] Alder Grant.

- Director Grenier, can you just clarify, have we had, on page 183, has there been a surplus for the Wheel Tax for three years? Or two years I mean. Sorry.

- [Steve] No, there was some unallocated funds for 2022 that we are carrying forward to offset needs in 2023. That's with the applied surplus.

- Okay. Is the bottom line, though? Even in 2021, 137,160. Or am I not reading that? Is that line not the difference?

- [Steve] No, this, everything in here actually balances.

- Okay.

- [Steve] So we're anticipating revenues in 2023 of about 1.9 million. We've got \$600,000 in cash, currently unallocated, that will be used for 2023 projects. The 2023 projects that we anticipate are blacktop materials, which is pothole patching material, that three years ago was elected by the council to be funded out of this fund. And again, we just increased that to 152,500. The joint ceiling materials at 137,500, and the balance of that 2.5 million, 2,210,000, would then go into the Pavement Construction/Reconstruction Program for 2023.

- Okay.

- [Brian] Okay. Is that good? Yep. Great. Okay. And Director Ellenbecker gave us that explanation, but of course we still have sort of the open motion on the floor, that Director Grenier made a recommendation to. And again, that's a zero sum transaction. That doesn't really affect anything, other than to, I guess, right-size expectations on those two items. So any further discussion?

- [Diana] And then we also have the motion.

- [Brian] Yep. And that's, we'll take a vote on this motion first and then we'll make that motion. So any further discussion on this particular item? And again, just as a reminder, that was to reduce blacktop, or excuse me, increase blacktop material to 152,500 and then reduce Paving Construction/Reconstruction, I think that stands for, to 2,210,000. All those in favor say aye?

- [Alders] Aye.

- [Brian] Opposed? Motion carries. Okay, and where is the account that we need to talk about? What's the number? Do we need me to say the number?

- [Pam] Page 184. The account number that we want to add is not in here. We haven't paid for Seasonal Salaries out of ARPA funding yet.

- Got it.

- So we can create account.

- [Brian] Okay. So I will make a motion to create account under this area.

- [Pam] 50003.

- [Brian] 50003, for \$43,868 for Seasonal Salaries using the unrestricted ARPA or the Lost Revenue ARPA bucket. Is there a second for that?

- [Bill] Second.

- [Brian] Okay. Discussion? Seeing none, all those in favor say aye?
- [Alders] Aye.
- [Brian] Opposed? Motion carries. So just a quick update, 'cause Alder Steuer was asking for that. That puts us at zero right now, meaning that the proposal in front of us is the maximum amount that the state law would allow us with Expenditure Restraint rules. So, okay. We are onto the Debt Service Fund, pages 189 to 191. Are there any questions on the Debt Service Fund?
- [Jim] Do we have to approve-
- [Brian] Oh, we didn't do the final report. Yes. Thank you. Can we get a motion for that?
- [Jim] So moved.
- [Brian] To approve as amended?
- [Jim] Yeah, to approve as amended.
- [Brian] I'll second that. We have a motion by Alder Hutchison, second by Johnson. Any discussion? Seeing none, all those in favor say aye?
- [Alders] Aye.
- [Brian] Opposed? Motion carries. All right, now we're onto number 15. Debt Service Fund, pages 189 to 191. Any questions? If not, we'll entertain a motion.
- [Bill] Motion to approve.
- [Brian] I'll second that. We have a motion by Galvin, a second by Johnson. Any discussion? Seeing none, all those in favor say aye?
- [Alders] Aye.
- [Brian] Opposed? Motion carries. Item 16, Capital Projects Fund. Just pages 193 to 238. Anybody need to pull anything? I don't know about all of you, I gotta flip through all these pages to see if I have notes. Okay, anybody? Director Ellenbecker.
- I just want to add a note. There are a couple of funds in here that have levy dollars. Don't know if you want them to be brought to your attention or not.
- [Brian] Why don't you go ahead and tell us so that we are all aware.
- Fund 421, which is on page 210. Actually that one, yes, that one is our IT Equipment Replacement Account. And that one is on top line, you're seeing the 41110, Current Real Property Levy, that one is requesting \$108,500 for equipment that he really has, there's really expenses of 192,000 offset by some other revenue sources, requesting a levy of 108,500.

- [Brian] Okay. Any questions on that item? And again, this is, these are items that Director Ellenbecker is sharing. These are items that will affect the levy and the mill rate and the ongoing conversations we've been having. These aren't special funds that get absorbed different ways. So just so that everybody understands.

