

NOVEMBER 13, 2007

Regular meeting of the Common Council was called to order by Mayor Meyers at 6:03 p.m., in the Council Chambers, City Hall Plaza.

PRESENT: Michael Feirer, Alanna Feddick, Trish Siegler, Tim Kraus, Ed Wagner, Josh Hansen, Donald Krueger, John Spiros, Tom Buttke and Pete Hendler

ABSENT: None

The flag was saluted and the pledge given.

The invocation was given by Rev. Scott Marrese-Wheeler, First Presbyterian Church.

RECOMMENDATIONS FROM MAYOR

Employee Milestone Recognition:

Josh Mauritz, Engineering	November 17, 1997	10 years of service
Amber Miller, Planning	November 18, 2002	5 years of service

The Mayor congratulated City Clerk Hall for receiving the designation of Wisconsin Certified Professional Clerk.

He also recognized that this November is the 30th Anniversary of the Marshfield Police Auxiliary.

CC07-357 Motion by Feirer, second by Hendler to approve the minutes of the Common Council special meeting of October 22, 2007. All Ayes

Motion carried

CC07-358 Motion by Spiros, second by Buttke to approve the minutes of the Common Council meeting of October 23, 2007. All Ayes

Motion carried

CC07-359 Motion by Spiros, second by Hansen to approve the minutes of the Common Council special meeting of October 29, 2007. All Ayes

Motion carried

CC07-360 Motion by Hendler, second by Hansen to approve the minutes of the Common Council special meeting of November 5, 2007. All Ayes

Motion carried

No items were added to the agenda. Item #O was moved to after item #Z on the agenda.

PUBLIC COMMENT PERIOD

Gary Gray of 507 W. Park Street. The City Council has every right and obligation to make any kind of amendments to the proposed budget that it wants too. The Mayor also has every right to veto things that he does not like. He encouraged the Council to over-ride the Mayor's veto regarding motion CC07-352. According to the Marshfield web-site we have five business industrial parks. There are 194 acres still available so why do we need to add another industrial park. Postpone the Yellowstone Industrial Park renovation/reconstruction until we see a need for it.

Dan Umhoefer of 306 S. Hawthorn Avenue. He is a member of the Marshfield Area Friends of the Trails and he is speaking on their behalf. He expressed their appreciation to the Common Council for their very generous support that they have given to the trails projects in recent years. Their hope is that the support will continue in the future and they hope that the Council will decide to support fully Mr. Brehm's departmental proposals that support trail building in Marshfield.

Scott Larson, MACCI Executive Director, spoke on behalf of MACCI's Executive Board. They had a couple of requests for the Council to consider as it relates to the 2008 budget proposals. The first request is to give consideration to the Phase 1 development in Yellowstone Industrial Park. With economic development, available infrastructure is key to being able to continue to grow and market the community and have sites available. The second request is regarding the position of Planning and Economic Development Director. The elimination of this position would have a significant change in how economic development is performed here in the community. As one of the partners in that economic development process, they would urge that some time be taken to analyze and detail what if any changes to duties/responsibilities this would entail and whether or not this would be the best move for economic development as it relates in the community. They have been very happy and proud to be a partner with the City and Main Street and they look forward in continuing to do that. He offered to sit down with all parties involved to discuss the matter as it relates to the economic development process.

Rob Nikolai with Don Nikolai Construction. He voiced his displeasure with the veto of the Yellowstone Industrial Park motion. This is another in a long line of instances where they have not gotten the support as a private developer of an industrial park here in the City of Marshfield. Their park is moving forward and they will continue to put their efforts to fill it up but it takes time. Until then, he sees no reason why the City would not want to partner in bringing in new businesses instead of competing with them. He asked the Council to take the responsible step and over-ride that veto.

Aldersperson Hendler announced that the Norwood Health Center Traumatic Brain Injury Unit is now running. This is a good fit for the City of Marshfield being a medical community and Wood County. He is the chair of this committee and he is extremely proud of the dedication and the knowledgeable staff that they have aboard. He thanked the doctors and the staff of the Marshfield Clinic because without their help this would not have been possible.

MINUTES OF GOVERNING BOARDS AND COMMISSIONS

CC07-361 Motion by Kraus, second by Feirer to receive and place on file the minutes of the Zoning Board of Appeals of September 11, 2007 and September 25, 2007 special meeting; Fire and Police Commission of October 4, 2007; Community Development Authority of October 4, 2007 and Fairgrounds Commission of October 12, 2007. All Ayes

Motion carried

MINUTES OF ADVISORY BOARDS, COMMISSIONS AND COMMITTEES

CC07-362 Motion by Feddick, second by Kraus to approve the minutes of the Historic Preservation Committee of October 1, 2007. All Ayes

Motion carried

MINUTES OF COUNCIL COMMITTEES

CC07-363 Motion by Wagner, second by Feddick to approve the minutes of the Cable TV Committee of September 24, 2007. All Ayes

Motion carried

CC07-364 Motion by Feirer, second by Buttke to approve the minutes of the Board of Public Works of November 5, 2007. All Ayes

Motion carried

CC07-365 Motion by Feddick, second by Hendler to approve the minutes of the Finance, Budget and Personnel Committee of November 6, 2007. All Ayes

Motion carried

CC07-366 Motion by Krueger, second by Kraus to approve the minutes of the Judiciary, License and Cemetery Committee of November 13, 2007 as read by the Clerk. All Ayes

Motion carried

MINUTES OF COMMUNITY ASSOCIATIONS

CC07-367 Motion by Feddick, second by Feirer to receive and place on file the minutes of the Central Wisconsin State Fair Board of October 15, 2007. All Ayes

Motion carried

Second reading of Ordinance No. 1116, amending Chapter 18 of the Municipal Code relating to Temporary Structures.

