

Chilton, Wisconsin
November 17, 2015

The regular meeting of the Chilton Common Council was called to order at 6:30 p.m. with Mayor Gerald Vanne presiding in the council chambers at the Chilton City Hall.

AGENDA POSTING:

On 11/13/15, copies of the agenda were delivered to the Mayor, Aldermen, City Attorney, and City Department Heads, were made available to the media, and posted on the City Hall bulletin board and city web page. The agenda was amended earlier today to include under new business to approve the Calumet Sno-Trails snowmobile trails within city limits.

ROLL CALL: COMMON COUNCIL:

Mayor Gerald Vanne and eight members of the Council were present at roll call:

Council Member Rick Jaeckels	Council Member Richard Bosshardt
Council Member Dan Hilton	Council Member Kevin Johnson
Council member Clayton Thornber	Council Member Kathy Schmitzer
Council Members Ron Gruett	Council member Linda Bangart

Other city officials present were Police Chief Craig Plehn, Director of Public Works Todd Schwarz, Library Director Steve Thiry (arrived at 6:45 PM), City Attorney Derek McDermott and City Clerk Helen Schmidlkofer.

General attendance:

Faye Burg, Delta Publications, Rae Anne Beaudry, Horton Benefit Solutions, City of Chilton employees Judy Thiel, Bob Moehn, Travis Boll, Troy Duchow and Tim Keuler.

Those in attendance recited the Pledge of Allegiance.

Moved by Hilton, seconded by Thornber and carried to approve the minutes of the council meeting held on 11/03/2015.

MOVED TO NEW BUSINESS:

Mayor Vanne introduced Rae Anne Beaudry of Horton Insurance Group to explain agenda items regarding health reimbursement account, non-lapsing insurance fund and the opt-out for health insurance.

Rae Anne said, "I attended a meeting several weeks ago and discussed with the health insurance advisory committee and some members of the council to review potential changes to the health insurance. The feeling at the time was that the City wanted to be looking forward and looking for ways to save money, maximize consumerism and get people to make some behavioral changes. I believe the health insurance advisory committee made a strong recommendation to the council to move forward and not make changes to the health plan."

"We did take a further look at potential ways for the City to save some money. There were three items that we had talked about that night that came up in sort of piece meal kind of methodology to look at ways for the City to look at what has been going on and make some changes. There are a couple of things that are on the city's budget. Things that the city has been doing that I think are a little of holdovers from past collective bargaining agreements, past health plans that were very much in the past pre-2010."

"So the first recommendation is that the City would move forward on January 1, 2016 with eliminating the health reimbursement account that the city provides for medical and dental expenses. This is currently being administered by the Horton Group. People submit their health insurance or dental insurance payment. This came from pre-2010; the city was self-funded. When the City was self-funded, the City was also covered under a very strong collective bargaining agreement, which was not unusual at that time. The city's self-funded plan is very much different from the fully insured plan with WPS that we have had for the last several years. (Clerk Schmidlkofer informed everyone present the

blue paper has the plan Rae Anne is referring to) So essentially, what was happening there were no deductibles for certain things like hospital expenses. It worked a lot like what you see for Medicare. Physicians had a small deductible, most hospital, x-ray; those types of expenses were not subject to any type of payment. Also, the self-funded dental plan had benefits above and beyond the standard dental insurance today. Those billing or reimbursement opportunities have never been really changed with the city's employees. So as you start to look at going from a small deductible of \$250 single with WPS all the way to a high deductible health plan and sort of looking at what that was doing. We looked at if you eliminated this payment for deductible, co-payment and different things that city employees and their family plan participants pay though out the year. The City from May of 2010 to year to date the savings for just health and dental reimbursements if we went to a standard plan that is literally in our document today instead of doing this reimbursement the city would have saved \$43,000.00. The City Clerk has provided you with a copy of those reimbursement dollars and how that breaks down over the years as well as the 5-year total, year to date. It will probably be a bit more as we end 2015, because that plan is in place and has been promised to individuals until 12-31-2015. That was one addition."

