

## Item 23-1407: Resolution #13-R-23 To Use ARPA Funding for Flock License Plate Reading Cameras for APD

Finance Committee

Mon, Dec 11, 2023 5:30PM

**Alderman Brad Firkus (District 3) 07:41**

All right. With that we will move into our action items starting with 23-1407 Resolution 13-R-23 to use ARPA funding for Flock License plate reading cameras for Appleton police.

**Alderman Chris Croatt (District 14) 07:55**

Move to approve.

**Alderman Sheri Hartzheim (District 13) 07:55**

Second.

**Alderman Chad Doran (District 15) 07:56**

Thank you. This resolution was just born out of discussion from our budget discussions earlier last month and related to the number of Flock license plate reader cameras, I guess, that the police department had initially requested was not able to be funded in the budget for 2024, under sort of discussion with Chief Olson, as we kind of came to realize the police department does desire in the future to purchase these other cameras. The sort of hitch there is that the cost of each camera will be more—\$500 more per camera—at least in 2024. We don't know maybe about beyond that if it takes that long.

**Alderman Brad Firkus (District 3) 07:56**

All right, we have a motion and a second. I would—Alder Doran how about we start—we'll give the floor to you if you want to kind of set us up here, since this is your resolution, and we'll go from there then. Oh 13. All right.

**Alderman Chad Doran (District 15) 09:05**

So, there's certainly an opportunity to save some significant savings to the city in purchasing these cameras now, with some ARPA funds. I think this is something that if we believe strongly in the program, as I think we do, because we approved the negotiated contract, I guess for the 2024 budget, and we're going to support requests from the police department in the future, it would, I think makes sense for us to purchase these additional cameras while we can under the original price and realize those savings while we have the opportunity.

**Alderman Chad Doran (District 15) 09:46**

The, I guess, note that I would share for a potential amendment is in discussions with Chief Olson and the budget manager for the police department, initially we were under the impression, there was not an additional cost for the management of these additional cameras, but on the day of the last meeting where this was held, we learned, I guess, from Flock, that there is an additional \$100,000 for the for the life of the contract for management of these additional cameras that we'd be looking at purchasing. So, there would, I guess, need to be an amendment to include that cost in this resolution as well.

**Alderman Chad Doran (District 15) 10:32**

But even with the additional costs for the management of the cameras over the life of this contract, there still is a savings for the city that we are going to realize upfront by doing this now rather than if we do it at a point in the future, whether that's next year, buying the additional 10 cameras or not, or if it's piecemeal over a number

of years where potentially both the cost of the camera and the management could be even higher than what that is. So, I would encourage our colleagues, I think, to support this at this point, and move this forward.

**Aldersperson Brad Firkus (District 3) 11:05**

Alright, thank you. Just—and Director Ohman, you can nod or chime in—just to clarify, so when we're talking about the extra \$100,000, is that—so it's \$25,000—it really ends up being \$25,000 per year for the entire five years of the contract. So that's what we're really talking about. Just Chief Olson, what microphone number do you have? District Six, too? Okay.

**Police Chief Polly Olson 11:27**

Yeah, thank you. I just want to make sure that we're all on the same page with this. So, what it is \$3,000 a camera—it'll go up to \$3,000 a camera per year. And right now, we've entered into a five-year contract with Flock at \$2,500 a camera per year. The cameras are not purchased, they're leased property. And it's a contract with Flock to provide those services, which includes storage, maintenance of the cameras, and all of the other equipment leases and things like that, that go along with that. So, it is a total of \$125,000 for five years, which would be the requirement that we would have to sign with Flock in order to get the best price.

**Aldersperson Brad Firkus (District 3) 12:14**

All right. Thank you for clarifying on that. I know, I know we keep using the word "purchasing" cameras, and but, yeah, that's a very important distinction that it's not equipment that we own. And you know, it's more like we're renting a cable box versus buying a TV. So, I guess with that, with the remarks so far, I'll entertain if somebody wants to make that motion. So, I saw Alder Hartzheim first.

**Police Chief Polly Olson 12:35**

Could I please ask a question?

**Aldersperson Brad Firkus (District 3) 12:37**

Sure.

**Aldersperson Sheri Hartzheim (District 13) 12:39**

Director Ohman, if the intent is to use ARPA funds for this, but we're talking about spreading it out over a five year, is that even possible?

