

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE BROWN COUNTY**  
**EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE**

Pursuant to Section 19.84 Wis. Stats., a regular meeting of the **Brown County Executive Committee** was held on Monday, February 7, 2022 at the S.T.E.M. Innovation Center, 2019 Technology Way, Green Bay, WI

---

**Present:** Chair Sieber, Supervisor Landwehr, Supervisor Deneys, Supervisor Van Dyck, Supervisor Buckley, Supervisor Brusky, Supervisor Schadewald

**Also Present:** Internal Auditor Dan Process, Director of Administration Chad Weininger, Corporation Counsel David Hemery, Supervisors Pat Evans, Ray Suennen, Devon Coenen, Amanda Chu, Megan Borchardt, Lindsey Dorff, Emily Jacobson, Tom Lund and Dave Kaster, Professional Football Stadium District Chair Chuck Lamine, Professional Football Stadium District Executive Director Pat Webb, Representative David Steffen, Green Bay Packers Director of Public Affairs Aaron Popkey, Planning Director Cole Runge, Stan Kaczmarek, other interested parties and media

---

**I. Call meeting to order.**

The meeting was called to order by Chair Sieber at 5:30 pm.

**II. Approve/modify Agenda.**

The agenda was modified to take Item 6 following Comments from the Public.

**Motion made by Supervisor Landwehr, seconded by Supervisor Deneys to approve as modified. Vote taken. MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY**

**III. Approve/modify Minutes of January 19, 2022.**

**Motion made by Supervisor Schadewald, seconded by Supervisor Brusky to approve. Vote taken. MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY**

**Comments from the Public**

-Anneliese Waggoner, 121 Greene Avenue, Allouez, WI

Waggoner spoke in support of the revised ordinance for redistricting and said she is in favor of it for the following reasons:

1. Using two prior members of the last citizen redistricting committee is a good idea because everyone learned a lot the first time around.
2. Including City and County Clerks as experts is good as they have much to contribute as advisors.
3. A lot was learned as to how important it is to honor municipal boundaries when creating maps.
4. She supports not drawing lines to favor incumbents. The first priority must be fair representation of the citizen population.
5. The revised ordinance provides more opportunity for the committee to submit additional maps if the first maps are not approved which extends the opportunity for give and take between the committee and the County Board.

-Jane Benson, 3672 Hallers Creek Road, Suamico, WI (not a lobbyist)

Benson had a number of questions regarding the redistricting ordinance/process.

1. She questions where the independence is since the County Board Chair is the only one who picks all the members and where the assurance of independence is.
2. She would also like clarification as to the number of people on the committee, whether it is seven or nine.
3. She also questions how the County Board is going to know the exact number of districts before the drafting committee does its work.

4. She also questions language that a public comment meeting will only be held if there is time.
5. Language was referred to in 15.12 that if the County Board does not like the maps, they can draw their own maps which would wash everything out and this is disturbing to her.
6. She is concerned about intimidation by Supervisors who attend meetings that are not on the committee.
7. She questions why the county is responsible for reviewing the census blocks the federal government uses.

*Although shown in the proper format here, Item 6 was taken at this time.*

1. **Review Minutes Of:** None.

#### **Internal Auditor**

2. **2021 Petty Cash and Cash on Hand Fourth Quarter Review - Report.**

Internal Auditor Dan Process informed this is an annual requirement of all departments that have petty cash or cash on hand. Based on the results, there were a few minor issues that have been addressed and taken care of.

**Motion made by Supervisor Landwehr, seconded by Supervisor Brusky to receive and place on file. Vote taken. MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY**

3. **Status Update (January 1 – January 31, 2022).**

This is a report of the activity done by Process during the month of January.

**Motion made by Supervisor Deneys, seconded by Supervisor Buckley to receive and place on file. Vote taken. MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY**

#### **Communications**

4. **Communication from Supervisor Suennen, including Supervisors Sieber and Schadewald: I am submitting a proposed ordinance to replace the existing Chapter 15 Ordinance, titled Redistricting Procedures. The existing Chapter 15 was used in 2020 and 2021 to create the Citizen Drafting Ad Hoc Committee and the redistricting maps. This process failed for several reasons. I formed a group of interested individuals in October from November 1<sup>st</sup> to January 19, we have worked to identify the issues, the procedures used, and identify improvement. The 9-member group included 3 members from the 2021 Citizens Drafting Committee, 2 municipal clerks, the Brown County Planning Director and 3 Brown County Supervisors. The group's recommendation is to significantly change Chapter 15, consequently this proposal is a replacement of the existing ordinance. I have included a summary of the redistricting process review groups members, actions, procedures and the 5-page Chapter 15 Ordinance proposal. *Referred from January County Board.***