Planner/Zoning Administrator Curtiss suggested sending this ordinance back to the Plan Commission to consider the time period, whether it be 30, 60, 120 or 180 days, and to possibly look at the definition of a temporary structure.

CC07-368 Motion by Buttke, second by Wagner to send Ordinance No. 1116 back to the City Plan Commission for reconsideration and clarification.

Aldersperson Siegler asked for further direction as to what they would like from the Plan Commission. Is it looking at just time frames or other issues?

Curtiss replied that one of the concerns brought up was time frames. What is reasonable enough?

Aldersperson Wagner would also like to see some other issues clarified as far as enforcement.

Aldersperson Feddick would like to see something on the definitions. They are fairly ambiguous. She would like them clarified.

Vote on motion **CC07-368**; All Ayes

Motion carried

Second reading of Ordinance No. 1117, amending Chapter 19 of the Municipal Code relating to lot line adjustments.

CC07-369 Motion by Buttke, second by Feirer to approve Ordinance No. 1117.

Aldersperson Feddick said that she is not in support of this ordinance because it is an unnecessary cost on land owners. This is certainly something that can be done through another process.

Vote on motion **CC07-369**; Feddick, Siegler, Kraus and Spiros voted Naye, Feirer, Wagner, Hansen, Krueger, Buttke and Hendler voted Aye.

Motion carried

CC07-370 Motion by Hendler, second by Siegler to approve Payroll Resolution No. 2007-38, setting compensation for the City Assessor effective June 1, 2008 at \$60,991; June 1, 2009 at \$63,071; June 1, 2010 at \$65,213 and June 1, 2011 at \$67,419. Spiros voted Naye, rest Aye.

Motion carried

CC07-371 Motion by Buttke, second by Siegler to approve Payroll Resolution No. 2007-39, adjusting the pay for temporary, seasonal and part-time positions effective January 1, 2008. All Ayes

Motion carried

CC07-372 Motion by Buttke, second by Feirer to approve Payroll Resolution No. 2007-40, adopting a salary schedule for non-represented position classifications of the City of Marshfield effective January 1, 2008. Siegler Abstained, rest Aye.

Motion carried

CC07-373 Motion by Kraus, second by Krueger to approve Payroll Resolution No. 2007-41, authorizing performance-based compensation adjustments for non-represented employees. Siegler Abstained, rest Aye.

Motion carried

CC07-374 Motion by Wagner, second by Feirer to approve Budget Resolution No. 21-2007, transferring \$1,995 from the Storm Sewer Construction Fund to the Airport budget for airport fill maintenance. All Ayes

Motion carried

CC07-375 Motion by Kraus, second by Wagner to re-schedule the second December 2007 meeting of the Common Council to Tuesday, December 18, 2007. All Ayes

Motion carried

Consideration of the Mayor's three vetoes regarding Common Council action that was taken at the Special Budget meeting on Monday, November 5, 2007.

The City Clerk read the first motion that the Mayor vetoed.

CC07-347 Motion by Hendler, second by Wagner to merge the positions of Director of Public Works and City Engineer and to reduce one engineer from the department. Feddick, Kraus, Wagner, Spiros and Hendler voted Aye, Feirer, Hansen, Krueger and Buttke voted Naye, Siegler Abstained. Motion carried

Mayor Meyers explained his justification for the veto.

1. Action on this motion took place without prior knowledge of, or consultation with the Mayor, City Administrator, Finance Director, Director of Public Works or City Engineer, despite solicitation of same from the Mayor in his memo to the City Council dated October 29, 2007.
2. Action was taken without consideration or action by the Finance, Budget and Personnel Committee.
3. Action was taken without specifying which of the “engineering” positions would be eliminated.
4. Action was taken without a presentation for consideration of a job description for the proposed Director of Public Works/City Engineer combined position, specifically the distribution of duties currently performed by the City Engineer to be assumed by the Director of Public Works or others, and/or the distribution of duties currently performed by the “engineering” position proposed to be eliminated.
5. Action was taken without consideration or discussion of financial compensation for those additional duties to be performed by someone else due to this proposed restructuring.
6. Action was taken without consideration or discussion of the financial impact on the budget of the Department of Public Works, the Engineering Department and/or the overall Administrator’s Recommended 2008 Budget.
7. Action was taken without consideration or discussion of the affects this significant proposed restructuring would have on the productivity of the Department of Public Works and/or the Engineering Department.
8. Action was taken without consideration or discussion of the affect of such action on the services provided to the citizens of Marshfield through the Department of Public Works and/or the Engineering Department.
9. Action was taken with total disregard to allowing for public involvement in the discussion of such action, or allowing citizens an opportunity to contact their elected representatives (Mayor and Aldermen) prior to a vote on such a recommendation.
10. The action which took place was contrary to what is considered “good local government” and could be considered a basis for public mistrust in local elected representatives.

CC07-376 Motion by Wagner, second by Spiros to over-ride the Mayor’s veto of Common Council motion CC07-347. Siegler Abstained; Feirer, Krueger and Buttke voted Naye; Feddick, Kraus, Wagner, Hansen, Spiros and Hendler voted Aye.

Motion failed

The City Clerk read the second motion that the Mayor vetoed.

CC07-351 Motion by Wagner, second by Feddick to include in the 2008 budget funds to hire two firefighters during the calendar year 2008. To declare the intent of the Common Council to hire two more firefighters in calendar year 2009 and two additional firefighters in 2010. In keeping with “parameter #9”, the motion includes making the following deletions from the budget.