**Director Jeri Ohman (Finance) 12:52**

So, I did have a lengthy conversation with our consultants on Friday regarding using ARPA funds for this on a couple of different levels. For your question about the five years, we are only allowed to use ARPA funds through the end of December of 2026. That is when ARPA funds have to be spent by. We cannot prepay for those additional two years. However, with the ARPA funds, there is a lost revenue clause which we've used for the parking utility in the past where we could have the Flock cameras fall under lost revenue, in which case we would need to transfer the funds to the general fund, and then we could prepay the five-year contract up front. There's just different reporting requirements for it. So right at the outset, if we wanted to prepay using ARPA funds, no, but we have a workaround, if that helps.

**Aldersperson Sheri Hartzheim (District 13) 13:54**

Thank you. So, with that in mind, I would like them to amend this to as best encapsulate what was just stated by Director Ohman. I believe that means that it would be \$75,000 for the three years that we're capable of doing this, and then the balance would be on the prepayment of lost revenue.

**Director Jeri Ohman (Finance)** 14:14

Yeah, my preference would be just to do the 125,000—

**Aldersperson Sheri Hartzheim (District 13)** 14:18

Okay.

**Director Jeri Ohman (Finance)** 14:18

—categorize it under lost revenue.

**Aldersperson Sheri Hartzheim (District 13)** 14:20

Excellent. That's what I would propose then, please.

**Aldersperson Brad Firkus (District 3)** 14:24

Alright, we have a motion.

**Aldersperson Chris Croatt (District 14)** 14:25

Second.

**Aldersperson Brad Firkus (District 3)** 14:26

All right. motion a second. All right, attorney, I'll just give you a moment to enter that in before we get too far ahead of you in here.

**Aldersperson Sheri Hartzheim (District 13)** 14:40

Might I ask another question, Chair.

**Aldersperson Brad Firkus (District 3)** 14:43

Sure. You can do that while we're...

**Aldersperson Sheri Hartzheim (District 13)** 14:44

Thank you. If I could, I'd like to ask, Chief Olson please. I know you will say we can get by with what we have because that was stated in the budget discussions, and I know that you can because you have excellent staff and you yourself are excellent. It's your job. Will—is the intent to fill out this Flock (this Flock we currently have to a bigger Flock with these 10 additional cameras) is that really on the agenda—is that what is going to give us the ultimate best in best practice with this camera system?

**Police Chief Polly Olson** 15:24

The short answer is "Yes." The addition of these 10 cameras at the current locations, which is what we have right now for our test pilot project, have proven to be quite successful as we know. And by eliminating 10 and going to 19, obviously, we risk losing potential leads on future crimes that perhaps we could have gotten leads on had those cameras been in place. We also have the flexibility of moving a camera. So, if we find that it would be more advantageous to put a camera at a different location, we certainly have the flexibility to do that. And certainly, with more cameras that allows much more flexibility with moving them as needed. So, the short answer is "Yes." I think that at this time where we have to try to maximize the resources that we have, this is a tool that we have access to that provides a lot of benefits to the whole community.

**Aldersperson Sheri Hartzheim (District 13)** 16:27

Thank you.

**Alderson Brad Firkus (District 3) 16:28**

All right. All right. I see Alder Alfheim. So, microphone number, please.

**Alderson Kristin Alfheim (District 11) 16:40**

Thank you, Chair. If I may ask a question of Chief Olson?

**Alderson Brad Firkus (District 3) 16:43**

And just a just a reminder, we do have the motion for amendment on this on here right now. So, questions should be—we should try and keep the questions pertinent to that just for clarity, but go ahead. Just yeah, I wanted to mention that before—I just wanted to make sure before we got too far into just discussing the broader topics that we focus just on the amendment at the moment as best we can. But go ahead.

**Alderson Kristin Alfheim (District 11) 17:04**

Okay. My question has to do with we have existing 29 cameras placed now. The budget—in the budget, we approved that we leased 10. And the proposal is to purchase—or I'm sorry, lease an additional 10. So, we would have 20 out of the original 29. But based on prior conversations, the 29 that are already positioned, they likely may not take them down for six to 18 months. Do I remember that correctly?

**Police Chief Polly Olson 17:38**

District Six. Okay, thank you. I don't know what the exact timeline is. Right now, they continue to be operational as our pilot program—they have not shut down those cameras yet.

**Alderson Kristin Alfheim (District 11) 17:51**

So, the APD is currently using all 29 of those cameras, and we'll continue to have all 29 of those cameras going forward until the day we don't?

**Police Chief Polly Olson 18:01**

Correct which could be any day.

