

CITY OF GLENDALE COMMON COUNCIL

Meeting Minutes
December 21, 2021

Regular meeting of the Common Council of the City of Glendale held in City Hall, 5909 North Milwaukee River Parkway, Glendale, Wisconsin and via Zoom conference call.

The meeting was called to order by Mayor Bryan Kennedy at 6:00 p.m.

Roll Call: Present: Mayor Bryan Kennedy, Ald. Tomika Vukovic, Jim Daugherty, John Gelhard, Richard Wiese, Steve Schmelzling, and JoAnn Shaw. Absent: None.

Other Officials Present: Rachel Safstrom, City Administrator; John Fuchs, City Attorney; and Mark Ferguson, Police Chief.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE.

The members of the Common Council, City staff, and all those present pledged allegiance to the flag of the United States of America.

OPEN MEETING NOTICE.

Administrator Safstrom advised that in accordance with the Open Meeting Law, the local news media was advised on Thursday, December 16, 2021, of the date of this meeting; that the Agenda was posted on the official bulletin board of City Hall, the Glendale Police Department, and the North Shore Library; that copies of the Agenda were made available to the general public in the Municipal Building and the Police Department; and those persons who requested, were sent copies of the Agenda.

PUBLIC COMMENT.

Glendale resident Josh Wadzinski, 2536 W. Wending Drive, read the attached statement regarding recent electrical outages in Glendale to the Council. Mayor Kennedy responded he is working with the local affairs manager for WE Energies, and it has been determined Public Service Commission (PSC) approval is needed to get capital expenditure to bury electrical lines. WE Energies is aware of the repeated outages and the problems associated with them. Mayor Kennedy will be working with WE Energies to prepare a proposal to the PSC, which will be brought back to the Council for approval later.

Glendale resident Robert Cronwell, 7530 N. Applewood Lane, has three items he wishes to address with the Council. First, he would like to urge the Council to place a non-binding referendum on the Spring ballot to address the question as to whether residents want a library in Glendale or Bayside, with a follow-up question asking if they are willing to pay \$100-200 more annually to maintain a Glendale library. Second, he is disappointed the mayor has decided not to allow the public to speak to agenda items before the Council tonight and would ask that the Council consider suspension of the rules under Ordinance 2.2.22 and suspend section 2.2.18(c)(3). Third, Mr. Cronwell is wondering why there is a meeting tonight when at the last Council meeting the date was changed to December 20, 2021, and he is not understanding how it was changed to December 21, 2021.

Mayor Kennedy stated in response to Mr. Cronwell's first question, he has already worked with the City Administrator and legal counsel on whether an advisory referendum can be created for a 2022 election.

In response to Mr. Cronwell's second question, Mayor Kennedy stated he has been deluged with dozens of emails all saying same thing and either having partial or incorrect information and therefore he did not think it was in the best interest of the City to have what would amount to a public hearing of residents sharing thoughts, opinions, and incorrect information which would then be spread around. Instead, tonight is intended to be information provided by the Chair of the Library Review Committee, versus public testimony. However, if most of the Council votes to allow the public to speak, then they will be allowed to do so.

In response to Mr. Cronwell's third question, Mayor Kennedy stated municipal court had already booked the Council chambers and court notices were already sent due to the holidays. The City Administrator reached out to Council members individually via email the day after the Council meeting to notify of the conflict and change the date to December 21, 2021. The meeting was properly noticed and changed under the authority of the Mayor and City Administrator, done under the premise there was no location to meet, and all Council members were surveyed and available on the newly proposed date. Mr. Cronwell stated he does not believe the Council had the authority to make this change under State Statute 62.11.2 and City Ordinance 2.2.10, and that it was a violation of open meetings law as the change request was a walking quorum. City Administrator Safstrom clarified there was no walking quorum as all Council members were contact individually and responded individually via email.

Motion by Ald. Gelhard, seconded by Ald. Schmelzling, to allow the public to speak to topics on the agenda at tonight's Council meeting. Ayes: Ald. Daugherty, Gelhard, Wiese, and Schmelzling. Noes: Ald. Vukovic and Shaw. Absent: None. Abstain: None. Motion carried.

Ald. Gelhard stated it is standard practice to allow the public to speak if they have contacted the Mayor or Alderman, and this should continue.

