

**Item 23-0276: Resolution #2-R-23 Resolution to Eliminate No Mow May**

**Municipal Services Committee**

Mon, Apr 12, 2023 4:30PM

**Aldersperson William Siebers (District 1) 04:12**

All right. Brings it down to 23-0276 Resolution 2-R-23 To Eliminate No Mow May. I'm going to call for a motion first.

**Aldersperson William Siebers (District 1) 04:29**

Move to approve. Move to approve.

**Aldersperson William Siebers (District 1) 04:34**

Okay. Do I hear a second to that?

**Aldersperson Brad Firkus (District 3) 04:37**

I'll second for discussion.

**Aldersperson William Siebers (District 1) 04:38**

Okay. Motion has been made and seconded to approve. Aldersperson Doran, I believe this is your resolution so will you speak to it please?

**Aldersperson Chad Doran (District 15) 04:48**

Sure. So, the idea behind the resolution here is separating out, I think, the ordinance that we have from the educational component of No Mow May, which I think has been fairly successful, maybe even more so and is a great benefit to the community.

**Aldersperson Chad Doran (District 15) 05:11**

But that said, the ordinance that allows us to grow our grass four inches longer in the month of May, I don't believe is necessary, because the study that was used as the basis of that by our colleague, has been proven to be—was withdrawn. I guess, you can decide how you or what you want to read into that as far as why. But the—I'll note the journal that in which the study was published, says that "editors should consider retracting the publication if they have clear evidence that findings are unreliable, either as a result of major error or as a result of fabrication or falsification." And I think it notes "retractions are not appropriate for studies to be pulled back if the main findings of the work are still reliable and correction could sufficiently address errors or concerns." So given that, it sounds like, from a layman's reading I guess, that that the study has been, quote unquote, debunked, I guess, in terms of its standing.

**Aldersperson Chad Doran (District 15) 06:17**

I think when we when we do an ordinance, we have to have some level of data behind it, be it scientific or otherwise and not just because we think something might feel good, or we think it might have some sort of benefit. That's not a reason to have an ordinance in place.

**Aldersperson Chad Doran (District 15) 06:35**

This study was the reason several communities around the state initiated having a No Mow May program, and I think I've heard from a couple of them now who, after hearing about this ordinance, are

now reconsidering that as well, because it doesn't have the scientific backing behind it. And because it doesn't, I don't think we need to have the ordinance anymore.

**Alderman Chad Doran (District 15) 06:55**

But that doesn't mean the educational component of this program can't continue. As I said, I think it's been very successful. There—I think there are other ways that groups that support pollinators could continue to push this program. Maybe they want to purchase some seed packets of flowers and hand them out to anyone in the community that wants them. There are lots of things that can still happen without having this ordinance that allows us to grow our grass four inches longer in the month of May. So, I just want to point out like that's the difference here. It's not—this isn't about the initiative being a bad idea. It's just simply separating the ordinance that that has no scientific basis behind it.

**Alderman Chad Doran (District 15) 07:34**

We've heard from a lot of people about this. Some of them certainly support it. We've heard some from some who don't. I imagine we've probably heard from the majority of people in the community who are participating or have participated in the program in the past. But I think it's interesting, none of them have really drilled down on the issue that the resolution brings forward. It's all about, you know, "we should do what we can to save the bees. This is great for bees and pollinators." But none of them have showed any information that shows that growing your grass four inches longer in May has a benefit to help bees and pollinators. And I suspect that's probably because there isn't any scientific data to show it. I've reached out to experts that I've presented to this Council and in over the past two years when we've had discussion about this, that say there is at best a negligible benefit to allowing your grass grow four inches longer.

**Alderman Chad Doran (District 15) 08:19**

A couple of a couple of things I think worth noting here as we sort of focus in on the point of this ordinance, the typical height of dandelions is six to eight inches, the typical height of clover is four to eight inches. These are, I think, the two main components that have been brought forward as being beneficial for bees when we talk about long grass and allowing your grass to grow—your yard to grow longer. The recommended—the recommendation for cutting your grass to help dandelions grow is actually four inches. That's from another study that I reached out to the author of a couple—I think that was two years ago. The highest, the highest setting of the average push lawn mower is four inches. Our ordinance the rest of the year, already allows you to grow your grass twice that height. And a USDA study shows that the optimal frequency for bee habitat is two weeks. You're supposed to mow every two weeks for the optimal habitat for bees. These are just a few of the things that I found that sort of, in my mind, go against this ordinance that allows us to grow your grass up to 12 inches long. It seems counterintuitive.

**Alderman Chad Doran (District 15) 09:22**

The argument that's been brought up against this resolution is that it doesn't hurt anyone. When have we done an ordinance just based solely on the fact that it doesn't hurt anyone. I mean that that whole idea just sounds ridiculous. I think people in this community can care about bees and pollinators and want to help without having the ordinance that doesn't have any scientific backing behind it. And I think the one fact—and I suspect we'll hear, you know, comments to the contrary. But I think the one fact that's indisputable in all of this is that experts in the field of bees point out that flowers and flower gardens are more beneficial. I don't know that anyone's going to argue that.

**Aldersperson Chad Doran (District 15) 10:04**

So, if the if the idea of this initiative is to really help, then let's do the things that help them most. Let's do the things that actually work. And I—I think that a lot of times we as a group end up voting on a motion because something feels good, like I said, or we you know, we hear a lot of feedback. But I encourage our colleagues here to do the hard work and really consider what the evidence here shows, and use facts and logic when we when we talk about this being about this one singular issue about the long grass ordinance, not the program itself. It's something that that I think is a worthwhile component, the educational piece of this, and that can continue without having this ordinance in place.

**Aldersperson William Siebers (District 1) 10:58**

Thank you. Aldersperson Del Toro, I believe you would like to speak. All right.

**Aldersperson Israel Del Toro (District 4) 11:09**

Chair, if I may ask, at what point do we get public input on this issue? I believe there are a couple of people here would like to speak on this issue.

**Aldersperson William Siebers (District 1) 11:16**

When you're done speaking.

**Aldersperson Israel Del Toro (District 4) 11:18**

Thank you. All right.

**Aldersperson William Siebers (District 1) 11:20**

But don't speak for 45 minutes.

**Aldersperson Israel Del Toro (District 4) 11:23**

I will avoid speaking for 45 minutes. I just finished lecture. I think I'm all talked out for the day, thank you.

**Aldersperson Israel Del Toro (District 4) 11:31**

Where to start? Let's talk about No Mow May for a little bit and focus in on what facts and data actually exist and a little bit of education on what the initiative is about and what the goals of the project are and what data exists to support the benefits of growing our lawns out. And keep one thing in mind, No Mow May is not actually about grass. It has nothing to do about grass. It's all about things that we allow to grow if grass persists beyond its regular cutting length. So, if we chop grass off at four inches, we never get a chance to let those dandelions grow or that mint or those clovers come to seed to allow that forage for pollinators.