"The second is the payment the city provides to employees who elect not to have health plan coverage. There are several reasons why I have not been a huge fan nor do I support or recommend people doing what is cash in lieu of benefits. The big challenge around for cash in lieu is if you are paying people to not take health insurance coverage now today. It used to be that we were paying people to not take family plan coverage because they would go on their spouses plan. Now with the Affordable Care Act being that children all the way to age 26 can be on their parent's health plan. You got a single person that is an employee here; you have to pay them as well to not take your health insurance coverage. Also with the Affordable Care Act are you paying people to not take the health plan thru the city and then they are going to the Federal market place and getting a tax subsidy, which is not allowed and the City could be fined for. Obviously, we had been thru some jump arounds with the Federal government to get you out of the fine for failure to offer affordable health plan. That is reason number two that I advocate we do not continue this."

"But the third and probably most important is the City I believe has had a long-standing philosophy of keeping benefits somewhat separate from compensation. When you start paying people to not take the health insurance plan that becomes taxable income. There is not another place to put these dollars. So as the plan introduces consumerism, basically the kitchen table conversation should be something along the lines of we are saving the 12% that we don't contribute to the premium to be on the plan and we don't have the coordination of benefit issues. So my recommendation is that we remove that. Now that's not quite the same dollar amount in savings but again in the time period that this has been provided we are talking about approximately \$13,000.00. This is just an additional pay out that the city is making, that we are not recommending that you would continue."

"Last but not least, it was mentioned that the city has an account in their budget that is a holdover from the city's self-funded health plan. When you close a self-funded plan there are what is known as run off claims. So whatever amount was budgeted was put aside by the city to pay those health and dental insurance expenditures. You have to obviously close out the account when you change to fully insured and are paying claims for a couple of months. Typically, if you think about your own health plan today, provider has an expense today and you have a run out time to take care of those expenses. It was recommended to the city at the time and in fact, under health insurance law you don't need to hold a reserve when you are fully insured, in fact you are not supposed to. So the reserve that was held or moneys that was left over I believe that to a certain extent the city is consulting with your auditor and certified public accountant as to how best distribute that money. My strong recommendation would be for the 2016 budget to no longer hold a reserve account."

Mayor Vanne asked, "So you had a meeting with the past mayor and a couple of employees and you had told them in 2010 that after all the (It was not in writing, it was all

Minutes of Council Meeting 11-17-2015

verbal communication) that the non-lapsing fund of that insurance account should be disbursed after all expenditures in the self-insured policies were complete, within 90 days or something like that?"

Rae Anne replied, "I don't know if we set that tight of a time frame. We definitely said that the city should track the run out expenditures and that the next plan year would elect to be fully insured, so that those funds would be expensed. Federal law does require that these funds be set aside for health plan participants to be used only for health dollars into the future. So the only way right now that I can see (and there probably are a few others I am glad the city is consulting with other experts as well as their financial auditors) is that the only way that I can see the city being able to do it at present is to disperse whatever funds are left if you take away the health reimbursement account and you take away even some of the opt-out dollars, because those would qualify. Whatever is left and let's assume it is \$30,000 or \$35,000 what the city and the plan participants would need to do is called a premium holiday. So for a period of time you would not collect employee premium contribution and the city would not collect additional budgeted premium dollars. So if the \$30,000 happens to be \$32,000 exactly and that was one month's premium to WPS premium, you could eliminate that fund in one month and still be tax advantage for everyone. That would be my recommendation how to disperse of it. That way it is only used for the plan participants. The city gets it's percentage that is paid back and I don't believe I am going off my own recollection of bargaining agreements I don't believe that that plan would have been able to of been purchased if the city would have remained self-funded. We could not have continued the base major medical."

DPW Schwarz asked, "If I understand you correctly, if you eliminate the opt-out, what happens when the people that opt-out actually get on the insurance plan?"

