



MINUTES OF THE PERSONNEL COMMITTEE

TUESDAY, MARCH 14, 2023, 4:30 PM

In person at City Hall, Room 207.

Virtual attendance also available via Zoom.

A. ZOOM MEETING INFORMATION.

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

B. ROLL CALL.

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

Others Present: Ald. Mark Steuer, Ald. Melinda Eck, Ald. Jennifer Grant, Finance Director Diana Ellenbecker, Police Chief Chris Davis, Public Works Director Steve Grenier, Park, Recreation and Forestry Director Dan Ditscheit, City Attorney Joanne Bungert, Chief of Operations Joseph Faulds, Human Resources Manager Melanie Falk and others.

C. APPROVAL OF THE AGENDA.

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

Motion passed.

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

D. APPROVAL OF MINUTES.

I. Approval of the Personnel Committee minutes from February 28, 2023.

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

Motion Passed.

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

E. REGULAR BUSINESS.

I. Consideration with possible action on the request to fill the following replacement position and all subsequent vacancies resulting from internal transfers.

a. GIS Analyst

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

Motion Passed.

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

2. Consideration with possible action to discuss additional security measures for the staff and the public at City Hall which may include full-time security personnel as well as physical improvements.

Moved by Ald. Brian Johnson, seconded by Ald. Jesse Brunette to refer to staff to prepare a proposal to the committee which includes solutions and costs to secure City Hall; a report that details the police calls to City Hall and a draft of an employee survey to gauge employee opinions on City Hall security.

Motion Passed.

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

F. INFORMATIONAL.

1. Report of Routine Personnel Action Items

2. Next Meeting: March 28, 2023

G. ADJOURNMENT.

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

Motion Passed.

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

VERBATIM MINUTES

- Just waiting for him to start.

- All right, this is the City of Green Bay Personnel Committee meeting on Tuesday the 14th. I apologize for my lateness. We'll start with roll call. Ald. Johnson.

- Here.

- Alder Brunette.

- Here.

- Alder Hutchison is on Zoom.

- Here. Everyone's here. I'll entertain a motion on the agenda.

- So, moved second

- All in favor, say aye.

- Aye.

- And that passes unanimously. I'll entertain a motion on the minutes.
- Move to approve.
- Second.
- All those in favor, say aye.
- Aye.
- Aye, and that passes unanimously. On to regular business. Consideration with possible action on the request to fill the following replacement position and subsequent vacancies resulting from internal transfers. A GIS analyst.
- Move to approve.
- Second.
- All those in favor, say aye.
- Aye.
- Aye.
- And that passes unanimously. Consideration with possible action to discuss additional security measures for the staff and the public at City Hall, which may include full-time security personnel, as well as physical improvements.
- So we do have some information from staff, just to talk about some proposals or rough numbers for security staff and all, and then also talk about some physical improvements. So I can turn over to Chief Davis to start on the, I guess, rough cost for security staff. I don't know if the committee has any thoughts.
- Yeah, I mean, can we? So here's the problem, I think, with some of the discussion that we had at council was like we're being told that there's this big security risk and council knows nothing about it. So I think before we start talking about costs for personnel, costs for security provisions, I think we need to appropriately frame the problem. We don't even know anything about it, right? And so we heard of course that, gosh, we had some things that happened a year and a half ago. What was talked about at council was there were three incidents that all involved the same person. Do we really have a massive problem? Do we have an isolated incident? Do we, like, is this security personnel, and I know you'll get into those costs, but is that the right reaction to the problem that we have? I think we need to understand what the problem is first.
- Do you want to start that?
- Sure.

- Okay.

- You got the same numbers I have? I had Kevin pull some numbers.

- [Chief Davis] I have those, yes and the incidents with that here. I think you have a couple of things going on. You've had the incidents that you've heard about, involving problematic interactions targeting staff and other people using City Hall. But really, I look at it, just from my public safety perspective, as a level of risk that we take on at City Hall. And, you know, just putting those three incidents aside, yes, that's a problem and when we had those kind of things happen, and we should probably address that. But this building is completely unsecured, which is not the norm, at least for City facilities that I'm used to. Granted, you tend to see more security measures at City Hall at larger cities, but there's effectively no real security for this building, other than calling the police if there's a problem. And we will certainly make every effort to get here quickly, but there's no one who greets anyone who comes in the door and people can just come into this facility, and go anywhere in this building. They have full access to this building, which is a risk. It's a risk for City staff because, in this day and age especially, you know, we are seeing more I think, every department probably, I know mine does, and I've heard from other department heads where their public-facing staff is having more and more kind of tense or stressful encounters with members of the public. And that's not to say that every member of the public who is dissatisfied with City service is dangerous. But, you know, nationally, I think the direction we are going is towards more risk, occasionally, of violence in public buildings. And there's nothing stopping that from happening in this building. There are probably some things that we could do to mitigate that risk and make our employees safer that might be worth considering. And then the other issue, just from my perspective, that I worry about, is the security for public meetings. Especially council meetings, these committee meetings and the public business that goes on in this building. I mean, if you look around the country, there are instances, regularly enough, of council meetings that get interrupted, and you know occasionally, even violence at public meetings. Now, is that to say that just because we have a spirited debate in a City Council meeting, that that's dangerous? No, there's a very big difference between someone who is passionate about an issue, and expresses that passion, and danger. But there aren't some of the typical, very simple security measures in place that would help mitigate the risk of something bad happening. You know for example, and I don't want to get into too much detail about this in a public meeting, but I noticed when I got here there was no plan for what to do if there was an emergency in council chambers during a council meeting and what were we going to do with all 13 elected officials and city staff who were there if we needed to evacuate them quickly? It's those kind of things that we've been looking at when we talk about City Hall security. And I think that's what the problem is. Yes, you do have a problem with some specific incidents that have happened, but really, the way I looked at this, when I was asked to look at this project, was more just in terms of the risk that we have operating a City Hall in the third largest city in the state.