**Aldersperson Israel Del Toro (District 4) 12:16**

So, let's just review why we do this. No Mow May is all about our community education of environmental stewardship. This educational component is great. And I'd love to see Alder Doran instead of building a proposal or resolution which detracts or deconstructs, rather to put some money behind that. I'd love to see money being poured into educational efforts on best sustainability practices within our city. And I'd cowrite that resolution with him gladly.

**Aldersperson Israel Del Toro (District 4) 12:19**

No Mow May is also about conservation of biodiversity based on science—transparent scientific data. And I'm actually a little bit glad that this is happening because it tells me that the scientific process is working and the openness and transparency of Open Access Journals works.

**Aldersperson Israel Del Toro (District 4) 13:03**

And the other part is that we lead by example to other cities. We set the wheels in motion here. Now there's over 50 cities across the United States, multiple states, at least a dozen states participating in No Mow May or Slow Mow or some variation of this that aims to provide foraging habitat for early emerging bees by simply reducing your mowing frequency and intensity. So, we're the leaders here. This is a—this is a feather in our cap as a city as for environmental stewardship.

**Aldersperson Israel Del Toro (District 4) 13:30**

I want to start off by talking about Peer J as a journal. I could have put this paper—my author, my coauthor, and I could have put this paper in a myriad of journals out there: Urban Ecology, Journal of Ecology, Animal Ecology, dozens and dozens of journals. But what's different about this journal is that it's not behind a paywall. That means that anybody can access it. If you have an internet connection, you can access this journal. You can access this article for free. All the other—many of the other publications that are out there, don't allow this. You have to pay 30 40 50 bucks for a journal, and it's really annoying, and the data doesn't become transparent.

**Aldersperson Israel Del Toro (District 4) 14:08**

The other aspect of this that's transparent is that the review history of the article is also transparent. You can see exactly what editors said to us in the review process, where the problems were in the scientific study or in the scientific design, and we can figure out a way of addressing this.

**Aldersperson Israel Del Toro (District 4) 14:25**

All right, am I getting too much feedback? Maybe my mic volume a little bit?

**Aldersperson Brad Firkus (District 3) 14:37**

Probably don't put your faces quite as close, a little bit back. Yeah.

**Aldersperson Israel Del Toro (District 4) 14:41**

Cool. All right.

**Aldersperson Israel Del Toro (District 4) 14:43**

Um, so with this in mind. There's transparency at all processes here from the generation of the data, to data accessibility, to the review process, it's—the integrity of this remains pure, and I really liked this.

**Aldersperson Israel Del Toro (District 4) 14:58**

Now having said this, we did receive reviewer feedback. Every article that goes through peer review does receive review your feedback. And some of the weaknesses that were identified in this original No Mow May paper was, one, that we compared lawns to gardens—er to parks. So, we compared our biodiversity metrics to city parks because they had a regular mowing intensity and regular mowing frequency. And some of our reviewers didn't like this. They said, "Oh, well, it'd be better if it was comparing yards, two yards." Okay, fair criticism. We thought about it, we addressed it in text and we moved on.

**Aldersperson Israel Del Toro (District 4) 15:32**

The other component of this that was criticized, was our capacity to identify these on the fly or in real time. So typically, as an entomologist, what I would do is go out into the field, set up some traps, collect the specimens, and bring them back to my lab, harvest, kill the specimens, bring them back to my lab, identify them, and put names to them. This seems to be counterintuitive to what No Mow May wants to do. We don't want to kill bees in this process. We want to save and protect individual bees.

**Aldersperson Israel Del Toro (District 4) 16:01**

And so, what we were doing as part of this methodology was identifying them to the best of our ability in the field to the lowest possible taxonomic unit. Some things are really easy to identify like a honeybee *apis mellifera*. Other things are going to be slightly more difficult to identify. If you could tell the difference between two *Lasioglossum*s that's going to be quite a challenge that requires some expertise and definitely the use of some equipment in the laboratory.

**Aldersperson Israel Del Toro (District 4) 16:29**

What doesn't change about this original No Mow May study is this: three out of the four components remain the same. In No Mow lawns, there are still more flowers. In No Mow—No Mow, No Mow lawns, there are still more coverage of more flowers. And there is still greater abundance of bees. There's just many, many more bees in No Mow lawns than there are in mowed lawns.

**Aldersperson Israel Del Toro (District 4) 16:58**

The only thing that came under question (and this I should point out is by an individual who did so in a blog post, which is not peer reviewed, and is not undergoing the merits of the scientific process) is this fourth panel here, is the richness components, specifically which species were present in the in these lawns. Was it *Lasioglossum* A? *Lasioglossum* B, C? That level of detail is where there was some disagreement between the community and our ourselves.

**Aldersperson Israel Del Toro (District 4) 17:31**

So, we came back in 2021 and reproduced this study. We reproduced the study with the goal of increasing our sample size. So instead of just doing it here in Appleton we replicated this study in Wausau, Stevens Point, Oshkosh, Kimberly, Kaukauna. And what we found is strikingly similar situations.

**Aldersperson Israel Del Toro (District 4) 17:49**

Uh, so one second, getting lost here. Ah yes. So here, for example, just to give you an example, if you could tell the difference between these two bees, I would give you a million bucks. It's just really, really, really tiny minute little things that require a microscope to identify those species level differences. And that's really the only thing that's being called into question is, which species. Not how many—there are more bees—just which ones are there.

**Aldersperson Israel Del Toro (District 4) 18:18**

So, with the 2021 study, we standardized our area of sampling with a paired study design, so we got a neighbor to mow and an individual to do No Mow. We had direct lawn to lawn comparisons. We had multiple observers. And in 2021, we did kill bees. We did harvest specimens and bring them back into the lab. We have a voucher collection. These specimens exist, they are in my lab, they are sitting there, we can identify them, we can put names to them, we can confirm that they, that they were collected as part of this treatment.

**Aldersperson Israel Del Toro (District 4) 18:54**

And what we find just—oh, well, I'll jump into the into the results here in just a second. But in in November of 2022, we decided to retract. We decided, like the author's decided, to retract the paper because we wanted to include the data from 2021 alongside that, alongside the data of 2020. New data, new analysis, new paper. Old paper needs to be retracted before the new paper comes out with and undergoes the same process. And this is what my colleagues have picked up on is this retraction process—something that is not necessarily uncommon in the scientific community, but not you know, it's really making a story of where there isn't one.

**Aldersperson Israel Del Toro (District 4) 19:43**

And here is where we actually find, er, some of our results of that 2021 study. We found that [indecipherable] standardizing our data, are areas that are being collected. We still collected data from 39 citizen scientists participating across 78 different sites. 38 different species of species—species of bees were sampled. And diversity and abundance continues to be high in No Mow lawns relative to mowed lawns. And we also now have additional data on additional insect groups.