Mayor Kennedy stated many of the residents wishing to speak will be sharing information from Ald. Gelhard, who previously shared impartial information as residents were only given half of the information, however it is likely there could be a campaign of misinformation.

Ald. Schmelzling stated all comments should be limited succinctly to two minutes per person, but that opinions should be allowed to be expressed even if the basis is incorrect.

Motion by Ald. Gelhard, seconded by Ald. Schmelzling, to limit public speaking time to one minute per person. Ayes: Ald. Vukovic, Daugherty, Gelhard, Wiese, Schmelzling, and Shaw. Noes: Ald. Vukovic and Shaw. Absent: None. Abstain: None. Motion carried.

CONSENT AGENDA.

I. File No. _____

Adoption of Minutes of Meeting held on December 6, 2021 and Approval of Monthly Reports.

Motion by Ald. Wiese, seconded by Ald. Daugherty, to adopt the minutes of the meeting held on December 6, 2021 and approve Monthly Reports. Ayes: Ald. Vukovic, Daugherty, Gelhard, Wiese, Schmelzling, and Shaw. Noes: None. Absent: None. Abstain: None. Motion carried.

UNFINISHED BUSINESS.

II. File No.

Reconsideration of Resolution Amending the Conditional Approval of Amended and Re-Stated Joint Library Agreement for the North Shore Library.

Mayor Kennedy stated on December 6, 2021, the Council voted on a Resolution to extend the deadline to allow for fundraising opportunities to begin, which did not pass. Alderman Daugherty has requested a reconsideration of the resolution. Approving this resolution would give the Library Board and a newly hired professional fundraising organization, Baker Street Consulting Group, six more months to reach their goal. If the goal is not met or if tonight's vote fails, the Council would have to determine if the Mayor should sign or not sign the North Shore Library Agreement with Bayside, and if not, it would make the determination regarding a referendum.

Present at the meeting were Bayside Village President, Eido Walny, and the founder of Baker Street Consulting and chair of the fundraising efforts, Jim Radford. Mayor Kennedy asked Mr. Walny to update the Council on where things are in terms of fundraising, and the next steps in terms of fundraising.

Mr. Walny stated he had previously met with the Library Board President and the head of the Library Foundation and implored on them the need to do fundraising and set out to begin the work. The results they were able to garner were disappointing, but he owed them a fair chance in the work they said they could do. Considering the lacking results, he spoke with over a dozen fundraising organizations and found Baker Street Consulting to help with the process because failure in the project cannot be an option. A contract with Baker Street Consulting was signed by the Library Board, with the Village of Bayside acting as the fiscal agent per the contract and was approved last Thursday. While he is disappointed the last months were not more fruitful, he is hopeful going forward in the ability to succeed and confident in Mr. Radford's ability as he has led numerous capital campaigns for libraries.

Mayor Kennedy asked for confirmation that at a previous meeting, the Foundation President was present and stated \$1 million was raised for renovation. Mr. Walny stated this was a verbal commitment, but there is no money in hand.

Mr. Jim Radford gave a brief overview of his background and history in consulting and fundraising. His work includes libraries, social service agencies, non-profit organizations, village/township projects, children's hospitals, and numerous other projects. He has also worked on strategic planning and leadership development. His company has recently worked on campaigns for libraries in Janesville, Oregon, and Brandon, Wisconsin. Baker Street Consulting typically does not advertise and works by word-of-mouth. He has other consultants with his firm and would be taking the lead on this project along with four others. Mr. Radford has worked on a 6-month timetable before and believes \$4 million to be feasible. Based on his campaign style, over 90% have either reached or exceeded their goals because people assemble in communities to work on the campaign, develop strategies, and position themselves to achieve their goal. All capital campaigns have peaks and valleys, however if there is focus and accountability, success is possible. Mr. Radford looks at projects as philanthropic endeavors versus fundraising projects and has helped write national standards for capital campaigning. His group reports back at least monthly, or as often as requested.

Mayor Kennedy questioned what happens if the fundraising is falling short in 6 months and will this mean asking the City of Glendale for money. Mr. Walny stated he does not see failure as an option and plans to meet and exceed his goals.

Mayor Kennedy raised the concern across the board regarding the 20,000 square foot space in the Bayside location, and whether this is negotiable. Mr. Walny stated this is only the current proposal, but the building has a footprint for 30,000 square feet and the developers have stated the plans are negotiable. Rinka was engaged as an award-winning firm and there is confidence in the best possible utilization of square footage available. In addition, other spaces that might traditionally fall in a library such as conference rooms and meeting spaces, could be hosted outside of the library in the same development space.