**Alderson Kristin Alfheim (District 11) 18:03**

Could be any day or also could be when they no longer function, and the company doesn't want to replace them. I guess my point is—and I apologize if I'm not exactly where I need to be. But my point is, we are looking at taking on a cost of the \$100,000 plus the \$25,000 for something that technically we would be getting for nothing for what could be six to 18 months. So, the idea of not taking up this amendment, and we get three months' worth of value out of the cameras that are on the pilot that we're not paying for at all that still work, would far out way the savings of buying them at a \$500 discount. Am I wrong?

**Police Chief Polly Olson 18:46**

I don't know where the six to 18 months came from.

**Alderson Kristin Alfheim (District 11) 18:49**

It's the company's purview to take them down when they choose. Right? The one—in the pilot program?

**Police Chief Polly Olson 18:56**

I would imagine so, yes.

**Alderson Kristin Alfheim (District 11) 18:58**

Right. And that pilot ran out when?

**Police Chief Polly Olson 19:03**

I don't have the exact dates in front of me. I could find them though and get back to you on that.

**Aldersperson Kristin Alfheim (District 11) 19:08**

Wasn't it a number of months ago?

**Police Chief Polly Olson 19:11**

It was. Yes, correct.

**Aldersperson Kristin Alfheim (District 11) 19:13**

Right. And we've been given any warning that they're coming down anytime soon?

**Police Chief Polly Olson 19:18**

No.

**Aldersperson Kristin Alfheim (District 11) 19:19**

So, that that actually is my point—right? We have the system in. We may have the system and without spending any money for an additional three—could be one month, could be three months, could be a year. So, I'm concerned that to try and save \$500 per machine may end up costing us. We're paying for a camera that isn't being taken down anyways, for another six months. That's my concern on this amendment. Because we don't know that they're going to take them down.

**Police Chief Polly Olson 19:50**

Can I make a comment?

**Aldersperson Brad Firkus (District 3) 19:52**

Yes, please.

**Police Chief Polly Olson 19:52**

Okay. My only—I understand where you're coming from. I think the questions that would have to be asked that if we just wait it out and then all of a sudden they turn them off and then take them down. The if we decide that we would in the future want to have those cameras at those locations, my guess would we would have to pay the additional costs associated with reinstalling them. So that would have to be taken into consideration with whatever decision is made and what those additional costs could be. There are—and I think—I'm not sure if anybody in this room could answer it, but there's—there were permitting costs and things like that involved with the installation to begin with. That was—those are the additional costs that we might be on the hook for if we don't go with this program now.

**Aldersperson Kristin Alfheim (District 11) 20:45**

And if I may, just because—I appreciate what you're sharing with me. So, the 10 that we've already agreed to lease, are we paying that permit fee to reinstall new cameras at those sites or are they maintaining the originals?

**Police Chief Polly Olson 21:00**

So, we have 20 cameras in place right now. 19 of them are stationary, and one is a mobile camera.

**Aldersperson Kristin Alfheim (District 11) 21:06**

I'm sorry. My question was, are we getting a new one now that we're signing on the dotted line to have this contract? Or are they maintaining the same con—the same cameras where they are? Is there any new permitting that we are taking on by doing the cameras that you already said yes to?

**Police Chief Polly Olson 21:24**

No. And part of that

**Aldersperson Kristin Alfheim (District 11) 21:27**

You see where I'm confused.

**Police Chief Polly Olson 21:28**

Yeah. And that's—the purpose of doing the pilot is to determine the best locations for these cameras, and to determine whether or not having them positioned in such a way because they're facing in certain directions at certain intersections. They had to go through different steps in terms of how to mount them, where to mount them. Some were on poles. Some are attached to other things to get the most maximum benefit. So that's why there's a pilot process just so that those cameras could be positioned in the best place at that time. So, I'm not sure how to answer your question because if the cameras at some point removed, and then we go to reinstall it, there's going to be additional costs involved with there is that.

**Aldersperson Kristin Alfheim (District 11) 22:12**

Yeah, and I appreciate your patience on it. I guess my there is thought on this is we like how the cameras are working. Right? This is good for our community. This is good for public safety. My question is, I'm challenging the math in trying to save \$500 when I don't believe they're gonna go steal the cameras in the middle of the night. They're going to give us some warning, right? So, I'm hesitant in saying yes to let's jump to use the ARPA dollars on this to save \$500 when we easily could be getting 90 days and not pay anything in which case, we would have saved more money than the extra 500 per machine. That's my only discussion on it. And I'll leave it at that.