Rae Anne replied, "Again if I looked at those dollars, if I look at those people that opt-out and are getting \$200 or \$400 a month. When I look at the 12.6% of your premium contribution, it is about the same thing so there is little to no reason to take two health plans. By opting out, I am still paying that premium contribution so this way I am still going to get a double whammy. I am going to lose the amount of money I am getting paid in the opt-out and I am going to pay a premium contribution."

Clerk Schmidlkofer clarified that the employee premium contribution is 12% and opt-out payment is \$250/mo.

Mayor stated, "But on a family plan it is \$2,500.00 and 12% of that is \$200 some."

Schmidlkofer said, "The Insurance committee minutes do indicate that the family health insurance plan is \$1, 619.65/month or \$19,435.80/year and 12% of the annual premium is \$2,332.29."

Rae Anne said, "If people need benefits we don't want to encourage them to go without them either. The whole point of providing great coverage I think is to make sure that people do have that conversation. By the working spouse who has a different level of benefits, we are young and healthy and we want to put money away in an HSA. Great we can still go ahead and do that. It should be something where people look at their own individual set of factor circumstances. Do I need benefits and which level of benefits do I need. I don't think we can pay people to not take health insurance. People are paying good money to have health insurance and that needs to be considered."

Mayor Vanne said, "Another one of the concerns I have is that the co-pays and deductibles were being paid by this fund and I don't ever remember in all the years that I have been here that we have talked about it and said that we would do that. And I think if I remember correctly, when three years ago or two years ago, I had asked Helen do we pay deductibles and co-pays and she said yes. So I just kind of left it. So I was kind of surprised that if you send in those deductibles and co-pays to the Horton Group and I don't know how the process really works. That some of them were approved and reimbursed. We will need to take a look at that. That is."

Rae Anne said, “There is an annual document that tells Horton what to reimburse. So this is not something that we have done without the knowledge of the City.”

Mayor Vanne said, “No, I understand that.”

Schmidlkofer said, “The City had a four year contract (2011 to 2014) of which this was part of that contract. This four-year contract was negotiated in 2010. The January 2015 to December 2017 contract, the HRA and opt-out remained as part of the contract. Years ago the insurance committee was created due to the fact the city had four employees that were not part of the Police or DPW Unions and they did not have a voice on insurance issues. So when Rae Anne is speaking about the difference between the self-funded (Auxiant) and fully insured (WPS) the difference between the two plans is what the HRA paid. Horton Group, the insurance professionals, process the HRA reimbursements. The claims were not processed through city hall; all paperwork is submitted to Horton Group. I just wanted to clarify that.”

Mayor Vanne said, “The 2015 Police budget, which I read to you yesterday. It said that the employees are responsible for the co-pay and the deductible. I am still asking that question, that we paid the copays and the deductibles over the years since 2010.”

Schmidlkofer said, “Actually what you are reading is from the Police Contract and not the budget which was provided at the October 28, 2015 Insurance Committee meeting. In reading the entire document it does specify the City needed to offer health insurance. When the Police Union negotiations were opened up, this is part of what could have been discussed or changed. Once the contract was set then the Insurance Committee would have met and reviewed everything. “

Mayor Vanne announced that it was 6:45 PM and time for the budget public hearing. Vanne then inquired if the council needed anything more from Rae Anne. Hearing from council members and staff that there were more questions it was determined that Rae Anne would remain at the meeting and then continue with insurance questions after the hearing.

MOVED TO NEW BUSINESS:

Mayor Vanne opened the Public Hearing at 6:45 P.M. to solicit comments regarding the proposed 2016 budget. Mayor Vanne inquired if anyone was present to speak in favor or not in favor of the 2016 budget.

Hearing no comments from the public Mayor Vanne closed the public hearing at 6:46 P.M.