Ald. Schmelzling stated he appreciates the confidence and strong feelings about how the fundraising campaign is doable; however, he is still trying to understand what happens if we aren't there and whether that means we just keep going or if we reevaluate the timeline, whether Bayside will proceed if Glendale doesn't join, and if there is an agreement that Glendale will not be financially responsible if the fundraisers come up short. Mr. Walny stated he is determined this will not fail and the money will be raised. If he goes into this with the what-ifs and looks to benefactors with donors about what happens if Glendale pulls out, he sets himself up for failure, which is a bad position to be in. There have not been conversations on what will happen if Glendale does not participate, and there is a hope those don't have to happen. Mr. Radford stated campaigns are successful if done well, and typically a feasibility is done as a trailer to a campaign. Even during the shutdowns of COVID-19, libraries have risen to the occasion and shown they have a huge impact on communities and the quality of life, proving the ROI comes from philanthropy over budget. Mr. Radford's initial research has identified several high-level donors in Ozaukee and Milwaukee County, as well as foundations in Milwaukee with an interest in libraries.

Ald. Wiese expressed concern over the statement the Library Foundation does not have the \$1 million in the bank and finds this surprising, as the Foundation President was present at the December 6, 2021 meeting and was emphatic the money was available, and whether this means there is a need instead for \$5 million versus the \$4 million. Additionally, if there is talk about needing to increase the square footage of the space, the current numbers being put forth for fundraising are using smaller figures on space and a buildout would require an extra effort that has not been accounted for. Lastly, Ald. Wiese would like to know how many contacts Baker Street Consulting thinks they will need to make to achieve their desired number of donors. Mr. Walny stated the reason a professional group was brought in was due to the lack of funds raised by Paul Pederson, and while he cannot speak for Mr. Pederson, he does not believe there is money in hand but that is why they are looking forward with Baker Street Consulting instead of at the mistakes that were made. The number to be raised is \$4 million in six months, and that does not mean that at the end of that timeframe all fundraising efforts will cease and a library will be built. There is definitely a possibility to negotiate with the City, other constituents, and Baker Street Consulting if more fundraising work is needed in order to work towards a buildout. Mr. Radford stated they have been involved in some very large campaigns, including Central Library in St. Louis, which had a goal of \$17 million with \$20 million raised. Campaigns understand donors have visions, and the campaign committee/action team will help raise money in a bolder vision than is often presented to them. In terms of contacts, people are inspired to certain levels, and the general rule is 90/10 – 90% of the funds coming from 10% of the donors, with an exact number of donors to be determined. Mr. Walny added that all communities are blessed with enthusiastic people, and

some who are fortunate enough to be able to contribute, making them confident they will meet and exceed their goal.

Ald. Gelhard questioned how much money is in the bank right now from fundraising efforts, as well as what guarantee is in place there will not be an expectation for residents to contribute to capital costs as he has seen fundraising efforts fail at Richard E. Maslowski Park and Nicolet High School. Mr. Walny stated he is not on the Library Foundation or the Board, and does not have access to those bank statements, so he is operating under the premise of them being at zero. Regarding contributions from residents for capital costs, Mr. Walny does not want to have to see Glendale or Bayside residents pay and does not want to make a statement about the what-ifs, so he cannot answer the question about what-if the fundraising effort fails.

Ald. Daugherty expressed concern as we have seen a first-class architectural firm give a first-class design at the last meeting, and now we are listening to a proposal about fundraising, but there does not seem to be a plan in place if funds are raised but it is not quite enough. The Council was also told there was \$1 million in the bank, and now it seems difficult to understand if this is the case. A conversation needs to take place that the reality could be in six months that the full amount needed to be fundraised has not been obtained, and there is not a plan in place if the numbers just don't meet up. Mr. Walny stated he placed his trust in the Library Foundation in October and was disappointed in the results that were garnered, but rather than wait around they took action to find a successful fundraiser with a good track record. They are excited to have Glendale continue to be a part of what is in place for the North Shore and hope to be proud partners through the end result. Mr. Walny takes personal responsibility for the success of this project and doesn't plan to let anyone down. When he spoke with the Library Foundation and the Library Board, he realizes there is a negative history however he is not weighed down by those failings and has the full intention of pushing forward on a vision and plan to succeed. Mr. Radford added he has heard from many communities the same apprehension of a capital campaign when going from \$0 to \$4 million in the bank, but the potential for efficacy is there. Citizen reputations are on the line when they are members of the fundraising campaign, and Baker Street Consulting reports to these citizens to ensure the plan is staying on track.