- *Deletion of the position of Director of Planning and Economic Development.*
- *Transfer of GIS technician to Engineering.*

- *Transfer of Zoning Administrator to Engineering under Building Services.*
- *Deletion of the following items from the IT Budget:*
 1. *\$7,100 for additional GIS ArchInfo License (I09).*
 2. *Deletion of \$8,080 for two “ruggedized” PCs for engineering, water utility and sewer (I08).*
 3. *Deletion of \$2,000 for GIS Network Analysis Software (I10).*

*Vote on motion **CC07-351 as amended**; Feirer, Hansen, Krueger and Buttke voted Naye, rest Aye.*

Motion carried

Mayor Meyers explained his justification for the veto.

1. Action on this motion took place without prior knowledge of, or consultation with the Mayor, City Administrator, Finance Director, Director of Public Works, Director of Planning & Economic Development, or Police & Fire Commission, despite solicitation of same from the Mayor in his memo to the City Council dated October 29, 2007.
2. Action to add two firefighters to the Fire & Rescue Department staff in each of the years 2008, 2009 and 2010 was made without an explicit request or recommendation for additional manpower at this time by the Fire & Police Commission, who through statutory powers are empowered to formulate the manpower structure of the Fire & Rescue Department, in addition to formulating the policies and procedures governing the operation of that department, aside from political influence.
3. Action was taken without consideration or action by the Finance, Budget and Personnel Committee.
4. Action was taken without consideration or discussion of the affect the elimination of the position of Director of Planning & Economic Development would have on existing or future economic development projects, or the partnership involving the City of Marshfield, Marshfield Area Chamber of Commerce and Industry (MACCI), Main Street Marshfield or the Community Development Authority.
5. Action was taken without discussion or a proposed plan for distribution of duties currently performed by the Director of Planning & Economic Development throughout other city departments or specific positions which might be affected by such a change.
6. Action was taken without discussion or a proposal for compensation to be given to any individual(s) who might be directed to assume the various duties now performed by the Director of Planning & Economic Development.
7. Action was taken without discussion or a recommendation to address the relationship of the City of Marshfield with the State of Wisconsin-Department of Commerce and other state and federal agencies in terms of economic development funding, specific duties currently performed by the Director of Planning & Economic Development.
8. Action was taken without consideration of a plan set forth by previous members of the City Council to promote more aggressive economic development efforts in the interest of future economic stability and growth, to the extent that past recommendations have been made to expand the Department of Planning & Economic Development.
9. Action was taken without discussion or consideration of the financial impact of eliminating the position of Director of Planning & Economic Development on the overall Administrator’s Recommended 2008 Budget.

10. Action to transfer the position of GIS Technician to the Department of Public Works, specifically the Engineering Department, and the transfer of the position of Zoning Administrator to the Department of Public Works, specifically Building Services, was taken without discussion or consideration of the financial impact on the budget of the Department of Public Works, the Engineering Department or Building Services Department and/or the overall Administrator's Recommended 2008 Budget.
11. Action was taken without discussion or consideration of the affect of any such actions previously mentioned on the services provided to the citizens of the City of Marshfield through the Department of Public Works or Department of Planning & Economic Development.
12. Action was taken with total disregard to allowing for public involvement in the discussion of such action, or allowing citizens an opportunity to contact their elected representatives (Mayor and Aldermen) prior to a vote on such a recommendation.
13. The action which took place was contrary to what is considered "good local government" and could be considered a basis for public mistrust in local elected representatives.

CC07-377 Motion by Wagner, second by Kraus to over-ride the Mayor's veto of Common Council motion CC07-351.

Aldersperson Wagner said that this veto message is very similar to the first veto message that the Mayor put out. He feels that his objections are without merit. Especially in the sense that there is an implication in the veto message that there was some requirement somewhere that the Council discuss with the individual members of the staff or the individual members of the departments affected the actions that the Council was taking. The Council has broad discretion under State Statutes. The Council, under State Statutes, is the ultimate authority on the finance control of the budget. The other point is that there seems to be another spin put out there that this was not well thought out. They have sat in meeting after meeting listening to protective services people telling them that they are short staffed, that they need staff or that we are not meeting requirements. The Council was even challenged by the Mayor to act upon it. When the Council does act upon it, it gets vetoed. There is something terribly wrong with that situation. He did a lot a research as to what the options were. It is the job of city staff once the Council sets the policy to figure out the details an how to make it work.

Aldersperson Kraus commented that there is a process in place that they tried to change. They wanted to be allowed to have conversation and make suggested changes or add comments as they went through each department. This would have facilitated a little bit more open communication back and forth. They had rules to play by and work under and they followed that. It would have been a much more informative session had they been allowed to make their changes as they went along instead of waiting for the third hearing. He hopes that next year that they make these changes now so that they don't run into this again.

Aldersperson Feirer stated that if you say you did some homework and you have an informed decision and you don't talk to the appropriate department heads, where are you getting the information from? You have to know the impact on the budget and on the City of Marshfield. You can't form an opinion unless you talk to the department head. You need to list the pros and cons and what is going to happen. If there's forethought and a lot put into this, then there has to be some facts to substantiate the impact to the community.