Suennen recalled the County Board approved a Redistricting Committee in January 2020. It was a great concept, but when there is a concept without identifying how it will function, the implementation can fail and it is his opinion that the Redistricting Committee failed. After talking with several people, Suennen decided to form a group of interested parties to try to identify and fix what was wrong while it was still fresh in people's minds. Suennen's group consisted of nine members, including three Supervisors, three members for the current ad hoc committee, the Director of Planning and two municipal clerks.

The group held three meetings and tried to conduct an open forum. Suennen was the lead of the group and Director of Planning, Cole Runge, facilitated the topics. Agendas and minutes for each meeting were distributed. Once the group felt they had identified the issues of the prior committee, verbiage was tweaked and the proposed ordinance was created and distributed for comment. The group felt the proposal appropriately reflected the consensus of the committee and there were very few issues that were challenged or contested. Suennen said there was no political talk during the meetings; they focused on how to make the process better. The proposed ordinance in the agenda packet would replace the current ordinance.

The proposed ordinance contained information on many of the questions asked by Jane Benson under *comments from the public* and Suennen spoke to these points and outlined other details contained in the proposed ordinance.

Director of Planning and committee member Cole Runge addressed census blocks and said the census blocks are provided by the federal government and Census Bureau and the county does not have much control over that. There is an opportunity to do a slight amount of tweaking to correct any egregious errors and submit them to the Census Bureau but that is all.

From a staff perspective, Runge feels having the input of municipal clerks is a very important aspect because what the county approves has to be turned in to the municipalities. Further, when they started the process, Chapter 15 was pretty wide open and allowed the committee and staff to identify and prioritize their own criteria. When they went through the process they felt there were certain criteria that should have been prioritized higher so under this proposal, going into the next process, there would be more clear guidance.

**Motion made by Supervisor Schadewald, seconded by Supervisor Brusky to approve. *Motion withdrawn.***

Supervisor Van Dyck commented on some of the language in the proposed ordinance and talked of areas he would like to see amended such as public comments, public hearings and submission of additional maps.

**Friendly amendment made by Supervisor Van Dyck to amend 15.10 to read, "The drafting committee must hold a public comment meeting before submission of maps to the County Board Chair." *Amendment withdrawn.***

**Motion made by Supervisor Landwehr, seconded by Supervisor Schadewald to open the floor to allow interested parties to speak. Vote taken. MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY**

-Stan Kaczmarek, 3848 Anston Road, Green Bay, WI

Kaczmarek was a member of the committee and thanked Suennen for all his work. Having a definitive number of seats from the beginning would have been helpful. Kaczmarek also talked about the compressed timeline and said in June the committee met and some of this was going to possibly get delayed and the redistricting had to go through for upcoming elections. He feels the criteria in the proposed ordinance will make it much easier for future committees to go through the redistricting process. When it was all said and done, they covered a lot in three meetings and they got Chapter 15 to a good working document and he is happy with the end result.

Kaczmarek submitted a letter from another member of the committee, Randy Griswold, that is attached hereto.

**Motion made by Supervisor Landwehr, seconded by Supervisor Buckley to close the floor and return to regular order of business. Vote taken. MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY**

Supervisor Deneys asked if this proposed ordinance has been reviewed by Corporation Counsel. Corporation Counsel David Hemery informed he does not draft resolutions or ordinances without being directed to do so by a committee. He has reviewed the document, however, there are several areas that should be revised and these were discussed with input from several supervisors.

Deneys stated he is in support of revising this ordinance because it will give guidance during the next redistricting process.