**Aldersperson Israel Del Toro (District 4) 20:15**

So here we have the flowering data. On the left panel, you see our mode area and on the right panel, we see our unmowed area across three different cities, Appleton, Oshkosh and Wausau. And what we see is that in those unmowed areas, plant diversity and flower diversity is three to 10 times higher. So that forage for bees is being produced by our No Mow efforts. Again, not about grass, it's about those other species that occur alongside that grass.

**Aldersperson Israel Del Toro (District 4) 20:45**

And when we break it down into which insects we covered, on the right bars, we have the mowed indivi—mowed lawns relative to the mowed lawns on the left side, and we see that we are collecting a lot of Diptera and a lot of Hymenoptera. Diptera are flies; flies are also valid pollinators. Hymenoptera are the family where bees are present in. And what we see here clearly (I really don't need statistics to show this) is these bars are much bigger than these bars in all three towns, Appleton, Oshkosh and Wausau, and the significance abundance of these organisms in No Mow areas suggests that this, in fact, is working.

**Aldersperson Israel Del Toro (District 4) 21:22**

I want to finish up by saying that No Mow is just one piece of the puzzle. Hey, there's actually a ton of literature out there that suggests that undisturbed habitat yields higher diversity. No Mow is one piece of the puzzle, but we should also consider how we deal with chemical use, our public education, and additional habitat conservation. To meant—to mention, you know, the additional literature that exists out there, just last year, there was a paper published that reviewed a total of 26 different papers out there that showed that these low interference practices actually do increase biodiversity in urban green spaces, specifically with respect to our urban pollinators.

**Aldersperson Israel Del Toro (District 4) 22:04**

So that's my spiel as a scientist, but I really want to take my scientist hat off for a second and speak as an alder for a second if I may, chair.

**Aldersperson William Siebers (District 1) 22:11**

You may do that.

**Aldersperson Israel Del Toro (District 4) 22:13**

Okay, so here's the problems with the resolutions. Oh—not just yet. I got two more slides.

**Aldersperson Israel Del Toro (District 4) 22:20**

Here's the problem with the resolution. Where—this is language pulled directly out of the resolution—"Whereas the retraction guidelines for this journal note that the paper should be retracted when the findings are unreliable or the result of fabrication or falsification." Here's what the actual retraction notice reads on the actual paper, "After finding several potential inconsistencies," (i.e., those mismatched identifications in data and handling) "the author's" (that's us two), "and the editorial team agreed" (So, there was a discussion that occurred between the authors and the editorial team) "to retract the paper in order to...with the opportunity to reevaluate should the author's use to submit a new version," (which we are.)

**Aldersperson Israel Del Toro (District 4) 23:04**

I just want to point out that the scientific method is an iterative process. We go through science—we go through this process and the science change, science changes, and nothing is proven in the scientific method. This is one of the things I tell my students all the time is we're not out to prove anything. We're out to hypothesis test. And if some that—if, you know, Alder Doran goes out and does his own study and finds that indeed, there is no data to support this, and goes through the arduous peer review process and has all the appropriate data and his colleagues agree that this this this has merit, then we can say Okay, maybe there's potential for false—er not falsification. But there's potential for countering this observation in the field.

**Aldersperson Israel Del Toro (District 4) 23:46**

Now, "whereas the basis for adoption of No Mow May and the science behind the study has been proven." (Again, we don't prove anything in science. We show data that suggests or supports a hypothesis.) "not to be reliable. Other apiologists," (just want to point out apiologists are people that study honey, honey, or honey bees, not pollinators,) "whose bees have been said that long grass provides no discernible benefit for bees and other pollinators." Again, I referenced you to the paper published last year that shows the exact opposite.

**Aldersperson Israel Del Toro (District 4) 24:19**

So, the cons with this—my recommendation to the committee is to move this resolution as received and filed because of these three big cons. There's false information being presented here and in situations that are frankly not appreciated. It also shows a lack of due diligence and lack of communication and foundational understanding of the scientific methods and basis. So, you know, going a little far beyond or maybe sticking your hand in a hornet's nest if you will. And it this definitely borders on defamatory, libel, and slander because it's actually attack—attacking not what I do here on Council. A Council member is fine to attack that. But he's actually attacking what I do as a job. And it might not seem like a serious accusation to the folks in this room, but other scientists lose their jobs over the language that was pressed in this resolution. So, I don't take this lightly. I take this as a serious grievance and an inappropriate use of policymaking. That is all I have for you chair, and I'm happy to address any questions like anybody.

**Aldersperson William Siebers (District 1) 25:36**

**[Off microphone, Aldersperson Siebers asked if there were members of the audience who wanted to speak.]**

**Relena Ribbons (Assistant Professor of Geosciences - Lawrence University) 25:39**

Hi, I'm Dr. Relena Ribbons. I'm the coauthor on this study. It's nice to meet some of you for the first time. You might not know me by name. But I was really alarmed to see that my reputation and scientific integrity was being put on the line.

**Relena Ribbons (Assistant Professor of Geosciences - Lawrence University) 25:58**

When you want to talk about this removal of No Mow May as an ordinance is not hurting anyone, you're looking at just one face, a female scientist, that you're personally attacking. I have not one but two PhDs. I have been in this field studying vegetation for over 15 years. And I do not appreciate being told that I'm not an expert in the study that I designed and have been working on systematically, consistently, using the scientific process, for the past three years. Sorry, if that sounds a little emotional. I'm really upset by having this thrown in my face, as opposed to engaging in a conversation.

**Relena Ribbons (Assistant Professor of Geosciences - Lawrence University) 26:33**

Actually, what's really astonishing to me is that I reach out to alders all the time. I email everyone. So really everyone on this Council who's on Common Council has gotten an email from me before at any time. I'm the only Relena in this town, probably in the state. Anyone could have reached out to say, "Hey, what's a retraction mean?" Because it turns out, I'm a professor, I'm a scientist by training, and I could explain the process to you, and I would have been really happy to do that. But instead, I'm being personally attacked. And I don't appreciate that. It's a form of bullying. And I understand that perhaps that's allowed in the political realm. But there's no space for that in science. There's no space for bullying in Appleton. We're not that kind of community.

**Relena Ribbons (Assistant Professor of Geosciences - Lawrence University) 27:17**

Now, my stance on No Mow May and the whole assortment of conservation and pollinator protection efforts is pretty clear. We can be doing more than we're already doing, and whatever we're doing can be helpful even if it's at a small scale. Every individual lawn that someone chooses to plant with an alternative lawn mixture. I really liked some of the suggestions that Alder Doran was suggesting. Loved some of the suggestions that Dr. Del Toro was suggesting as well. Alternative lawns are a way to both conserve the amount of water that people are using when they are watering landscapes. And these alternative lawn methods could include things like just allowing clover and dandelions to propagate in addition to the 30 odd species we were able to document over the past few years.