Aldersperson Wagner said that this was a budgetary decision. His decision was made based on budgetary concerns and not on personnel and certainly not on personalities. He looked at alternatives from where we could purchase additional planning services or consultant services for planning because he wanted to solve the manpower problems at the fire department. Because of Council rule #9, if he tried to solve the manpower problem in the budget session at the one and only meeting where he would be allowed to offer those changes, than he had to cut something else out of the budget. He can not believe what they are talking about here is whether or not they have to cut some positions in order to get others. It is just not positions. We are talking about the matter of public safety, the protection of our citizens and he can not believe that they have to make this choice to keep our citizens safe.

Aldersperson Siegler made two points. When they voted last week it was very difficult for her to make that vote based on the fact that this came up to her just 20 minutes before the motion was made. To make an informed decision upon something where you don't have the complete set of facts is difficult. Regardless of how this veto over-ride vote goes, she would like to see the need for additional firefighter staff addressed by the Fire Commission. When you talk about economic development, she recommended the creation of a working committee consisting of business leaders as well as representatives from the various economic development partnerships within the community. Specifically to review the roles of MACCI, Main Street, City Planning, MEDA, Community Development Authority and others. She feels that they could benefit from soliciting the expertise of the business leaders in the community and they could provide them with steps or actions that could be implemented to enhance economic development within the community. When we looked at our Strategic Planning this summer, economic development was on everybody's fore mind. Yet our actions last week took away from that. How do we balance fire protection and economic development? She feels that they have to go hand in hand. We can't sacrifice economic development because of fire protection. They are both extremely important.

Aldersperson Kraus stated that the fire department needs and staffing was brought to their attention on the 28th of September by the Fire Chief at a Town Hall meeting and reiterated again two weeks later at a round table discussion. When the Fire Chief was asked if they are short manned with the apparatus that they have, his response was yes. There are a lot of logistics and important factors that go into fire response but they don't meet that right now. The city could have a lawsuit if something happened because the fire department is short staffed. He asked the Administrator to ask our insurance company that if we don't meet NFP 1710 are they going to cover the City if something should happen. You have to look at what the options are if you are going to get rid of a service you have to look at who can pick that up with the least amount of burden and still do a credible job. The Chamber for years handled the first line of economic development.

Mayor Meyers responded that there is no rule that says that the Council needs to contact any of the department heads before any one of the alderspersons want to make any changes to the City budget. The email that he sent out asked them to contact the Administrator, any other responsible department heads or himself with any questions that they may have regarding any portion of the budget, especially if they required particular numbers or clarification on any aspect of the budget. It was an eye opener for some alderspersons tonight to have some reasoning behind some of the action that was taken at this meeting but none of that information was shared

at the last council meeting. This leads him to believe that the decisions were made without all the information possible to make a decision like this. The second point that he would like to make is recommendations for additional firefighters for the Marshfield Fire Department come from the Police & Fire Commission. They don't come from an epiphany on the part of an alderperson who got information from someone on the street that said that we need additional firefighters. Granted the information came from the Fire Chief. The reason we didn't do anything about this before is because the City Council in recent years had passed parameters with zero increase budgets which the City Administrator followed to the point where he directed city departments that there would be no increase in manpower in any of the departments.

Aldersperson Hendler would like the city to form a Task Force that is made up of citizens, alderspersons and staff to analyze the city's personnel because he feels that we are top heavy. If administration is not able to do this than we need to have an independent group that does do this and review the entire city's personnel situation.

Administrator Brehm said that he recognizes roles. The Common Council is the policy decision makers and staff is there to support, implement and recommend policy. The number one thing that you have to have is communication. From his perspective there was no communication from the aspect of some of the decisions. He recognizes that they are their decisions but he could find some alternatives for their consideration but he had not been contacted at all in regards to this. At the last meeting there was a comment about E. 29th Street. E. 29th Street is a CIP project. It was scheduled for 2009 but the Industrial Park Authority took the action this spring to move that up and they also took action to phase in Yellowstone. It was a planned expenditure. There was a comment at the last meeting on staffing ratios. He indicated that for Marshfield for the general fund that our personnel costs were 63.6%. He didn't have the number at that point in the time for the overall budget but the total budget when you look at personnel costs is almost 41%. You need to compare cities to cities. Counties are different. He contacted three comparable cities; Wausau, Wisconsin Rapids and Stevens Point. It is difficult sometimes to compare things because they do things differently than we do.

<u>PERSONNEL COSTS TO:</u>	<u>GENERAL FUND</u>	<u>OVERALL BUDGET</u>
Wausau	72 ½ %	39.2%
Wisconsin Rapids	77%	54%
Stevens Point	77.6%	58%

There was a comment made regarding property values. He looked at the last five years of the city's history of property values. The average values, without the Clinic, for those last five years increased 8 ¼%. Our growth has been modest but it has been steady.

Administrator Brehm explained that he has been doing the budget for the City since 1973. He doesn't resent comments; he welcomes them because you can see things from a different perspective. Government is in business because the private sector doesn't want to do that because there is no money in government. The Mayor pointed out that we have difficulty adding staff because of the parameter of the Council. That is fine, it is your discretion. The Council wants a no tax rate increase. He has given the Council that parameter and he has met that parameter in his recommended budget. This is the 3rd year in a row of that. He did not recommend a budget that is way out of line. It met their parameters and almost all of the CIP expenditures that were approved in May. In regards to the comment that we are top heavy. The

Common Council hired an independent consultant in 2003 to evaluate whether we were top heavy or if we had too much staff. The conclusions of that study indicated that the City was not top heavy and that they did a very good job in managing their growth. If you take a look at the staffing summaries in the budgets, you would see that our increases have been very modest. In regards to the comments on firefighters as far as the staffing, we are not required to follow any of the NFPA standards. Staffing requests come from the individual departments because they are the ones that know their departments in and out. He can't explain why the previous Fire Chief did not request additional firefighters.