Ald. Vukovic questioned with the fundraising aspect if there are people willing to donate, but not commit until they are sure the library is officially going to happen. She also expressed concerns because Glendale currently pays 49.5% of the operating costs, and with this moving outside of Glendale she does not want to see a larger contribution, especially since her district hardly utilizes the library and it is even less likely for her residents to do so with it moving further away. Mr. Walny stated conversations have begun with potential donors and having Glendale on board is helpful. This is a personal commitment and is more than just terms of communities but a personal goal to succeed. As far as library usage, the goal is to develop a building in a redeveloped area which will be more efficient and have more to offer than just the library, drawing more people in to utilize the space. The location is one exit up from Glendale. Mr. Radford added after libraries are built, studies show participation increases, and there is a bus stop which will allow access to the location and plenty of new resources for the community.

Library Review Committee Chair Katie Wood was present to address the Council. Ms. Wood stated the committee last formally met in July; however, she has spoken with members over the past week regarding the Bayside development. The current recommendation has not changed based on the information available and data at hand and is for a Glendale only library. Concerns by the committee members include lack of autonomy, transparency and truthfulness of the

Foundation regarding fundraising, space of the Bayside development which would not be adequate at 20,000 square feet and would need to be 30,000 square feet to be in line with MCFLS recommendations. Additional expenses as a result of the extra space needed, the ability to fundraise \$4-6 million, parking availability, lack of a drive-through based on the most recent renderings, limited interactions with key stakeholders such as MCFLS, and treating the library as a destination. Ms. Wood is also concerned about the timing, as we are already 18 months into a 3-year deadline to have a new library arrangement, and if nothing has been set, we would be responsible for the fee to MCFLS. If the City goes to referendum, the operating costs need to be reviewed as the current North Shore Library is underfunded. MCFLS highlights the Shorewood Library, which is comparable in size needs and community size, but has a higher budget. The committee raised two questions for the Council to consider. First, if there is confidence in a fundraising group, why not hire the group to build a Glendale only library in line with most public survey respondents. Second, have they considered the optics of a library being in a wealthier, less diverse area which seems an unfair expectation of residents to travel to Bayside to utilize services.

Mayor Kennedy asked Ald. Daugherty if he was willing to make a motion to reconsider the resolution, as he brought the item back for consideration. Ald. Daugherty requested more discussion from the Council.

Ald. Daugherty questioned what other choices are available, as it does not seem we know what residents want since only a handful and not the full 13,000 residents have provided feedback. Mayor Kennedy stated in conversation with the City Administrator, the intention was to bring back an advisory referendum to determine if residents were willing to pay more in taxes for services, which would be on the April ballot. If the referendum fails, it will indicate a binding referendum would not be supported. If it passes, it will indicate residents support the possibility of a library and puts the onus on the Foundation to raise funds because if they don't, we would be going to a binding referendum on the fall ballot to proceed with a Glendale only library and ask for a tax increase. The options at this juncture are the Bayside library, a Glendale library, or no library – which would result in a \$906,000 fee to join MCFLS and would necessitate budget cuts. Mayor Kennedy is aware Nicolet has a referendum on the spring ballot, however he does not now know the exact amount, but it could be as much as \$100 million. With all possible referendums, it could increase taxes as much as \$500-600 on a \$250,000 house in Glendale.

Ald. Wiese stated if an extension is approved, he would like to add into the motion to walk a parallel path to consider the options for the other two sites for a Glendale Library, in order to have definitive requests for binding referendums with finite numbers based on options available in the City.

Ald. Vukovic expressed frustration that the Council has adamantly wanted the Library Foundation to fundraise, yet now we aren't giving them confidence and could stifle the process if we follow a parallel path at the same time. Instead, we should see what happens in six months, and if necessary, we can do a referendum in November and still get done what needs to be done. We cannot ask questions of fundraisers and make plans to pull out, as it makes us seem hesitant to any potential donor.