**Aldersperson Brad Firkus (District 3) 22:50**

All right. Just before we go on with talking about this. I mean, we're talking about already 19 for sure. There were 29 in the pilot. 19 we've already said, yes, we're going to do. And this is asking for to keep the other 10, the difference between that. From my standpoint, I'm thinking if we're going to discuss this, we should discuss this with enough funding to cover the five years. I'm not comfortable with kind of gambling and hoping that they don't, you know, pull the plug, you know, until an extended period of time. I think that's kind of a that's a little too high variable a little too risk, excuse me a little too risky. Where my preference is, as we continue this discussion, is if we're going to even consider this, we should consider this with enough money to cover the full five years. So, with that, does anyone have any other comments or questions? Do you still Alder Hartzheim?

**Aldersperson Sheri Hartzheim (District 13) 23:39**

It's not necessarily on the amendments and it is following up on what Alder Alfheim said, so I'll leave it to you whether you would entertain that.

**Aldersperson Brad Firkus (District 3) 23:47**

Let's just to keep it moving. Let's keep it more pertinent to the amendment. We can come back to you after we reach the point of—Alder Fenton.

**Alderson Denise Fenton (District 6) 23:53**

Thank you, chair. So, my question is probably for Director Ohman, but we can ask the resolution author. My question is where in the ARPA funding was the intent to get the original \$25,000? And I honestly need it explain to me how this constitutes loss—how this can fall under lost revenue. Because I'm looking at as of September 30, what the breakdown on our expenditures and our, you know, what we have allocated and what we have left. And we talked a whole lot into different budgets to hammer out those allocations. And where I see that, you know, we have some in the COVID 19 response, which I guess we could loosely—I mean understand that we have that lost revenue. In my mind the parking util levy funding clearly fits the definition of lost revenue from COVID. So, I need it to explain to me in really short words how these public safety cameras fall under lost revenue if we're not using them for any sort of traffic enforcement wherein we would have ticketing revenue, etc.

**Director Jeri Ohman (Finance) 25:06**

So, I'll try to do this in a few words. ARPA funds—we have our budget, where we've designated the different categories where we're going to spend within. These cameras could fall under—I forget the full name—I think it's "community wellness", but it has violence prevention. And that's where you could claim this as part of violence prevention.

**Director Jeri Ohman (Finance) 25:56**

The lost revenue side of it is simply an ARPA reporting piece of it, where if a municipality chose, they could claim a large chunk of ARPA dollars just as lost revenue and then use it to offset different expenses without having to follow any other reporting guidelines as long as you could show allowable expenses. So that's what we were doing with the parking utility with the initial one and a half million dollars.

**Director Jeri Ohman (Finance) 26:33**

For this, it's not necessarily that we're saying the Flock cameras are a result of lost revenue. It's just a way to report them on the ARPA side of it for federal reporting, where we don't have to follow the same guidelines, for instance, with making sure that we spend those dollars or that they apply to the period prior to 2026.

**Alderson Denise Fenton (District 6) 26:59**

So, can I follow up from that? So, am I correctly understanding that the bucket in terms of the allocations where we would be taking that would be "community wellness, mental health and violence prevention"?

**Alderson Brad Firkus (District 3) 27:15**

I don't think that's been defined at this point. And I would like to revisit—I would like to visit that topic once we get through the amendment. Okay.

**Alderson Denise Fenton (District 6) 27:22**

Perfect. Thank you. I will defer that, but...

**Alderson Brad Firkus (District 3) 27:26**

All right. So, with that, are there any other comments or questions pertinent to the amendment? Alder Wolff.

**Alderson Nate Wolff (District 12) 27:33**

Thank you, Chair. Just to follow up with Director Ohman real quick. You said that it was falling under "violence prevention." And we can point to specific instances—

**Aldersperson Brad Firkus (District 3) 27:45**

Alder Wolff, we just established that that has not been determined yet. The resolution does not specify where in ARPA

**Aldersperson Nate Wolff (District 12) 27:51**

No, not that. That's not what I'm asking. I'm asking our guidelines. Right. We're using lost revenue under violence prevention, correct?

**Aldersperson Brad Firkus (District 3) 28:00**

That has not been established yet. Okay, the lost the lost revenue, yes, but the violence pretend—prevention, no. That that half of it has not been established. And that's something I'm interested in us thrashing out up here, but we have not gotten to that point yet.

**Aldersperson Nate Wolff (District 12) 28:16**

Okay. Thank you.