Schmidlkofer presented the 2016 City of Chilton budget highlighted first by the City’s mission statement. Schmidlkofer then went through the process that is used to prepare the executive budget involving the department heads and council committees. The proposed budget of \$2,653,228.00 in expenditures is a 2.11% increase from the 2015 expenditures, which was \$2,598,293.00. The proposed levy is \$1,200,220.00 compared to \$1,184,490.00 in 2015; this results in a tax rate of \$5.53, \$0.02 less than 2015. The proposed budget does not include the requirement to receive the 2016 expenditure restraint program (ERP) funds of \$13,753. If the City were to meet the ERP, \$148,840 would have to be removed from the proposed 2016 expenditures. The common council voted one other time to exceed the ERP requirements in 2008. The General Government Committee did consider a proposed budget applying for the expenditure restraint, which would have resulted in the following differences.

	<u>Without Expenditure Restraint</u>	<u>With Expenditure Restraint</u>
Expenditures	\$2,653,228	\$2,515,391
Revenues	\$1,453,008	\$1,453,008
Tax Levy	\$1,200,220	\$1,062,383
Unused Levy	\$0.03	\$137,836.69
Estimated City tax rate	\$5.53	\$4.89

Minutes of Council Meeting 11-17-2015

In addition, net new construction for 2016 is 1.328% compared to .468% in 2015. Last year \$317,225.00 was used from non-lapsing funds to balance the budget compared to \$98,852.00 for the 2016 budget. The proposed budget does include a 2.5% wage increase for employees in the Police Union and 3.0% across the board for all other city employees. Detailed budget reports highlighting revenues and expenditures were available however; there was no need to report line item by line item.

Jaeckels said, "I just want to clarify the reason why we are going without the limit restraint because otherwise to get that \$13,000 we would have had to cut another \$137,000.00."

Schmidlkofer replied, "You are correct."

Moved by Jaeckels, seconded by Hilton to introduce, adopt and waive the second reading of Resolution No. 1705, a resolution to adopt the 2016 municipal budget and direct a levy.

Gruett asked, "Does that mean if we vote for that, this is going to be the budget?"

Mayor Vanne replied, "Yes."

Gruett said, "Okay then, I think we should talk about some of the things. How did you decide upon 3% raises, when the rate of inflation is zero?"

Mayor Vanne said, "Actually that was my suggestion. Because last year's raise was 1.57% for the public works and utility employees. The police received a 3% raise, so this year the police are receiving a 2.5% raise. I thought that the public works and utility employees to make it fair to them it should be 3% and the office employees."

Gruett noted, "How about being fair to the taxpayers? If you are on social security, you did not get a state increase this year. My son is a prison guard. He has been a guard for 3 years and hasn't got a 3% raise in all 3 years. I haven't got a raise where I work. I just don't understand. We complain that we don't have any money and the inflation rate is zero and then we offer a 3% raise. I find it befuddling; I don't know what to do."

Mayor Vanne replied, "Without raising the taxes and because our levy went up we are able to figure that 3% raise in the budget. That was again my suggestion."

Gruett, "Again, I disagree with it, half a percent would be in line."

Schwarz said, "I think you have to take into consideration Act 10, the amount of money that was taken away from the employees, which basically the 3% doesn't even cover that. The fact that it still comes out less than it was given."

Mayor Vanne said, "The police also, they pay 2% this year and next year 4% to their retirement. The DPW and all non-union employees pay the 6.8 and 7% all up front right away. Last year we went according to the CPI of 1.57%. I asked what the CPI was and the entire committee did. We all have that information in our packets and in fairness to them that is what my suggestion was."

Gruett asked, "Where are the amounts?"

Mayor Vanne, "Actually we are approving the budget and the General Government committee has to meet yet to finalize quite a few of them that we have not gone thru yet. That resolution will be approved at the next meeting with the exact amounts. It is always done a week after the budget is approved."

Schmitzer asked, "Just so that I understand. Even though this percentage is in the budget that does not mean that."

Minutes of Council Meeting 11-17-2015

Mayor Vanne replied, "That does not mean that is what is going to happen if the council does not agree with it."

Thornber stated, "I found serving on various boards that once something gets in the budget, well we have it in the budget and therefore we have to spend it."

Mayor Vanne, "Well, we don't have to do that."