- Yeah, and I think that's an important discussion. You know, I think it appears to many members of council that this agenda item here is a reaction to the discussion that we had about the audio surveillance. And again that's great, right? If there's a problem, we need to talk about it. And I think just, we're behind. We're, I mean, wherever staff might be in this discussion, we're 10 years behind because nobody has ever brought this concern to us, so we just need you to bring us up to speed.

- Sure.

- And part of that too is when you deal with personnel interactions with staff, or with the public, that can turn into a personal matter on you as a body, so it's for quasi judicial hearing purposes, make sure you're not biased in your decisions? That's part of the reason why those personnel matters are not brought to the common council.

- Yeah, and I did get that Joe. And again, it's just... I think we all agree, we all nodded our heads at council. If there's a security issue, we're going to absolutely talk about it, and we want to be a part of that solution. We want to provide the necessary resources, to an appropriate level, to kind of meet the risk. And so that's why I just hope at least today, you know, because it at least seemed initially it was going to be like, "Here's all the solutions." But we don't even know what the problems are. And so I appreciate you sharing that initial perspective, and I think at some point, you know, and I don't want to speak for the rest of the body, if this dialogue's going to go in a direction where we're making decisions, or if we're going to refer it to staff, or hold it, but I do think that more information is healthy for this body, so that we can fully understand the scope of what we're addressing.

- Sure.

- Yeah, the intent wasn't to find the solutions tonight. It was to start the conversation.

- Yeah, yeah, I know, and that's great.

- [Chief Davis] So these are really preliminary estimates, and there are a few options that we would have. And the way I looked at this was that, you know, we want to maintain a balance, right? Between public access to the community's space and its resources and its officials, while also balancing just some common sense, basic things that we can do to maintain safety in City Hall. And I focus more just on things that involve people, instead of equipment. I mean, we have some security equipment in the building already but what a lot of cities do is they have onsite security at City Hall, and so we have a few options for that. Some cities, like, if I understand the response that I got from Milwaukee, I asked if all of the Chiefs Association. We have a website where we can put out inquiries for all the chiefs in the state. And I got one response back from the City of Milwaukee, and asked what they do for City Hall security. It's, it looks like they have some police officers who are assigned to City Hall during the day, and then they have a contract security resource that secures all of their City facilities at night. So that's not super analogous to us police officers, just if we wanted to start with that at a minimum, to staff City Hall at all of the times that it's open, you'd need two full-time employees. I cannot find a place where I can take those out of out of the resources we have now, because I already have, and like we've talked about before, just pressure on our overtime budget and a bit of a gap between demand for police service and capacity to meet that demand, so this would be an add. And you know, just conservatively estimating for police officers at the top step of what they get paid is \$92,000, a little over \$92,000 a year per officer. And when you factor, and that is factoring in salary and fringe benefits. So you're looking for two full-time employees, about just south of \$185,000 a year. The downside of that is that it's probably more than you need to maintain security in City Hall, because you have a fully functioning police officer with arrest powers, the ability to write search warrants, respond to domestic disturbances and all kinds of other things that they will normally not encounter in City Hall. So then we looked at what it would take to... for a security resource, probably the smartest way to do that would be to contract with someone to provide onsite security. And, you know, without calling up security companies and getting quotes that they won't want to give us until they have the scope of work. Just the average armed security officers in the Green Bay Metro area, looks like they'd make about \$43,000 a year. And then, you figure you want to add on another

10% or 15% to cover the cost to contract with somebody to provide that service for us. If we're going to go with, especially, armed security, my advice would be contract with somebody to do it. Don't try to run it ourselves, because then you have another category of employee for us to manage, figure out what department they report to, all of that stuff. Then it's probably easier just for us to contract for that service. But you're looking probably at about \$150,000 a year to do that the right way and have that staffed right. That is a pretty low-confidence estimate at this point though because until we put out a request for proposals and ask what people want to charge us for this, we really won't know. The last option that we looked at would be to try to use something other than police officers, like CSOs, or Community Service Officers who, they're not sworn officers, and they cost a lot less. The downside of that is we can't accommodate that within the CSO program that we have now, because it is set up basically for college students to come work here. There's a very small number of hours that like six of these positions share in the police department in a year that would not cover this. So my recommendation is if we want to go down that road, we look at, and we also have a problem right now, unrelated to City Hall security, with CSOs, that we're not competitive in terms of our wages for CSOs, and they're not represented employees by a union. So I'm not talking about this here, but we would probably want to look at raising that rate, and developing some full-time CSO positions to staff this work, that included benefits, so that we can make sure we can fill them. We're paying our CSOs right now about \$12.68 an hour. You look around the neighborhood here, and the going rate is more, the low end is \$15, and at the high end, there's some agencies paying almost \$20 an hour for that work, but that's still lot cheaper than a police officer. And then, that's somebody with a radio, with a direct connection to the police department. And the last thing that I looked at, I can't estimate the cost of this for you, is there would probably, it would be a good idea for us to consider just some modifications to the facility to make it more efficient, and reduce the amount of time that members of the community have to come several floors deep into this building to get services. And so we might want to look at moving the public-facing things that people come to City Hall, like, you know, dog licenses and absentee ballots and paying parking tickets and all those kind of things, to maybe a service center model, where it's just one-stop shopping, and you can come in and there's people there who can do whatever you need, right on the first floor. And then, maybe going to a little bit more, not so much access control, but if you need to visit the mayor's office or something on one of the upper floors, check in at the security desk downstairs. They give you a pass with a floor number on it and get the elevator for you, and help you get to where you need to go. Something like that, really. Other than moving resources in City Hall to be a little more, have all the public stuff, basically, be more easily accessible to the public, there isn't a whole lot of cost to that. It's just a matter of process with your security folks. So that's where we've been able to get so far on human security for the building. And then happy to answer any questions you have at this point. This is a very preliminary estimate.

- Alderman Brunette?

