



MINUTES OF THE FINANCE COMMITTEE

TUESDAY, JANUARY 31, 2023, 4:30 PM

In person at City Hall, Room 207.

Virtual attendance also available via Zoom.

Immediately following Personnel.

AMENDED

A. ZOOM MEETING INFORMATION.

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

B. ROLL CALL.

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

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

Also present: Ald. Mark Steuer, Ald. Jennifer Grant, Ald. Steven Campbell, Ald. Chris Wery, City Attorney Joanne Bungert, Deputy City Attorney Lacey Cochart, Interim IT Director Dave Wilquet, Police Chief Chris Davis, Development Director Neil Stechschulte, Parks Director Dan Ditscheit, Public Works Director Steve Grenier, Finance Director Diana Ellenbecker, Assistant Finance Director Pam Manley and others

C. APPROVAL OF THE AGENDA.

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

Motion Passed.

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

D. APPROVAL OF MINUTES.

I. Approval of the Finance Committee minutes from the January 10, 2023 meeting.

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

Motion Passed.

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

E. REGULAR BUSINESS.

1. For consideration and possible action the request for reimbursement of 2022 property taxes of \$12,017.18 for 5-1523-1 (610 N Broadway) for N.E.W. Community Clinic contingent on Assessors determination of exempted status.

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. Bill Galvin to open the floor.
Motion Passed.

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

Kim Franzen-611 N. Broadway, Green Bay

Moved by Ald. Bill Galvin, seconded by Ald. Jesse Brunette to close the floor.
Motion Passed.

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

Moved by Ald. Brian Johnson, seconded by Ald. Jesse Brunette to approve contingent on a successful review by the City Assessor for property tax exempt status for Tax Year 2022.
Motion Passed.

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

2. For consideration and possible action the request for reimbursement of 2022 property taxes total of \$14,102.83 for 14-426 (612 Stuart St), 14-410 (304 S Quincy St), and 14-410-A (618 Stuart St) for St. John's Ministries contingent on Assessors determination of exempted status.

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. Jim Hutchison, seconded by Ald. Brian Johnson to open the floor.
Motion Passed.

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

Alexia Wood-612 Stewart St., Green Bay
Keith Szerkins-2095 Green Acres Ct., Howard

Moved by Ald. Bill Galvin, seconded by Ald. Jim Hutchison to close the floor.
Motion Passed.

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

Moved by Ald. Brian Johnson, seconded by Ald. Bill Galvin to approve reimbursement of taxes, excluding the pavement special assessments, contingent on a successful review by the City Assessor for property tax exempt status for Tax Year 2022.

Motion Passed.

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

3. For consideration with possible action the renewal of the Environmental Systems Research Institute, Inc (ESRI) software for three years at \$214,425.00.

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

Motion Passed.

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

4. Consideration with possible action on a request to purchase a Graco Grindlazer pavement marking eradicator from Sherwin Industries in the amount of \$57,554.

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

Motion Passed.

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

5. For consideration with possible action staff recommendation for the use of American Rescue Plan Act (ARPA) allocation for a total of \$5,576,880. Item was referred to staff to bring back recommendation from the August 30, 2022 Common Council Meeting.

Moved by Ald. Bill Galvin, seconded by Ald. Jesse Brunette to open the floor.

Motion Passed.

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

Sarah Inman-112 N. Adams St., Suite 201, Green Bay
Jamie Tramte Brassfield-201 W. Walnut St., Green Bay
Holly Baseman-1270 Main St., Green Bay

Moved by Ald. Bill Galvin, seconded by Ald. Jesse Brunette to close the floor.

Motion Passed.

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

Moved by Ald. Bill Galvin, seconded by Ald. Jim Hutchison to amend File Number 7-2-211 to strike the four-party agreement.

Motion Passed.

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

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

Motion Passed.

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

6. For consideration and possible action to approve a limited conflict waiver for the firm of Renning Lewis and Lacy.

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. Brian Johnson, seconded by Ald. Bill Galvin to enter closed session at 6:37pm. Motion Passed.

Ald. Brian Johnson read the closed session language.

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

Moved by Ald. Brian Johnson, seconded by Ald. Bill Galvin to reconsider the agenda to combine Items #6-8 as one item in closed session.

Motion Passed.

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

Moved by Ald. Bill Galvin, seconded by Ald. Jesse Brunette to return to regular session at 6:48pm. Motion Passed.

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

Moved by Ald. Bill Galvin, seconded by Ald. Jim Hutchison to reconsider the agenda and separate Items #6-8.

Motion Passed.

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

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

Motion Passed.

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

7. For consideration and possible action on Jamb Investments v. City of Green Bay.

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 for staff to proceed as directed in closed session.

Motion Passed.

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

8. Report of the Claims Committee.

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

Moved by Ald. Bill Galvin, seconded by Ald. Brian Johnson to approve.
Motion Passed.
Yes- Bill Galvin, Brian Johnson, Jesse Brunette, Jim Hutchison

F. INFORMATIONAL.

1. 2022 Contingency Account: \$157,297.00; unobligated is \$57,297.00.
2023 Contingency Account: \$250,000.00.

2. The next Finance Committee meeting will be held on Tuesday February 14, 2023 at 4:30 PM.
Next meeting will be Tuesday, February 28th, unless urgency requires a prior meeting.

G. ADJOURNMENT.

Moved by Ald. Bill Galvin, seconded by Ald. Jesse Brunette to adjourn.
Motion Passed.
Yes- Bill Galvin, Brian Johnson, Jesse Brunette, Jim Hutchison

H. VERBATIM MINUTES.

- [Ald. Johnson] All set?
- [Dir. Ellenbecker] Yes.
- [Ald. Johnson] So. Okay. I'd just like to apologize to everybody. I had a planned trip out of town, which was initially between our normal finance committee and council, Of course, this got delayed by a week, So instead of me in person, you get me on the screen, so hopefully we'll get through this okay. We'll entertain a motion. Actually, first we have roll call. The record reflect Alder Hutchison, Alder Brunette, Alder Galvin and Alder Johnson are all present. Item C. The approval of the agenda.
- [Ald. Galvin] So moved.
- [Ald. Brunette] Second.
- Motion by Galvin, second by Brunette. Any discussion? Seeing none. Those in favor say "Aye".
- [Committee] Aye.
- Opposed? Motion carries. I have the approval of minutes.
- [Ald. Galvin] So moved.
- [Ald. Brunette] Second.
- [Ald. Johnson] I believe it's a motion by Galvin, the second by Brunette. Any discussion? Seeing none, those in favor say 'aye'.
- [Committee] Aye.

- Opposed? Motion carries. Item E. Regular business For consideration possible action request for reimbursement 2022 property taxes \$12,017 and 18 cents for 5-1523-1 610 North Broadway for N.E.W. Community Clinic. contingent on Assessor determination of exempted status. I'm gonna first ask staff to give an overview, then I'll invite members of the public, if you are interested in speaking on this item, just approach the party and then we'll open the floor. So staff, can you please give us an overview?

- [Dir. Ellenbecker] Sure. Thank you. Alder Johnson? Yes, we had a request from Todd Bryce, from the N.E.W. Community Clinic, asking about once they received their tax bill, they were asking whether or not they had to pay it, or if there was any way that they could get that reimbursed, or not have to pay their tax bill. We have the information in the packet, of the letter that was sent to them, a copy of the assessment letter that was sent to them. But the information is, that you know, there's a deadline of March 1st, to turn in exemption on paperwork to the Assessor, and that was not completed, and that's what generated a tax bill for 2022.

- [Ald. Johnson] Is there anyone from the public that wishes to speak on this item?

- [Dir. Ellenbecker] Yes

- [Ald. Johnson] Entertain a motion to open the floor.

- [Ald. Brunette] So moved.

- [Ald. Galvin] Second.

- I have a motion by Brunette, a second by Galvin, Any discussion? Seeing none, those in favor say "aye".

- [Committee] Aye.

- Opposed? Motion carries. If we could please just bear with me, name and address the record.

- [Kim] Aye. Kim Franzen, 610 North Broadway Street, Green Bay, Wisconsin, 54303.

- [Ald. Johnson] Okay, go ahead. Thank you.

- [Kim] Thank you. So, I'm here on behalf of N.E.W. Community Clinic regarding an appeal for the property taxes for 2022. N.E.W. Community Clinic, purchased property at 610 North Broadway on February 15th of 2021, and in August of 2022, started a new construction project. We are a federally qualified health center, and we provide healthcare services to the community, for individuals who are uninsured or underinsured. And we provide about \$2 million worth of free services here to our community to keep us healthy. And, during the process of due, of purchasing the land in our construction at the end of 2021, we did not receive any tax bills. We do have property at 622 Bodart Street, which is, exempt from property taxes. So, we went through 2021 and 2022. We opened our new clinic at 610 North Broadway and at, and then we received our tax bill. At that time it was recognized that we had not done the formal process, as explained, to submit the tax exempt status

documents. So, we have paid the first half of our taxes for 2022. Have submitted that, and we have submitted our documents, for our tax exempt status, to be approved by the Assessor.

- [Ald. Johnson] Any questions?

- [Ald. Galvin] I have no questions.

- [Ald. Johnson] Now are there, is there any, Thank you, Ms. Franzen, Is there any other member of the public who wishes to speak? Seeing none, we'll entertain a motion to close the floor.

- [Ald. Galvin] Motion to close the floor

- [Ald. Brunette] Second.

- [Ald. Johnson] Motion by Galvin, second by Brunette. Any discussion? Seeing none, all those in favor say "Aye".

- [Committee] Aye. Any opposed? Motion carries. And look guys, this is one of those things I think if you only go through this once in a lifetime, to me this is an item that's just so easy to overlook. You not even realize you need to do this. This just seems like an easy one to me. Unless anyone's got a different perspective on it, I would make a motion to approve the appeal.

- [Dir. Ellenbecker] Alder Johnson, can I add just two points?

- [Ald. Johnson] Yes.

- [Dir. Ellenbecker] The number one point is, I guess, I would want confirm with Kim what date they actually started their business. I'm sorry, I think of you said August of 2022.

- [Kim] So we obtained the property on February 15th, 2021. We ended our construction project and had occupancy, and started our clinic hours there on June 2nd, 2022.

- [Dir. Ellenbecker] Okay. So, okay, thank you. I'm apologize if you'd had to open the floor again, but if anything for exemption, you would have to be 1/1 of 22 to get the exempt status. That's what a state statute would say. And then second, the paperwork that they just turned in, is really for 2023 determination. It really wouldn't be for 2022. So those are just two clarifications.

- [Ald. Johnson] Well, Director Ellenbecker, I thought the, is the appeal not on here though for 2022?

- [Dir. Ellenbecker] The appeal is for 2022. Correct. But the paperwork was not turned in. They were not open for 1/1 in 2022. And the paperwork they really turned in right now, is really gonna be given 'em their determination for 2023 exemption.

- [Ald. Johnson] So, does this body have the authority to approve an appeal for 2022?

- [Dir. Ellenbecker] Any money that you would decide, that you would give them from reimbursement cannot. There is no nothing. And I might be deferring to the law department or Attorney's office, but there's nothing in state statute that says that we are obligated to reimburse

them. This would be all on city expense, and would have to come out of contingency, if you were to cover this expense. Attorney Bungert is also willing to speak on this item.

- [Atty Bungert] Yes. So as far as a procedural process, there is no mechanism by which, a person can appeal to common council, for setting aside their property tax. In this instance, as far as, like, retroactively applying a property tax exempt status, obviously there are other mechanisms at law, there's Board of Review, there's the Department of Revenue and potentially Circuit Court, that an entity can go forward with. So this is operating more as a constituent request, not necessarily a formal appeal.