Thornber replied, "I know, but you know what I am saying. I am at least partly on board here. The reason for that is that I have taken a poll of several area businesses. Our salaries are more than and competitive with local private enterprise. Our benefits are way fair as far as cost to the employee and benefits to the employee are way above what is standard to private enterprise."

Mayor Vanne inquired if there was any other discussion.

Schwarz stated he would like to speak. We are compared all the time with private enterprise. Now if you want to compare, when you are talking about private enterprise, you are talking about someone that sells trucks, and other items and services. When you are in government, you are a service-oriented business. Besides just selling the truck and servicing the truck you have about 10 or 12 other things that you are responsible to complete. For example if there are problems in the water department, the entire city is affected. The sense of responsibility is not just for one customer it involves the entire city.

Schmitzer, Bangart and Bosshardt stated that they disagree with comments made when comparing private enterprise to city employees. In fact, all three gave detailed information regarding how many hats they wear as an employee or business owner.

General conclusion was that regardless what job you have, you wear many hats.

Mayor Vanne called for a roll call vote.

Gruett – nay	Bangart – yes	Bosshardt – yes	Thornber – yes
Jaeckels – yes	Schmitzer – yes	Hilton – yes	Johnson – yes

Eight votes cast. Seven votes aye. (Gruett-nay) Motion carried.

Mayor Vanne requested Rae Anne to come forward to review health questions.

Schmitzer was informed that two employee's currently opt-out of the City's health insurance coverage. Schmitzer questioned if it has ever been before the full council and discussed.

Mayor Vanne replied, "I do not know that. Actually, I asked Helen for that yesterday, and according to the contract, it says that the insurance has to follow the master plan of 2001."

Schmidlkofer asked to speak, "The entire paragraph in the Union Contract states that a 30-day notice must be given regarding insurance changes. Also everyone that attended the Insurance Committee meeting on October 28, 2015 the Police Union Contract was part of the information provided to everyone. In response to the mayor's question regarding if these issues were brought before the full council, yes. In fact the type of meeting and dates were:

<u>Meeting</u>	<u>Date</u>
Meetings held to review self-funded health insurance to fully insured health insurance coverage:	
Insurance Committee	12/11/2009
Council meeting	1/19/2010
Insurance Committee	3/4/2010
General Government	3/15/2010
Insurance Committee	3/16/2010
Council meeting	3/16/2010

Minutes of Council Meeting 11-17-2015

Council meeting	4/6/2010
General Government	5/11/2010
Council meeting	5/18/2010
Insurance Committee	5/19/2010
Insurance Committee	5/26/2010
Insurance Committee	6/29/2010
Council meeting	12/21/2010
Insurance Committee	9/1/2011
Insurance Committee	12/15/2011

The insurance committee meetings were held during the day to give the employees an opportunity to be involved with the insurance changes.”

Mayor Vanne said, “I asked Schmidlkofer to get this and I have not had time to review to see in writing where the city will pay the deductibles and co-pays. We will work on that.”

Rae Anne stated that she learned of other information this evening and in particular was not aware that insurance coverage is part of the Police Union Contract. A legal opinion should be reviewed before we can move forward. One more important factor is that if the HRA is going away from the employees, they need to have an opportunity to address their flexible spending account. This needs to be done I believe no later than the second week in December. There is a 30-day material modification rule and this would be considered a material modification. You need to give employees proper notice so they can select their flex. A notice was given to the employees about the plan that was given consideration. Had that plan gone into effect, which is a high deductible and health savings account compatible all of this would have been mute because the HRA has to go away.

Mayor Vanne said, “We should table this and we have to do further investigation before we make any of these decisions.” Discussion then took place whether to table or just place on a future council meeting. It was determined that health insurance issues will be reviewed at the next General Government committee meeting and at the December 1, 2015 council meeting.

MOVED TO REPORT OF COMMITTEES:

Chairman Jaeckels presented the minutes of the November 4, 2015 General Government committee meeting.