- Yeah Thank you, Chairman. And then, just so you know, Alder Grant has her hand up virtually. Chief, thank you for that. I am also frustrated. I don't know if Ald Johnson said that word, but I'm a little frustrated that we hear of security issues at City Hall in the manner that we heard about it. And I'm not blaming you, but the question is, was this discussed leading up to this budget year? Because it, I mean, that's where, in my opinion, we're dealing with it now, which we should be dealing with it, but it would have been nice to have City Hall security considered as a Finance Committee going into this budget year. Because now we're faced with, we're told there's a big security issue at City Hall and we could have addressed it like four or five months ago, and so we kind of walked through that. Was this proposed to the mayor and he just opted not to, or what are we talking about here?

- [Chief Davis] We never proposed anything specific to the mayor for the budget, but we have had these discussions as this issue has become more and more in front of us. You know and I think some of the incidents that we've had at City Hall over the last year and a half or so have been the catalyst for some of those discussions among us, and I know Joe and I have talked about this a lot. We've also talked about, and we've done some work, trying to come up with a draft code of conduct for City facilities in general. And we've imported some ideas from where I came from where we dealt with these issues, but I don't think we've gotten to the point of, you know, "All right, let's get some numbers on paper." I think we were trying to, you know, I'll let the other folks in City government speak for themselves, but I think there was an effort to try to address the issues as best we could with what we had, understanding that resources are tight. And it's really hard with all of us department heads with all the needs that we have to. You know, we know that it is difficult to come to council and ask for more money with resources being as tight as they are. And like I said, I mean, I just don't think we quite got to this point in this conversation until recently.

- I mean, honestly, if the mayor is responsible, as we're told, for City Hall, and I know you're police, and you have your duties as a police chief, but if we're told that the mayor is responsible for securing City Hall, or day-to-day management of City Hall, I mean, quite frankly the attention should be on him. Like, why didn't he inform the Council? I'm not trying to put you in a conversation, in a position poor with mayor, but it just seems like if we would've known that, as a council, as a body, we could have had that discussion when we were figuring out how to fund City government. So now, we're kind of doing it backwards, where we're told that the main security, or one of the main security features, implemented at City Hall was very unpopular audio surveillance, whereas if the conversation was, "We have issues or threats at City Hall. These are the things that we're considering," Then it would've been much easier for us to have that discussion six months ago or even a year, year and a half ago to secure the building. So now we're trying to figure out, like, how do we address the issue? How do we fund the issue? Which we are being told now that it is a serious concern. It seems like a little backwards in how we're doing it. So you don't need to respond to that. You're more than welcome to, but it's just, it frustrates me as a council member that this is being addressed in this manner.

- [Chief Davis] And I, I totally hear that and I totally respect that. You know, I would say that we have discussion with the mayor's office on the need to do something about making city hall a safer place. I'm not going to engage in a whole lot of speculation, but if we want to point fingers at somebody, one place I would suggest you point that finger to me because maybe I haven't been clear enough with the rest of the team about, you know, "Okay, maybe we need to make some movement on some of these other issues." I don't know how productive that is, but I just know that we do have a risk here and I think there are some things that we can do, again, to achieve that balance between the public's legitimate need to be able to access services in this facility, but also our responsibility to keep our employees safe.

- Yeah, I can appreciate that. Mr. Chairman, I'll save my questions a little bit later, but I'm almost curious if it would be good for you to share, or the chief to share, the situations that have occurred at City Hall.

- Sure.

- That are leading us to this point.

- So we have calls for service, where somebody calls to the police department to report something, and then we actually have times when officers respond. So, I mean, someone could call, and say, "There was a guy in here. He's acting weird." And they can document that without sending an officer. They can document it with a specific report, again, without sending an officer. But I asked him to go back to January 1, 2019, and 207 calls were made from City Hall. They break down to a 911 assist, which could be someone calls 911 for a good reason or a bad reason. It's determined to send someone or not send someone, I mean, we had 911 hangups, we have accidents, alarms. Now, the alarms could be like a panic alarm. Some of the officers do have that capability here. The animal calls. Assists for other law enforcement agencies. So they might be calling to say, "We think there's a guy with a warrant at City Hall. You know can you go look for them?" That kind of thing. Court calls. Same thing that's usually warrants. Crime prevention. That could be anything from someone reporting something suspicious. I mean, sometimes the same thing gets relabeled something else. It just kind of depends upon the call taker, how they field the information. Crime prevention calls, criminal damage to property, disturbances, fire alarms, fraud, harassment, hazards, lost and found, medical or EMS calls, miscellaneous calls, which is who knows until you go digging into it. Parking problems, rescue squads, suspicious persons, suspicious situation, and suspicious vehicle, traffic stops. And welfare checks. And welfare checks, they're usually someone that is in need of attention. Maybe they're exhibiting odd behavior or sickness or something like that and you just want to have them checked up. So anyway, that's 207 and the ones I kind looked at were the 911 assists, We had one call over that time unit, all those years. We had six alarms over that period of time. Four assists for other law enforcement agencies. Two court calls. Damage to property, four calls. Disturbances, seven Of which in 2022 we had five out of that seven. Harassment, we had seven of those. Miscellaneous, again, there were 59 of those. We'd have to do some digging to really see what that was all about. Suspicious person, we had eight of those. Suspicious situations, we had 10. Suspicious vehicle, we had one. Welfare check, we had six. And then where they actually sent the officers, were 35 times where an officer actually came over here and was on the scene. The ones that pop out is crime prevention, one, criminal damage, we had two, disturbances, three, harassments, two, suspicious person, three, suspicious situation, three, and welfare checks, five. Total of 30, 35 out of those. Though some were just minor things.

- So, and if I could...

- Sure.

- A four year period of time, and keep in mind Covid is in that stretch as well.

- Right.

- So

- Things are locked up.

- In a four year period of time, we basically averaged less than one police call per week. You know, 200 divided by four years is 50 so,

- Sure.

- And then only 35 times an officer in that four year period was sent to City Hall.

- Sure.

- So it's like, I don't know, that's not much at all.

- Well, when I was the captain and I was in charge, we had four districts, and it was my job to look at calls for service throughout the district, to look for hotspots. 207 calls to an address would've been a pretty good hotspot, even over that period of time

- Four years.