There was a News-Herald article in the paper last week where the headline said that Marshfield mirrors Rapids in its discussion of the Engineering Department. What was lacking in that article which should have been in that article was that in 2000, Marshfield had seven employees in their Engineering Division and Wisconsin Rapids had sixteen employees. In 2007, Marshfield had seven employees in their Engineering Division and Wisconsin Rapids had eight.

In regards to the positions of Public Works Director, City Engineer and Director of Planning & Economic Development, he was the one that recommended that the Planning Department be organized in 2003. He wasn't the first one but that recommendation also was supported by the Director of Public Works. If you take a look at these positions, you are asking that they be merged and you cut one position and that you add more responsibilities, and you can do that. But the Director of Public Works is in charge of four divisions; Wastewater, Street, Engineering and Building Services. Over 55% of the Director of Public Works position requires overall coordination of these departments. 60% of the City Engineer's position deals with specific things such as special assessments, overall coordination of particular projects in development within the city and other things. To have the Council move to merge those positions, to eliminate the Director's position, there is just too much work if you want Marshfield to continue to be progressive and move forward and to have proper planning.

Comments were made in regards to now that the Comprehensive Plan is over with, that this position is not needed anymore. To the contrary, this position is needed and that department continues to be needed. We are doing things that we have never done before in that department because we now have staff to be able to do that. We are being proactive.

Vote on motion **CC07-377**; Feirer, Siegler, Krueger and Buttke voted Naye; Feddick, Kraus, Wagner, Hansen, Spiros and Hendler voted Aye.

Motion failed

The City Clerk read the third motion that the Mayor vetoed.

CC07-352 Motion by Kraus, second by Wagner to delete all of East 29th Street reconstruction, as well as phase one of the Yellowstone Industrial Park. This will reduce our borrowing of \$1,550,802. This will provide an additional \$449,198 of borrowing to split 50/50 between the new fire station and road maintenance. Feirer, Hansen, Krueger and Buttke voted Naye, rest Aye. Motion carried

Mayor Meyers explained his justification for the veto.

1. Action on this motion took place without prior knowledge of, or consultation with the Mayor, City Administrator, Finance Director, Director of Public Works, Director of Planning & Economic Development, despite solicitation of same from the Mayor in his memo to the City Council dated October 29, 2007.
2. Action took place with total disregard to previous actions by the City of Marshfield Industrial Park Authority, a city committee charged with the development and promotion of the economic development and vitality of the city, specifically business and industrial development.
3. Action was taken without consideration by or a recommendation of said Industrial Park Authority.
4. Action took place with total disregard to the foresight expressed through the actions of previous members of the City Council in the City of Marshfield who continued to recognize a need to promote growth of the city through the availability of future development land.
5. Action took place with total disregard for the true lack of land within the City of Marshfield which might be offered by the City of Marshfield to potential developers for future industrial development.
6. Action was taken with total disregard for a plan set in place in 1996 with the procurement of land and options for future possession of land by the City of Marshfield to be used exclusively for industrial development.
7. Action took place with no consideration of the affects of such action on the plan set forth in Tax Incremental Finance (T.I.F.) District Number Seven (7), established in 2001 to finance improvements to Yellowstone Industrial Park.
8. Action took place with total disregard and without discussion of the recommendations of the Capital Improvement Plan (CIP) Executive Committee in regards to a phased development of Yellowstone Industrial Park and planned borrowing for this and similar projects in the 5-Year CIP.
9. Action was taken with total disregard to allowing for public involvement in the discussion of such action, or allowing citizens an opportunity to contact their elected representatives (Mayor and Aldermen) prior to a vote on such a recommendation.
10. The action which took place was contrary to what is considered “good local government” and could be considered a basis for public mistrust in local elected representatives.

CC07-378 Motion by Kraus, second by Feddick to over-ride the Mayor’s veto of Common Council motion CC07-352.

Aldersperson Kraus said that there was a lot of forethought put into this and to say that there was total disregard of a plan is not correct. He met with the City Administrator in August, September and October and discussed a lot of different things. Not only did the Administrator, but also the Mayor because he also met with him, knew of his intentions. The public can still give their comments at the public hearing. The motion was not to cut the industrial park out but to pull the industrial park plan in its entirety out of a funded year and put it into a non-year so that when the existing M-3 quality industrial park that is sitting out at Norwood becomes 80% filled, we would then put this into a funding year so that we continue having heavy industrial park available.

Vote on motion **CC07-378**; Feirer, Siegler, Krueger and Buttke voted Naye; Feddick, Kraus, Wagner, Hansen, Spiros and Hendler voted Aye.

Motion failed

Recessed at 7:58 p.m.
Reconvened at 8:12 p.m.

Chairperson Buttke of the Finance, Budget and Personnel Committee assumed the chair.

Marty Anderson, Sustainable Marshfield Committee Chair, requested that the Council reconsider funding for staff training on sustainable practices. If the Council is uncomfortable with the requested \$10,000, consider funding of \$7,500 or \$5,000. No matter the funding level, the important thing to keep in mind is that the dollars you allocate to training will be an investment into the future governmental savings and economic growth for the City of Marshfield.

A presentation was given by Scott Larson, MACCI Executive Director, regarding some of the efforts that they are doing in economic development and summarized some of the new businesses as well as those that have expanded or moved out of the city. He also presented some marketing and demographic information.

Administrator Brehm had one recommended change for their consideration. This is in regards to the utilities on the Vobora property. At the last meeting, they approved the transfer of \$500 to the Debt Service account. The other side of the entry should have reflected a \$500 revenue increase.