**Motion made by Supervisor Schadewald, seconded by Supervisor Brusky to refer to Corporation Counsel for review. MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY**

*Supervisor Van Dyck was excused at 8:52 pm.*

5. **Communication from Supervisor Suennen: I am submitting a proposal to create an ordinance regarding jurisdictional authority of the Brown County Board. This ordinance is for the board to only consider resolutions on subject matter issues that Brown County has jurisdictional authority over, except where it directly involves an existing or prior financial specific subject matter issue; or an existing or prior operational or specific subject matter issue, of Brown County municipalities within Brown County. Referred from January County Board.**

Suennen noted issues have come up in the past where resolutions have been drafted on issues the Board has no jurisdictional authority over. This proposed ordinance says that if the Brown County Board has jurisdictional authority over something, a resolution can be drafted, but if they do not have jurisdictional authority over an issue, they should not waste time with a resolution. He recalled the marijuana issue in the past and said he received a number of calls asking why the Board spent time on an issue they did not have any authority over.

Landwehr does not think this is something we can restrict. Hemery responded that this would be this body regulating itself. He likes the idea but would like time to review it, but he feels it may be something that can legally be done.

Schadewald said this was attempted in the past but failed because there were questions as to who would enforce it, how much money would be spent to enforce it and will there be a lawsuit for trying to enforce it. Under Roberts Rules, the County Board has self-regulating motions. A motion can be made to table something and then there is no discussion. There is also the ability to call the question at any time. You can also challenge the Chair. He will support this but sees minefields ahead that he does not want to go through because Roberts Rules already has provisions in place.

Suennen agreed that anything can be tabled at any time, but part of the issue is that if there is a basic criteria on things that a Board has decided upon, you can refer to that and then create an exception to anything if the Board approves it. In his opinion, we should set up the criteria and if the Board decides they want to vary from it, they can take a vote to do so. Otherwise, this criteria will hopefully minimize the number of things taken up that the Board has no jurisdictional authority over.

Supervisor Chu hears that the Board invests too much time on things that are not going to have a changeable impact and she also hears comments frequently that we do not want to tie the hands of future Boards and she is confused as to how to hold those two things together at the same time.

Hemery explained there is always only one Board of Brown County Supervisors; there is no past Board or future Board. The makeup of the Board changes from time to time, but it is always the same continuous Board of Supervisors and the Board can always undo the things they have done in the past.

Supervisor Coenen appreciates this because she feels there are times discussions should end, but she also feels that since the Board is an arm of the state, she does not want this to hinder things when there are times the Board needs to have a voice for their constituents.

Sieber feels the people that can decide if something is pertinent to Brown County is the Board at the time. It seems that at least half of the things that have been discussed since he has been on the Board have had absolutely nothing to do with the function of the County; it is either how the Board conducts their business or giving an opinion on some other subject matter. He believes it is up to the Board to decide at each meeting what they are going to take up and what they are not. Leaving it up to the Board is the best place to be and each County Board member should have a vote on whether or not they want to take something up.

**Motion made by Supervisor Landwehr, seconded by Supervisor Brusky to refer to Corporation Counsel. Vote taken. Ayes: Buckley, Landwehr, Brusky, Schadewald, Deneys Nay: Sieber MOTION CARRIED**

6. **Communication from Supervisor Evans: To read as such: "The Brown County Board of Supervisors is in support of the Green Bay/Brown County Professional Football Stadium District." Results of the vote will be sent to the Wisconsin State Legislature (all Senate and Assembly members) and office of the Governor. As the people of Brown County have provided over \$300 million in a half-percent sales tax lasting almost 15**

**years, they should have a voice in support (or dissolving) of the District and subsequently District Board (oversight body). This vote of support (or lack there-of) should be conducted through representation, on behalf of the of the constituent, by their respective County Board Supervisor. Please send correspondence inviting Representative David Steffen, Aaron Popkey of the Green Bay Packers and Patrick Webb of the Stadium District Board to attend this meeting. Referred from January County Board.**

Sieber introduced Representative David Steffen, Green Bay Packers Director of Public Affairs Aaron Popkey, Professional Football Stadium District Director Pat Web and Professional Football Stadium District Chair Chuck Lamine. A handout of FAQs, a copy of which is attached, was distributed to the committee by the Stadium District Board.

Rep. Steffen thanked the committee for inviting him to this meeting. He spoke to the “why” of the draft proposal contained in the agenda packet. There are three primary reasons that he has drafted this legislation for community discussion, debate and reflection.

1. Honoring his commitment. As an employee of the Packers in 2000 Steffen made a commitment to the community that related to the temporary nature of all elements related to the referendum. This proposed legislation is his way of honoring his commitment and promise relating to the referendum. It is imperative to him that every commitment he made during the campaign be honored because without those commitments, we would not have the beautiful, bountiful stadium we have and the Packers would not have the success they have today.