- [Ald. Johnson] Okay. So then why is this doing the agenda? If the form is for 2023? It's in before the deadline. I guess, why do we even have this item on the agenda?

- [Atty Bungert] Right. So, essentially because, the entity came forward to administration with their concerns with receiving this property tax bill, thinking that they did qualify for this property tax exempt status for 2022. And it essentially is, kind of, because city funding and city money is within the purview of council. It is in your authority to reimburse money, if that's a policy decision that council wants to make. So there, it's not really a legal mechanism, or a legal hearing, it's more of a policy decision as a request, from a local community organization, that's bringing forward the request for this consideration.

- [Ald. Johnson] Okay. So if we've got the authority, then we can do that. Maybe might ask somebody ask, if this is the 2022 tax bill, are we allowed to use the 2022 contingency on the balance to reimburse it?

- [Atty Bungert] That I would defer to finance.

- [Ald. Johnson] Because we are carrying a balance there.

- [Atty Bungert] Correct. Two.

- [Dir. Ellenbecker] I was just gonna say, thank you. I'm thinking it's actually 22 bud. 22 tax bill, is for 23 budget. And, we would also be paying it out in 23, because any money collected for 22 tax bill, again is really applied to 23 budget.

- [Ald. Galvin] Oh, okay.

- [Ald. Johnson] Okay, well. We'll say we tried.

- [Dir. Ellenbecker] And as far as if we did, we did include closed session language just because, if the Alders or the committee, wanna have any other specific conversations, or questions as far as legal positions and things like that, that would be something, that would be appropriate for closed session. Just wanted to put that out there.

- [Ald. Johnson] Yeah, I appreciate that. I don't feel the need for closed session. Does anybody else?

- [Ald. Brunette] No. No.

- [Ald. Johnson] Alder Galvin have you got your hand raised?

- [Ald. Galvin] Yes, Director Ellenbecker. I'm just trying to just understand, you were saying that because the project wasn't completed, and they weren't open for business until June of 2022, they weren't exempt anyway. Is that what you? Did I understand that correctly.

- [Dir. Ellenbecker] Yes. I'm gonna say the Assessor, you know, has made his determination 'cause he didn't, they didn't have the paperwork prior to March 1st of 2022. So the determination was made that they are exempt. I mean they are taxable. The state statute would say they would have to be in business as of 1/1 of '22, to really have gotten that exempt or by the time they filed their paperwork by March 1st, that they would have to be, using it for that purpose.

- [Ald. Galvin] So, using it, or the paperwork had to be in by March 1st?

- [Dir. Ellenbecker] From the. I don't know if the Attorney wants us. Yeah, would you, whatever you like to.

- [Atty Bungert] Nope. Go ahead.

- [Dir. Ellenbecker] I'll let Lacey speak to this. [Lacey] So, we're switching up a bit. Just for clarification. The tax assessments are made on January 1st of the tax year. So for 2022, they were made January 1st, 2022. And this property was deemed to be taxable. Then there's a process by which the entity can submit a request for an exemption that's set by the Wisconsin Department of Revenue. But the form and documents are submitted, submitted to our Assessor, that has to be in by March 1st. A favorable decision for exemption by the Assessor, would then reduce the assessment from whatever the value was previously down to zero. That process for 2022, was not done. They were appropriately issued a tax assessment letter in September. There's an opportunity to come to the Board of Review at that point. That opportunity wasn't taken advantage of. And then, so they received a tax bill. So there's not a process for the Assessor to retroactively issue an exemption, after it's been assessed and a tax bill comes out. So the deadline is March 1st for that purpose because then the city relies on that assessment value in their tax role. But that's the process that starts January 1st. Did that help clarify that point?

- [Ald. Galvin] Yeah, Sure. It did. Okay, thank.

- [Lacey] Sorry cannot hear that?

- [Ald. Galvin] Yes.

- Sure, it did. Thank you. Thank you very much.

- Thank you Alder Johnson.

- [Ald. Johnson] Can you just help clarify that, I mean. So then they go to the Board of Review. I mean, they would have to know that the tax bill is coming, and if they don't know that, then Board of Review would seem to be a kind of a clumsy process, right? Because you don't get the tax bill until after the Board of Review convenes.

- [Lacey] Yes, but they would've received the assessment letter, which was, they were dated September 14th, and this entity received an assessment letter that had the value, at a positive amount, six hundred and, I don't have it right in front of me, but I think it said it was six to 700,000, whatever it might be for exempt entities. Their assessment letter would've said they're exempt and had a value of zero.

- [Ald. Johnson] But I think again, a person who doesn't do this every day, I think it's a reasonable position to assume that they wouldn't connect the dots on that. Sometimes we get so ingrained in how city government works, we understand it. You have to take a step back and think about, what does the average person see?

- [Lacey] Yeah, so that's why.

- [Ald. Johnson] I'm not sure the average person, would understand the need to fill a form by March 1st. You know, the assessment value needs to say zero. You know, and that's my concern.

- [Lacey] Yep. And that's absolutely why it's here, in front of you all to make that decision. I'm just setting the procedure out for you, what exists in state law.

- [Ald. Johnson] And I appreciate that. Okay, Alder Brunette?

- [Ald. Brunette] Yeah, Attorney, you know, we have these sorts of issues. This is a little different than things we've done in the past for residential properties, but I've always maintained that people can make mistakes, deadlines get missed. People new, like a residential homeowner new to the process, they may not know that the city requires this, that or the other. And we as a body should always be flexible, in the pursuit of doing what's right and just. In this particular case, when you had quite a few conversations with the requester, would you feel that they're acting in good faith? That it was a simple mistake, that they've gone through the correct processes for this body to consider it?

- [Lacey] So from the time they received the tax bill, I think, Mr. Bryce contacted us, started talking about this. I think there was a comment at one point, about how infrequently they build, that they don't build new buildings. But I would really defer to them on that. But in terms of just this process, we just first heard from them in December, when the tax bill came, had some internal discussions about the most appropriate avenue. And because there isn't an appeal procedure, Board of Review has been concluded. There's not an another Administrative Review process. This is where, we're left with their request.

- [Ald. Brunette] And the request is for \$12,000 and some change there. Their other entities have always operated, or at least from what we could tell, as tax exempt. Is that correct?

- [Dir. Ellenbecker] Yes. They have one other property I believe on Bodart that would be considered that was.

- [Ald. Galvin] It's been that way for years.

- [Ald. Brunette] It's been that way for years. So, you can see that the evidence shows, that it was an oversight. And what I would argue, is that the public good that they provide the citizens in Green

Bay, N.E.W. Community Clinic, far outweighs the \$12,000 the city could, you know, wipe plain through our processes, for this oversight. So, I think that's reasonable. That's why I would support.

- I would suggest if.

- [Ald. Johnson] To piggyback on that, Alder Brunette, had they submitted this form by March 1st, had they known, I'm sure they would have. We would've never assessed this in the first place. Right? This so I believe that's even the records.

- [Lacey] So, we don't know that for sure. So I would say if you want to do a reimbursement request, it should be to the extent that, you can ask the requester to do a retroactive. Ask the, I'm sorry, the Assessor, to do a retroactive review of tax exemption status. I would make any decision you make here, subject to the tax, to the Assessor's decision, because he hasn't had a chance to review a 2022 exemption. And I wouldn't want us to exempt and pay for taxes for a property that's not exempt. So, as much as we would want to, I think it would be appropriate for the Assessor, my recommendation to ask, to be requested to do a retroactive review. The information hasn't changed, the time has passed because if there is a situation where the property wouldn't have been exempt, we shouldn't be reimbursing the taxes because to your point, they would not have been exempt on March 1st. I can't make that determination. Only the Assessor's office can. And the documentation for that wasn't submitted. So we'd have to do kind of a retroactive review. You probably want me to suggest that.

- [Ald. Johnson] Yeah, I'd be okay with that, mostly 'cause I acknowledge that the other facility is already exempt, so I think we likely know the outcome. But to your point, if you want be thorough, I think that's a fair opinion. Maybe just add, a contingency on there that, if for any reason, the Assessor deems it's not tax exempt, that it come before this board again. So, Alder Hutchinson?

- [Ald. Hutchison] Yeah, I think being specific, I think they paid half the assessment. So we owe them in theory, if the Assessor finds they don't owe tax, we owe them the half, the \$6,000 back, right. And then we would zero out the remaining.

- [Lacey] Actually, I'm sorry, this is really for finance, but we have to pay the county the taxes as a reimbursement. It's not a zero out because we're only one of the four taxing entities.

- [Dir. Ellenbecker] No, in this case, it would be the city's full responsibility, so.

- [Lacey] Yes. correct. But.

- [Dir. Ellenbecker] Because as of January 31st pens, fines, penalties and interests are accruing. So that's why we ask them to pay the first installment, until this is decided.

- [Ald. Brunette] Right.

- [Dir. Ellenbecker] You are correct if you, if there is a decision that in a hundred percent of this is going to get reimbursed by the city, then the city would yes, reimburse them for their portion. We would pay the balance to Brown County. We just have to remember that this is not only \$12,000, but we're also out the \$3,000 that the city would've gotten from that tax bill. So it's really a swing of about \$16,000. It's going to cost the city.

- [Lacey] And my clarification point, which I should have said is, I, in my discussions with them and in the letter that we sent, we suggested they pay the taxes because we can't hold them and as of tomorrow they start incurring fees, penalties 'cause the deadline was today.
- [Ald. Hutchison] Right.
- [Lacey] If you don't make at least half the payment, that was the portion of which I discussed with them.
- [Ald. Hutchison] Well, I think that was smart. So, it's just, so when the Assessor, if we so move to have them reassess, that they know exactly what to do.
- [Lacey] So for this property, they've already submitted all the paperwork for 2023. So I think the question would be if there's anything remaining for 2022, but the original date of the occupancy is part of those documents. So I think, we probably have all the information we need to look at that.
- [Ald. Hutchison] Good.
- [Ald. Johnson] Okay, we ready for a motion?
- [Ald. Brunette] Yeah.
- [Ald. Johnson] Alder Brunette.
- [Ald. Brunette] Chairman Johnson, because of the complexities involved, would it be appropriate to suggest to the City Attorney, a motion for us to consider? I want to get the wording correct. Thoughts on that?
- [Ald. Johnson] Well it seemed to me, like the process perhaps, was a motion to approve contingent on a successful review by the Assessor. For, what the word I'm looking for.
- [Atty Bungert] For property tax exempt status for tax year 2022.
- [Ald. Johnson] Yes. Yes, that's it.
- [Atty Bungert] Yep.
- [Ald. Brunette] Is that your motion then? Is it?
- [Ald. Johnson] Yeah, I'll make that motion.
- That works.
- I'll second it.
- [Ald. Galvin] That works.
- [Ald. Hutchison] Very good.