Moved by Jaeckels, seconded by Johnson to renew the health insurance coverage with WPS- Statewide Network PPO from December 1, 2015 to December 31, 2015 with no plan changes. Roll call vote.

Gruett – yes	Bangart – yes	Bosshardt – yes	Thornber – yes
Jaeckels – yes	Schmitzer – yes	Hilton – yes	Johnson - yes

Eight votes cast. Eight votes aye. Motion carried.

Moved by Jaeckels, seconded by Thornber to renew the health insurance coverage with WPS- Statewide Network PPO from January 1, 2016 to September 30, 2016 with no change to the plan.

Discussion then took place regarding if this included the health reimbursement account and opt-out option. Rae Anne sated, “No the current health plan does not include these two options.”

Mayor Vanne called for a roll call vote.

Gruett – yes	Bangart – yes	Bosshardt – yes	Thornber – yes
Jaeckels – yes	Schmitzer – yes	Hilton – yes	Johnson - yes

Eight votes cast. Eight votes aye. Motion carried.

Jaeckels finished the General Government committee report by stating that the committee did review the proposed wages for city employees and this will be coming up at the next council meeting.

MOVED BACK TO REPORT OF OFFICERS:

MAYOR REPORT:

- We will be talking about all wages at the first council meeting in December. We have a General Government meeting yet to review those that have not been proposed.

CITY CLERK REPORT:

- Future committee meeting dates and times were provided
- City hall holiday hours were provided

APPROVE OPERATOR LICENSES:

Moved by Hilton, seconded by Thornber to approve the two-year license application to serve fermented malt beverages and intoxicating liquors from November 17, 2015 to June 30, 2016 for Anna M. Hickinbotham. Motion carried. Clerk Schmidlkofer noted the applicant has been approved by the Chilton Police Department.

DIRECTOR OF PUBLIC WORKS:

- ↻ Street Department – will continue with leaf pick-up until next week and putting up snow fence. Schmitzer noted that several residents have complained to her that when they push leaves out to the sidewalk they are not picked up. Schwarz did indicate that there is no set schedule and in fact, it may take from one to three days to complete one section of the city. So once every three days residents can expect leaf pick-up.
- ↻ Well #10 - conducting 10-year maintenance, the DNR has given approval for removal of the right angle gear drive from the well 10 pump. In doing so we could see what the problems are. The pipe is worn down as well as the stainless steel spiders that hold the shaft down. Replacing these items are estimated to be \$18,000.00 and it will be 3 to 4 weeks before we get the well back on line.
- ↻ I have a meeting tomorrow with the Department of Transportation and the architect for Premier Financial. Premier is planning to build next year and wanted to coordinate their project with the road construction.

NEW BUSINESS:

Clerk Schmidlkofer informed the council that Hawkins Ash, the City's auditing firm indicated that they anticipate having to perform Government Accounting Standards Board (GASB) 68 and 71 services in addition to those agreed to in the original agreement dated October 22, 2015. In order to complete the audit for the financial statements for the City of Chilton they are requesting a change order for first year implementation of GASB 68, accounting and financial reporting for pensions and GASB 71, pension transition for contributions made subsequent to the measurement date. The cost of the change order is \$1,000.00 and terms and conditions will be the same as in the engagement letter.

Moved by Bangart, seconded by Bosshardt to approve the change order of \$1,000.00 to complete GASB 68 and 71 with Hawkins Ash CPA. Roll call vote.

Gruett – yes	Bangart – yes	Bosshardt – yes	Thornber – yes
Jaeckels – yes	Schmitzer – yes	Hilton – yes	Johnson - yes

Eight votes cast. Eight votes aye. Motion carried.

Clerk Schmidlkofer informed the council Chief Plehn did review the proposed snowmobile trail map with the Pete Herrick from the Calumet Sno-Trails Club. Schmitzer questioned if the map was different from last year. The area around the high school is included this year; last year this area was used by snowmobiles but not approved.

Moved by Schmitzer, seconded by Hilton to approve the 2015-2016 Calumet Sno-Trails snowmobile trails within City Limits. Motion carried.