Steffen outlined the history of the Packers meeting with the state legislature in 1999 to express the dire situation of the team over a long-time period. It was projected that by 2005 the Packers would be insolvent as they were losing \$8 million dollars a year and did not have much of a reserve. Their facility was only generating revenue 10 days a year and one way for financial self-reliance was to have a facility that generated revenue all year long. The proposal was then unveiled and the Packers began their campaign to see where the public stood and the tax was ultimately passed.

2. Transparency and oversight. Rep. Steffens feels transparency and oversight is insufficient, to say the least. The Stadium District controls more money than 22 of the 24 communities in Brown County, yet it is has less transparency and oversight than all of them. Every township and municipality have a very structured process of reviewing bills and invoices and having this information publicly available. This is an appropriate standard to have but does not exist at the Stadium District. He is not saying there is anything wrong going on, but when you take in free money from the government, the least that is expected is a great amount of transparency. Steffen provided the last six years of audits indicating there are issues with the handling and those issues should be addressed.
3. Rush to a new lease involving the stadium. This is critical and Steffen is very concerned. There is currently a lease in place between the Stadium District and the Packers that the Stadium District has a tremendous authority over, much of which they do not need to report on. The lease runs through 2033 with five consecutive two-year extensions. There have been discussions about the Stadium District wanting to get the lease from the Packers and amend it, but Steffen is concerned about that because very few of the members even know what is contained in the 140 page document. There has also not been any outside legal counsel to provide a presentation or independent evaluation. Before there is a new lease, every single community, the County Board, Village of Ashwaubenon and Green Bay City Council should be aware of what is contained in the process.

Steffen wants to make it abundantly clear that the legislation he provided is an incredibly rough draft; a whiteboarding exercise. The bill is a series of decisions that the community or legislature would have to make along the way. The legislation has not even been referred to get a bill number. It was the opportunity to have a very frank and important discussion because the lease currently provides a tremendous amount of opportunity for the community once we get to a trigger date in 2031. It was built in to ensure that

everything was temporary. The sales tax went away and there is language in the current law that provides a self-destruct mechanism for the Stadium District. Further, the Packers created a very long off-ramp on the financial support. After 2031, the lease still has opportunities to extend to 2043, but the expenses stop for the communities while the revenue continues to flow from the ticket tax.

In closing, Steffen said the two most important things are that the Stadium District provides additional transparency and oversight of Stadium District funds and secondly, under no circumstances should the lease be extended, modified or renewed until there has been an independent outside legal evaluation and expression of the current lease to the County Board, City of Green Bay, Village of Ashwaubenon and the community so there is a full-throated understanding of what the terms are of the existing agreement.

Stadium District Executive Director Pat Webb informed he has no personal stake in keeping the District going and he would be fairly happy if it could be eliminated. In addressing some of the issues brought up, Webb informed the Stadium District is a government body, they notice all their meetings and provide the same kind of line-by-line expense reports that other governments do. They are very transparent and give a very detailed list of all general operating expenses to the Board every month.

Regarding the rush to a new lease, Webb said there really is not a rush. The Packers have asked the Stadium District to look into a new lease. The lease is built on building the place and things like that and there is a lot of extra language that could be streamlined. The Packers have made a big investment and have said they want to extend it to protect their long-term investment.

Webb continued that the District has no money of their own. All the money they have is committed to the team, other than \$700,000. The District has no discretionary funds whatsoever, other than an economic development fund that was created by negotiating a special provision with the team for the ticket tax from special events at the stadium. Originally that would have gone to the team, but the District was able to siphon that off and use it for things like bringing the girls WIAA tournament here and projects at the Resch Center and Resch Expo.

The District has money put away in a fund that matures every year to meet the obligations to the team on an annual basis per the lease and the legislation. This started at \$3.4 million dollars and it goes up by a percentage each year. This year they owe the team about \$5.2 million dollars and they have investments that come due that equal that amount and they turn that over to the team for the lease.

Webb agrees that the sales tax portion of the amount paid to the Packers ends in 2031, but the 10% ticket tax portion goes to the Packers forever. That is in the lease and legislation and that money flows to the team. There is no other source of funds, so when talking about taking \$60 million dollars from the District and distributing it to the public and then turning the obligation over to the City of Green Bay, it is saying the City needs to come up with \$60 million dollars and there has been talk that they can use the ticket tax. The District's view is that the ticket tax is already committed to the team so the City would have to tax residents to give refunds to the residents of other municipalities.