**Relena Ribbons (Assistant Professor of Geosciences - Lawrence University) 28:00**

But you want to know who else you're hurting are all of the children who helped us collect bees over this time period. In the midst of a pandemic, this was a movement that was able to show people, and even Dan Rather picked this up as something that was inspiring for the entire nation to consider how small steps in your lawns could make a difference. Because we don't have to all have the status quo of the same type of lawn. It turns out, we have options, and we can push for change in our communities. And I really think this would be a step backwards, rather than continuing on this trajectory of being a leader in the state and the country.

**Relena Ribbons (Assistant Professor of Geosciences - Lawrence University) 28:35**

I also think that alternative lawn practices and planting things for pollinators, like wildflower mixtures—again, that's a great suggestion. I think those are great ideas. And we can continue this into a Slow Mow summer where folks are planting different types of grasses that get cut at a different height. You can talk to turfgrass specialists. I have a whole host them where I will clearly provide you with evidence and



the studies, as well as the individuals names and their contact information and you can reach out to them. Nobody reached out to me. I'm still alarmed by this.

**Relena Ribbons (Assistant Professor of Geosciences - Lawrence University) 29:06**

It's really frustrating to know that I've spent my entire life dedicated to the work, since I was in high school as a member of the Envirothon team, working to figure out how our environment works in this state. I've been dedicated for years to trying to figure out how the environment works, what we can do to make the world a better place. I'm a lifelong Girl Scout member. You're attacking all of those groups when you attack me. And that's what you're doing with this resolution. You're not saying oh, we actually think there's no scientific evidence when in fact, the peer review process takes months. It's not something that is rapid fire. Instead, you're saying let me turn this into a political move for I don't know what gains. Because honestly, you're not helping the pollinators. You're not helping the homeowners. When really when it comes down to, what do the constituents of Appleton want? What do the citizens here want? Do they want aesthetics, and controlling other people's landscapes? That seems like a weird thing to suggest? I don't want to suggest what people plant in their gardens. If they like squash, I want them to plant squash. I don't want them to have to plant a specific height regulated lawn. You should allow people to plant what they want in their lawns. You should allow No Mow May to continue to exist. And I actually think we should get more progressive with future measures to promote pollinator conservation.

**Relena Ribbons (Assistant Professor of Geosciences - Lawrence University) 30:22**

You can freely contact me at [ribbonsr@lawrence.edu](mailto:ribbonsr@lawrence.edu). Or if you want to contact me in a nonprofessional email, it's [ribbons@gmail.com](mailto:ribbons@gmail.com). All of this has been on my website that's really visible. I'm just a few blocks from City Hall, and I'd be happy to talk with anyone about the science.

**Aldersperson William Siebers (District 1) 30:41**

Okay.

**Relena Ribbons (Assistant Professor of Geosciences - Lawrence University) 30:42**

Thank you.

**Aldersperson William Siebers (District 1) 30:42**

Thank you. Anybody else? Name and address for the record.

**Bob K. (Resident) 30:56**

I am **[Bob K.]** I reside at **[XXXXXX]** in Appleton. And I would just like to reiterate what I said last month I was here. And I'm in support of No Mow May for a number of reasons. Number one, for me, it's a no brainer. First of all, it is of no cost to the City of Appleton and his residents. It does not include adding money to the budget to support it. Secondly, there's no safety concerns, as I've heard about other issues that have come before this committee. And also, it's just simply very beneficial to the environment. And why would not all of us be concerned about that, these days? If it's good for the environment, it's beneficial for all of us. And so, with that, I just implore you all to support No Mow May.

**Aldersperson William Siebers (District 1) 31:57**

Thank you. Anybody else?

**Brian P. (Resident)** 32:05

I'm [Brian P.] I'm at [XXXXXX] in Appleton. And a few questions came into mind as I was sitting here listening, and I don't know what your process is, and I won't want to engagement back and forth—

**Alderson William Siebers (District 1)** 32:19

You can ask the questions of me.

**Brian P. (Resident)** 32:20

But I—that's what I thought. I would just lay out my questions here and for your consideration as we, as you, I think are going to then deliberate a little bit here. Okay, so we saw—we heard the resolution. And we heard, you know, a whole lot of new information here that takes some of that suppositions and implications of that off the table here. And so, did we learn anything that would make us want to change our mind and maybe withdraw the resolution? And if not, what is it that we're looking for? What information are we looking for that maybe would change your mind? Because I don't know what else you would need other than what we saw here today. And if you can't name that that information of what it would take to change your mind, you know, is—nothing would change my mind. I'd like to know that because that's not rational. Okay. And it starts to border on a whole bunch of other reasons that are pretty ugly. And, I, you know, that wouldn't want that to happen. So, I think those are my questions.

**Alderson William Siebers (District 1)** 33:29

Okay. Thank you.

**Brian P. (Resident)** 33:30

Thanks.

**Alderson William Siebers (District 1)** 33:31

Anybody else in the audience? Okay.

**Brian P. (Resident)** 33:40

I did have one more. The other thing I'd like to know is, how did we learn that the paper was withdrawn? How? How did anybody learn that the paper was withdrawn? How do we know that? I mean, that's pretty, pretty obscure piece of information I would think.

**Alderson William Siebers (District 1)** 33:57

Okay. Anybody else? If not...Name and address.

**Sophie L. (Resident)** 34:12

[Sophie L. XXXXX] in Appleton. And I would just like to stand up for Dr. Del Toro and Dr. Ribbons, and I know how much they care about their work. Dr. Del Toro went up for tenure, and he received it, and he was peer reviewed by a lot of his colleagues and he stood that line of fire. And so as far as the quality of their work and for as important as keeping the academic process away from politics as much as possible, I think they both do a great stand-up job, and we're lucky to have them here today.

**Alderson William Siebers (District 1)** 34:49

Thank you. One more time. Anybody else? All right. Alderson Fenton. You're six now? Are you on? I got you.

**Aldersperson Denise Fenton (District 6) 35:21**

How about director one?

**Aldersperson William Siebers (District 1) 35:23**

You're on.

**Aldersperson Denise Fenton (District 6) 35:25**

Thank you chair. So as a mere holder of a BA in Economics, I can't compete with my colleague and his colleagues with multiple doctorates and many, many, many years of research, but I have been an avid environmentalist and a gardener for a really long time. So, I did my own little research as a gardener would, and I looked to address the—some of the letters we got and some of the comments by the author of this resolution that said that there are far better solutions than letting the grass grow and for attracting and supporting our pollinators. And that was planting flowers, planting blooming shrubs and trees.