CC07-379 Motion by Wagner, second by Siegler to add \$500 to revenue account 301.4900008.080430.49240. All Ayes

Motion carried

Administrator Brehm said the budget process is a very important policy statement for the coming year. One of the items included for their consideration and has been discussed for several years now is the proposal for a second fire station. The budget does include an appropriation of \$605,000 in it. At the end of this process he is looking for some direction from the Common Council as to how they would want to proceed with that.

Fire Chief Schmidt thanked the Council for recognizing the needs of the Marshfield Fire & Rescue Department. What he will be proposing next year will be consistent with the desires and the direction in the end results as what several alderpersons decided to do based on the last meeting and the opinions expressed as this meeting. He feels that they are on the same page as far as the destination on where they want to be and where they want to go. However the route in which they are taking is just somewhat different. The plan was and is to look at the second fire station or the need for a fire station. Then to look at and work with city staff, specifically Administrator Brehm and Keith Strey the Finance Director, to determine the best way to finance the additional positions that they have been asking for in their department for several years. They are looking at the second fire station. There is an excess of \$600,000 in the budget for building a fire station. What is not clear to him is what the collective intent is of the Council as far as a second fire station, a new central station or building in the current location. That is something that he hopes to get an answer from the Council on a collective basis so that he as well as staff can move forward in that regard and they can do this in the most cost effective manner that they possibly can.

Alderperson Buttke said that this should be brought up at another time in the near future where they can get the facts about this.

Administrator Brehm updated the Council on where they are at based upon the actions of last Monday as well as the sustaining of the vetoes at this meeting. The tax levy is \$11,162,885 and the tax rate is \$9.85. You can raise the levy about \$56,300 and that would bring you up to the same tax rate as last year.

Aldersperson Feirer said that he has two items that he would like to see back in the budget. One was the Sustainable Marshfield and the other one was the \$20,000 for the bear pen. He has had four calls on this item from potential people that would go out and be the ones to do fundraising for this \$500,000+ that we are going to need to build this pen. They wanted to know how they could go out and solicit private funding for a project in the park when they don't know what it is going to be. He would like to see this put in but he didn't know where he would subtract anything from the budget.

Aldersperson Siegler asked that with the changes that were made last week there was about \$56,000 saved so potentially couldn't those moneys be used without changing the tax levy.

Administrator Brehm responded that his understanding of parameter #9 is that changes to the budget should not impact the tax rate or tax levy. The Council's goal was to have the same tax rate as last year so the answer is yes, you can use that \$56,300 if your goal was to keep the same tax rate. Once you have reached that goal and that levy, than some other alternative sources or cuts or revenues would need to be found to compensate for that.

Aldersperson Feirer stated that the \$20,000 for the bear pen came out of room tax which is not considered part of tax levy.

CC07-380 Motion by Feirer, second by Hansen to add \$20,000 for the new bear exhibit design, project PR-L-2805, back into the budget. Funding for this project will come from room tax. Feddick, Kraus, Krueger, Spiros and Hendler voted Naye, Feirer, Siegler, Wagner, Hansen and Buttke voted Aye. Mayor Meyers broke the tie by voting Aye.

Motion carried

CC07-000 Motion by Kraus to pull out funding for the E. 29th Street Reconstruction as well as the \$248,080 for Industrial Park Construction.

The difference in this motion from last time is that the \$428,000 from last year that we borrowed that is just sitting there for Yellowstone Industrial Park should be allocated for the purpose of construction of a new fire station.

Administrator Brehm said that they would have to refer back to the original borrowing resolution of the \$428,000. If that resolution says that it is for industrial park purposes and not capital projects, then you can't use those borrowed funds for another purpose. You have to use them for which they were originally borrowed.

Attorney Hutchinson said that it is his opinion that the motion is probably out of order. It is substantially the same as the motion that was made previously. It was vetoed by the Mayor and the Council failed to over-ride that veto.

Administrator Brehm commented that the Common Council has to decide how comfortable they are with the City Attorney's opinion as to how they want to proceed. If you feel comfortable with the opinion then you don't proceed with the motion. If you want to think otherwise then you can proceed with the motion. If you want to proceed and vote then you will have to recess or give the Finance Director some time to get the borrowing resolution from last year to see what it specifically says.

Alderson Buttke as Chairperson said that he would chose not to act on this motion heeding the advice of the City Attorney.

Alderson Kraus said that the Council should be queried and asked for a vote to see if the Chairperson's opinion is in order or if the Council would like to go forward with this.

Attorney Hutchinson said that Alderson Kraus is correct in that he can have a decision of the Chairperson put to a question of the members of the Council.

CC07-381 Motion by Kraus, second by Wagner to act on the motion as made by Alderson Kraus, notwithstanding the comments provided by the City Attorney. Feirer, Siegler, Hansen, Krueger and Buttke vote Naye, Feddick, Kraus, Wagner, Spiros and Hendler vote Aye. Mayor Meyers chose not to break the tie.

Motion failed

CC07-382 Motion by Kraus, second by Siegler to pull E. 29th Street Reconstruction in the amount of \$806,920 out of next year's funding cycle.

Attorney Hutchinson stated that this is a very fine line but because it is substantially different than the prior motion the Council can consider that motion.

Director of Public Works Knoeck handed out a summary of the sources and uses of funds for the E. 29th Street project and the Yellowstone Industrial Park project. There are two projects related to the Yellowstone Industrial Park. One is the reconstruction of E. 29th Street and that has an estimated price of \$806,920. The other project is Phase 1 of the Industrial Park which is a new street developed in the Industrial Park. What he understands the motion to be is to remove the \$806,920 that would have been borrowed in 2008 for reconstruction of the E. 29th Street project.