Webb concluded that he does not have a problem getting rid of the District and added that they got rid of the bonds in 10 years and the sales tax in 14 which is unheard of in this day and age of Stadium Districts. There were a lot of good decisions made by the Board. It is not the end of the District he is concerned about; it is taking money put away for a specific purpose and then asking another municipality to make it up.

Green Bay Packers Director of Public Affairs Aaron Popkey thanked the committee for the opportunity to be here. In going back to the redevelopment and effort and the discussion that took place, a lot of time was put into explaining why and it was generally understood that the Packers were in dire straits in terms of revenue and what the stadium provided and the stadium itself. There was a great discussion that involved many people to educate the community as to why this should take place and why it was needed and what the future would entail with the successful outcome. At that time, they also spoke of what would take place. The money was needed to redevelop Lambeau Field and provide a like-new stadium and a new source of revenue for the club to compete with other teams in the league. Popkey continued that at that time they said they were going to put money together – the team would have some money; the NFL would provide

some money and the public would provide some money to build a like-new stadium. They also spoke at the same time of the need to set aside money for the future upkeep of the stadium through the sales tax. Money was also set aside for obligations for maintenance and operations. The ticket tax was also part of that. There were two pieces that went into the redevelopment of the stadium and paying off the bonds that were used for construction was the public portion, but also setting aside the money for future operations and maintenance. It was clearly stated at that time that the sales tax money was going to be put aside to do that and the materials that were put together by the parties at the time did include that piece of information. Also in that information brick and tile, license plate and sales tax were addressed. The ticket tax is another portion of that. It is essentially money paid by those who go to the games to help keep up the stadium.

Popkey continued that at the time, the legislature and Brown County voters were explicit that the sales tax was exclusive for Lambeau Field purposes. The lease and contract were equally explicit. The proposed legislation ignores all of that and doles out the sales tax money to select homeowners and other favored recipients, disregarding the legislative and voter mandates and terms of the lease and contract which is irresponsible and illegal. The proposal also redirects ticket tax proceeds that have been legislatively and contractually dedicated to Lambeau Field to a wide variety of alternative uses believed to have certain appeal. The purpose of the ticket tax is to have season ticket holders and other attendees share in the cost of upkeep of the stadium they use and enjoy as spectators. The proposal is to single out one particular Green Bay facility and tax its patrons to fund completely unrelated programs and projects. Even setting aside the damage that would be done to the Packers finances and Lambeau Field's finances, it represents unprecedented, discriminatory and illegal taxation.

Popkey continued that the sales tax was set aside for a specific purpose as was the ticket tax. The people who attend games help pay for the upkeep of the stadium through the ticket tax which is contractually obligated to the stadium through the current lease and any extensions of the lease.

The process by which a lease extension is being discussed is very deliberate and Popkey said it is not rushed at all. It is something that was discussed years ago looking far down the road at the end of the lease at some updates that are prudent and needed. This has been discussed with previous administrations and more recently with Mayor Genrich and all the parties agree to it in terms of it making sense and looking at the future and what it looks like and what makes sense. These things take time and beginning to discuss it makes sense. There was a \$300 million dollar investment made by the Packers and the public and since then the Packers have spent an additional \$500+ million dollars on the stadium without any public tax money. There are plans to continue to keep the stadium up with significant investments in maintenance and operations as well as capital improvements. It makes sense to look past the current lease as the improvements and upgrades being made have a lifespan that go beyond the current lease and it is practical to discuss what the future looks like for multiple future generations.

Rep. Steffen heard almost three different versions of what the lease says. He has worked with attorneys in Madison and obviously this is something that should have greater involvement, not just seven members of the Stadium District Board without proper and full understanding of the lease making such massive decisions. Steffen agrees with most of what Popkey said, except the financial commitment ends in 2031. That is where the off-ramp is. There was commitment to maintenance and operation. In terms of other points made, Steffen obviously has provided the highest standard of evaluation saying the legislation is legal. He does hope that the legislative detail can be set aside and that at least greater transparency and oversight can happen and also that no lease is acted up with any party without having a full understanding of what is in the current lease.