- [Ald. Brunette] Second,
- [Ald. Johnson] I'm sorry, there was noise. Was there a second?
- [Ald. Brunette] I second that.
- [Ald. Johnson] Okay, so got a motion by Johnson, a second by Brunette, any further discussion? Seeing none. All those in favor say "Aye".
- [Committee] Aye.
- [Ald. Johnson] Opposed? Motion carries.
- Thank you for the discussion. Item number two. For consideration possible action, request for reimbursement of 2022 property taxes, total of \$14,102, 83 cents, for 14-426, 612 Stuart Street, 14-410, 304 South Quincy Street, and 14-410-A, 618 Stuart Street, for St. John's Ministries, contingent on Assessors determination of exempted status. I assume we're just talking about the exact same thing here.
- [Dir. Ellenbecker] Very similar with situation. Correct. We have three properties at this point. There's been no paperwork turned in for the 2022 or 2023 exemption paperwork. So recommendation would be to hold until the, you know, paperwork has been turned in, to determine if there is exempt status on, 'cause one is a, there is a business on one, there is an empty lot, is one of these parcels, and the other one is a parking lot. So, you know, make sure that they all really would be determined exempt.
- [Ald. Johnson] Yeah. I think if we're taking the same approach as the previous one, I assume we can just, like, literally hold it, or actually take action tonight. It's really kind of an indifferent thing, because the Assessor still needs the paperwork. And you're saying that he, he doesn't have any paperwork right now.
- [Dir. Ellenbecker] To determine exemption status, Correct. On these three properties.
- [Ald. Johnson] Okay. Alder Hutchison?
- Did they pay half the tax, or are they gonna be subject to fines?
- [Dir. Ellenbecker] I've seen acknowledgement from the, that they did pay first half.
- [Ald. Hutchison] Okay.
- [Dir. Ellenbecker] First off, I'll confirm it. Okay. Yes, same situation. I know the same situation was explained to them, that it's better to pay it now, so there's no penalties and interest that will be accrued. And then once the determinant is made, would be the same thing. We would reimburse them if that was a council decision, and then we would pay the remaining balance to the code.

- [Ald. Johnson] Okay. Diana, I see you, you're making kind of, acknowledging that perhaps there is, is there anyone, a guest in the audience, that wants to speak to this item? I wanna give that opportunity if, in fact I do wanna speak.

- [Dir. Ellenbecker] Yes, it looks like, yes.

- [Ald. Hutchison] Move to open the floor.

- [Ald. Johnson] I'll second that. We have a motion by Alder Hutchison, second by Johnson, to open the floor. All those a favor say "Aye".

- [Committee] Aye.

- [Ald. Johnson] Opposed? Motion carries. If you could please, just state your name and address for the record.

- [Alexia] You betcha. Alexia Wood, 612 Stewart Street, Green Bay, Wisconsin, 54301. So you certainly heard the background information, from City Hall staff. We purchased this property. Our Micah Center was originally located at 700 East Walnut Street. We had a property tax exempt status for that location. April 30th of 2021, we purchased and moved our Micah Center program, to a new location there at the 612 Stewart Street. And then we had a new Director of Finance begin with us in July. So beginning in October, she started reaching out to City Hall, asking what needed to be done, to make sure this property was tax exempt. There was a series, she had sent four different emails, making sure prior to that March window, that she had completed what she felt needed to be done for the tax exempt status. She was directed to the multi-parcel tax exemption form. So she did fill that out, which again looks like, as a tax exempt organization, the umbrella where we're listing our addresses. She then asked and confirmed, said that sounded quite easy, is this all I had to do? And so we were in good faith believing everything was taken care of until the tax bill arrived. So we did go ahead and pay the first half. I do have the entire exemption request, that we're ready to file. We just wanna have it reviewed, especially with the complexities of the parking lot and the open field. Have an Attorney review it to make sure everything's coded correctly before we submit. But everything should be in place moving forward. But looking for reimbursement, given the fact that, that the steps we followed at the direction, of somebody trying to be helpful at City Hall, were misguided in terms of what Julie then filed.

- [Ald. Johnson] Okay. Any questions for Dr. Wood? Okay, go ahead Alder Galvin?

- [Ald. Galvin] Just like the last group that was in here, did you receive a letter, like was explained from the city?

- I am not aware of a letter personally, to my knowledge, no. Julie never brought anything. I was looped into this in the middle of December, when we received that tax bill, and that's when I reached out to the Assessor's office, sharing the string of emails, and sharing the information we had. That was the first that I, personally, am aware of any correspondence about the tax bill.

- [Ald. Galvin] All right, thank you.

- [Ald. Johnson] Okay, any further questions? All right, great. Anybody else that wish to speak on this item? If not, we'll entertain a motion to close the floor?

- [Ald. Galvin] We have someone coming.

- [Ald. Johnson] We have someone else.

- [Keith] Real quick. Yeah So, my name is, is it okay to approach?

- [Ald. Galvin] Yeah.

- [Keith] Sorry. Thank you. My name is Keith.

- [Ald. Johnson] Just state your name and address for the record please.

- [Keith] Yep, so Keith Szerkins and my address is 2095 Green Acres Court of Hobart, Wisconsin. So, just real quick to clarify, when we started this process, I'm with N.E.W Community Clinic by the way. So, the same way partners with St. John's, we provide services within St. John's shelter. So when we started this process to try to find out like, what would, what could happen, what is the possibility for getting a refund, we actually went to NWTC, we went to Brown County, and the Green Bay School district as well. So they told us that, all those other three entries, verbally, I don't have anything in writing, told us that the decision made here, they would follow. I don't know if that changes opinion, as far as like, finances, whatnot. Certainly, if there's anything that we can do, to help get those entities to give money back, we certainly would as well. But they said they were gonna follow your guys' decision. I know that's only verbal, but that's what I was provided. Just thought. So, hopefully, the dollars would all balance out everyone's budget equally, and not be a \$17,000 hit to you guys. Thank you.

- [Ald. Johnson] Appreciate that. Any questions? Okay, entertain motion to close the floor.

- [Ald. Galvin] So moved.

- [Ald. Hutchison] Second.

- The motion by Galvin, second by Hutchinson. Any discussions? Seeing none, all those in favor say "Aye".

- [Committee] Aye.

- [Ald. Johnson] Closed. The motion carries. Unless just further discussion, I would be willing to make a motion, very similar to the first one, that we approve the appeal, contingent on our receipt of the exemption status forms, and an appropriate determination by our Assessor, in the event that, the determination is unfavorable to the exemption status, that it could be brought back before this body.

- [Dir. Ellenbecker] Can I add one more bit of information? I apologize for not bringing up, on these three tax bills are also, are some special assessments for street improvements, that would be, I just want you to know that, I've included in them, are special assessments of \$761 and 89 cents, for street improvements. So if you would be approving, if you decide to go down that path, I don't know if

you'd wanna separate that or not. Whether or not you would want to cover street improvements for these properties.

- [Ald. Johnson] Yeah, could, could we get clarification? I did actually notice that in the packet, when we do street improvements, I know we do the 50% on commercial. If the commercial is nonprofit, is that nonprofit still assessed or how does that work?

- [speaker] It's assessed like other than residential.

- [Ald. Johnson] Okay. So I think for now, my motion's gonna just be restricted to the property tax portion. If anybody else wants to take up the special assessment, I would ask that you do that separately. So, to the motion on the floor, is there a second?

- [Ald. Galvin] Second.

- [Ald. Johnson] So its a motion by Johnson, a second by Galvin. Any further discussion? Alder Brunette?

- [Ald. Brunette] I just need to be recorded as abstaining for employment conflict.

- [Ald. Johnson] Yes sir. Okay Right. Any further discussion? Seeing none. All those in favor say "Aye".

- [Committee] Aye.

- [Ald. Johnson] Opposed? Motion carries. 3-0-1. Okay. Any further discussion on this item? Alright, if not, we'll move on to item number three. for consideration and possible action, the Environmental Systems Research Institute Inc, ESRI, software for three years at \$214,425. Staff? Are there any questions, Alders?

- [Ald. Steuer] I have a question.

- [Ald. Johnson] Alder Steuer?

- [Ald. Steuer] Thank you, Chair. I just wanted to know if this was, is this just normal update software, per se? How many licenses we might have? And, is this already, was this already included in the budget?

- [Dir. Ellenbecker] I think at this point, I would probably turn over to the Director Wilquet.

- [Dir. Wilquet] Yes, it was budgeted,

- [Dir. Wilquet] Mike Hronek,

- [Ald. Steuer] Right?

- [Dir. Wilquet] put this in the budget. He did a three year maintenance renewal. It gives us updates, it gives us all our licenses that we currently have existing, and it's a reduced rate, because it was a

three year purchase. It's the GIS that touches police, D.P.W, fire, all our open data and anything parcel on the website. So it's kind of integrated into everything. So.

- [Ald. Johnson] Good. Any other questions?

- [Ald. Steuer] Nope.

- If not, we'll entertain a motion.

- [Ald. Galvin] Motion to approve.

- [Ald. Brunette] Second. Second.

- [Ald. Johnson] Motion by Galvin, second by Brunette. Any further discussion? Seeing none, those in favor say "Aye".

- [Committee] Aye.

- [Ald. Johnson] Opposed? Motion carries.

- Director on that, one other point I forgot, I wanted to mention during the tax appeal stuff, if it, I don't need this in to be partly in motion, but if staff can take a look at how non profits are notified for that tax exemption status. Just to see if there's a trigger point in there, that we can add another process, so that way, you know, they're a little bit more clearly or explicitly notified. It's more of a request.

- Okay. Item four, consideration with possible action, request to purchase a Graco Grindlazer, pavement marking eradicator from Sherwin Industries, in the amount of \$57,554. Any questions? Alders? If not, we'll entertain a motion.

- [Ald. Galvin] Motion to approve.

- [Ald. Brunette] Second.

- [Ald. Johnson] Motion by Galvin, I believe it was a second by Brunette. Any discussion? Seeing none. Those in favor say "Aye".

- [Committee] Aye.

- [Ald. Johnson] Opposed? Motion carries. Item number five. For consideration with possible action, staff recommendation for the use of, American Rescue Plan Act ARPA allocation, for a total of \$5,576,888, item was referred to staff to bring back recommendation, from the August 30th, 2022 Common Council Meeting. Just a little bit of overview on this. Alders. I did ask the mayor and staff to put before us, a total package that was staff recommended, so that way we could get all of them together, talking about it in terms of what they could all agree upon. And then, of course, you did notice that the agenda was amended. These were previously listed as individual items. They are now combined under one agenda item. They did that because I thought, procedurally, this would be a little bit more seamless. So that way, you know, we don't have to have motions to reconsider and open up

other items, if we wanted to increase an item for any reason. And, of course, conversely reduce an item, and how that all balances out. So by keeping it clean in one agenda item, we eliminate all that procedural chaos. And, of course, we still have the ability to make motions to amend what's before us, any particular item. And then that amendment would kind of, you know, stand as it is. So on the item. For those, if there's members of the public in the audience, this is purely a recommendation tonight. This recommendation will be forwarded onto the full council for final approval or action on February 7th, its Tuesday, February 7th. And if there is any member of the public, this would be the item that you would want to speak on for anything that is ARPA related. But before we open the floor for that purpose, I would just maybe ask, whether staff wants to provide an overview, and/or, if Alders have any specific questions that they would like to ask before we start this process.

- [Dir. Ellenbecker] I can jump in. As Alder Johnson had recommended that the staff, did meet, all senior staff met, to determine what are the priorities. As you can assume, we had a much bigger number than 5 million, 576 in requests. So we had to go through and find, come down to what was our remaining balance, from the resolution. Now it's broken to two categories. And so at this point of unapproved dollars, we had \$5,576,880 left. And so that is the package that was put in front of you. We also had to keep it separate of the loss revenue items versus what we call the economic impact. And at some point, there was about \$500,000 left, some \$500,000, so that, we have obligated, dedicated, to, like, the 2023 bonding or CIP, to really to use up the remaining dollars, out of the loss revenue. But again, that is how the, the 5.7, \$5.6 million package was pulled together.