**Aldersperson Denise Fenton (District 6) 36:32**

So, I kind of went through my gardening catalogs and I looked at the various species of flowers and plants that attract pollinators, and then I look to see when they bloom. So, dandelions, clover, some of those other wildflowers that our four-inch-high mower deck would cut down, bloom—they're the earliest flowers we see. So, bee balm, great pollinator flower, blooms in mid-summer to late fall. Black Eyed Susan, great pollinator flower, June to September. Lavender—the zone five hardy lavenders bloom in midsummer. Lilacs bloom in early spring as long as we have the proper cold. Now there was an article about the lilacs blooming in fall because of climate change, and they're confused and they don't know what to do anymore. Purple coneflowers are great for pollinators. They bloom in mid to late summer. Sunflowers, late summer to early fall. The serviceberry tree blooms in spring. American plums, mid spring. Flowering cherry, mid spring. Our beautiful flowering crab—crabapples, mid spring.

**Aldersperson Denise Fenton (District 6) 37:52**

So, the bees start hatching. And again, not an entomologist, not an environmentalist, an old lady who likes to garden. The bees come out in early spring, and they're hungry. Yes, absolutely. Lavender, bee balm, black eyed Susans, filet mignon to bees. But those dandelions, you know, that's a Ritz cracker. And when that's all there is, that's what they can eat. So, so I'm struck by the people who, without any data, cite scientific studies telling us that what we should be doing instead of what we do, what we are have been proposing—and just to refresh all of our memories, No Mow May, when we started it in 2020, not by ordinance by the by a suspension of our enforcement, was not based on scientific study that was done here. The data from that study was collected during our first No Mow May in 2020. We were following the lead of some environmentalists like ourselves, amateur gardeners from across the pond, the Plant Life Organization in the UK, who got the citizen scientists to put their lawn mowers away. And they found much greater varieties of plant life and pollinator life. And that's what we based our first No Mow May on.

**Aldersperson Denise Fenton (District 6) 39:35**

The second you know—putting codifying it into our ordinance was partially based on that study, but also partially based on the huge success that we had in terms of people adopting it, the enthusiasm people had for it. People—I know all of us on Council—we got letters from other community saying "How did you guys do this? We want to do what you did."

**Aldersperson Denise Fenton (District 6) 40:02**

So, um, I do not know the motivations for submitting this resolution. But I certainly urge my colleagues on the committee here to recommend this for denial for next week, and support our scientists and the scientific method. Thank you.

**Aldersperson William Siebers (District 1) 40:25**

Thank you. Aldersperson Hartzheim.

**Aldersperson Sheri Hartzheim (District 13) 40:30**

Thank you, Chair. Since I'm given one opportunity, please forgive me if I'm a little bit scattered. I'm not here to compete with anyone either. But I would like us to all stay away from logical fallacies in our arguments. I am concerned when we begin to talk about this ordinance bordering on defamatory because in stating that there's potential for more defamation. So, I'd like us to stay away from that, because I believe that the substance of the ordinance is: we don't have the scientific backing so the ordinance is no longer needed.

**Aldersperson Sheri Hartzheim (District 13) 41:12**

I do have a question that I'm sure we don't have time to have answered, but I'm curious as to why the retraction was not presented to the Council ahead of time for us to say, "Oh, we get it, we understand." You're trying to advance the study that that was a—that that concerns me. I don't believe that there was anything nefarious going on with that. But I was concerned because this study has been touted as the reason behind some of this this policy.

**Aldersperson Sheri Hartzheim (District 13) 41:48**

I hear a lot of people say there's no cost to this. And I caution us to remember that cost doesn't just come from our city budget. Cost comes from community good feelings, costs come from goodwill amongst your neighbors. If it's not all about grass as Aldersperson Del Toro said, then we don't need this ordinance. Because you can still grow your grass all year long to eight inches, which still would accommodate the clovers and the you know, all the early bloomers, etc. I believe that eight inches is a long enough length of grass and the things that come along with grass to sustain this educational policy.

**Aldersperson Sheri Hartzheim (District 13) 42:39**

I'm also curious, in regards to the study, was eight inches measured as a opportunity for success? If we don't know that 12 inches is the ideal then, you know—do we know if eight inches would be enough? And I think until we know that eight inches should be satisfactory.

**Aldersperson Sheri Hartzheim (District 13) 43:01**

And I hate to say lastly, because then you're gonna have to call me on it. I heard that we in Appleton should lead by example. And I believe that leading by example would be not only respecting the scientific community that developed this, and those who are very fervent about supporting No Mow May, but respecting all citizens in our community. And that I believe could be done with the—with staying within our eight-inch standard that is yearlong throughout the city in the municipal code.

**Aldersperson Sheri Hartzheim (District 13) 43:46**

I would like us to keep the educational piece that comes along with No Mow May or, as Aldersperson Schultz has mentioned before, Low Mow. I think we can do a lot to educate folks in the city with those things. But I still think we have to have a standard and a standard that is acceptable—again—to all

citizens in Appleton, not just those folks who are interested in this particular plan of growing their lawn through May.

**Aldersperson Sheri Hartzheim (District 13) 44:17**

I worry also that there will be additional chemical usage in in our neighborhoods because some neighbors are not.... Whether we like it or not, lawns are, are a part of a city. Families love a lawn so their kids can play ball. Whether we like it or not. And there has to be some sort of standard. And I think the standard that we have in play through the rest of the year—eight inches long—is an acceptable standard. I would like us to do that, to stick with that. And I would respectfully ask the committee to consider keeping this resolution. Thank you.

**Aldersperson William Siebers (District 1) 44:55**

Thank you. Aldersperson Schultz what...?

**Aldersperson Alex Schultz (District 9) 45:03**

Thank you, Chair. Oh, been struggling with what I was going to share with committee tonight. And I guess primarily I would ask that, given what was presented on the nature of the science and the scientific method that the author, I would hope, would elect to pull this resolution, but I suspect that won't happen. So, I guess I'll go on a little bit of a rant here.

**Aldersperson Alex Schultz (District 9) 45:32**

We're not asking individuals to mandatorily participate in this program. This is a voluntary program for people in this community who want to find a way to try and do something a little bit different with their lawns. And it has been shown scientifically after a couple of iterations of evaluation that not mowing your lawn immediately at the beginning of this month, might actually have some benefit to pollinating populations and increase diversity and the number of bees that have a chance to establish themselves if we don't disturb their habitat right away when we—as we have all done this weekend—get the urge to get our rakes out and start cleaning up our nasty yards, which is undeniable. I mean, we all have that urge to get out there and clean things up.