- Four years. The type of calls that we have would've caused some concern, wouldn't have been, like, alarming, but it would've been concern and I probably would've had the CPs go and take a look and see what was going on there, see what they could do to interact and try and have an effect on those numbers. I think if you looked at any other business with this amount of manpower just in this building, I would bet most of them would have far less calls for service than this. But again, this is a public building. There's a lot of action that takes place here. And like the chief was saying it, it can get emotional at times. And not even just council meetings, just people coming in to talk about taxes, citations they got, inspection issues, any number of things, human resources issues. So...

- Yeah, you're right.

- [Chief Davis] Can I?

- Yeah

- [Chief Davis] Just to make one... Just point something out. Yeah, these are the police calls that you had here since 2019. But again, I think it's important in this conversation about City Hall security to look at risk. And we, in the police world, you know, we staff the patrol districts at 4:00 in the morning with way more officers than we need, to justify, just because of the call load. We've done some work recently that there are some hours of the week that just based on call load, we can get by with having three officers for the whole city. But it would be a really bad idea to staff that low because every once in a while something happens where you need more than that. And there's a couple other things I would just invite us to look at in this conversation. One is the risk that this in this building is, it's a very commonly known place and it's potentially a lightning rod for us. And the other thing is for our employees, an employee's sentiment. And if you come to work in a place that you are starting to feel like is unsafe, maybe there is some benefit to our employees also of having that just peace of mind that there's somebody down there with an eye on things in case something goes wrong. So I, I just I always caution us against looking strictly at, well, how many calls do we get at that location over time. Because that's one piece of a bigger picture of risk and that kind of thing.

- Yeah And I think we're all on the same team on this one. I think we all want to keep City Hall safe and employees safe, comfortable coming to work. The public, everyone, I think we all would agree to that. And of course, 35 calls made on a number basis may not seem like a lot, but that was 35 times where somebody felt necessary to contact the police and they were scared and they were frightened and they perceived an actual threat, regardless of what the call covered. I remember you and I had, actually, a meeting and my wife texted me because they're at a Burger King and there was a member

of the public that was very loud and abusive and the clerks there were afraid to contact the police. So my wife texted me and texted you, you're in the same meeting, you sent the patrol officer out there and the kid at the counter felt relieved to see a Green Bay officer there. And so I think when there's a uniformed officer, even a security guard, people feel safer in that facility. And there are a lot of vulnerabilities, not just at City Hall, but at all neighbor... All city facilities. And I don't want to monopolize the time, but I think that the thing that we really need to consider too is while we have to secure City Hall, which I'm in agreement with, the question is how do we fund it and how do you pull resources from neighborhoods that are experiencing high crime right now? Thought is, "Well, you're securing city hall. How about my park? How about my neighborhood? How about proactive policing in my community?" Like, why is city hall the priority when there are other facilities throughout the city, even schools. I mean, some parents would argue, "It's nice that you're securing City Hall, but why not place another police officer in a school with a much higher number of people?" So you don't have to respond to that if you don't want.

- [Chief Davis] But I would say the schools have responded. You see all the doors are secured. They have security systems, you have armed private security at the federal courthouse. You have armed private security at the Social Security hearings at the federal courthouse. You have an armed private security at the Social Security building at Dousman and...

- Military.

- Military.

- Yeah

- So there's a lot of that going on in this community that we're unaware of and I think that the chief's correct, there's a lot that he thinks about a lot that a lot of us are oblivious to. And we're unaware because that's just the way our life is.

- Yeah.

- You know, obviously in the last, Since Columbine, we've all become much more aware of the risk. You know, we had an issue, I think maybe it was before you got reelected, whether to allow guns in the state buildings or not. And we had a number of people showing up at council meetings wearing their guns open carry to make a point. But it made other people in the building very uncomfortable to have that going on. So, I mean, you have armed security now at the Brown County Courthouse, and they're talking about beefing that up even more. So there's a lot of it going on and like I, I read those two letters from those two employees. They're very concerned and I don't know, Do you feel when you go to work every day that you're at risk? Because that's how they feel here because they don't know who that next person is, coming through the door. Is it going to be that person, or is it just a guy that is kind of upset about his taxes, or A, B, or C. So that's, and they're vulnerable. They've gotten nowhere to go. You know, like it said, some of them have tourniquets, some of them have objects with them that they can break out the windows so they can flee. They've got things to jam doors and these are... This is the new reality that we live in. And so how do we work with these employees to educate them on how best to be safe and how do we work with those employees and also with the public. Because this is a public building, they have to come somewhere, you know, to get that, the city work done. And so how do we make that accessible to them without Like, at the federal courthouse, if you're going to go in that courtroom, you have to go through a metal detector.

Anything you're carrying has to go through a scanner, like at the airport. They've got armed guards there watching you. You know, so it's complicated.

- Yeah, and like I said, I'm in agreement with all of what you said. It's an issue that we need to discuss and I want to make sure employees feel comfortable and the public feel comfortable coming to City Hall. It just feels like, to me, the timing of it all. We should have had this discussion. I'm glad we're having it now, but there's a part of me that feels like we're having this as sort of a distraction from a very unpopular decision to install audio devices at City Hall. Like it, I'm glad we're having this discussion. I wish it didn't come at the point that we're having it now because it seems like we're almost, in a way, justifying the use of audio surveillance, which I am still very much against. So I'm glad we're having it.

- Right, right

- We're on the same team

- I don't think it's Yeah, I don't think that's the point of this. I think the point of this is as an offshoot of the audio thing. Someone said, "Okay, well, we're getting rid of the audio thing." We still need to think about what we're doing. And maybe the audio thing wasn't preventing anything.

- No.

- Okay, it was just recording if something did happen. So you'd have evidence later on. That's about all the audio was giving you. You know, what people were really saying or not saying.

- And I think that's part of the problem is the audio stuff is a very reactionary measure. Right. It's really meant to build evidence for a case against someone who already did something. But we're talking about right now is preventative. And so it does look very peculiar, whether it was intended or not. Right? That this is almost a reaction to that. So I'll make the political statement, Chief, and keep you out of it.

- [Officer Davis] Thank you.