- [Ald. Johnson] Okay. And thank you as well, Director Ellenbecker. I know when we talked yesterday about amending that agenda, there was work that had to be put in on your end, and I appreciate what you and the staff did to make that happen. Okay. Alders, do you have questions? Or do you wanna open the floor? What's your pleasure? Alder Brunette?

- [Ald. Brunette] Yeah, thank you Chairman Johnson. I do have questions. I'm not sure the best person on staff to answer this, perhaps Director Ellenbecker, but I noticed some increases. You know, there were some new things that we as a body referred quite a bit of things to staff. I had two, and Director Grenier did address those with me, and I was fine with not including them, but some of the new projects that were being introduced, those were not things that necessarily were of the council's opinion to pursue. There's one that I'm very interested in, that's Chief Davis' over hiring police department or putting funding like that without a doubt makes 100% sense to me. But some of this other stuff like, tourism project, increased funding, facade project, daycare license support, those are all new. Can you kind of walk us through how those were determined and why they were included? I'm not disagreeing with the decision, I just want to know how that process came to be.

- [Dir. Ellenbecker] Yeah, and I was gonna say, I assume you're looking, 'cause on the fifth page was any of the new requests, is that, is that what you?

- That's correct.

- On the very last page.

- [Ald. Brunette] Yes.

- [Dir. Ellenbecker] It's 1,000,531 with the new projects. Anything else before that, has been at least in front of the CONE Floor Committee at one point, as you can tell, there is a staff name next to

each one of them. So potentially, you could ask Chief Davis, or you would also have IT, and then we would have Economic Development here, if you'd want to ask these items why they would thought they were a priority and why they wanted to add them to the list.

- [Ald. Brunette] So, for yours specifically, Capital Improvement Plan Bonding, reduce overall borrowing, yes, like, that makes complete sense to me. I've advocated for that a long time ago. Can you kind of tell me how you came to that decision, or was it just the funds that were leftover?

- [Dir. Ellenbecker] In this case, it was anything that was left of the \$10 million, the 10 million loss revenue. So that is, in most cases that is, the only thing, that for Capital Improvements, we would have to use loss revenue, cause they would not fit any of the other categories for economic impact. So at this point we had nine points, you know, \$4 million approved. The remaining balance, we said let's just use it for capital. That is how that item as new got added, to just use up the balance. So, if we were gonna bring you to the package, it was really to use up the remaining dollars.

- [Ald. Brunette] Okay. And Chief Davis, you had, and I'm sorry, Chairman, if this is out of protocol,

- It's just easier for me to ask them.

- [Ald. Johnson] Keep going, you're fine.

- [Ald. Brunette] Okay, Chief Davis, you have talked about this a number of times. You can just kind of let us know, this is well hashed out in the description, but are you confident that this is enough, enough dollars allocated for this specific goal? And was this at the exclusion of the shot detector system we were talking about at one point?

- [Ch. Davis] This is, I think this proposal can take advantage of the fact that, we switched from a gunshot detection proposal, that cost a lot more, to the license plate reader camera system, that costs a lot less. We have worked with finance department, I think pretty closely on the estimate, to make sure we're asking for enough, but not too much. And you know, some of it will depend on just how long it takes us to hire above our authorized strength. Right now, if memory serves me correctly, we're about three or four, sworn positions that are vacant. So we would obviously wanna fill those first, before we get into the contingency fund. So we're confident in the numbers.

- [Ald. Brunette] We got a, there's a news story that Press Times did, that indicated that we are fully staffed. Now you're saying we have, like, three or four openings,

- [Ch. Davis] right?

- [Ald. Brunette] What's going on with that?

- [Ch. Davis] Well, police staffing always fluctuates in an organization with, you know, in our case 187 sworn positions, you can count on, throughout the year. Retirements, resignations, you know, unfortunately, sometimes we have people get into disciplinary trouble, who are excused from their duties as police officers. But it's normal turnover at this point, to be three or four down right now, is actually pretty good. As police departments go,

- [Ald. Brunette] Yep, I'm definitely not complaining, this is great news. But that's all I had.

- [Ald. Galvin] And I'd like to say, if you looked at the personnel, there's two officers that resign, and the problem I've been advocating, I mean Menasha over hires, there's a few other communities that overhire, and when it takes, what, six months?

- [Ch. Davis] No, at least usually more like a year.

- [Ald. Galvin] Six months to a year. So when you hire that kid, and you give him that badge and that gun, he is not able to go work by himself for up to a year. And with these two kids that just resigned now, they're back at it again, trying to find a replacement. So by over-hiring, what it allows us to do is actually, when the guy walks out the door, we've got someone to step right into his boots. When you have 187, and I personally feel we should be about 204 to 210, that when you're down to 187, we're down CP officers, we're down detectives, we're down a lot. And, then, when you have three, four, that effects, it's a ripple effect through all the shifts. And, so I advocate that we do this all the time. If we can find the resources in the future, and make this a policy for our city, I think this is great what he's suggesting, I think it'll do a lot more, than a gun detection system would ever do. And if we can get it going from year to year to year, I think you'll see some significant changes in our ability to get manpower out on the road more often.

- [Ald. Brunette] Yeah, and I agree, and my thought was, is it enough. So behind, you know, so I was copied in some emails from Alderman Wery, and he was questioning that, you know, we're 187, which is excellent, that's how much our funded a police department is. But, at one point the budget in years past indicated 194. So I think what he was poking at is, where, and how, and who, reduced that number in the budget from 194 to 187. Because if we, at some point, as a body said 194 is what we should have in the table organization, is the 354 enough to overhire the 187? Or should we use more ARPA, to even hire more additional officers? Can you respond to that?

- [Ch. Davis] Sure.

- [Ald. Brunette] You know, 187 is, Alderman Galvin, you wore the uniform you know, that I would love to have more. And, if that means using these dollars to leverage and get more officers, that's where my preference is.

- [Ch. Davis] Yeah, there's a lot to unpack there. But to your first question about how we got to 187, obviously, that conversation happened over a period of years and predates me. When I got here and got into that conversation, I saw one version of our Table of Organization, that said we had 194 sworn positions, but we only had funding for 187. And so, really that's all I can hire up to, because if we can't pay for it, we can't do it. So that's where I, you know, frankly I made the decision not long after I got here, that we will reflect the number of positions that we have funding for. As far as the, what the number should be. We are working right now, and in fact, today I got a briefing, on some work that our analysts are doing, to give us some science behind, what our staffing levels should be, based on the outcomes that we want to see. And we're, I think we're making a lot of progress there, because I don't want to just pick a number, kind of at random, that feels good. I, you know, I want to have a business case to give you, for what we need. But, you know, one observation that I've made, that's really interesting to me, is we have minimum staffing levels in patrol, that are set by our contract, that are safety based. And then if you look at those, actually versus calls for service demand, just at those minimum staffing levels, through most of the day, we do not have adequate staffing, just at minimum staffing levels to meet demand for service. And neither of those things appear to have

informed our decisions over the years about staffing levels in the police department. So in having done this kind of work before, I think a good place for us to start is, what outcomes do we want to see in terms of self-directed, self-initiated time and patrol, call response times, and you know, those kind of metrics, and then what's our demand for service? And then that sets your patrol staffing level, and then in detectives, what kind of outcomes do we want to see, in terms of case clearance rates, and then what kind of workloads do we do we have, because you know, another thing that can do, is it can actually save you money. If you're constantly using overtime to meet minimum staffing mandates and patrol, then you don't have enough people working there. So lots of things to think about, in staffing the police department. But what this proposal does, is it just gets us one step closer to at least smoothing out those times when, you know, we are predicting that we will have six retirements this year, and not waiting until those people retire to hire their replacements. But, certainly lots more discussion and data to come for you to.

- [Ald. Brunette] Yeah and I support you. You know this, I support, I think you're doing a wonderful job. The fact that we're at this point right now, is a real testament to your leadership, and ability and your staff. 'cause I know you're humble with a lot of this stuff as well, but my question though is, are you satisfied with the 353? Or would you prefer to add more if necessary? Because when we look at some of these other things, it's like gosh, I would hate to put money towards facades, as important as that is, and I'd rather have you have more money for your objectives.

- [Ch. Davis] And I appreciate that. I think I'm satisfied with the number that we have. Because the goal is only to overhire by the six positions that we anticipate being vacated by retirements by the end of the year. If we add to that, one concern that I would have is if we're still over hired, staffed above what we're, what we can afford when next year starts, that creates a budget issue for 2024. And so I don't want to take on additional budget obligations outside the budget development process. And so that's why we have to be a little conservative with this and stick with six. Thank you.

- Okay, good question.

- [Ald. Brunette] That's all I had for Chief Davis. Can I keep going Alderman Johnson?

- [Ald. Johnson] Keep going Jess.

- [Ald. Brunette] Director Stechschulte? Yeah, Director Stechschulte, about half a million dollars, actually \$600,000 for your area. The increased facade project, increased tourism project, and then a hundred thousand for the beach here. Kind of touch on all of those.

- [Dir. Stechschulte] Yep, absolutely. I would like to be self-serving obviously, pointing out the \$1.1 million of zeroed out expenses, we did before adding those, just to be clear.

- [Ald. Brunette] Yeah, well done.

- [Dir. Stechschulte] So, we certainly took a look at these two. First of all, the facade project, and the tourism project funds are both existing programs, that were already approved ARPA programs previously. Just based on current activity, and interest levels we've seen in both those programs, we're suggesting adding a little bit more funds there. The facade project, we've issued four grants at about \$630,000 investment. That's usually at least double that. No, that's a 50% reimbursement grant. So that's been matched by private sector investment of at least double that amount. We have two

more pending grants that have been awarded, but not contracted about \$105,000. And one significant project probably related to the railyard that has not been finalized is still under review, would certainly exhaust our funds. And we could certainly like to use funds, particularly the facade program, in relation to the building 'T' renovations. Folks have noticed the paper transport, recent ribbon cutting in the rail yard. This is, they've kind of established their, their base footprint in that building right now, but there are substantial renovations to that building that need to be accommodated, to help them move into a larger part of that building. So we're seeing this, as a way to kind of assist with that expansion, in that particular building, is by assisting with that if those funds were authorized. Similarly, with the tourism project, we've had about six grants issued at about \$180,000. Those are generally about a 50% reimbursement as well. We have \$70,000 I think remaining in that project. But we have two or three projects currently within the system being reviewed. Incidentally with the recent press release that was done there with the Sistine Chapel exhibit over at the KI, we've received several other inquiries about funding for that particular program. The \$100,000 for daycare actually was originally in the tourism amount. The conversation with the mayor's office came forward. The United Way is currently had a little bit of a studying initiative done, to try to get more unlicensed daycare providers, actually to become licensed, which we do have identified in degree as a major workforce development issue. So their study indicates \$100,000 for seed money, that would allow them to kind of help facilitate training, and actually get some of these folks who are unlicensed in, doing in-home care, actually getting them to become fully licensed, and try to impact the actual ability to expand daycare within the city.

- [Ald. Brunette] Yeah, and I think I can get on board with that but what's the, and maybe this is when we open the floor, we'll let the requester speak, but what's the target, \$100,000? How, what's the goal? How many in-home license providers are we targeting?

- Yeah, and I think that would be, certainly we would go talk to, and I don't believe that the Applicant, probably assuming it would be the United Way, unless.

- [Ald. Brunette] We have a couple.

- [Dir. Stechschulte] Oh, hi guys. Hi guys?