**Aldersperson Alex Schultz (District 9) 46:28**

And that's something we can't get away from, but it's a it's a habit that we have grown to accept because most of us have grown up in the last 50 years after World War II, where people came home to lawns that were long grass, and we're sold on this notion that we should be cutting our lawns and maintaining a space that looks clipped and manicured and looks like a golf course. And over 50 years that gets ingrained to our psyche. And all of us have grown up with the notion that that's what we must do. That's the accepted and tolerable standard for what we do with our grass if we buy a house. We have to create a lawn and it has to be four or five inches, look great green and, and singular.

**Aldersperson Alex Schultz (District 9) 47:07**

I have not done that. I've owned my homes for over 25 years. I've never done anything with my lawn. No herbicides, pesticides, fertilizers, and it's a patchwork of lots of different things out there. And I don't know if it's 30 species of different things out there. But there's at least half of that number. And I don't mind it. It's green; it serves its function. And I can tell you that I noticed a lot of insects that I don't notice, in neighboring properties, And I walk my neighborhood. I try to be observant when I do walk my neighborhood and see what's happening on their properties, particularly because I was an author of this resolution several years ago. And so, I'm trying to pay attention.

**Aldersperson Alex Schultz (District 9) 47:48**

And I noticed that what I do is voluntary and, fortunately, after letting it be what it is, letting nature do what it's what it wants to do, I don't have to mow it maybe three or four times a year. And even then, it's just to mow down the [indecipherable] that gets a little crazy.

**Aldersperson Alex Schultz (District 9) 48:07**

So, I guess the point is that everybody's lawn is a little bit different. We all have treated our lawns differently. We've applied things, maybe, and there is no exact science to this. A one rule does not apply to all lawns. And if I were to go to my neighbor and say "You shouldn't mow your lawn," if that neighbor has been applying pesticides for eight years, after two weeks, his lawn is going to be pretty darn high. It might be 10 inches, 12 inches, because what's residual in the soil is having an effect on his grass.

**Aldersperson Alex Schultz (District 9) 48:41**

And actually, I don't want him to grow as lawn eight inches tall, because what he's doing is allowing flowers to bloom that have [been] pulling up herbicides, pesticides, and fertilizers that have been there for five, six, ten years.

**Aldersperson Alex Schultz (District 9) 48:53**

So, the point is that every lawn is different, and individual—every individual who is a homeowner who wants to try and do something different with their lawns, their gardens, and anything else is looking for the ability to explore that. And this month, in Appleton, May is not the same in other communities could be April could be June and other communities depending where you are in the country. But in Appleton, we've decided on May. We're really just trying to get people to [indecipherable] to think about what they're doing and question and what they've been indoctrinated into believing is the thing that they should do with their grass. And there are lots of other options out there.

**Aldersperson Alex Schultz (District 9) 49:35**

So, I think this idea that we're going to rescind the No Mow May because the science, which coincidentally has been proven to show that there is positive benefit, that the science is somehow in question I—it's frustrating to me, particularly because it's calling with question the scientists in this room and that's personally just a little infuriating.

**Aldersperson Alex Schultz (District 9) 50:04**

I'm sorry, I'm rambling a little bit. I didn't, I didn't want to get into this. But this is all about where we're headed as a society, in that, you know, climate change is with us. And we are seeing its evidence, and all we are trying to do in the city—it's just ridiculous to me that we're even having this conversation where all we're trying to do is allow citizens to not mow, allow the city to not issue violations for 30 days, and let whatever happens to these lawns happen, and then let the individuals who are participating figure out what they're going to do. Today, in the future, they might not like their lawns getting that long; they might elect to cut it after two weeks. And in some places that might be beneficial.

**Aldersperson Alex Schultz (District 9) 50:50**

There's lots of questions about the pros and cons of No Mow May; it's not black and white. We have seen an increase in Japanese beetles in the last couple of years. Can we attribute that to the fact that we've allowed more organic matter into our lawns? We don't know. That science will happen. That investigation will happen. These things are not black and white, and they take time to figure out and resolve.

**Aldersperson Alex Schultz (District 9) 51:13**

What we do know is that over 700 communities elected to participate in a No Mow may webinar a couple weeks ago, because they were interested in moving this idea forward. And that over 50 communities in Wisconsin have already instituted No Mow May and are interested in pushing this forward. So, there's a huge interest.

**Aldersperson Alex Schultz (District 9) 51:34**

And what we do know is that Appleton was the first community to start this. And I think it's a travesty that we would be considering this resolution given the history of what we've done and not have a deeper conversation before something like this would come before this committee and before Council to have a conversation, when it is obvious to me that the science is sound, that the science has reason, and that the foundation of this resolution does not stand against the science. Thank you.

**Aldersperson William Siebers (District 1) 52:10**

Thank you.

**Aldersperson Chad Doran (District 15) 52:11**

Chair, I would like an opportunity to respond to [indecipherable.]

**Aldersperson William Siebers (District 1) 52:14**

No, not right now. Aldersperson Meltzer.

**Aldersperson Vered Meltzer (District 2) 52:22**

Thank you. I beseech the committee to deny this resolution. I want to just address a couple of points. I want to try not to repeat things that have already been said. But talking about how it's not about the long grass so we don't need the ordinance. And whether or not how tall your grass is, what benefit does that have to the bees. I think that that misses the point of what No Mow May achieves.

**Aldersperson Vered Meltzer (District 2) 52:57**

It is not about the grass height. It is about not mowing. It's about not disturbing the habitat. So, whether the ideal height is four inches, eight inches, 12 inches, or even three inches, every time you go in there with your mower, you are destroying the world that these creatures live in, and you are destroying the only food they have as they emerge from the winter. However, they can manage to survive during that beginning emergence, that determines the entire population of these insects that get to procreate and continue their existence on this planet.

**Aldersperson Vered Meltzer (District 2) 53:40**

No Mow May isn't about letting people grow long grass. It's about giving these living things a chance to eat some food and not starve to death. And giving people the opportunity to experiment and explore what it takes in their own yard for them to come up with different practices that don't involve mowing so much. The month of May gives them that space to do that figuring out for themselves so that after participating in No Mow May, they have a new relationship with their yard. Maybe they decide that they don't want long grass at all. Or maybe they decide that there are certain parts of their property where the grass grows really tall that would make a great rain garden.

**Aldersperson Vered Meltzer (District 2) 54:31**

Be that as it may, the ordinance was not adopted because of the science of the Lawrence professors' papers. The ordinance was adopted because of our own scientific experiment that we engaged in

together as a community over three years. We had a novel idea. Let's suspend the fines. City staff are concerned. How is this going to burden us? What's gonna happen? Are there going to be complaints?

**Alderson Vered Meltzer (District 2) 55:05**

The entire success of this experiment hinged on what was going to happen. That's why after two successful years of it, we made the ordinance permanently suspending the fines because the city determined that, through the trial, there had been no ill effects. So, we didn't even need the papers and the lifetime of dedication that our scientists have. As citizen scientists, as experimenters, and leaders in our own community, we were able to try out a concept and see that it was good and change our ordinance accordingly.