Ald. Gelhard stated a six-month extension could have benefits, which would allow the group to fundraise and simultaneously allow the City to explore the possibility of developing its own library at two possible sites, by getting figures of costs and specific details worked out. He

would like to see an advisory referendum done and if people say they want a Glendale library all efforts should go into that, but if they say they do not, we continue with the Bayside project.

Ald. Wiese responded to Ald. Vukovic's point and stated we cannot worry about other municipalities and need to think about Glendale. The building options available for the library are owned by businessmen and may not be available down the road and should therefore be considered now and narrowed down to at least one option for hard and fast numbers to be presented in a non-binding referendum for an option of a decision. City Attorney Fuchs stated when referendums were initially discussed, it was binding referendums and the statutory format for the ballot and now it has been advisory referendums. However, we cannot adopt the resolution and agree to fundraise, but then have an advisory referendum that might indicate we want to pull out. Mayor Kennedy clarified the referendum would only be done in the instance the fundraising goal is not met. If all goals are met, we will agree to be permanent partners with Bayside. Ald. Vukovic stated her interpretation from Ald. Gelhard and Wiese is they would like to see a referendum even if fundraising goals are met. Attorney Fuchs stated if the resolution is adopted, and in six months all conditions are met, we are contractually bound and should act in good faith as such.

Ald. Shaw stated during her time on the North Shore Library Board and over the past fifteen years, the desire for a new library has existed. There have been numerous discussions to purchase properties and various proposed locations, however anything previously suggested by Glendale was refused. This time Glendale is being difficult in committing to an agreement. Ald. Shaw is concerned we are not talking to our constituents about the debt we would be adding to their taxes indefinitely, or the unfair burden it would place on those residents who are on a fixed income. Both properties suggested have issues with operating costs and building or land quality. At this time, residents have not been advised of the tax burden, only asked if they would like a library. There is a chance a referendum would not even pass during our current environment with schools and the current economy. The costs to operate remain the same and our best option is to join Bayside, showing a joint venture works. With less than 1% of the constituents reaching out, it is not a fair representation of the needs of those who elected their alderpersons or the desire to work within budgets by incurring this burden in the City. As far as library programs, this is the opportunity for the library director to work from the ground up and build something new and innovative in a space that will work.

Motion by Ald. Daugherty, seconded by Ald. Shaw, to Reconsider Adopting the Resolution Amending the Conditional Approval of Amended and Re-Stated Joint Library Agreement for the North Shore Library. Ayes: Ald. Vukovic, Daugherty, Gelhard, Wiese, Schmelzling, and Shaw. Noes: None. Absent: None. Abstain: None. Motion carried.

Ald. Schmelzling stated his stance that fundraising should be given a fair chance. A location is confirmed, and the project plans have begun, so it is fair to see what can happen in the next six-months in the way of fundraising. In terms of a referendum, there are other referendums competing for taxation, so it doesn't seem like the right time for another referendum asking for money from the taxpayers. Ideally, if the fundraising goal is not met then we can return later and revisit the idea of a referendum. While no one wants to think failure is an option, it is a possibility, but it doesn't mean things won't end up okay and still have an acceptable result, which means having all options open in case others fall short is a good idea.

Ald. Wiese questioned if a "Plan B" can be part of the motion to allow for the option of a six-month extension. Mayor Kennedy stated we cannot amend the resolution, and therefore any

motion is approving the language exactly as is. However, there are other agenda items which will address other options.

Motion by Ald. Vukovic, seconded by Ald. Shaw, to Adopt the Resolution Amending the Conditional Approval of Amended and Re-Stated Joint Library Agreement for the North Shore Library. Ayes: Ald. Vukovic, Daugherty, Gelhard, Wiese, Schmelzling, and Shaw. Noes: None. Absent: None. Abstain: None. Motion carried.

III. File No.
Review and Possible Approval of North Shore Library Agreement.

Mayor Kennedy stated this item is no longer in effect, as the deadline on the Resolution has been extended for six months.

NEW BUSINESS.

IV. File No.
Review of potential library locations 6373 N. Jean Nicolet Rd. / 7101 N. Green Bay Ave. including estimated costs.