- If you want to go on to the next one, next page 211, which is the 423 Fund. That is your Police Equipment Replacement Fund. This is, as you see the top line, we're looking for levy of 566,110. There are some other revenues in there, which is some sale of equipment. And then down, you'll see the expenses, is for equipment lease, and that's 590,910.73. That's a combination of a couple of items, but that includes your 526,000 for the body cameras, the tasers, and the dash cams. That's what's included in that 526. And then the other portion is on leases for support vehicles, offset by, again, some revenue, and then then the difference is, we're looking for a levy 566,110.75.

- [Brian] Okay. Chief Davis, I'm gonna ask you a question on this one. And this is ignorance speaking right now, does every officer have to have a taser, or is that something that can be kind of checked in and you check out when you're on shift?

- That is something that we would really be better off if everyone had one. We've run into some problems with that. That's the way we've done it in the past. And again, you get that situation like a Packer game, where almost all of us are working. Then you do have some uniformed officers who are working at a Packer game who don't have one, which is technically a violation of our policy.

- [Brian] Okay, thank you. Okay.

- [Diana] If we move onto, on page 213, that is Fund 425. Top line, there is a levy request for \$30,000. Again, that is for equipment, that is for leased vehicles for our inspectors. As you can see the expense is 30,000, and we have a levy of 30,000.

- I presume we're under contract for those already?

- [Diana] Yes. Again, about three years ago we decided to move forward, instead of bonding for some support vehicles that we have replaced them with some leased vehicles. I believe inspectors have it replaced about half their fleet. Six, seven vehicles now are now under a lease program and we're not bonding so that they can bring their fleet more current.

- Okay, thank you.

- So really to answer your question, some of them are, we already own them. We're already paying lease payments, and there is anticipation that several more maybe three more vehicles are gonna be leased in 2023.

- [Brian] Okay.

- Move on to the next page, 214. That is 426, that is our Park and Rec Department Equipment Replacement, that on the top line, they are looking for 35,000. That also is to pay for some equipment leases offset by some sale of equipment, and that is requesting \$35,000 for levy to pay for those leases. And then the last item for levy request is 427 Fund, which is on page 215. That is

100,000. Again, that is to pay for the lease cost for a number of leases for support vehicles for the DPW. So that would include, those are the only items within that 400 series that have general levy requests.

- [Brian] Okay. I appreciate you pulling that out. I wouldn't have known that, so thank you. Okay. Any other questions on the Debt Service Fund? If not, we'll entertain a motion.

- [Jim] Isn't this Capital Projects Fund?

- [Brian] It sure is. We're under the Capital Projects Fund. Look, we're going faster than I thought. Yeah. Okay. Otherwise I'll entertain a motion.

- [Jim] Move to approve.

- [Brian] We have motion by Hutchison, a second by Brunette. Any further discussion? Seeing none, all those in favor say aye?

- [Alders] Aye.

- [Brian] Opposed? Motion carries. Okay, we are onto the Internal Service Funds. 256 to 258. Any questions? If not, we'll entertain a motion. I'll make a motion to approve.

- [Jesse] Second.

- We have a motion by Johnson, second by Brunette. Any discussion? All in favor say aye?

- [Alders] Aye.

- Any opposed? Motion carries. Okay. All right, guys, Item G. Regular Business continued.

- [Jennifer] I'm sorry, . Talk about anything we just went over or?

- [Diana] Those are both staff members.

- [Jennifer] Oh, okay.

- Thank you.

- Sorry.

- Okay. For consideration with possible action, the approval to award the marketing and branding initiative to North Star Place Branding and Marketing for the sum of \$101,000. Held from the 9/20/22 Common Council Meeting. I'm gonna make a motion to hold this item until we can apply for a grant and receive a determination letter back on that.

- [Bill] I'll second that.

- Okay. Alder Brunette.