- [Dir. Stechschulte] Perfect. Yeah, I would certainly defer that question to them. Absolutely.

- [Ald. Brunette] All right, thank you.

- All right, I'm done with this fine sir here.

- [Dir. Stechschulte] Until next time.

- [Ald. Brunette] Yeah, until next time. One final question and I'll be done, Alder Johnson. Director Ditscheit, I know it's not on the added list, but one project that's really important to me, even though it's not my district, that would be the Farland Park, and I know the redesign and the restructuring of some things. You had said that there could be some other funds, and I noticed that's in here. Is the money that's allocated from ARPA, is that going to accomplish that project in totality?

- [Dir. Ditscheit] No, it will not. So, we did amend the funding request. Originally the request for Farland was \$650,000 in ARPA funding specifically all towards Farland Park. What I did instead, and I

worked with Alder Campbell on this, was to put a proposal forward for a \$1 million ARPA request and split that in between, into seven different projects throughout the city, instead of just all of it towards Farland Park. Unfortunately, one of the projects doesn't show up on your list, 'cause it ran out of tech space, and we didn't know about it until after, the packet was published. But there is seven projects within that million dollars. But for Farland itself, what we're proposing for funding for that is, \$250,000 in ARPA funding, 100 and, let me just check my notes here, to make sure I have it accurate. It will be \$173,500 is available in 2023 Community Development Block Grant funds, that we can put towards Farland Park, and then the remaining \$226,500, would have to be bonded for in 2024. But what I've done in my project list here is, almost all of the projects that I've selected, were in our bond request, in our five year Capital Improvement Plan. So although now we're proposing to bond a little bit for Farland Park next year, we're severely reducing our bond request over the next five years accordingly.

- [Ald. Brunette] Yeah, I guess, what I would suggest in that case, is because we have \$538,000, allocated to reduce overall borrowing that we could just shift that to the Farland Park project and make it a whole, I mean that's probably a discussion for us to have. That makes the most sense. That way we don't have to worry about Farland Park borrowing in the future. 'cause it's kind of like, it cancels out, in other words.

- [Dir. Ditscheit] Yeah, the only thing that you would have to take into consideration is we were gonna request that money for Farland in 2024, so it wouldn't reduce our 2023 request, from what's already listed. So that's just for consideration.

- [Ald. Brunette] Right. That's all Chairman Johnson, thank you.

- [Ald. Johnson] And I think to add to that point, I think kind of the equivalent, right, if you did that, you'd end up paying really a year's worth of interest and a bond that maybe you could avoid.

- [Dir. Ditscheit] Sure, that's a fair point.

- [Ald. Johnson] Bill.

- [Ald. Brunette] Now I know you're there. Chairman Johnson, we have two Alders, Alder Campbell raised his hand, this is relevant to him. And then, Alderman Steuer raised his hand as well.

- [Ald. Johnson] Yeah, we'll go to Alderman Campbell first, His hand's up there.

- [Ald. Campbell] You can stay here. So I just want to clarify, that we did sit down and discuss this project, and I somewhat, agreed on, solving the situation. We sketched out the park and I mean, it really does address the problems that have existed and continue to grow at Farland Park. Mostly with the parking up the end of the streets. There was a poor design. This should take care of that, to start. And it does get the project going. We talked about the plumbing, and utilizing the parking. I mean you got, I mean if you look at the sketch and everything, I mean this does get it off the ground and it does go there. I surely understand that. And with the progress of the year after and the following with the funds that we discussed, hopefully that doesn't go away, and it continues to get the project done, and maybe it could stem on some private donations along the way that possibly I could work toward. That might be, but I think it does shoehorn, it does handle all the situations that were existing here, and that's what I was satisfied with, as far as my constituents, and seeing the park utilized to its full

extent, and including the parking and so on. So, you know, that's what I think they did a good job there, and I'm glad we finally got to this stage. So, and I appreciate the extra, and we'll see what we can do about it. But I think this is a good start. Thank you.

- [Ald. Johnson] So Alder Campbell, appreciate you meeting with Director Ditscheit. And of course, our conversation at the last council meeting, when we debated our, you know, there was sort of that verbal commitment acknowledgement from council that, you know, this project would be included. But I hope that satisfies that, request on your part too.

- [Dir. Ditscheit] So, I think it does.

- [Ald. Brunette] Alderman Wery is trying to get in. He texted me. Oh, I see, he's on the list now. Nevermind.

- [Ald. Johnson] Yep, Alder Steuer.

- [Ald. Steuer] Thank you, Chair.

- Director, could you, what was the other item that wasn't on there?

- [Dir. Ditscheit] We had a \$90,000 request for playground equipment replacement at Murphy Park.

- [Ald. Steuer] Okay.

- [Dir. Ditscheit] That was in our 2023 bond request. So by approving this ARPA funding, we can reduce our 2023 request by that amount.

- [Ald. Steuer] Okay.

- [Dir. Ditscheit] That was the one that didn't show up on the list. The other one that was currently listed in our 2023 request, was the tennis court resurfacing at East High School, Joannes Park. That one was also in our 2023 request. All of the other projects were listed in future years, for bonding.

- [Ald. Galvin] Could I ask one other question? I thought we had discussed maybe at one time about FIS Park, you know, West High School, the courts over there, and I know the school district was gonna be involved in that as well. Can you talk to that a little bit?

- [Dir. Ditscheit] Yeah, so in regards to FIS Park, we actually bonded for that money last year. So that money is available, and the project is currently out to bid right now. I do want to mention that all of the projects that I selected in this ARPA request are in the qual, are located within the qualified census tracks. So FIS Park, I don't think is within those boundaries, but everything listed in my project list is.

- [Ald. Steuer] Where's that map? I'd Like to see that.

- [Ald. Galvin] That kind of surprises Matt, to be honest.

- [Dir. Ditscheit] Yeah, I can double check that. I'm just going off of memory, but I don't think it's.

- [Ald. Steuer] Well I know that there was some concern that there's to be a lag of time, you know, with the updates.
- [Dir. Ditscheit] Yeah.
- [Ald. Steuer] So I'm just wondering if we're moving forward that.
- [Dir. Ditscheit] Yep. It's currently out to bid, and it will be constructed this summer or resurfaced.
- [Ald. Steuer] Alright, thank you.
- [Ald. Galvin] If I could just to jump in on that, tennis courts East High, West High, those courts are painted in the school colors if I remember correctly.
- [Dir. Ditscheit] They can be, yes. There's no additional cost for picking colors.
- [Ald. Galvin] Do the schools kick in for that at all.
- [Dir. Ditscheit] Yeah, so this is a 50/50 split with the city for both the ones at East High and West.
- [Ald. Galvin] All right. And that's just good to know and it's not like, we're bearing all of the costs.
- [Dir. Ditscheit] Correct.
- [Ald. Galvin] So schools benefit from having those courts there.
- [Dir. Ditscheit] So in this ARPA request, I'm only requesting half of the funding for the total project.
- [Ald. Galvin] All right, thank you.
- [Ald. Johnson] Director Ditscheit, if you could, because you brought it up, and I think it's important to reinforce for everybody, could you speak to that qualified census tract requirement?
- [Dir. Ditscheit] I don't know if, I'm the best person to answer that. I know that there's a map that's available where you can, see where the majority of the funding can be allocated for the ARPA funds, and the rest of the funding, if you want to use it outside of those boundaries, you have to use our other pot of money, which is the loss revenue calculation. Otherwise, I think all of the funding has to pretty much stay within those boundaries. But I could be wrong, like I said, you'd have to, I'd have to defer to Director Ellenbecker on that.
- [Ald. Johnson] Yeah, no, and you kind of hit the broader point that I wanted to take home, which is, you know, we don't have full liberty to do whatever we want with this funding. That there are restrictions including geographic, the geographic location of where some of these investments are. Okay. Any other questions for Director Ditscheit? Alder Galvin, were you stretching or did you, were you putting your hand down.
- [Ald. Galvin] No, I was, I was getting ready to ask a question of Director Grenier.

- [Ald. Johnson] Okay. Director Grenier.
- [Ald. Galvin] The request for on the sidewalks that, I'm trying to find it again, I had it here and I lost it. Shoot.
- [Dir. Grenier] Page five of seven.
- [Ald. Galvin] Five. In the far right hand column, it says reduced by half contracts, contractors not available. Is that reduced in half the \$550,000 in column number 4, or the original request of \$1.8 million?
- [Dir. Grenier] No, I think the intent originally, was to reduce the original 1.8, and then, I think what you heard from Director Ellenbecker earlier tonight, they were looking at where some of that, well this may just be how much money was left in that pool.
- [Ald. Galvin] Okay.
- [Dir. Grenier] And it got reduced from the 900 to the 550.
- [Ald. Galvin] Okay. All right. I was just concerned that we were gonna reduce in half the 550.
- [Dir. Grenier] Nope.
- [Ald. Galvin] All right.
- [Dir. Grenier] The 550 is the funding amount that is being proposed.
- [Dir. Ellenbecker] That is correct.
- [Ald. Galvin] All right. Thanks so much. Appreciate it.
- [Dir. Grenier] Sure.
- [Ald. Johnson] Okay, Alders. Any other questions? Otherwise, maybe entertain a motion to open the floor for interested parties.
- [Ald. Galvin] I was just wondering if Chris Wery I think wanted to speak. I don't know if anyone's in contact with him.
- [Ald. Brunette] He's there, yeah.
- [Ald. Johnson] Alderman Wery, did you have any questions?
- [Ald. Wery] No, I appreciate it Mr. Chairman, but I'm just an observer. Thanks though.
- [Ald. Johnson] Okay, thank you.

- [Ald. Galvin] Yeah, I would make a motion we open the floor for any interested parties.
- [Ald. Brunette] I'll second that.
- [Ald. Johnson] Motion by Galvin, a second by Brunette. Any discussion? Seeing none. Those in favor say "Aye".
- [Committee] Aye.
- [Ald. Johnson] Opposed? Motion carries. Okay, if you have any interested members from the public, who wish to speak on any items that are proposed right now, if you could just please approach the podium, state your name and address for the record.
- [Sarah] Hi, my name is Sarah Inman. I'm from Brown County, United Way. 112 North Adams Street, Suite 201, and
- [Jamie] And Jamie Tramte Brassfield, Family and Childcare Resources of Northeast of Wisconsin at 201 West Walnut Street, Green Bay 54303.
- [Sarah] I think they gave us it .
- [Ald. Johnson] Welcome.
- [Sarah] Thank you. Thanks for having us. So we're here to speak in on behalf of, I believe it's item number 25 in the packet, Daycare License fees, line item for \$100,000. So this is part of a, a series of childcare innovation recommendations, that we shared with the mayor's office, to improve access and quality, of childcare in the city of Greengate. So funding would be used for things like, background checks, renovations, fencing, fingerprinting, age appropriate materials, cost of application to apply for a license, for either group or home based centers, within the city of Green Bay. We know in general, and Jamie has tons of data from her organization, childcare was a critical need before the pandemic, and it certainly has been exacerbated since then. One of many issues that have been, we know that access within the city of Green Bay is limited, and there were a number of slots that were lost. Over 500, I think, within the city of Green Bay during the pandemic. 583, either group, group or home-based regulated slots, childcare in general. This recommendation's important for economic thrivability within the city of Green Bay, because we know for a fact, that when children receive high quality care, then they are supported developmentally, in their earliest years, when their brain development, that window of opportunity is open the widest, and then they're ready to start school. Not only just to be there but also to thrive and succeed.
- [Jamie] And then it's also the economic support that happens when families have reliable, high quality care for their children. There have been studies that have shown employer, employees are more, they're more productive, they're more available to work, which again, which does help the economic situation in the city of Green Bay.
- [Ald. Johnson] Alder Brunette?