- But it's, But that's what it looks like. And to Alder Brunette's point, if City Hall safety and security was a concern, this absolutely should have been a budget discussion. To suggest that audio surveillance and armed security are apples to apples comparisons. If I can't have one, then this is the substitute. It's not at all the case. Right?

- And I, again, I don't feel like that, and maybe that's because of what I did for a job. We had security issues and we continue to have security issues, at that PD. We've tried to solve it, never came to city council unless it was for funds to install it. But they haven't found any, I mean, I can't tell you how many times we found strange people wandering around the station in the middle of the night that somehow found their way in. We've had people sleeping in our lounge.

- Yeah, and it's a very common problem.

- We've had people escape from this. So, I mean, there's a lot of this stuff that goes on that I would say the council, and maybe even the mayor, isn't aware of because the different department heads

handled... That's their responsibility to handle those things. You know, and obviously the mayor, until recently, was in charge of security for this building. The day to day. We're the

- We just took control of our...

- But we're, you know, we're the week to week, month to month, more of the big picture, and he's more of the day-to-day, what's going on stuff. And I don't want to get down to the minutiae if this is an attempt to try and muddy the waters or anything. This is something I think, and like the Chief said, long overdue. It should have been done years and years ago.

- So we do have a committee dedicated, at our facility committee, that has looked at different facilities, right? So that's part of the reason why I didn't go to the council, because we have a committee dedicated to renovating City Hall, looking at different facilities. So that committee was looking at what to do with City Hall, and security was part of that, and renovating the first part.

- Yeah, if we're being practical, Joe, I still think we're years away from, you know, really being able to see any of that stuff materialized. I mean, Chief, you kind of ran through some of the examples about securing City Hall. Those to me seem like obvious things. I have long thought we should have someone at that reception desk. Somebody who can answer any question. I have long questioned why City Hall is a free-for-all. Like it, And I, Director Grenier, I know people come to third floor all the time to pay parking tickets. Do they have to or is that something that can be handled on first floor? Right? I feel like those are probably pretty immediate things that we can discuss. And can we, can we make physical investments, you know whether it's your security systems, your fobs, you know someone working that front desk. You know. Those types of investments seem like really easy things. Even maybe even a little bit of reorganization to handle internal staffing for how those transactions come and go. Some training, you know. Armed security is a bigger budget impact and discussion we'll have to have. And you gave us some different options, of course. And I think it's really hard to react today, and as you guys said, it's not necessarily the intent. And I suspect what we'll see out of today is, you know, a referral and come back with some more tangible suggestions on how we proceed from here. But I think there's some really quick, easy fixes though to help mitigate some of the risks that currently exist.

- Before we let the Chief go, I've got a couple people that I want to talk about. Alder Grant is on Zoom.

- [Alder Grant] Okay, just a couple questions to verify. The video and audio cameras were installed at the same time, is that correct? Or did video exist a while ago and audio was installed in December and July?

- My understanding is the video cameras have been here for some time and the audio was an add-on.

- [Alder Grant] Okay. So the incidences that happened about a year and a half ago, since audio was installed, did we see a decrease in incidences?

- [Chief Davis] That is a really good question, and I would need to look at, maybe, the calls for service because the, And the only information I have about these issues in City Hall that we've heard of, the, what is it, two or three different, apparently, interactions that were problematic. The only

information I have about those is more anecdotal, but we could look and see if calls for service went down. I don't know the answer to that.

- [Alder Grant] Okay. And the reason I asked that is I, again you did make some very good ideas. I really like keeping the traffic to the first floor. Those are very easy things that we can change around. But I agree, when this was brought to our attention, it was all in the same conversation of the audio recordings, and it was almost like a threat. If you get rid of audio recordings, then we need to beef up security. And I don't think audio, the audio recordings were necessarily stopping things, bad things from happening. So I agree that if we're going to implement something, it should be comparable or equivalent to justify the big changes or budget wise. So that was just kind of, I think, Again, I don't want to focus on numbers. I understand things are getting heightened and I understand that changes should be made. But I agree, the way it was brought to us was kind of, "If you make this decision now, you need to do this." So... And just a question to Alder, I don't know who is better to answer this. Alder Galvin, you spoke about calls. When you say, a suspicious activity, or someone reporting someone who has a warrant out for arrest, is that kind of more our staff doing a good job of watching for a suspicious activity or people who should not be there? And those calls, in my opinion, are good things because they spotted someone, called it in, helped our police department.

- Well, actually, I mean, it is a good thing. I mean, sure, and Chief and I have heard people tell us stories about, "Yeah, I saw this car and it was really suspicious and it just bugged me for two days and then I called the police and then I found out it was stolen. And you know, if I called the police right away, they could have gotten the guy." You know, we hear stories like that all the time. So when people see something happening and they call it in, and people are timid to do that, and you'll tell them, "Look, you pay taxes. This is what we do for a job. If anything bugs you, call. Call right away." That's the best way to prevent something serious from happening. Don't wait six hours or a day or two. So yeah, that's a good thing, if they're calling. I mean it's the whole thing that, you know, you hear at the airports. "If you see something, say something." And that's where our whole society is kind of rotating to now. So yeah, that's a good thing. But the thing is it's like winning the lottery. You know, you're going to respond to how many calls in your entire life and you're never gonna fire your gun. Most cops never do, and thank God. And so you're going to have a lot of suspicious people and things happen here that people are going to call on and thank God it turns out to be nothing. Or maybe, in a way, with the police showing up, it does prevent something more serious from happening. You'll never know. But yeah, I encourage anybody and everybody that when they see something suspicious going on that makes, you know, If it makes you think this is Something's wrong, then you should be calling.

- [Alder Grant] Right. And I, Why I bring that up is, I would like... Is it possible, can you share your numbers with us? But what I would like to see is what calls. I know you read some off. I tried to write down what I could.

- Sure.

- [Alder Grant] But I would like to see it in front of me, really dissect what the harassment or threatening calls were. Or, "Hey, I know our police department's looking for this person and they're in here, I'm going to call it in." I think that's important to separate to see, like Ald. Johnson said, where are our main issues? And what I would also like to know if is it certain times of the year? Is it while people are paying taxes and they're upset? Is it around election times? Is that when we need to maybe beef up security at those points so we're not spending money throughout the entire year?