-Chuck Lamine, 2614 Indian Hill Drive, Green Bay, WI

Lamine informed the Stadium District puts out a check register for every meeting for every check that is cut and they also have an annual budget that is approved by statutes. The decisions made and funds expended fit in that budget. He reiterated what Webb said earlier that there is very limited flexibility for the dollars they have. It is identified in the statutes and clarified in the lease, similar to how the county process is carried out for things like the STEM building for which he was project manager.

Lamine continued that costs do not go away and the proposal would shift the cost to the City of Green Bay whose staff will have to allocate time for this and incur expenses and it will be added to the many

responsibilities the City already has. The proposal as written in the whiteboard mechanism is an unusual way to do legislation. Funds have been collected to take care of the maintenance and the proposal to dangle a \$600 gift to every homeowner in the City of Green Bay does not seem like a very responsible approach for legislation. The body of the Stadium District is appointed by Brown County, City of Green Bay and Village of Ashwaubenon. He feels they have done a good job, but if the county does not agree, they can replace the members.

As a taxpayer in the City of Green Bay, Lamine takes the responsibility of taking care of and overseeing the jewel within the City very seriously. The work the Stadium District does with overseeing the maintenance is very serious and he acknowledged that someone else could do that, but the responsibilities are still going to be there and the cost of the maintenance is not going to disappear and he does not want it shifted to someone else, in this case the City. If that is done, maintaining Lambeau Field would be thrown into the same pot as maintaining streets, addressing flooding issues, etc. and he feels that is a difficult way to try to administer Lambeau Field, a very unique property.

Lamine concluded that he is honored to be on the Stadium District and work with Pat Webb and the check register and budget is available for anyone who would like to see it. The intention of the Stadium District is to be sure this facility, which is a jewel in our community, is taken care of forever.

At this time Supervisors had an opportunity to ask questions of Rep. Steffen, Webb, Popkey and Lamine. Sieber thanked these people for attending the meeting.

**Motion made by Supervisor Buckley, seconded by Supervisor Schadewald to receive and place on file. Vote taken. MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY**

Supervisor Evans is not in support of the motion to receive and place on file and reminded that Brown County is an arm of the state government and, as such, has a say in this. The initial proposal bothers him because it says Brown County homeowners would get money, but because his district consists of many apartment complexes, many of his constituents would get zero dollars since they are not homeowners. Secondly, the whiteboard nature of Rep. Steffen's proposal bothers Evans. It is absolutely evident that it is not cut and dried for any reason to absolve the District. Evans concluded that the people in Brown County should have a say in this and he feels the Stadium District needs to stay in place and we need to send this position to the state.

Supervisor Van Dyck spoke in support of the motion to receive and place on file, not because he agrees with the dissolution of the Stadium District Board, but because at this point what we are discussing is the opinion of one representative of the State of Wisconsin. He would rather wait to take a position on this when there is actually some legislation.

Supervisor Landwehr opined that sending a letter to Madison at this time when it is not referencing a bill is putting the cart way before the horse. He agrees that the Stadium District serves a purpose, but to send a letter at this time is premature.

Supervisor Lund agreed with Van Dyck and feels that keeping the Stadium District Board is up to Green Bay and any entity that has authority over this. Further, if they got rid of the Board and the City has to fund the stadium, they would have to make sure the Packers pay for proper maintenance for the stadium or they could move to another city at the end of the lease and Green Bay would be stuck with a stadium that could be in disrepair. Lund feels it is appropriate to have an oversight Board to make sure the necessary maintenance is being taken care of but at this time he feels receiving and placing this on file is appropriate.

Supervisor Buckley feels receiving and placing this on file is appropriate at this time as this is simply in draft form.

Supervisor Suennen also feels receiving and placing on file is the correct action as there is no concrete legislation. This is an exercise we gained knowledge from, but to create a document in support of something at this time would be an exercise in futility.

Supervisors Coenen and Borchardt thanked the guests for coming to the meeting and putting in the work they have and also thanked the committee for allowing the discussion.