- [Ald. Brunette] Yeah, thank you for both being here. Could you, kind of, explain, how the money would flow through city ARPA, through United Way, to Jamie's organization? How does that all work?

- [Sarah] Yeah, as I mentioned, we, through United Way, Jamie and their Executive Director, Paula LaBree, a number of other childcare experts in the community, came together with us to look at a number of innovations. And this is one of our top recommendations. So the dollars would flow through United Way as part of that comprehensive packet of solutions, we would contract with family and childcare resources, around anticipated outputs, outcomes, any reporting requirements by the city. It's something that we've done together for many years.

- Yes.

- Can vouch for you Yes.

- [Ald. Brunette] Well, you know, part of the thing that we have done with ARPA, is we'll talk about leveraging dollars. You know, like, every dollar that we put into some of these programs that another agency like United Way, or other private donors would kind of match it, so we can give more bang for the buck hateful that term. But that's just the way we we talk about it.

- [Sarah] Yeah.

- [Ald. Brunette] Is that what's happening here? Do you see that there'll be some other funds that this, these funds would be leveraged with?

- [Sarah] Yes, absolutely. This particular recommendation, in addition to the series of recommendations that are coming in. So for instance, we've invested \$50,000 so far, for a cultural respo, culturally responsive childcare partnership, family and childcare resources is a partner in that.

- [Jamie] Yes.

- [Sarah] We have additional dollars, set aside through United Way for this year for that, and other childcare innovations. So this is a piece of that total package.

- [Ald. Brunette] My only I, I'm supportive of this, without a doubt. I think it's a great use of the dollars. My only regret is I wish we kind of would've known about it a little earlier in the process, because you know I've been critical of some of the things we allocated ARPA towards. There are a lot of things that are important. I know that, but this seems like a good use of ARPA dollars, in that it would impact many families, you know, during the pandemic and childcare and the situations we had at different times of the past we had to rely on in-home childcare, to have more of these opportunities to Green Bay families, would've been very good, especially earlier in this whole process. So, I'm definitely supportive, I just wish we could allocate a little more dollars to it. But, I understand that other priorities that are before us. Thank you.

- [Sarah] Grateful for any investment that would be possible. Yes, absolutely. Thank you.

- [Ald. Johnson] Alder Galvin?

- [Ald. Galvin] Have you been able to calculate how many slots you think you might be able to help create with this program?

- [Jamie] It varies based on the needs of each, individual, potential provider who would contact us to apply for this. There, we talk about using these dollars to support both group centers, which would have higher capacities, as well as family providers, who would have a capacity of potentially eight children. But again, since the pandemic, we lost in the city of Green Bay over 500 slots. So I think.

- [Sarah] There's a wide range right there.

- [Jamie] There is.

- [Ald. Galvin] And I get it, I mean I've, I've got three daughters with four children,

- [Jamie] Right?

- [Ald. Galvin] And them scrambling around, trying to find daycare and then, hopefully their boss will allow 'em to adjust their hours and I end up and my wife end up running and picking up and getting the kids to other places and things like that. I mean it's hard, and I think the more we can do, one, to provide good environments for these children, but two, to allow their parents to be able to work and make the income they need to be able to have a decent life here in Green Bay. I think the more we can do the better. I mean there's, there's been a shortage forever, but I know the pandemic really impacted it hard and we see that we've got the jobs out there, we can't get the people to work, and if we can get more decent daycare programs up and running out there, the better it's gonna be for our community and the whole.

- [Sarah] And I would add too, building on that, this is something new and innovative for our city. It's not something that, where there's a pot of for instance, new state funding coming through, or any existing state funding coming through, to support local childcare providers in this way. So it truly would be, in my opinion, groundbreaking for our area.

- [Ald. Galvin] I think it would be good if this works, I mean, I look at it like our water program, to remove lead pipes. I mean, we're nationally recognized, and it would be neat if this would be something that other communities could build on and replicate to make, you know, again, better for the kids, better for the community.

- [Jamie] Absolutely.

- [Ald. Galvin] Thank you.

- [Ald. Johnson] Alder Brunette?

- [Ald. Brunette] I just have a quick question and then, Alder Campbell has his hand raised, if you don't see him. You had mentioned socially responsive,

- [Jamie] Culturally responsive.

- [Ald. Brunette] Culturally responsive. So, one of the thoughts that I've had, just observing Green Bay, and some of our demographic shift, that last several years, let's say, you have Somali refugee, or Somali immigrant that comes to you.

- [Sarah] Did you read our recent news article?

- [Ald. Brunette] No, I did not. But oftentimes I think like there are a lot of, you know, recent arrivals to Green Bay, very close-knit family, very culturally. you know, there's a lot of deep respect for families, but I often think, like how hard must it be for those folks to navigate the complexities of American society. And so, if we can leverage or put resources towards them, to train them, to make sure they're qualified, and get the right paperwork, and that they know what a lot of, you know, out of home daycares know already, is that what this is going towards as well?

- [Jamie] Well, yes. So the first piece that Sarah talked about, the culturally responsive childcare, is a partnership between Brown County, United Way, our agency and COMSA, which supports the Somali refugees. And, one of the things that we've been working on, is providing some of the entry level training that people would need to work in childcare. And our first class, was completed back in September, October. We had 27 Somali women complete one of the classes that's required for working in the childcare industry. And we have a second class going on right now, with about 35 participants because it isn't just. Part of it is the fact that if I'm a Somali family, and I wanna bring my child to childcare, because I have to work, I go to a childcare program, but the food that they're serving for lunch doesn't meet our cultural needs. So we want to make sure that, families feel welcome in childcare programs, and that their children are served items that are appropriate for them to eat, but also that there are childcare providers who look like the families do. So there's been a lot of excitement around this, around the classes both within our area, as well as the state level as well.

- [Ald. Brunette] Okay. So, alright, thank you.

- [Jamie] We have plans this year, to meet together as a partnership, to talk about additional populations to expand to beyond this one.

- [Ald. Brunette] Yeah. Some Afghan refugees recently and so on, Congolese. Okay. No other questions

- [Ald. Johnson] Thank you, Alder Campbell?

- [Ald. Campbell] Yes. I just have a few questions for you ladies. And I understand this. About 25 years of childcare. My spouse was involved in United Way back beginning. And many organizations including . When you talk about in-home, I mean organized, qualified daycares is very good as you know, in Green Bay. And I've seen it grow over 25 years and a day, and been involved in Brown County ourselves before that. So my question, 'cause I know what she goes through, she's gonna kill me for this, is about hiring qualified staff. So it's really hard to find qualified staff, 'cause they can hardly afford to pay them. This is my concern. 'cause they can go work somewhere for about the same money. And then you have people that have been there for 10 years and they have, they have to increase them too, just to be fair across the board. But it raises the question, whether this money is actually gonna go into the private sector. 'cause if you can't find quality people, to teach and

organize community facilities, where's the check and balance of the training, or is it just free money, that's going into that home based business.

- [Jamie] So part of what we've talked about is, we know that there is a population of people, who are providing care in their homes right now, in the city of Green Bay, that are unregulated, but may still be legal. And then there are those who are unregulated, and might be illegal. So what we would like to do, is help provide, help people who are already providing that care, in the pathway to get regulated, which then could increase the capacity of children that they serve, as well as increasing their education, increasing their income, which then again promotes the academy.

- [Ald. Campbell] And then.

- [Jamie] So this would not, my intention would not be to just, here's some money for you and here's, just because you're watching children, this would be really promoting the regulation,

- [Sarah] Yes.

- [Jamie] To support quality childcare.

- [Ald. Campbell] And you know, when you talk, this all comes around to cost, and money all the way around across the board, you know, and I'm quite aware of since the pandemic, the CDC rules have really, really, really pushed into a gray area, that I know for a fact now. Where she is, there is no gray area. But I will say from her sharing of knowledge and frustration, that even organized private ones, not in home, were definitely pushed beyond the boundaries and sometimes people had to look the other way. And there was a lot of dancing around town going on, and trying to just find care number one, too. And like, I said, you couldn't go to work, and then it's the breakdown of a teacher in a room or/and outside of it coming into a facility. I mean there's so much regulation with CDC. I personally hope something can be done. into the private residential type, 'cause there's always gonna be a shortage of daycare, and limits are gonna be pushed, I guess. So, I like to see this important. I think this is a good place, to kind of get things back on track.

- [Sarah and Jamie] Thank you.

- [Ald. Johnson] So thank you Alder Campbell, for those questions. One question I did have, you alluded to state before, and I know the state has put out a number of ARPA grant applications. Most recently I know there was one, that was open for daycare related facilities. So two questions. One, are you aware of that? And if you are, is that what you were saying before with this program doesn't fit the state bucket?

- [Jamie] Correct.

- [Sarah] Correct.

- [Jamie] So the state has a couple of projects going on. They have the Childcare Counts program, which I believe is funded through ARPA dollars. That is for programs that are already regulated and already open and caring for children. And what we're looking at serving with this project, is the programs that are not regulated, that would not qualify for those Childcare Counts dollars. There also are some other funds from the state scholarships to provide for scholarships for credit-based

education through the teach program. Again, that is for people who are already working at a regulated childcare program. So we're not looking to duplicate those services. We're looking at meeting needs before they would even qualify for those other dollars.

- [Ald. Johnson] Okay, great. Thank you. All right, Alders any other questions for our guests? Okay. Thank you for speaking on this item.

- [Jamie] Thank you.

- [Sarah] Thanks. If there are any other members of the public who wish to speak on this, any ARPA item, not just the daycare, any ARPA item. I see you've got Baird Creek with their hand raised. If you wanna go ahead and unmute yourself, state your name and address for the record please.

- [Holly] Yeah. Good evening . The address is 1270 Main Street, Green Bay 54301. And I'm Holly Baseman, the Executive Director for the foundation. I just wanted to touch base on items. I believe it's 5.6, which is the stormwater management for Baird Creek, and it's Burgundy Court in I believe, Twin Lakes. And just wanted to speak up again. I was at the last meeting where we discussed this, and it got referred back to staff, and so I just wanted to kind of find out where we are with that, and speak up to the validation of the projects, and the issue that there is with all of the runoff coming from these two gully issues, especially Burgundy Court with it impacting neighborhoods there. So, just kind of wanting an update.

- [Ald. Johnson] Well I can, speak from a funding perspective and that is, I mean, finance committee tonight is taking up this item, all the ARPA items as a recommendation from staff, you know, before the meeting is over, ultimately make a final recommendation. Albeit it may have some modifications, and that will go to the full city council next week Tuesday. And council of course can make a decision to approve, not approve, hold and modify. So while we appreciate you being here tonight, it's important for us to hear your feedback. I would also maybe point out that, you know, if you want to stay in tune with this project proposal through its entire process, it would be probably a good idea to be present for the council meeting as well.

- [Holly] Okay.

- [Ald. Johnson] As far as the actual work itself, I assume that the work would not be done without funding but I would need to defer to Director Grenier.

- [Dir. Grenier] That is correct.

- [Ald. Johnson] Okay. Alder Hutchison?

- [Ald. Hutchison] Yeah to that issue. I just wanted to let this committee know, I've been contacted by three or four people in these neighborhoods, the Burgundy neighborhood regarding this work, all asking the same question, what's the status of this, because there's high interest in this, there's a lot of erosion going on in their backyards, and there's a lot of concern from these individuals regarding this project. Just wanted to make sure this committee heard that, and common council will hear that as well.