REPORT OF COMMITTEES:

Mayor Vanne noted the council had the following committee minutes in their packets:

November 2, 2015 Insurance Committee minutes

October 12, 2015 Library Board minutes

Discussed General Government already

November 11, 2015 Plan Commission we need to set a public hearing.

DPW Schwarz said that a public hearing is required to amend the City of Chilton official map.

Moved by Johnson, seconded by Schmitzer to set a public hearing for January 19, 2016 at 6:45 PM regarding amendment to the City of Chilton official map. Motion carried.

DPW Schwarz spoke with Calumet County Administrator Romenesko regarding proposed plans for the new Calumet County Highway Shop to be built on the existing site off Chestnut Street/Hwy 57. The preliminary plans presented showed a basic design, which may require revisions and downsizing of interior rooms. The project was intended to start with razing of the existing highway shop in March 2016; however it has been put on hold in order to secure a supervisor contractor to oversee the project. Two driveways were shown on the plans coming off Chestnut Street. There was concern about the safety of one of the driveways located along the bended stretch of the highway furthest to the north. Members also discussed why the facility needed two detention ponds on the site. DPW Schwarz said the DNR requires ponds because the parcel of land for this site is over one acre. After further review of the plans, DPW Schwarz was asked to discuss with Romenesko two potential safety concerns:

- To consider elimination of the driveway off Chestnut Street/Hwy. 57 because access is available at a controlled intersection at the corner of Chestnut Street and Calumet Street.
- Discuss the safety of the two detention ponds as shown on the plans; Ponds are very close to the pedestrian sidewalk along Chestnut Street and could be of danger to children walking in the area.

The County will have to come back to the Plan Commission due to the fact they will require a conditional use permit for the fuel tanks and perhaps at that time they will have final plans.

Mayor Vanne stated Briess is talking about a future expansion plan and asked Schwarz to explain. Schwarz stated that Briess Co. is looking to expand their Main Street operation. The expansion consists of another production building and zoning of the property is correct for the proposed expansion. The Plan Commission reviewed preliminary plans. Schwarz indicated when final plans are available Briess will attend a future meeting to provide a formal presentation regarding their expansion.

DPW Schwarz updated council members of the sale of three out of four City owned TIF properties in the Business Park. There is one remaining lot for sale off Irish Road, which is approximately 15 acres.

Moved by Hilton, seconded by Bangart to go into closed session at 8:00 PM under WI Statute 19.85 (1) (g) regarding litigation for 804 Graves Street. Roll call vote.

Gruett – yes Bangart – yes Bosshardt – yes Thornber – yes

Jaeckels – yes Schmitzer – yes Hilton – yes Johnson - yes

Eight votes cast. Eight votes aye. Motion carried.

Council reviewed litigation regarding 804 Graves Street. (Bosshardt exited to room)

Moved by Hilton, seconded by Bangart to return to open session at 8:12 PM.

Roll call vote.

Gruett – yes Bangart – yes Bosshardt – absent Thornber – yes

Jaeckels – yes Schmitzer – yes Hilton – yes Johnson - yes

Seven votes cast. Seven votes aye. Motion carried.

COMMUNICATION:

Staff minutes of the November 3, 2015 meeting and the Housing Authority October 14, 2015 minutes were distributed.

APPROVE PAYMENT OF BILLS:

Moved by Hilton, seconded by Thornber to pay the bills. Roll call vote.

Gruett – yes Bangart – yes Bosshardt – absent Thornber – yes

Jaeckels – yes Schmitzer – yes Hilton – yes Johnson - yes

Seven votes cast. Seven votes aye. Motion carried. Voucher No. 77806 through Voucher No. 77908 or accounts payable and payrolls totaling \$97,179.52.

ADJOURNMENT:

Moved by Schmitzer, seconded by Jaeckels and carried to adjourn at 8:13 p.m. on November 17, 2015.

Helen Schmidlkofer, MMC
City Clerk