*At this time a vote on the earlier motion was taken.*

### **Resolutions & Ordinances**

**7. Ordinance to Amend Chapter 2 of the Brown County Code of Ordinances.**

**Motion made by Supervisor Landwehr, seconded by Supervisor Schadewald to suspend the rules and take Items 7, 8 & 9 together. Vote taken. MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY**

**Motion made by Supervisor Landwehr, seconded by Supervisor Deneys to hold Items 7, 8 & 9 until the next Executive Committee meeting. Vote taken. MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY**

**8. Ordinance to Create Subsection 2.06(10) of Chapter 2 of the Brown County Code of Ordinances.**

*See action at Item 7 above.*

**9. Ordinance to Create Section 2.18 of Chapter 2 of the Brown County Code of Ordinances.**

*See action at Item 7 above.*

### **Other**

**10. ARPA Funds Discussion.**

Director of Administration Chad Weininger provided an ARPA Allocation Process Overview Sheet, a copy of which is attached. He outlined the information and said the county's total award was \$51 million dollars, \$23,828,408 of which was allocated in the 2022 budget, leaving \$27,555,774 available. Part of the remaining available funds were used for the Cofrin 911 Tower and Library boardroom, leaving \$24,255,774 available to be split up equally between the oversight committees. Weininger also talked about the process and timeline for appropriating the remaining allocation as set forth on the handout and then answered several questions from Supervisors.

*No action taken.*

**11. Audit of the bills.**

**Motion made by Supervisor Deneys, seconded by Supervisor Buckley to acknowledge receipt of the bills. Vote taken. MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY**

**12. Such other matters as authorized by law.**

The next Executive Committee meeting will be held on March 7 at 5:30 pm.

**13. Adjourn.**

**Motion made by Supervisor Schadewald, seconded by Supervisor Brusky to adjourn at 9:43 pm. Vote taken. MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY**

Respectfully submitted,

Therese Giannunzio  
Legislative Specialist

# GREEN BAY/BROWN COUNTY PROFESSIONAL FOOTBALL STADIUM DISTRICT

## FREQUENTLY ASKED QUESTIONS

### 1. What is the Stadium District?

The Green Bay/Brown County Professional Football Stadium District is a special district under the provisions of Chapter 229 of the Wisconsin Statutes. The District serves a public purpose in its jurisdiction (Brown County) by providing recreation; encouraging economic development and tourism; reducing unemployment and bringing needed capital into the District's jurisdiction. To these ends, the District provides grants for special events and capital projects.

The District has an ownership interest in the Lambeau Field Complex and currently serves as landlord under the lease agreement with the City of Green Bay and Green Bay Packers. As landlord, the District has ongoing responsibilities including but not limited to managing funds held in trust; planning capital improvements; monitoring standards for maintenance; repair and improvement; planning special events; and ensuring compliance with targeted business participation and workforce diversity requirements.

### 3. How is the Stadium District governed?

The District is governed by the District Board, which is comprised of seven members. The Mayor of the City of Green Bay appoints three members subject to confirmation by the City Council; the Brown County Executive appoints three members subject to confirmation by the County Board; and the President of the Village of Ashwaubenon appoints one member subject to confirmation by the Village Board of Trustees. Each Board member serves at the pleasure of the appointing authority.

### 4. What has the Stadium District accomplished?

Accomplishments of the District can best be viewed in the context of several phases as follow:

#### a. Planning and Organization Phase (May 2000 to May 2001):

During this phase the focus was on developing the organization structure and relationships necessary to complete its duties under the Act. The District secured Board appointments, hired staff, established an office, negotiated and entered into the Lambeau Field Lease Agreement By and Among the District, City of Green Bay and Green Bay Packers. The Construction Administration Agreement By and Between the District and Lambeau Field Redevelopment, LLC was negotiated and executed. The District enacted the sales tax, ticket tax, and a plan of financing was developed and executed including the issuance of bonds.

#### b. Construction Phase May 2001 to December 2003:

The District administered the Lambeau Field Lease Agreement and Construction Administration Agreement, received and invested and administered project funds, implemented the commemorative brick and tile program and provided oversight of the renovation to ensure that the project was completed on time, within budget and consistent with the architectural program.

#### c. Post-Construction Phase January 2004 to Present:

During this phase a major emphasis was given to ending the District's sales tax as quickly as possible by retiring all outstanding debt and fully funding the required statutory escrows for

stadium operations and maintenance and District administrative expenses. All debt was retired on August 1, 2011 and escrows were fully funded in 2015 which allowed termination of the District's sales tax.