**Alderson Vered Meltzer (District 2) 55:53**

I do not see anything in this resolution that addresses or touches on that. I do not see anything in this resolution that really explains how it originates, what harm is it trying to solve for? We have a robustly popular community program. We have a lot of attention to our city. We have leadership opportunities, and we're doing great things. So, let's keep doing that. Thank you.

**Alderson William Siebers (District 1) 56:31**

Thank you. Alderson Croatt, do you? Would you want to speak at all? Do you have a...?

**Alderson Chris Croatt (District 14) 56:42**

Thank you.

**Alderson William Siebers (District 1) 56:43**

Okay.

**Alderson Chris Croatt (District 14) 56:43**

Thank you, Chair. I'll keep my comments short. It's actually for staff. We heard, we heard some about increased cost and cost to the city, and I'd like to under better understand the impact that this has had on the inspections department. Back in 2020 there was a memo issued by the inspection supervisor and the former Director of Public Works, expressing some things to consider when deliberating on the original resolution, which was complaints, increased cost (which they identify as something that was going to happen), essential service (which is the amount of calls that were coming into their department to deal with complaints about properties), noxious weeds, and managed natural landscape. Will there be some sort of memo from the Department of Public Works, recapping the impact that No Mow May has had on the department as far as straining resources, allocating staff time to address issues in June? That type of thing?

**Alderson William Siebers (District 1) 57:49**

Director Block.

**Director Danielle Block (Department Of Public Works) 57:51**

Thank you chair. To date, we have not prepared such a memo recapping or reviewing. I could follow up with inspection staff, but to my understanding, there isn't a measurable increase June one. But that memo has not been drafted. No.



**Aldersperson Chris Croatt (District 14) 58:13**

Okay. I'd like to see some level of data or something from the department showing that there has not been an impact to the resources because it's my understanding that the resources in that department are very strained in regards to citizen complaints, things being reported, and their ability to address them in a timely, effective manner.

**Aldersperson William Siebers (District 1) 58:34**

Director Block could you make sure there's an attachment to the minutes by the time this reaches Council?

**Director Danielle Block (Department Of Public Works) 58:43**

Yes.

**Aldersperson William Siebers (District 1) 58:46**

Okay.

**Aldersperson Chris Croatt (District 14) 58:47**

Thanks.

**Aldersperson William Siebers (District 1) 58:48**

Okay. Thank you. All right. Five minutes. Aldersperson Del Toro, there is some question asked have you.

**Aldersperson Israel Del Toro (District 4) 58:57**

Absolutely. Happy to address them.

**Aldersperson William Siebers (District 1) 58:58**

And if you can address the question that was Aldersperson Hartzheim had of you?

**Aldersperson Israel Del Toro (District 4) 59:03**

Yep.

**Aldersperson William Siebers (District 1) 59:05**

You got five minutes.

**Aldersperson Israel Del Toro (District 4) 59:06**

Absolutely. Why wasn't the Council notified? Well, I don't notify the Council about every decision that I make as a scientist. And also, particularly in this situation, when the story doesn't change then there's nothing to notify. You know, when the story says essentially the same thing after year one, there is nothing to notify. There's no story to tell.

**Aldersperson Israel Del Toro (District 4) 59:28**

Same—that actually kind of goes along the lines of the drafting this memo. I feel like we're asking folks to do more work to show that we're not doing more work. And that seems problematic in itself.

**Aldersperson Israel Del Toro (District 4) 59:41**

And in response to the statement regarding defamatory language. It would be as if, you know, I accused a colleague of political mismanagement and inappropriateness by representing some sort of political candidate and spreading some conflict of interest, rendering the—rendering them incapable of performing

their aldermanic duties. Yeah, it has an impact on their job. What we say and what we do on paper and what we write in preparation in these resolutions and spread to our communities, the misinformation that we spread to our communities has implications to our constituents. And it increases distrust in this body of government.

**Aldersperson Israel Del Toro (District 4) 1:00:24**

So, to summarize, the memo seems like a like a silly idea, because it's just not—it seems like it's going to take more time, more staff time to generate said memo than it is to actually address the calls of No Mow May.

**Aldersperson Israel Del Toro (District 4) 1:00:43**

Secondly, we have to use this as a teachable moment as a Council to improve on our communication skills. There are other Council members here who reached out to me and said, Hey, Israel, let's talk about the retraction of that paper. Alder Fenton did it. The mayor did it. Alder Schultz did it. Folks, talk to me. And I said, "Oh, yeah, here's the story." No story. The story is there is no story. However, when presented with that opportunity, the author of the resolution repeatedly declined communication with me. And then so as now wasted, what, 45 minutes of our time today and another 30 last time? And with that, I'm gonna stop wasting everybody's time and let you guys get to a vote.

**Aldersperson William Siebers (District 1) 1:01:22**

All right. I think there's no waste of time. You know. Alder person Doran, you have five minutes if you want to say anything. Sorry, you are clerk?

**Aldersperson Chad Doran (District 15) 1:01:39**

Yeah, thank you. As I said in the beginning, I think almost everything we've heard today is based on emotion. Lots of emotion.

**Aldersperson Chad Doran (District 15) 1:01:49**

I'll note a couple things, I guess by the—I'm not sure if, I guess I'm not entirely sure if he's a doctor or not, but I believe he notes himself as an expert in the identification as the as the person who brought up the concerns about the study. And I'll just note the issues that he raised. Where I think there were three or four things.

**Aldersperson Chad Doran (District 15) 1:02:13**

One, it says "The paper reports multiple bee species that simply do not occur in Wisconsin in May."

**Aldersperson Chad Doran (District 15) 1:02:21**

Another says "The paper methods state that the majority of specimens were identified by sight in the field. This is a problem because many of the listed species require a microscope to identify." The paper listed total of 33 bee species. This this person—like I said, I believe he's a doctor, but specializes in identifying bees says, "19 of those 33 would need to be collected and examined under a microscope. I'm a bee taxonomist, whose primary job is identifying bees so I have a lot of experience identifying these both in the field and in the lab."

**Aldersperson Chad Doran (District 15) 1:02:56**

Another one of the red flags he noted was about implausible—what he said was implausible plant data that in the study, that was, as I said, since retracted, Canada thistle was noted as being present. But he says "finding thistles blooming in May in Wisconsin is biologically implausible. Recording blooming

Canada thistle in May from 30% of lawns as in this study is downright bizarre." And he noted that there were many misspellings of bee names in the study.

**Alderson Chad Doran (District 15) 1:03:30**

So, take from that from that what you will, I guess, but I'm not commenting on the work of the authors because I don't—I'm not a bee specialist. But these are just issues that were addressed by someone who identifies bees as a living as issues with the paper.