- [Ald. Johnson] Thank you Alder. Any questions for our speaker? Okay, seeing none. Thank you Holly for your comments. Is there anybody else who wishes to speak on this item?

- [Dir. Ellenbecker] No, Alder Johnson.

- [Ald. Johnson] Anybody else? If not, we're gonna obtain a motion to close the floor.

- [Ald. Galvin] So moved.

- [Ald. Brunette] Second.

- [Ald. Galvin] We have a motion by Galvin, second by Brunette. Any discussion? Seeing none. Those in favor say "Aye".

- [Committee] Aye.

- [Ald. Johnson] Opposed? The motion carries the floor is now closed. Alders. Anything you want to discuss, any initial questions you have for staff? Alder Brunette.

- [Ald. Brunette] I am happy to say, that I am very, very impressed with everything, and I can get on board with pretty much everything that was proposed. I do have a couple thoughts? A couple concerns. One would be the shipyard project. I know it is pending on a resolution, or the shipyard bid dollars, \$25,000. It's pending a resolution. And you know, I know of people, you know, connected to that group, and I know that they have taken some positions, they've kind of almost seem like, they're separating from the Broadway district, that's like a standalone. So if we allocate something of ARPA, \$25,000's a rather substantial amount of money, for something that we haven't even approved a resolution to authorize. So why would we be earmarking \$25,000, for something that the council hasn't yet approved?

- [Ald. Johnson] Yeah, Alder Brunette, I think you know, and of course, I'll let Director Stechschulte speak to that as well, but I did put this item in, you know, they're not part of the Broadway district, this area, and this is an area, that hasn't been represented by a bid. One of the reasons I put this in there though, and I added the contingency for the resolution, because that is something we've been working towards. But really at the end of the day, the types of improvements, investments that would be made down there, would be in conjunction with our staff, right? So, our staff ultimately made the final recommendations. But these are all public improvements that benefit anybody, right? So that area deserves investment, just like any other part of our city, whether you're talking about benches, or garbage cans or other streetscape amenities. So that's why I was comfortable, still putting this forward even without, I think quite frankly, we could even drop the resolution piece. Cause I do think that, the investment down there still is justifiable, and warranted to kind of help, really take a part of our city that's wide and under represented, and maybe bring some, you know, some useful investment down in that area. But I would also defer, to Director Stechschulte to respond to that.

- [Ald. Brunette] Yeah, real quick before he does, Alderman Johnson, you know, I grew up in that neighborhood, so I, without a doubt I know that community, that neighborhood, that business district could use a lot of improvement. And it's not that I'm objecting to the \$25,000. One thing that I have noticed, makes me kind of uncomfortable as a city representative, is the shipyard was a project of the city long before this group of, as far as I can tell, loosely connected individuals at this point, in

businesses, have kind of adopted the shipyard name. That makes me very uncomfortable, because we don't have a resolution authorizing them, to be known as that as recognized as a bid can. When you answer your question, can you kind of, you'll circle and include that in your answer. Like, what's our position as a city at this point?

- [Dir. Stechschulte] Yeah, absolutely Alderman Brunette. I'll answer that question first. That's probably, I guess, the tougher question in the room. You'll certainly not, I think both staff, and I believe, Alders certainly, have expressed some concerns over, I guess, the brand confusion, for I guess, lack of a better term between the two, the one organization versus the city's project. We have evidence of media reaching out to the wrong entity for questions, and there just have been examples of it obviously, not being clear who was really responsible for what aspect. That has been one of the points of conversation that we have had with the Shipyard District Inc. As that is a 501C, they're registered, they legally, they're a legal entity. They do exist, in terms of discussions, internally with our legal department. Didn't feel that there was a, tremendous amount of, of legal standing from like, a trademark standpoint. So really just trying to kind of work with them, in terms of just on an operational basis thing, guys, That definitely does create some degree of confusion. How could we move forward, essentially, try to eliminate that and going forward, regardless of if it's named or renamed, or, how we would proceed on that. There are a couple of initiatives, that staff is kind of looking into, that probably aren't quite ready for public discussion yet, but at some point we'll certainly want to have that with council when the time is appropriate. Again, I believe, certainly Alder Johnson mentioned this specifically. I think we have started off with looking at this \$25,000, as kind of an operating assistance grant, similar to what was given to the existing business improvement districts. These are entities thinking about becoming a business improvement district. They've got some ideas. It started off as that kind of grant to them, to kind of assist with that. I think we've kind of evolved that over the time, where we're looking at specifically now, really, you know what, let's target that towards public improvements on that stretch of the Broadway corridor specifically. So I think banners have been discussed, benches have been discussed, other sorts of streetscaping type of improvements, have been really the kind of, the main areas of conversation at this point.

- [Ald. Brunette] So can we have that flow through, the SIT without a organized recognized bid, you know, to allow \$25,000 to be in their operating budget and have them administer these programs That what makes me uncomfortable. No disrespect involved.

- [Ald. Johnson] Alder Brunette, I think, the point of when I structured that, was that it would've flowed through the city, okay. But if those decisions would be made in conjunction with the organization and the board of Directors, but your point, I think we can make investments in that area that are out outside of the scope of the brand. So for example, you could, they know we're not gonna pay for branded banners until that issue's resolved or whatever, we can can pay for other investments in that area, that are a public good that everybody benefits from, that are, you know, not branded.

- [Ald. Brunette] Yeah, and I can support that. My question though is, because it's not an organized bid at this point, there are businesses that could benefit from public improvements, who may not be on board with that group, of shipyard group that's formed. Like, when we consider the \$25,000, would we make sure that those projects, and those businesses are also considered, you know, benches, you know, signs, improvement for businesses that don't identify with the shipyard district.

- [Dir. Stechschulte] Yeah, absolutely, Alder Brunette. I think what would we very easily do, you know, some targeted public engagement. So it's open, so we can actually hear from anybody who's interested. There also is a neighborhood association in that area that we know is forming. So we absolutely, we could have, you know, whatever ideas we may come up with. There's gonna be plenty of opportunity I think for some public engagement in terms of, what would be, what would residents most appreciate, and benefit from in businesses and businesses specifically in that area? I think, you know, we've certainly heard things about bike, you know, bicycle improvements, they wanna become more bike and pedestrian friendly, in that particular area for customers walking around. You know, we know that from a business standpoint it's certainly an area of interest, but is there something that would go beyond that, if we did a little bit more targeted outreach for that area. We have a very good outreach history in this neighborhood, in this from the original shipyard project. So we do have a considerable amount to build on, but it certainly never hurts to go back out, and do one more round, of asking what everybody would be interested.

- [Ald. Brunette] Oh yeah. Absolutely. So correct me if I'm wrong, but the federal dollars, either ARPA or the first batch of federal dollars, we had, I forget what it was called at the time,

- [Dir. Ellenbecker] American Rescue.

- [Ald. Brunette] American Rescue, each of the four bids were awarded \$25,000 at one point. Is that correct?

- [Dir. Stechschulte] That is correct, yes.

- [Ald. Brunette] So this would be like, even though it's not recognized that district, 'cause I don't want my comments to be negative towards the shipyard district. I want it to be successful. I want it to be a part of our city organization. I just very uncomfortable with the things, that I perceived to be the case. But you corrected, and as Alderman Johnson.

- [Dir. Stechschulte] I think staff would be very much, would be very comfortable with operating it, as keeping it as a city, dedicated city fund for a specific public improvement projects in that corridor.

- [Ald. Brunette] Okay, thank you, I have no other questions, Alderman Johnson.

- [Ald. Johnson] And one more thing I would add to that. I think much like a lot of the programs that are proposed here, I think additional documentation, and procedures will need to be established. So while we may, you know, obviously withstanding what the, the committee decides here today, but we may say, hey, we're gonna you more funding for this. Some of these cases, you know, a grant process needs to be established, or some other type of process might need to be established, before the funds are actually expended. And I think this can certainly fit in that bucket, and I would be comfortable with staff deciding what that process looks like.

- [Ald. Brunette] Okay.

- [Ald. Johnson] Okay. Any other questions from Alders. Ald. Steuer

- [Ald. Steuer] Yeah, a little bout with Director again.

- [Dir. Stechschulte] Yeah, sure.

- [Ald. Steuer] Some of these might be pretty straightforward, but the number 7-2-21 I for \$300,000, for a three year Director of Urban Plan and Design. I, and I've asked you this before, but can staff handle this area if the request would fail.

- [Dir. Stechschulte] On current workload, and staffing conditions, knowing we're undertaking the comprehensive plan update and particularly like the JBS project? I would probably, at least not, for the current or the coming year.

- [Dir. Stechschulte] So there was a lot on the table there. Okay. Then again, you may be touched on it, but the benefits that are measurable here, I mean the fact is that you're redoing a plan, so to speak, right? Comprehensive.

- [Dir. Stechschulte] Certainly the comprehensive plan, but I think in terms of, you know, obviously working with Director Grenier's department, in terms of looking at specific design elements for the downtown street scapes and so forth in the downtown area, we have several documents that were planned, documents that are floating out there. Some have been adopted by ordinance resolution, some of them haven't been, so there's been, there's multiple kind of loose ends I guess, so to speak on doing that. Plus, a lot of those documents are fairly dated. So this would actually be an effort to kind of, number one, bring them up to more current expectations and what folks would like to see, to Alder Brunette's point, in terms of some of the updated design guidelines and standards and also being able to apply that, really to across the downtown. There should be some things that are unifying elements for like both sides of the river for downtown areas and whole bay and those areas. But then there's also needs to be some areas that allow those areas to be unique and define themselves.

- [Ald. Steuer] Okay.

- [Dir. Stechschulte] So this would be kind of, a comprehensive position, that would allow a dedicated staff person to actually to work on all of those areas.

- [Ald. Steuer] All right. And then I, it's listed as a three year position. What scenarios happen in year four possibly? We'll have to wait and see, right?

- [Dir. Stechschulte] Yeah, I think right now, the way it's positioned right now, the way it's been described is that the, if it's wanted to be continued at that point, the downtown organizations, would need to basically fund that position.

- [Ald. Steuer] Okay. And just one other point Chair, I'd like to know about some of these other 62-211 and 62-212, for \$150,000 and \$50,000 arts grant and the rotating arts. You know, I firmly believe that, you know, the pandemic and other things, have really put a damper on art, culture and different things in this community. I really feel that those two items would really help, you know, bring things back and you know, if you're looking at quality of life, I think art, culture, music, those are all very, very important. So I'm very much in support of those. Thank you.

- [Ald. Johnson] Director Stechschulte, just on that Director of Urban Design position.

- [Dir. Stechschulte] Yep.

- [Ald. Johnson] That was obviously, a communication I submitted, I spoke with Director Stechschulte earlier, and to more directly answer your question Alder Steuer, This would, this would be a position employed by downtown Korean Bank, and there is sort of the acknowledgement that the position will be funded after the prelim period. So, but just not on the city tax dollar, which was a nice way, I think for us to kind of maybe shift some of that responsibility and partner off to the private sector for continued benefit for the tax bail. One thing though that was kind of added, that was not part of my original communication, was a requirement for a four-way agreement with the bids, That was not something that was part of my communication. And so Director Stechschulte, if you could just maybe, speak to that item in particular. Are you okay with that item going away?