The District continues to serve as landlord of the stadium and administers provisions of the Lease including:

- Receiving, investing, and managing funds,
- Processing draws for operations and maintenance and capital improvements,
- Designed and implemented the commemorative brick and tile program that has generated approximately \$2.6 million in gross District revenue,
- Monitoring post-construction targeted business participation and workforce diversity,
- Coordinating the user fee and ticket tax with the Packers and City of Green Bay,
- Coordinating the planning, funding and monitoring of capital improvements projects with the Team. Since 2003 the District has provided nearly \$50 million to support improvements at the stadium including but not limited to the south endzone renovation and concourse improvements.
- Conducting the annual insurance review with the City and Team,
- Working in coordination with the Team and other organizations to produce over \$2,000,000 in District revenue for the District's Special Event and Economic Development Fund and generate local economic impact through the following Lambeau Field events:
  - Snocross – WSA 2004 – 2006,
  - College Hockey – Frozen Tundra Hockey Classic UW vs. Ohio State 2006,
  - Religious event – Leap of Faith 2007,
  - Welcome Home for Vietnam Veterans - LZ Lambeau 2010
  - Concerts - Kenny Chesney 2011 and 2015, Billy Joel 2017 and Paul McCartney 2019,
  - College football - UW vs LSU 2016 and UW vs. Notre Dame rescheduled from 2020 to 2026 due to COVID, and
  - Packers Hall of Fame Induction Ceremony – Brett Favre 2015
- Providing over \$2.7 million in grants from the Special Events and Economic Development Fund for capital projects and events to foster economic development and tourism.
- Implementing the Standards for Maintenance Monitoring Program with the cooperation of the Team to:
  - Protect the Team and taxpayer's investment in the Lambeau Field Complex.
  - Maintain a clean, safe and secure environment for tenants, employees and the public.
  - Meet customer service expectations.
  - Reduce operating costs by fostering the efficient operation of systems and minimizing downtime through preventive maintenance.
  - Extend the useful life of assets and identify assets in need of repair or replacement.

#### 4. Did legislation intend for the District to dissolve?

Legislation provides that the District may be dissolved by action of the District Board. Dissolution is optional and not mandatory. The District prepared a Future of the Stadium District Discussion Paper dated August 29, 2013 that was used as the basis for discussions and meetings with State officials, the Packers, local elected officials and the Brown County Taxpayers Association. Based upon the input received and an extensive analysis of the Lease and legislation, the District decided to continue operations.

Dear Members of this Committee:

My name is Randy Griswold. I am a Brown County resident and have been for nearly fifty years. I served as an Ad Hoc Committee member that was charged to draft Redistricting Boundaries based upon the recent 2020 census.

I found the process to be fair and productive and based upon objective data that was provided to us as Committee members. Although our final recommendation was not well received by the Brown County Supervisors as a group and subsequently revised, the process we went through to come up with our recommendation was worthwhile.

In retrospect, it would have been beneficial to have had a better understanding of the County's expectations as to the various realities of redistricting. The group that was assembled to revisit the process we undertook, I feel has provided the needed guidance for future Committees to look at when it comes to Redistricting based upon changing population measures.

I am in support of the proposed Chapter 15 Revised Redistricting proposal, and feel it better defines the realities of redistricting with better guidance, in writing.

Thank you

Randy Griswold  
1041 VILLAGE GREEN CT.  
GB  
54313

## 2023 ARPA Allocation Process Overview Sheet

Overview of ARPA Allocations		
Total Award		51,384,182.00
2022 Budget Allocation		23,828,408.00
Remaining		27,555,774.00
<i>Budget Adjustments</i>		
Cofrin 911 Tower	PS	2,200,000
Library Boardroom	Exec	1,100,000
<i>Remaining</i>		
	1/31/2022	24,255,774.00
<b>Committees</b>		
	PS	2,392,629.00
	E&R	4,592,629.00
	Admin	4,592,629.00
	PD&T	4,592,629.00
	HHS	4,592,629.00
**Emergency Funds	Exec	3,492,629.00
		24,255,774.00
<small>*2nd ARPA Allocation in June</small>		
<small>**Emergency Fund Reserve Outside Allocation Process</small>		

Timeline of ARPA Appropriation Allocation	
February	Process Overview
March	External Review of ARPA Requests
April	<i>Spring Elections</i>
May	Presentation of Requests to Oversight Committee <i>Public Input &amp; *APRA Request Form Review</i>
June	Committee Ranking of Requests
July	Final Outside Review of Ranked Requests
August	Committee Approval of Requests Budget Submission Inclusion
October	Committee Budget Approval Process
November	County Board Budget Approval
<small>* All ARPA requests require 'ARPA Request Form' and all requests are processed through oversight department &amp; oversight committee.</small>	

10