Glendale resident Lyndsay Smanz, 405 W. Apple Tree Rd., stated she had sent her comments to Ms. Katie Woods who included many of those comments in her earlier talk. She would like to see consideration from an equity standpoint, particularly to those of lower income where lifelong learning and literacy are essential. Also, while it's not easy to think of anything being centrally located or convenient, that was a common theme among survey responses.

Glendale resident Helaine Glass, 6911 N. Crestwood Dr., stated she believes in a Glendale library and takes a firm stance that 20,000 square feet is not enough. She believes in building for the future, not just for now, and while there is a possibility to include 10,000 square feet in outdoor space she does not consider that a practical addition to the library as it is not able to be utilized the full year.

Glendale resident Lin Mc Cracken, 5636 N. Braeburn Ln., stated her feelings echo many things Katie Woods and other members of the Library Review Committee felt, and that she is concerned about the size of the proposed space for a tier one library. She feels the development in Bayside has a footprint which is restricted and won't meet future needs, as well as agrees with the question of equity because families in Glendale could have limited means for transportation. The library committee surveyed the people and at least 600 household responses indicated they were in support of a Glendale library, which Ms. Mc Cracken believes should be the voices to listen to.

Mayor Kennedy stated there have been two properties proposed in recent weeks, which were discussed at the last Council meeting. Resident Josh Wadzinski was contacted regarding the review of two properties within the City for a potential Glendale Library: 6373 N. Jean Nicolet Rd. and 7101 N. Green Bay Ave. Mr. Wadzinski was on the Library Board, CDA, and Plan Commission. Mr. Wadzinski was able to do a review of the actual plans for 6373 N. Jean Nicolet. Plans for 7101 N. Green Bay Ave. are not available. Engineering studies have not been completed if the Council were to consider either location, and a main concern is knowing whether the second

floors can withstand the weight of book stacks or are engineered for this. Mr. Wadzinski's notes were provided to the Council. It would be recommended to work with a broker to obtain more information on each property, and come back to Council with a more detailed recommendation.

Ald. Vukovic questioned if it would be possible to come back with a cost of obtaining the necessary information first, as we don't want to get information without having a price point upfront. Her recommendation is for a proposal for the cost of a feasibility study in order to allocate the funds for those studies.

Ald. Wiese stated since one of the building owners is present at tonight's meeting, it would be possible to have them address some of the concerns on the engineering study, as he believes one has already been conducted.

Michael Mullarkey was present on Zoom to give a brief presentation on the property located at 7101 N. Green Bay Ave. Mr. Mullarkey discussed concepts that could be opportunities for the Council to review.

Motion by Ald. Wiese, seconded by Ald. Gelhard, to direct city staff to obtain costs of a feasibility study on both properties identified to bring back to Council. Ayes: Ald. Vukovic, Daugherty, Gelhard, Wiese, Schmelzling, and Shaw. Noes: None. Absent: None. Abstain: None. Motion carried.

Ald. Gelhard stated the building at 6373 N. Jean Nicolet Rd. has been for sale since May, has approximately 18,500 square feet, 57 parking spaces, and is fairly modern. He originally hoped to see a library within Bayshore, however that did not pan out. The proximity of this building to Nicolet High School contributed to his recommendation of this location as a potential library location.

Ald. Vukovic stated in opinion neither location are a feasible option. Neither location is on a busline. She added that we are asking a group to fundraise \$4 million, but then keeping our options open which gives a perception of a lose-lose situation and making things seem half-hearted. In addition, 719 people returned a survey, but there are 13,000 people in the community. This means that .05% expressed an opinion and there is a possibility of putting forth money and raising taxes in the City for the wants of .05% of residents. Ald. Vukovic added there are shortages in quality of life areas, such as the police department, which makes something like the cost of a library seem less purposeful.

Ald. Daugherty stated he understands Ald. Vukovic's point regarding the percentage of respondents to the library survey. In regards to her statement on the perception of not being all-in to the fundraising efforts or work towards the Bayside option, he sees this as a way to have an alternative in case the first plan does not work out or if Bayside is unable to uphold their end of the arrangement at the end of six months, as we have committed to saying we are in for the six months and will sign off if all requirements are met.

Ald. Wiese stated Richard E. Maslowski Park fundraising was solid. Mayor Kennedy interjected the fundraising for the project was not solid, and those who contributed for ten years only paid for three years. Several of the largest contributors have been lost and it is now tax-payer dollars paying for the Park. Ald. Gelhard added he believed the development process of the Park improved when multiple players were introduced to the development proposal.