Because again, we still have video surveillance. That didn't go away. So that security system is still implemented. And you said we have, we do have panic buttons within City Hall?

- In some of the offices, yes. And they also have...

- [Alder Grant] That's great.

- They also have the ability to lock the stairwell doors on the first floor and to lock the door going into the law offices and the mayor's offices. Of course that's glass. So I mean, it'll slow some people down, but if someone really wants to get in there, it's not much of a stop.

- [Chief Davis] And to your question about certain times of year. I mean, just looking through this, and you'll get this, this spreadsheet, but if you look at all calls for service, they appear to be pretty evenly spread out. Another thing I would just offer, for some food for thought, is when you're talking about risk mitigation and security services at a facility like this, you don't just plan for what has happened. You plan for what you can, what reasonably might happen. So there are some scenarios that we don't want to plan and staff for because it's just not very likely that You know, the kind of Bruce Willis scenario is going to come up or something like that. But you plan for what you can reasonably expect to happen in a facility like this, and calls for service fluctuate just naturally in ways that no one can predict over time. This is really hard to say, well, we would only want to have somebody in the building, say at tax time or versus a different time of the year. Just food for thought.

- [Alder Grant] Okay. No, that's a great point. So, okay, that's all the questions I have. Thank you.

- Ald. Steuer?

- [Alder Steuer] Thank you, Chairman. Very good discussion. I Listening to what Alder Johnson said before, just, you know, I think one of the things that happens for council is that we don't know all the incidents that are going on. I could talk to Director Grenier about his office, or Director Ditscheit. And, Joe, you mentioned something to the effect that a lot of this is personnel related that we're not going to be privy to some of that information. Is that true?

- Sometimes, yeah.

- [Alder Steuer] So I mean, that kind of handcuffs us a little bit too. I mean, I think we want to see something good happen and I think this discussion is going to be very good. Moving forward I want to... We all want to be part of that. But like I said, our hands are tied a little bit, partly because we could've done budget, but that's another story. You know It's just that it would've been nice to get a handle on how many of these incidents happen, huh? You know, public works. You know, that we have 20, 20 last month or 30, whatever, we'd like to know. But like you said, you have to keep it kind of quiet too. So I'm just trying to figure that out. And also, I know we have one officer at that council, right? Is that the only time that we have, I probably... I don't want to blow the secrets here in the building, but you know, it seems like, we know there's one there, but I haven't...

- Two. Two, Chief.

- [Alder Steuer] Yeah, Chief. Yeah, you're right. I'm sorry.

- Maybe one and a half.

- Come on.

- It's been a while, but I can follow...

- Do some good.

- Get in the way.

- [Alder Steuer] So, that's part of it. You know, at council meetings, I've seen it, but in the rest of the building, you know, when I'm here I don't see it. So, okay. Thanks for discussion.

- I think at, you know, at risk of merging too many issues, I think there's a couple things here. Of course we're talking about security of City Hall for our public and as well as our employees. And I think we all agreed at that, the last council meeting, that is a really top priority for everybody. If there's a gap there, we want to fill it. But I don't want to lose sight of the customer service component either. And I think it, And that's why I say the risk of merging too many issues, but I think there's some merit in having that simultaneous discussion. And how do we improve the flow, the workflow, down on that first floor that also has this side effect of securing the building. Oftentimes that when people come into the building, it's not a really friendly building to enter, right? Nobody's here to greet you, you don't know where to go. And I think if you can fix some of that in this same conversation, I think it's a worthwhile dialogue to have. The other piece that I want to be really sensitive to, and I appreciate your point, Chief, that having somebody who's armed creates a sense of safety for a lot of people. But it creates a lot of angst for others. And I want to be really sensitive to that dialogue. We oftentimes talk about how some of the most marginalized members of our community don't have great relationships with our police department. And when you make an intentional decision to say we're going to put armed officers or armed security in your City Hall, you're almost making an intentional decision to say you're not welcome here. And so we have to figure out how to bridge that gap as well. And I just... I don't want that discussion to get lost.

- [Chief Davis] Yeah and I think that is a very valid point and that's one of the reasons why we kind of tried to think of... Is there a softer option like a CSO or something like that? Whatever you do, if you have security here, we probably want the same people all the time. So it's somebody people get to know and people get comfortable with for exactly that reason. Because we don't want to make it into Fort Knox, where the public that owns this building feels any kind of discomfort about coming in here.

- Right.

- But that can be handled. I mean, the federal courthouse, their security team, they're in sport coats and ties. Whereas though, Social Security building, uniform. I mean, if it was even one of our officers, again, they can dress in civilian or casual clothing but... And we used to have people down at that front desk. I don't know if you remember that. They were cut out of the budget several years ago, but they were just literally meet-and-greet and steering.

- It was more of a, program support

- Right. They couldn't really handle anything because...

- Yeah, it does make sense of, Is there a way of streamlining things so people aren't wandering all over the building if they don't have to be. And they can handle their business at one kiosk or one desk down in the front.

- So I just want to be clear for the committee. Like, that's not an easy fix. That's not, you know... We've thought about that for years. So it's not like we just put one kiosk and everything's solved. Like that's probably a big renovation of the first floor. Not that we're going to not think about other ways to do it, but it's not an easy simple fix to do.

- Right.

- Alder Eck, did you have a question?

- Well actually it piggybacks on to what Alder Steuer was pointing out, that during, And I know there's more than just during our council meetings, but we do have the officers there. And my understanding is one of the incidents, because we were given the three, happened in council chambers. And so I guess I was just wondering if the person was feeling threatened, did they ask the Chief Davis that was there to handle it?

- [Chief Davis] So, I'm going to be a little bit careful not to give up all of our security plans for city council. But I will tell you that... And assuming we're talking about the same incident, there was an incident that I remember that happened not long after I got here. And I go to almost all the council meetings, and I go in uniform on purpose. Where after that incident, that's when I got asked to just stick around until everyone left. And then it was a while after that where I made the decision that we just need to have someone assigned to those meetings who has that role. Because while I'm at my cubicle answering questions and working with council, that we really need someone dedicated to that role. That position wasn't there, I don't think, when that incident happened.