- Yeah. How was it going to be paid for prior to what you just suggested, Alder?
- [Brian] I believe inside the packet it indicated that we would have to identify the funding source.
- What is it though? What was, just pie in the sky, just the money tree out back?
- [Brian] I guess I don't know the answer to that. Mayor.
- [Eric] Yeah, if it wasn't designated in the packet, the thinking was ARPA.
- [Brian] Okay. Maybe I missed that too. Maybe, and I would just add a little bit of clarity. There is a grant from the State of Wisconsin that is posted right now. This type of item could potentially qualify in that. So the reason I made the motion, because I want to give our staff time to apply for that grant, and then receive a notice back, before this body is forced to take action on it. And again, the point is to keep that RFP open so that way we don't have to go through that process all over again if we vote no on this. And then we're kind of starting all over from scratch with the grant and the RFP. So the motion is to hold. There was a second, right?
- Yes.
- Yeah, Galvin. Yep.
- Galvin.
- [Brian] Any further discussion? Seeing none, all those in favor say aye?
- Aye.
- Aye.
- Any opposed?
- No.
- [Brian] That motion passes. Okay. item two. Consideration with possible action, amendment to the five-year Axon agreement, fully executed December, 2020. I believe that's Chief Davis?
- Yes. Thank you. This is an add to the existing contract with Axon, who is the vendor for our body worn cameras, the vehicle mounted cameras, and tasers. What this will do for us is this will give us enough tasers to issue one to every sworn member of the department. And then it also will add vehicle cameras for, we're doing some fleet realignment and adding five marked vehicles to the fleet. And so it will allow us to put vehicle cameras in those. We don't have enough software licenses right now to cover all of the professional staff that needs to access video. What the body worn camera, what Axon does for us is they provide us with all these tools and they also provide us with storage for many, many, many hours of video of police officers interacting with the community, in a software online system that allows us to find things that we're looking for, basically, with search functions and it sorts all that stuff for us. This would give us enough software licenses to cover professional staff in

places like records, who need access to that for obvious reasons. And then the other thing that this covers is a \$20,000 cost, spread out over the remaining three years of the agreement, to allow us to use something called Axon Standards. It's some internal affairs, administrative investigation, case management software that will be very helpful to some internal changes we're making in our accountability systems. And really what this fee is just to do is to migrate some data. We have access to that as part of our agreement with Axon, but we can't use it because we need to migrate data into it to allow us to use this Axon Standards program.

- [Brian] So just so that we're all clear on this, this is already accounted for in the budget. So this is really for us to take action on an amendment to the agreement? Or are we gonna have to find another way to pay for this? We have to, are we supposed to identify that right now?

- [Diana] I can speak to it if you'd like.

- [Brian] Oh, sorry. Yep.

- Correct. The amendment, that's really kind of a two part. There's amendment and there's a dollar amount that needs to be increased if the amendment is approved. And again, this just came through the last couple of weeks. It was after a proposed budget was pulled together. So this would be an additional add to the budget. Something up to this amendment would, the invoicing would be \$88,000 annually for the next three years. We'd have to find a source of money for that cost on an annual basis. We do have some bonded money that could be used for a portion of year one, but that still would be some additional expenses that would need to be added. And again, I know it looks like kind of an odd way to present it to you, but before we go try to find the funds, we have to make sure the amendment to the agreement needs to be done. It's kind of, and we didn't know which one to bring to you first. So it's really brought you together, saying if we make this amendment and want to add these additional items, it's going cost money. Then we have to find the funding source. If the funding source was budget, that's why it's been added on here, whether or not a portion of that money would be added to the 2023 budget.

- Okay. I wasn't anticipating having to open back up the budget, which would likely have to occur if we're gonna find almost \$90,000, 88,677. So I would perhaps offer a suggestion, but I'm not gonna make the motion, 'cause I just want to see how anyone else reacts. But we could advance this to council without a recommendation, and then acknowledge that, if we want this in the budget, we're gonna have to figure out what we're cutting. Or we can talk about one time funding. Or obviously there's always the option to say no, we're not gonna approve it. So I think those are probably your three options. So is there anybody else that would want to comment on that before we talk about a motion?

- [Bill] Yep. Chair?

- Yes. Go ahead, Alder Galvin.

- Chief, is it necessary to have all these things right now or could we parse some of this stuff down and then look at adding on the ability for more access by more people or is there things where we could do a little whittling here just to add it on in another year or two?

- No, these are all things that fill gaps in these programs, that the sooner the better, I would say, for each of these things. Once we, for example, if I can't add vehicle cameras to new vehicles when they come in for the fleet, it's harder to use those because now I have two different kinds of vehicles in the fleet. Some with cameras and some without, and there's the expectation that those will all have cameras. I would say one option might be to hold off on migrating the data for the Axon Standard software. That's a \$20,000 cost spread out over three years. So that takes off, that's \$6,700 a year. However, that is a piece of software that is covered in the cost of the overall agreement that we are not getting any use out of right now.

- [Bill] Right, right.

- So there's always ways to try to make this work, but really these are things that we've identified as gaps that we really should fill because these are, for example, the longer we hold off on issuing tasers to every sworn member of the department, there's a risk associated with that. Because if there is a significant use of force by somebody who doesn't have a taser issued to them, we will be asked why we didn't have that option available for our employee. If we don't have cameras in patrol cars, we may find ourselves in a situation where we really wished we'd had one to get video of something that happened. So I would say the software licenses and the Axon Standards part is the most optional of this.