- [Dir. Stechschulte] Yeah, I think from our standpoint, obviously just having the one primary entity be responsible for the position is actually probably simpler from an administrative standpoint. Knowing that the, that these organizations are already working cooperatively from a reporting and actually investment standpoint, I think it's actually easier and more straightforward if it's just with one entity. So staff is fine with it being with DGBI, we don't have any issues with that. So I mean, I guess it would be scratching, the requirement about the four party agreement we'd be, staff does not have any problems with that.

- [Ald. Johnson] Okay. And so, Alder Galvin.

- [Ald. Galvin] So do we need to make an amendment on the, if we approve this package here, does that need to be an amendment on that approval?

- [Dir. Stechschulte] I think, it probably would be certainly, I guess, if everyone's comfortable with that Alder, I think best just have that on the record.

- [Ald. Galvin] Just on the record. Okay.

- [Ald. Johnson] And Alder Galvin, let's do this. If you want make that amendment, let's actually wait until, the motion is on the floor to approve the whole report, and then we can make amendments on that motion.

- [Ald. Galvin] Okay, all right.

- [Ald. Johnson] That would be the appropriate procedure. Just hold onto to that for a hot second. Okay. Any other discussions for Director Stechschulte? Okay, Alders, broadly speaking. Any other questions for staff? Any other comments? I think, the comment that I will put up, is when I looked at this, and Alder Brunette said it, and I'll reinforce it. I think the staff did a really, really nice job with balancing a lot of competing interests and I think, if any Alder were to look at this and be honest with themselves, there's, I think we all got something we wanted and we all lost something we wanted. But I think the wins I'm hoping, are better than the losses for most of us, or all of us, so that we can look at this and say, hey, just about everybody in our community is benefiting from a program here. I think that ought be our ultimate goal, is to serve as many members of our communities to expand with this long-term investment. I think we're doing a lot of good things here that, that would achieve that goal. So, I just want to commend staff for bringing back, a proposal that I think is well thought out, makes

the right compromises without sacrificing really important investment. So kudos to you. With that, and again, unless there's any questions, any further discussion, I would entertain a motion.

- [Ald. Galvin] I make a motion to approve the proposal.

- [Ald. Hutchison] I second.

- [Ald. Johnson] Okay, I have the motion by Alder Galvin, and then the second by Alder Hutchison, Alder Galvin, if you wanted to propose an amendment, now would be the time to do it.

- [Ald. Galvin] And that's what I'd like, to add that amendment on, I mean, I understand, just in case, I'd like that amendment in there, that line be struck from the part of the proposal.

- [Ald. Johnson] Okay, that's a motion. Is there a second on the amendment?

- [Ald. Hutchison] Second.

- [Ald. Johnson] Okay, the motion by Galvin, second by Hutchinson, because that amendment technically contains my employer. I think it'd be safe if I abstain from that. Let's say, is there any discussion on the amendment? Seeing none. Those in favor say "Aye".

- [Committee] Aye.

- [Ald. Johnson] Opposed? Motion passes. 3 0 1. Any other amendments? Any other discussion? All right, seeing none, all those in favor of the motion to advance the council, say "Aye".

- [Committee] Aye.

- [Ald. Johnson] Opposed? Motion carries. All right. Good discussion folks. We are on to item number six, for consideration and possible action to approve a limited conflict waiver, for the firm of Renning, Lewis and Lacey. Staff. I presume you want to go over to closed session with this?

- [Atty Bungert] Yes.

- [Ald. Johnson] And go over the closed session?

- [Atty Bungert] Yes, Alderman, yes.

- [Ald. Johnson] Then let's entertain a motion. I make a motion that we go into closed session?

- [Ald. Galvin] Second.

- [Ald. Johnson] Is there a second?

- [Ald. Brunette] Galvin seconded.

- [Ald. Galvin] Second.

- [Ald. Johnson] Okay, sorry, I didn't hear that. Alright, so I guess, I gotta read it now. The Committee may convene in closed session, pursuant to Section 19.85 , Wisconsin Statutes, for the purpose of conferring with legal council 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 , Wisconsin Statutes, to take action on items discussed in closed session, if appropriate, and to consider the remainder of the agenda. Is there any discussion? Seeing none. Those in favor say "Aye".

- [Committee] Aye.

- [Ald. Johnson] Opposed? Motion carries we are in closed session.

- [Dir. Ellenbecker] Hold on.

- [Atty Bungert] Before we, stop recording, I just wanted, while we're still on the record, I just wanted to suggest that you, and this is up to the committee, because it looks like we have three items that are all going into closed session, all under the same language. So instead of having everybody shuffle back and forth, we can take up all three and just answer.

- [Ald. Galvin] Yes.

- [Ald. Johnson] We'll make a motion to reconsider the agenda, and combined items six, through eight, as one item in closed session, which has already been done.

- [Ald. Galvin] Second.

- [Ald. Johnson] So there's a motion by second, excuse me, motion by Johnson, second by Galvin. Any discussion? Alder Brunette.

- [Ald. Brunette] Yeah. I just, for the sake of public disclosure and public access, were there anyone, members of the public, that you know of, who were in the audience, who may have wanted to speak on any of these.

- [Dir. Ellenbecker] I don't believe so. No.

- [Ald. Brunette] Okay, good.

- Right.

- I think we're good.

- [Ald. Johnson] Good question.

- [Atty Bungert] And you can always ask once we go back into open session.

- [Ald. Brunette] Okay.

- [Atty Bungert] Or, once everybody is back in the room, if there was anybody.
- yeah
- [Ald. Brunette] No, we combined it, you know, obviously with,
- Yes.
- Them leaving, that's all. So as long as you feel we're comfortable with.
- Yes.
- Okay.
- [Atty Bungert] Yep. 'cause it's all being recorded, so we're good.
- [Ald. Galvin] Are we off now?
- [Atty Bungert] Now, we can turn off yes.
- [Ald. Johnson] All right, we rolling?
- [Ald. Galvin] Yep.
- [Ald. Johnson] I'm wanna make a motion to separate items six, seven and eight. Unless we reconsider the agenda, and separate items six, seven and eight, since I made a motion before, to combine.
- [Ald. Hutchison] We're also, Brian, we also have to open.
- [Atty Bungert] Return to open session.
- [Ald. Johnson] Yeah, sorry, we'll entertain that motion.
- [Ald. Galvin] Motion to go back in open session.
- [Ald. Brunette] Second.
- [Ald. Johnson] All then, motion by Galvin, second by Brunette. Any discussion? Seeing none. Those in favor say "Aye".
- [Committee] Aye.
- [Ald. Johnson] Opposed? Motion carries. And again, I would make a motion to reconsider the agenda, and separate items six, seven and eight.
- [Ald. Galvin] So moved.

- [Ald. Hutchison] Second.
- [Ald. Johnson] All right, We'll go with Bill and Hutchinson on that one. Any discussion? Seeing none. Those in favor say "Aye".
- [Committee] Aye.
- [Ald. Johnson] Opposed? Motion carries. Back to item six then, for consideration of possible action to approve a limited conflict waiver for the firm of Renning, Lewis and Lacey. We'll entertain a motion
- [Ald. Brunette] Motion to proceed as directed in closed session.
- [Ald. Hutchison] Second.
- [Ald. Johnson] I think we can just make a motion to approve on this one.
- [Atty Bungert] Either/or is fine.
- [Ald. Brunette] Alright.
- [Ald. Johnson] Okay. I'll do however you wanna word it.
- [Ald. Brunette] As long as I got the green light from the City Attorney and the Chairman, I'm fine with making a motion to approve.
- [Ald. Johnson] Okay.
- [Ald. Hutchison] Second.
- [Ald. Johnson] That's a motion Brunette, second by Hutchinson. Any further discussion? Seeing none. Those in favor say "Aye".
- [Committee] Aye.
- [Ald. Johnson] Opposed? Motion carries. Item seven for consideration possible action on GM investments versus City of Green Bay. Is there a motion?
- [Ald. Brunette] I'll make a motion to proceed as directed, have staff proceed as directed in closed session?
- [Ald. Johnson] I'll second that. I got a motion by Brunette, second by Johnson. Any discussion? Alder Brunette
- [Ald. Brunette] Yeah, prior to us going into closed session, I had made the comment about, if there were any members of the public, who wanted to speak to this item, because we combined them and went in closed session and just want to make it known, that there's no members of the public here.

- [Ald. Johnson] Okay. Perfect. Good observation. Okay, any further discussion? Seeing none. Those in favor say "Aye".
- [Committee] Aye.
- [Ald. Johnson] Opposed? Motion carries. Item eight. Report of the claims committee. Any discussion? If not, we'll entertain a motion.
- [Ald. Galvin] Motion to approve.
- [Ald. Brunette] Second.
- [Ald. Johnson] I'll second that. We have a motion by Galvin, second by Johnson. Alder Brunette.
- [Ald. Brunette] Similar as the previous point, there are no members of the public here looking to speak to the item.
- [Ald. Johnson] Thank you. Any further discussion? Seeing none. Those in favor say "Aye".
- [Committee] Aye.
- [Ald. Johnson] Opposed? Motion carries. Item F, informational. Number one. 2022 Contingency Account: \$157,297.00; unobligated is \$57,297.00. 2023 Contingency Account: \$250,000.00. Have I got that on record. We have finalization from the parks department on 2022.
- [Dir. Ellenbecker] No, at this point there's one outstanding item yet, that they are trying to confirm their dollar amount. So there's one more item I would expect we would have that answer for you for the next finance committee meeting.
- [Ald. Johnson] I presume the reason 2022 is continuing to be reported is 'cause of that outstanding item?
- [Dir. Ellenbecker] Yes.
- [Ald. Johnson] Okay. Thank you. Item number two. The next Finance Committee meeting will be held on Tuesday, February 14th, 2023 at 4.30 pm.
- [Dir. Ellenbecker] Alder Johnson, the question is, we have a meeting scheduled for February, 14th, and then we have one scheduled for February, 28th, but the next council meeting will be March, 7th. So, I do believe Chief Falls did send something also to Alder Galvin, to see whether or not we would want to cancel the 14th, and just have it on the 28th, since you only have one council meeting.
- [Ald. Galvin] It's my daughter's birthday.
- [Ald. Brunette] Valentines day, 14th.
- Yeah, 28th.

- [Ald. Johnson] I'm fine with that, if there's no items of urgency. If something comes up that is time sensitive, you know, obviously, I would request that we do hold that meeting then. The other thing, just be sensitive to the load, right? If it's a lot of agenda items, then we may want to reconsider that, but if you think it's an average amount, then I'm good with it.

- [Ald. Galvin] I concur.

- [Ald. Brunette] Yeah.

- [Dir. Ellenbecker] Okay.

- [Ald. Johnson] Alder Hutchinson, you had your hand raised.

- [Ald. Hutchison] I was pointing at right the Director.

- [Dir. Ellenbecker] Yeah.

- [Ald. Johnson] Okay. Good. Good. Alright folks, thanks for tolerating me being virtual tonight. I appreciate it. Hope it wasn't too much for disruption.

- [Ald. Galvin] No. No.

- [Dir. Ellenbecker] No, it wasn't.

- [Ald. Johnson] We'll entertain a motion to adjourn.

- [Ald. Galvin] Motion to adjourn. What are the temps there? Brian?

- [Ald. Johnson] 55, I don't know.

- [Ald. Galvin] Oh! come here.

- [Ald. Johnson] We have a motion by Galvin, quick to second.

- [Ald. Brunette] I'd second that.

- [Ald. Johnson] Second by Brunette. Those in favor say "Aye".

- [Committee] Aye.

- [Ald. Johnson] Opposed? Motion carries. We're adjourned.