- Okay.

- Yeah.

- [Chief Davis] But that's why, actually, I started staying at... Sticking around until everyone left. Not that I was in a hurry to leave after that.

- Alder Brunette?

- The people at the front desk welcome center, that's something that former Mayor Schmidt really focused in on and they were placed here through Aspiro.

- Yeah.

- Through a program.

- Yeah.

- And I think that 2019 budget, that was an unfortunate budget casualty in the... I was against cutting those. I thought that was good for the constituent service aspect. I don't know if they were meant to be a frontline defense of City Hall. Regarding this item, because I believe it's an action item. Who placed this on our agenda? Was it your item or did the mayor place it? City administration?

- I'm looking.

- The mayor asked

- What is he proposing? I mean, because real quick, let me preface this question. Obviously, he's saying that this is a major concern. We're hearing that it's a major concern. Is he just, kind of, outsourcing this decision to the city council to figure out, or does he have some ideas? Because if we implement something, we need to have funding to implement it. Has he discussed that with you, Director Faulds? Has he just?

- He has not discussed with me his final thoughts or solutions to this, like they have a solution today. I think the biggest part is to have a discussion started and make sure we don't lose sight of it. And then again, I'll just say it again. The ad hoc facilities committee has been looking at this issue, I think, before the budget. So I think that's the committee to really focus on the renovation and physical improvements to City Hall. That's one of the reasons why it didn't come to the common council. Because we had committee dedicated to looking at that already.

- I can appreciate that, but I also kind of push back a little bit on that because if we're told it's a major security concern to the point that he put audio without noticing it, it seems to me like it should have been discussed with urgency.

- Right.

- Ad hoc facilities, you know, government committees are going to take a year or two or three or five. But if we're being told that it's a serious concern now, I would hope that he would have some recommendations. Because I can offer recommendations. But I don't know if it's something that a majority of council would approve of. So if the mayor is placing this on the agenda for us to consider, what specifically is he suggesting we do?

- So I think that's up to the committee to decide what to do. Like, if the committee has suggestions, that's what the committee would do.

- Did the mayor talk about any funding? Is there any?

- No, like I said I think this will start the discussion.

- I mean, I appreciate we're starting the discussion but, I mean, he placed it on the agenda and he's not here to give us suggestions. It just seems like he's outsourcing some of the tougher decisions to city council, which I'm more than happy to take on. But that means that maybe we need to look at our budget and find cuts to maybe free up \$100,000, \$200,000, or whatever it be, so that we can put immediate procedures and practices in place. I mean, to refer to staff who knows what, How long that will take. In the meantime, our building is unsecured. I just, I wish there was a little more, like, teeth to what the mayor's asking us to do because I'm more than happy to make some cuts to the

budget. Because I proposed some budget cuts this last budget year, not knowing that security was such a big concern.

- And I think it's tough for the staff to make proposals for security more than make a lot of cuts to it. Right, okay. If the council is making all these cuts, how do we propose safety improvements?

- Well, you balance things. I mean, I don't want to put you in a spot, but you balance your organizational priorities. But if we're not told that securing City Hall is something that we should discuss as part of a budget, then we're just out to look like we're the bad guys now because of the way that this is all headed. So, I guess my question is, just for an immediate solution to this, because we're at the personnel committee. The mayor has an open position in his office, the chief of staff position, that has not been filled since November. That position, I believe, the annual salary is \$70,000 plus benefits. Is that something that this committee could act on, that we freeze the hiring of that position until the next budget year, and then use that \$70,000 plus benefits to fund whatever security plans that the mayor could come up with to fall within the \$100,000?

- I don't know that I. That that makes a lot of sense right now. Because we don't even know what kind of costs we're talking about. Like what...

- That's what I'm saying. This is why I'm frustrated. This gets placed before us, but we don't know. We're going to refer it to staff probably, and we're going to, week after week, we're told that it's a major security threat and we have no policy proposals like that. It just seems a little weird how this is all coming to us.

- [Officer] Can I make a suggestion?

- Yup.

- [Chief Davis] I think we're... Even in this discussion I'm getting some clarity, or at least about the part of council that's represented here, on where your priorities are. And some of the points about, "Do we really want to have a police officer there?" I mean, I was asked to come here and provide some options. If I'm hearing the discussion correctly, it almost seems like a way forward might be for us to just look at the possibility of CSOs. And there are some nuts and bolts and things to work out there. But if we want to narrow these down to an option like that and a request for proposal for a contract for security services is going to take a while, because there's a procurement process that we need to go through. But I'm hearing some, you know, not a whole lot of enthusiasm for the idea of armed security in this building. Would it be helpful for me to come back to the next one of these meetings with a little bit more dialed-in proposal for what staffing this need with CSOs would look like?

- Oh, yeah. And I think to Alder Brunette's point, I think that's what's frustrating. Where, I mean, usually when something's put on the agenda it's because it's ready for action.

- Right.

- We don't have anything to act on. So I think having a scope of work that says, "Hey, this is what we're proposing." And I think it goes beyond the CSOs. I think it goes, what investments would you make in City Hall to shore up security? These are the changes we'd make, whether it's layout, what

kind of personnel, as I talked about, intertwining that a little bit with the customer service experience. This is how we would make city hall function better. And then here's the scope of work. here's what it's going to cost. I think that's when we can be valuable. I think right now we're having a discussion that the administration ought to be having. Right, we're doing the job with the administration right now. And we need you to come, not you specifically, administration, to come to us and say, "Here is our proposal"

- "and this is how we're..." That's a motion you can make.

- What's that?

- It's a motion you can make to staff, to do that.

- Yeah. But I don't want jump the gun, in case somebody else has more questions or points to make.

- If I could.

- Yeah, I mean that would be great. And then also how they're gonna fund it.

- Jim has his hand... Alder Hutchison.

- Hutchison.

- Go ahead, Alder Hutchison.