- Okay. All right. And Chair, I'm having a little bit of difficulty with my computer out here, but did I, I wasn't sure, but I thought I heard someone say something about bonding for some of this. Is that correct?

- I guess in theory that would be a fourth option I didn't talk about. But-

- It's a lease.

- Oh, it's a lease?

- Yeah.

- Yeah, so in theory, you could still bond for it. I don't know that I would, but.

- Right, and if that's a serious consideration, I'm gonna have to say that, again, that's one of those things, like we were saying about some of the other suggestions earlier tonight, that's kicking the can down the road. These are things we need to budget for and not be bonding for. They should be part of the regular yearly budget. And we, okay, in my opinion, we need to find a way to fund it without taking out loans. I don't think that's the right way to fund this item.

- Right. Okay. I'm gonna go over to Director Ellenbecker.

- Alder Galvin, you're correct. I did mention the word bonding, but one or two years ago there was some money that was bonded to upgrade their interview rooms. And that money has not been spent. There's \$60,000 that was bonded in 2021, I believe, for interview cameras. And that money is still sitting there. So part of this amendment includes some upgrading their cameras for their interview rooms. So again, this additional money, we can use that bonded money for, not for the lease portion, but for buying of the equipment for those cameras.

- [Brian] And what amount of that total is equipment?
- We were able to come up with \$60,000 worth of equipment.
- [Brian] Oh, I'm sorry. I thought you said that was the bond balance. But 60,000 of this 88,000 could be used with that-
- Roughly, yeah.
- [Brian] That balance. So we would have to put 28,000 either onto the levy, ARPA.
- Potentially for year one. But then you have two more years at 88,000 then. 'Cause the total amount that is then allocated over three years equaling 88,000 for the next three years.
- [Brian] Okay. All right. Committee, what would you like to do? Just, maybe just, instead of holding it, just say advance it without a recommendation.
- [Jim] Yeah.
- [Brian] Yeah. All right. That's a motion from Alder Hutchison. Is there a second?
- Second.
- [Brian] We have a second from Brunette. Alder Brunette also has a question.
- Director Ellenbecker. This technically could be a ARPA allocation, right?
- [Diana] Yes.
- Remember like three hours ago there was a very wise man who suggested this very thing. Here we are. So I'll just, I'll support the motion, but it's worth considering.
- [Brian] Yeah. Lot of time to consider that.
- Yeah.
- [Brian] We're gonna do this all over again in a week, and I know you're all looking forward to that. Okay. Any further discussion? All right. All those a favor say aye?
- [Alders] Aye.
- [Brian] All those opposed? Motion carries. Is that it?
- [Diana] Would you like an update on where we ended the meeting?
- [Brian] Yeah, well, Enterprise, Transit pages, you already gave us that kind of overview, right? Or is that different?

- [Diana] What that is, is that is, that is what you're seeing is the Transit budget. That's a full budget. We have it under Informational because that is not something that the city takes action on.

- We don't take action on.

- [Diana] You only take action on the portion that is levy to help support their budget. And that was on that earlier page, that 1,248,000 that we identified earlier.

- [Brian] Sure, it's just when you talk, there's a lot of Einstein numbers and figures coming out, so I don't know, sometimes they get confusing, but okay. The Contingency Account is 184,297, unobligated. 57,297, if you may recall, we obligated some of that for some damage done to our parks during the storm. And just for a final recap.

- Yes, coming into the meeting out of the proposed budget, the mill rate was at \$7.84. Between the time the budget was printed and today, we had some allocations and changes in the assessed value, which brought the mill rate down from 7.84 down to 7.78. But now, as of today, we have added back \$122,603, which is about a penny and a half. So we are sitting at \$7.80, that is the mill rate, which will maximize our Expenditure Restraint and still falls under our levy limit.

- [Brian] Okay. Can I obtain a motion to adjourn?

- So moved.

- So moved.

- [Brian] Alder Campbell.

- I've been quiet the whole time. I just have an announcement. Hoping that Melinda, Alder Eck, has good luck in her surgery here. She's been battling. But more or less celebrating her birthday today. She's buying drinks at the bar.

- [Melinda] No, I'm going home to my family.

- [Brian] Yeah. Well, happy birthday and well wishes.

- Shall we sing?

- Yes, you do.

- [Brian] All right, we're gonna adjourn first, and then you can sing all you want.

- [Mark] Karaoke.

- [Brian] All right. I think we had a motion by Hutchison, a second by Brunette. All those in favor say aye?

- [Alders] Aye.

- [Brian] Opposed? Motion carries. Thank you, everybody. Thanks, Bill, for joining.

- [Jim] What time is it?