Vote on motion **CC07-382**; Feirer, Krueger, Spiros and Buttke voted Naye, Feddick, Siegler, Kraus, Wagner, Hansen and Hendler voted Aye.

Motion carried

CC07-383 Motion by Kraus, second by Wagner to put \$5,000 back into the budget for a training fund to help advance the training of the Sustainable Marshfield Committee. Feddick, Spiros and Buttke voted Naye, rest Aye.

Motion carried

Alderson Wagner stated that at last week's meeting Administrator Brehm had suggested that it would be possible to delay the capital expenditure for the planimetrics until 2009. That showed a price of \$59,840. Is the flyover going to be done this year and should they postpone the planimetrics off until 2009?

Administrator Brehm responded that his recommendation is to include \$142,000 in the budget for both the flyover and the planimetrics. In talking to staff, this can be split into two parts where the flyover would come first and the planimetrics in the second year. His recommendation would be that it be done all at once.

Director of Planning and Economic Development Miller added that it could be split up into two phases. It does work better if it is all done in one year but it could be done in two phases.

Aldersperson Wagner said that the County is getting ready to do flyovers too. Granted, they need the 1" equals 200' resolution and we require a much higher resolution but there is a possibility that there is another buy up for there. As part of what is budgeted this year, he asked Ms. Miller to explore with the County the possibility of some cost saving measures in combining that consortium for the flyover.

Ms. Miller said that they could but the issue is the DTM and ground controls are things that have to be set for the level that they need which is the additional cost. From her understanding in meeting with the consultants is that it would need to be a completely separate flight because of the distance level but she will look into his suggestion.

Administrator Brehm added that city policy requires that projects of this magnitude be bid out. They will provide that RFP to this particular firm and if they can meet those specifications then they can submit that. They can also explore and ask them if they will do it and at what price but they are obligated under city policy to send out a formal Request For Proposal.

Aldersperson Hendler said that he received 49 telephone calls from constituents all over the City of Marshfield as well as written letters and 7 emails. They all spoke positively of his last week's motion. He would like to support the citizens thoughts so he made the following motion.

CC07-384 Motion by Hendler, second by Feddick to reduce one (1) Engineer in the Public Works Department.

Aldersperson Hendler feels that as a representative of his constituents that if he does not push this that nothing will happen as far as any examination of staffing levels. There are other cities that he looked at.

<u>Municipality</u>	<u># of Engineers</u>	<u>Per Capita</u>
Eau Claire	5	12,000
La Crosse	5	11,500
Marshfield	5	3,800

If he could be somehow assured of the fact that staff takes a serious look at this and does something with it, he would not bother going through this.

Administrator Brehm commented that from his perspective they came off of that study in 2003. He feels comfortable with that study as far as the level of staffing in that particular department. That is why he has not come forth to the Common Council for consideration to delete that one position. He can certainly look at it again and talk to staff.

Attorney Hutchinson said that it is his opinion that this is not substantially the same motion as made previously because the prior motion included a motion to merge the positions of Director of Public Works and the City Engineer. That is not part of this motion. This is limited to reducing Engineering staff by one engineer.

Knoeck said that he is not sure that the ratio of engineers to population is the true comparison. There are other factors that would go into the size of an engineering staff; the department structure; what the responsibilities of those positions are; what support staff might be available for those positions; and what infrastructure needs are required in that particular community. He pointed out some of the values of having your own in-house engineering staff as well as the history.

History

- Fourth engineering position created in 1996 upon retirement of an Engineering Technician – no net change in number of positions.

Expanding Responsibilities

- Storm Water Permit
- Water Quality Improvements
- Mill-in-Place Program – deteriorating residential streets
- ADA requirements – sidewalk, curb ramps, domes, etc
- Desire for increased public outreach, meetings, etc.

Added Value of in-house staff

- The ability to do work for other departments
- Availability for public interaction
- Pride of ownership – personal stake in the projects knowing that they drive these streets everyday and have to answer to their friends and neighbors if something isn't right.
- Quality finished product
- Proven track record
- Available for unanticipated projects

Engineering needs are increasing and if we are saving a percentage or two by doing that in-house versus outside consultant services, 2% of a \$3 million project is \$60,000. So there are some real numbers that can be recognized in savings. You have an in-house engineering staff that is professional and committed to their job and you are getting a benefit out of that, not only in dollars and cents but also in the intangibles as well.

Aldersperson Krueger said that what they are going to find is by the time Mr. Knoeck goes back through the budget and finds the projects that are in the budget year 2008 and then consider outside services, you are going to have a budget probably higher in Public Works than what you have presently with this engineer position that you want to eliminate.

Aldersperson Wagner stated that at the beginning of the budget hearings, he asked Mr. Knoeck to ascertain how much the total salary burden was for maintaining the Engineering department. He got back to him verbally but never got back to him with the actual figure.

Mr. Knoeck answered that it was right around \$525,000. He doesn't have an exact number because a lot of the engineering costs are spread among the capital projects. The new financial software will have that capability but we are in transition right now so to pull all those costs from the various projects they had to do it manually.

Aldersperson Hendler said that he would be willing to withdraw his motion if there is a genuine attempt at doing an impact analysis within the next 60-90 days.

Aldersperson Feddick said that she would not withdraw her second because she has brought up this issue for the last three years. She believes that the time for action is now. If in fact the Administration was so eager to give them some numbers and information to actually change their minds or make a change in the department, they would have done so already.