- [Alder Hutchison] Hi, can you hear me?

- Yup.

- [Alder Hutchison] Okay, good. I think I've heard a lot of discussion. I think it's all good. I think we're a position, this committee, and then ultimately the council to move forward on this. I know the administration has this role, currently a role, but they've been told and hammered with, "The council didn't know, the council didn't know." Well, the council is being told, in effect, through this committee, of where we were sitting at in terms of safety at City Hall and elsewhere. So I think we can accept this information. I like the idea of going back to staff, and getting recommendations and summarizing what we just talked about and then moving forward with full knowledge. So this time, we know. That's my input. Thank you.

- All right. I'll entertain a motion.

- I move to refer this to staff to come back to the finance, or personnel committee. Well, it might be finance too.

- Yeah.

- With a proposal on solutions to help secure City Hall. Is that good? I mean, you guys get the broader point so.

- Just one question. Alder Grant, are you still there?

- [Alder Grant] Yeah.

- Would you like, as part of this motion, a deeper dig by the PD into the calls for service? To see, you know... would? It sounded like you wanted to know a little bit more of the meat of what these calls were all about. If they could break it down further. Would you like that as part of this motion?

- [Alder Grant] I mean, I would like the information. I don't know if it needs to be part of the motion. If it's useful for everybody when it comes to deciding what measures we take, would I? Probably, again, more information is better as to what level of security we're going to implement. The gravity of these calls. Do you know what I mean?

- Sure

- [Alder Grant] Yeah, I think that might be useful information. Thank you.

- Alder Brunette?

- Yeah, and I'll support the motion, but what we need, too, is we need to know the funding mechanism. If we get to free up money in our budget, we got to take it from contingency. We can freeze open positions. I had just mentioned the chief of staff, but there might be other positions in our city government that we don't necessarily need to fill, if that means we can save money to implement whatever security features are chosen. So I think there's a financial component too. So it doesn't do as much good to talk about, "This is what we can do," without the dollars attached to it. And if that means that the city council needs to make some tough cuts, or figure out a way to free up some money in our budget, or borrow money through bonding, whatever it is, we need to have that discussion too. Also, mindful as what chief said with the CSOs. Right now they're making \$12.68 cents an hour. That's not enough, and we know that. It's probably harder to fill those positions. So we need to have that financial consideration as well. So we got to free up money. So I want proposals, I want ideas, but I want some dollars attached to them, with, perhaps, proposals on how we're gonna fund the security updates.

- I would expect the Chief can come up with an idea on the CSO program. But that's going to be up to finance in that to give us...

- Well, that's what I'm saying. I think it might need to come back to both committees.

- Right, yeah. |

- Yeah That would be my only recommendation... So right now you have come back to personnel. I don't know if we're going to be talking about this at finance.

- And, well, I think it's implied, Alder Brunette, but I think the point is that the CSO program... Chief, if you came back with, "Here's where I think the wages need to be for this program as a whole." It's just, you know, it's complex. At the risk of making it even more complex, it is a part of the ultimate solution.

- [Chief Davis] I have a lot of that CSO wage analysis done already in anticipation of a conversation I thought we would have later this year. So, but, yeah, in terms of finding the money, obviously that's a little outside my lane. We'd have to work with the finance department

- And that would come to personnel though too. CSO wages. And I think this plan can stay at personnel as well, even if it deals with funding.

- Alder Brunette, we have dedicated some ARPA funds to... Over hiring and some things in your department. I mean, I know we have exhausted ARPA, at least allocated ARPA, perhaps not funded everything with ARPA yet, but is there's some thought that we could use ARPA that has been designated to public safety for this?

- [Chief Davis] It's possible. We have a couple of different variables there. One is the contingency funded over hire, and how far into that funding we get, which we won't know the answer to that until later in the year. And then there's also a possibility that we may have identified a different funding source for another project that has some ARPA money attached to it. So that's possible. But I don't want to make promises that I can't keep and I can't guarantee. That's certainly something we can take a look at. And some of it'll depend on the timing and figuring out this other source of funding for this totally unrelated project.

- Okay.

- But yeah, we'll certainly keep our eyes open for where in the couch cushion we can come up with the money.

- It's a big couch.

- Yeah.

- [Chief Davis] But we look at it a lot.

- All right, so that's the motion.

- Yeah.

- Do I have a second?

- I'll second.

- Oh, Alder Grant.

- [Alder Grant] I'm really sorry, and if you guys could, This is nothing really to do with your motion. Just something. I don't know if it's worth... Director Faulds knows, I love employee surveys, but if we truly want to hear from the staff, maybe, does it pay to even hear what they would find more comforting at work as far as safety measures goes? Is it worth sending a survey out to hear feedback from them too? Just to hear from all parts of the equation before we make decisions as well?

- We can do that.

- Can you bring a copy of that survey draft back with the plan?
- Yeah, of course, we can send it out before the plan is put together.
- Right. It's... I mean, do you guys want to review the survey before we send it out? I mean, typically, we're... Just HR would work on it.
- I think because we're kind of stuck in this rut, I think in the spirit of transparency and cooperation, collaboration, I think it would be good to give counsel an opportunity to give you feedback before it goes out. Do you want that to be an open session at a meeting or do you want me to email that or get us to reveal?
- I think if you just include it in the meeting packet with the next meeting, I'd be satisfied with that. I don't know about anybody else.
- Sure.
- And Chief, if you could have your people take a look at these calls for services, see if they can flesh out, just so we have a better grasp of what all these calls for service were and what they entailed.
- [Chief Davis] Yeah, we'll ask the, the crime analyst to do the, the kind of Analysis that they do for addresses like this. It should be pretty easy.
- All right. Thank you so much. All right. So we have a motion.
- Second.
- We have a second. All those in favor say aye.
- Aye.
- Aye. Opposed? That passes unanimously on the informational. Anyone have any questions on the reporter of routine personnel action items? If not, our next meeting is March 28th, 2023. I'll entertain a motion to adjourn
- Motion to adjourned.
- Second.
- All us in favor say aye.
- Aye, Aye
- And we are adjourned.