**Alderson Chad Doran (District 15) 1:03:47**

But I think the important thing to note here is that in none of the discussion today, or in the past, have we had any information that shows that allowing your grass to grow up to 12 inches from the eight inches already allowed every other month of the year has any benefit beyond allowing your grass to grow eight inches. I noted the numerous studies that show the typical height, maximum height, of dandelions and clover is anywhere from four to eight inches. Nothing says there's a benefit to allowing them to grow more than eight inches. The recommend—recommendation for helping dandelions grow is four inches. I guess I would assume that means maybe they get they get blocked by sunlight perhaps if grass grows longer than the dandelions do. I don't know. That's just what studies show.

**Alderson Chad Doran (District 15) 1:04:39**

So, again, I think we're not separating the facts from feelings here. Most of the discussion has centered on the fact that that I or maybe others who support this resolution, want to see people maintain their yard like a golf course. Golf courses are mowed at less than an inch. I don't know anyone in Appleton or anywhere who has a yard that's less than an inch long. That's not what this is about at all. The old resolution and the current resolution throughout the rest of the year allows you to grow your grass to eight inches. No one has an issue with that. I'm not suggesting we change that at all.

**Alderson Chad Doran (District 15) 1:05:18**

All I'm suggesting is that we take away the ordinance that allows you to grow it for 12 inches in May, and put it back to the way it was prior to this resolution being brought forward. Because as I've said, nothing that we've heard says there's any benefit to allowing it to grow longer than eight inches.

**Alderson William Siebers (District 1) 1:05:39**

Thank you.

**Alderson Katie Van Zeeland (District 5) 1:05:44**

Thank you Chair. I actually learned of the notice of retraction of other Alder Del Toro's paper last fall. But as I read the retraction notice at the time, it just appeared to me that there was an issue with wrangling the data versus there being anything nefarious, and as I'm not an academic, I decided I would just wait until there was more information. Once the retraction took place, I did reach out to Alder Del Toro and also to the bee scientist who had said that they had problems with that study. Alder Del Toro explained what he explained here very clearly. And actually, Alder Doran brought up these points already that the scientist had posted, he had explained that they hadn't retained samples, so they couldn't refute the claims, but they had done so in later experiments and other universities in Wisconsin had done so it well as well. It took a couple of contacts for me to reach the bee specialist, but I was finally able to reach him. And in response to my questions and concerns, he said he had nothing more to add beyond the previously stated issues.

**Aldersperson Katie Van Zeeland (District 5) 1:06:48**

So, I'm gonna make this simple. I voted for No Mow May the first time after amending it to remove the grace period of two weeks that allowed my constituents to experience a No Mow May and see that some of the fears that they had were unfounded. And since then, each time this has come before us, I have supported it because my constituents have shown great interest in support of the program. Nothing has changed since then so I will not support a resolution to curtail this. And I also don't believe that there's any issues with Municipal Serve—or I'm sorry, the DPW handling any complaints because we would have heard about it before today. I as president would have heard about it before today. Thank you.

**Aldersperson William Siebers (District 1) 1:07:32**

Anybody else? Aldersperson Firkus?

**Aldersperson Brad Firkus (District 3) 1:07:35**

Thank you chair. The points made about this professor Portman's blog posts that led to the concerns that led to this paper being retracted, my colleague, expressing that he's familiar with this, would also then be familiar with why this was done, why this was retracted. What this resolution fails to add in, what it intentionally omits, is that bee populations were stronger where there was no mowing. That seems to me to be the strongest and most relevant fact of all about this.

**Aldersperson Brad Firkus (District 3) 1:08:09**

The fact that you would know that information, omit that information, and submit this resolution makes it inconceivable that this resolution's primary impetus is about No Mow May to even begin with. I think that this is an entirely inappropriate use of the powers we have as an aldersperson. And I think we should defeat this. And I think any aldersperson that decides to use their power in the future should face some sort of public notification—something. I don't know what, but I find this entirely inappropriate. Thank you Chair.

**Aldersperson William Siebers (District 1) 1:08:43**

Okay.

**Attorney Christopher Behrens 1:08:56**

Need a motion to deny if this one fails.

**Aldersperson William Siebers (District 1) 1:08:59**

**[Aldersperson Siebers was not picked up by the microphone. He called a vote with three committee members voting against the motion to approve and Aldersperson Doran voting in favor of the motion to approve.]**

**Aldersperson William Siebers (District 1) 1:09:19**

Chair votes nay. I need a motion to deny the...

**Aldersperson Katie Van Zeeland (District 5) 1:09:24**

Motion to deny

**Aldersperson Israel Del Toro (District 4) 1:09:26**

Can you also do a motion to receive and file?

[Aldersperson Siebers said something off microphone.]

**Aldersperson Brad Firkus (District 3) 1:09:34**  
Second.

**Attorney Christopher Behrens 1:09:35**  
Chair, I'm sorry, who was the mover?

**Aldersperson William Siebers (District 1) 1:09:39**  
Aldersperson Van Zeeland.

**Aldersperson William Siebers (District 1) 1:09:45**

[Aldersperson Siebers said something off microphone before realizing his microphone was off and turning it on.]

**Aldersperson William Siebers (District 1) 1:09:53**  
All those in favor of denying the resolution signify by saying aye.

**Alderspersons Firkus, Van Zeeland, and Thyssen 1:09:58**  
Aye.

**Aldersperson William Siebers (District 1) 1:09:59**  
All those vote against.

**Aldersperson Chad Doran (District 15) 1:10:01**  
Nay.

**Aldersperson William Siebers (District 1) 1:10:02**  
Chair votes, aye to negate the resolution. Four one.

**Aldersperson William Siebers (District 1) 1:10:11**  
Okay. I know you want it to receive and file but a motion was made and I—

**Aldersperson Israel Del Toro (District 4) 1:10:17**  
How—just for clarification, how does that process work of receive file relative to negate? Receive and file keeps it alive or...?

**Aldersperson William Siebers (District 1) 1:10:26**  
City attorney? Would you want to answer that question?

**Attorney Christopher Behrens 1:10:28**  
If you'd like me to chair.

**Aldersperson William Siebers (District 1) 1:10:30**  
Yes.

**Aldersperson Israel Del Toro (District 4) 1:10:31**

Teachable moment. Thank you.

**Attorney Christopher Behrens 1:10:34**

It's not necessarily a motion to receive and file, it's a motion to table either for a period of time where you bring it back to committee or table indefinitely, which in case—that case it it's stands indefinitely, somewhere in space. Could be called back, but most likely isn't.

**Aldersperson Israel Del Toro (District 4) 1:10:50**

Gotcha. Thank you. Appreciate the clarification.