Vote on motion **CC07-384**; Siegler Abstained, Feirer, Krueger and Buttke voted Naye, rest Aye.
Motion carried

Recessed at 9:44 p.m.
Reconvened at 9:58 p.m.

Administrator Brehm said that earlier in the evening the Common Council approved the elimination of the E. 29th Street project which was \$806,920. A portion of that included in-house engineering in the amount of \$94,839. It is the Common Council's intent to eliminate one engineering position. In order to follow through on that, that additional \$94,839 needs to be allocated to another construction project. That would reduce that department by one position. It is his recommendation that the \$94,839 be transferred to the Engineering Administration account.

CC07-385 Motion by Kraus, second by Siegler to transfer \$94,839 to the Engineering Administration account. All Ayes
Motion carried

Finance Director Strey updated the Common Council on the new budget numbers after the changes were made. The budget levy is \$11,178,850 and the tax rate is \$9.87.

CC07-386 Motion by Wagner, second by Kraus to set the date of December 3, 2007 at 6:30 p.m. for the public hearing on the proposed 2008 City budget and authorize the Finance Director to publish the notice of hearing and the proposed 2008 budget, incorporating any previous budget actions of the Common Council. Krueger voted Naye, rest Aye.
Motion carried

CC07-387 Motion by Kraus, second by Spiros to approve Resolution No. 2007-43, Resolution Authorizing the Borrowing of \$1,817,090; and Providing for the Issuance and Sale of General Obligation Promissory Notes, Series 2007B Therefor. All Ayes
Motion carried

The meeting was turned back over to Mayor Meyers.

COMMENTS FROM THE MAYOR

Word to the Wise: When your cart reaches the foot of the mountain, a path will appear. Author: Chinese Proverb

Mayor Meyers made a few comments regarding the 2008 Budget.

If it is felt that we still need to pare away at what some might consider an over abundance of city employees, let's ask the City Administrator and others to bring back information which will make a decision like that easier. If it is felt by some that we need to add manpower to one department or another, let's ask the City Administrator and others to present us with information to justify a new position. We ask the same if there is an open position to be filled. The Council itself instituted that procedure within recent years, and each opening since was judged by the information presented to the Finance, Budget & Personnel Committee and the City Council. Why should it be any different for adding or deleting, or even combining a position?

Another issue some took exception to was the three meeting process used for almost twenty years to review the overall budget prior to sending to a public hearing and eventually being approved. This is not to say that something we have always done cannot be changed. The budget document itself has been changed several times over the years, from one almost four inches thick to one maybe two inches thick at the direction of previous city councils who found the detailed document much too cumbersome. The intent of a proven process for the review is plainly to walk through each department budget, ask questions of those responsible for each budget, and formulate the basis for action on the third and final night for any possible changes to the Administrator's proposed budget. If someone on the council wants to change it, it's as easy as having the council vote to change it. The City Administrator and city departments follow the direction of the City Council; it is not the other way around. City staff is here to work for you. That is the basis for their existence, to serve the city council and the citizens of our community.

Another point of contention through this budget process was the budget parameters designed to give the City Administrator and city staff direction through the budget preparation. For the convenience of the City Council, the parameters are presented by the City Administrator each year, and are open to any changes the City Council might wish to make. The one tossed around most often is whether there should be a budget presented for consideration with a tax rate increase if needed, or none at all. Once the parameters are approved, they best be followed by city staff in the actual preparation of the budget. One parameter that the council members themselves are conscious of is the self-imposed rule that requires the reduction of something else already in the budget of equal value when making a suggestion to add something to the budget. This can prove difficult to do, for instance, when talking about adding two positions, and charged with finding something to cut.

Since its inception, the Capital Improvement Plan (CIP) has proven to be a helpful tool in the budget preparation for many reasons. The CIP helps to keep our borrowing from year to year on a level field, avoiding peaks and valleys from one year to the next. It allows for a process to prioritize recommended projects in the order of need rather than want. And it's flexible, to the point that a project itself can be changed for another, with little or no affect on the borrowing schedule. The CIP has proven to be as important a process as the actual annual budget itself.

The Administrator's Budget is a "recommended budget". It's sad if anyone thinks it cannot be changed. The several nights each year we spend scrutinizing the budget serves more than one purpose. It allows for a process to assure that the city lives within its means in providing the services and facilities the taxpayers expect. It allows the council to better understand the operations of the city. It allows for the citizens of Marshfield to better understand how their tax dollars are spent each year for "city" purposes. And it allows for an opportunity to consider ways we might consider doing things differently.

Much of what was discussed in the last several weeks will be the basis for action by the City Council in coming months. Changes to the manpower structure and to facilities and services might very well be the result. But he encouraged the council and the city staff to work together to bring about any possible changes.

Marshfield is a progressive and productive and prospering city. A city with a population of over 19,200 residents; which has become a regional hub of employment for as many as 11,000 people who come to work here each working day in a diverse assortment of employment opportunities from medical to manufacturing, from trade services to professional services; which attracts 3,500 to 5,000 people a day to the medical facilities; which has much to offer residents and visitors alike in terms of recreation, and leisure activities, and widespread retail trade.

Many people in this room, from elected officials to employees of the city, from business owners to the growing number of volunteers, are true examples of that good old Marshfield spirit. They are ever willing to show their appreciation for a good and wholesome lifestyle by doing whatever it takes to make life in Marshfield just a little bit better and to help make it prosper and grow even more.

Motion by Buttke, second by Krueger to adjourn at 10:17 p.m.

Motion carried

Deb M. Hall
City Clerk