V. File No.

Discussion related to social media posts – possible social media policy.

Ald. Daugherty requested this item as it relates to social media posts regarding the library options for the City of Glendale. The social media posts/emails regarding the library that prompted this item were provided to Council. Ald. Daugherty requested additional information as it related to a social media policy, and an example of a policy from the City's insurance company, CVMIC, was provided.

Ald. Daugherty stated the Council meetings are a public forum, where discussion in public is essential for residents to get the same information. With social media, people are getting all sorts of information that is not vetted, partial information, disinformation, and information presented differently which could potentially have negative impacts. Instead, it needs to be determined how we can utilize social media in a predictable manner. In a corporate setting, all information is vetted before being disseminated to the public, and that is not necessarily the case when being posted by individuals on social media. It is essential that to be more conscious as a City on what information is being shared.

Mayor Kennedy stated the City of Glendale has a NextDoor page, Facebook account, and official City website. The information posted to these pages is vetted and announces events, and is only posted by the Mayor or authorized City Staff. Any information shared by the Mayor on his personal page is not done on behalf of the City.

Ald. Daugherty would like to have this item laid over for a future meeting for further discussion.

This item was for discussion and informational purposes only.
COMMISSION, COMMITTEE, BOARD, AND STAFF REPORTS.

There were several updates from Council members, on the activities of the various Commissions, Committees and Boards on which they serve.

CLOSED SESSION.

No closed session was held. Discussion was already held regarding the properties at 6373 N. Jean Nicolet Rd. and 7101 N. Green Bay Ave. earlier in open session. An update was provided by City Attorney Fuchs regarding the 7113 N. Navajo Litigation. The property has a lender, who has an interest in the proceedings. Attorney Fuchs has reached out to the attorney for the lender, and they are supposed to have consolidated the mortgage foreclosure into our action but did not. Judge Ashley has put over the case until February 6, 2022 and ordered them to appear. City Attorney Nathan Bayer is aware of the case. Ald. Gelhard stated his residents have been requesting updates on the raze order since June 2021.

ADJOURNMENT.

There being no further business, motion was made by Ald. Vukovic, seconded by Ald. Daugherty, to adjourn the meeting. Ayes: Ald. Vukovic, Daugherty, Gelhard, Wiese, Schmelzling, and Shaw. Noes: None. Absent: None. Abstain: None. Motion carried and adjournment of the Common Council was ordered at 8:46 p.m., until Monday, January 10, 2021, at 6:00 p.m.

Megan Humitz
City Clerk

Recorded: December 22, 2021.

December 21, 2021

Glendale Electrical Outages

I am here this evening to request action be taken in regards to power outages throughout the City of Glendale. Within the past 4 months there have been two significant storm events that have caused major, extended power outages to Glendale residents and businesses. These outages are stressful situations to families and have great financial impacts on homes/businesses/emergency services.

Throughout the City we have exposed electrical overhead lines that are subject to general safety concerns, chronic maintenance and are susceptible to storm & vehicle damage. Major electrical pathways often follow major traffic routes – an example of such is Green Bay Road.

Along these traffic routes we have one of Glendale's greatest assets, residential subdivisions with large groupings of homes in quite, tree lined neighborhoods. The value of these neighborhoods comes from Glendale's regional location, property maintenance and mature landscaping/trees.

Through smart planning we can reduce disruptions to our electrical grid and minimize outages to smaller areas. In doing so, the utility company will be able to focus their efforts on smaller outages increasing the speed in which they are able to address an emergency power outage.

In lieu of tree trimming, that is often neglected, the optimal solution may be to bury major electrical lines. This is a win/win solution: overhead lines are a safety concern, are susceptible to storm damage, involve chronic maintenance and are an eyesore. Buried lines are the opposite: safe, maintenance friendly and do not involve constant plant trimming.

I would request that the City of Glendale, led by the Mayor, focus an organized and cohesive effort to:

1. Work with We Energies & the Public Service Commission to identify major exposed power line pathways that are chronic problems throughout Glendale.
2. Work with energy partners to find the optimal solutions to protect these power systems.
3. Protect our neighborhood's property values by not doing visual or acoustic harm through the removal of vegetation.
4. Implement a strategy in spring/summer of 2022 to correct overhead line issues.

Thank you,
Josh Wadzinski