**Aldersperson Brad Firkus (District 3) 28:17**

All right. I still have Alder Croatt and then Alder Hartzheim.

**Aldersperson Chris Croatt (District 14) 28:20**

Thanks. So, on the amendment, I think the important part here is—and that's a good point. Good points brought up about where's this money coming from. But I think the important part is our consultant was consulted, and they are saying that there is a way to use ARPA money to fund this over the entire term through lost, quote, unquote, lost revenue. It's a relative—I know it's a lot of money, but it's a relatively small amount compared to what other communities are doing with some of the ARPA dollars. I know, just for the Outagamie County there was over \$600,000 allocated to the sheriff's department in supplies and crime prevention things under lost revenue.

**Aldersperson Brad Firkus (District 3) 29:03**

Thank you. Alder Hartzheim.

**Aldersperson Sheri Hartzheim (District 13) 29:05**

Thank you, chair. If the seconder would allow, I would like to modify my amendments, please.

**Aldersperson Chris Croatt (District 14) 29:14**

Open.

**Aldersperson Sheri Hartzheim (District 13) 29:16**

I would like to modify what I stated—actually what Director Ohman stated—and include that these funds would come from the community—what was the category?

**Aldersperson Denise Fenton (District 6) 29:34**

Community wellness, mental health, and violence prevention.

**Aldersperson Sheri Hartzheim (District 13) 29:37**

Correct. Please, if I could amend.

**Alderson Chris Croatt (District 14) 29:41**  
Second.

**Alderson Brad Firkus (District 3) 29:42**

All right, we have a motion and a second. So, I guess we then continue on with conversation on the amendment with that added language. So, I'm going to give all the rules the opportunity to revisit since I did kind of shut you down when that part of it was not relevant to the amendment, but now that it is if you would like to proceed with your question. And then Alder Fenton, I'll come back to you.

**Alderson Nate Wolff (District 12) 30:02**

Thank you, Chair. So, we specifically are using the reasoning that it is preventing violence, correct. As far as loss of revenue?

**Alderson Brad Firkus (District 3) 30:14**

Alder Wolff, just clarify, who you're asking?

**Alderson Nate Wolff (District 12) 30:17**

Director Ohman.

**Alderson Brad Firkus (District 3) 30:17**

Okay. Thank you. Sorry.

**Director Jeri Ohman (Finance) 30:21**

That is the bucket that we are selecting from. Yes.

**Alderson Nate Wolff (District 12) 30:26**

And do we have specific examples that we can back that statement up with?

**Director Jeri Ohman (Finance) 30:32**

That I would have to refer to Chief Olson.

**Police Chief Polly Olson 30:36**

I have district 6. Thank you. I can point to an example that just comes to the top of my head just to answer your question regarding tools for prevention. There was a case recently, and I believe it was out of California—I can find the exact case if you'd like. But there was a homicide suspect that was traveling through multiple communities and actually just killing random homeless folks. And it was a lead that was developed through the Flock cameras that they had there that led to the identification and then subsequent arrest of this individual. This is a case that I can 100% guarantee—well, I guess nobody can 100% guarantee. I can almost guarantee that there would have been more unfortunate victims in this case, had they not been able to get a lead from these Flock cameras as quickly as they did to make an arrest. I mean, that's one of I'm sure many examples that if I was given some time to dig into that I could find that we could use these Flock cameras to point to evidence of violence prevention.

**Alderson Brad Firkus (District 3) 31:44**

All right. Then next I had Alder Fenton.

**Alderson Denise Fenton (District 6) 31:49**

Thank you, Chair. I'm grateful for to Alder Hartzheim for making that amendment because that allows me to say just how violently I'm opposed to taking money—a quarter of what we have allocated for community wellness, mental health, and violence prevention, to put up 10 cameras. And I will absolutely grant that those are very useful in catching some people. I took the tour of the mobile command facility. I was absolutely fascinated with the amount of data. And if—but I do not think that that is worth—we have half a million dollars that we have allocated for mental health, community wellness, and violence prevention. And I honestly think that those funds are better spent on things that serve the whole community in terms of domestic violence and just other things, more so than the cameras.

**Alderson Denise Fenton (District 6) 33:00**

I wish we had all the money to buy the cameras right now. We approved what we what the police department and the Council agreed was worthwhile at the time, the 19 for \$54,000. But I just can't see taking a quarter of what we've allocated for a certain purpose for this. And if I could have a follow up question on—I'm going to come back to this because I have absolutely forgotten it.

**Alderson Brad Firkus (District 3) 33:36**

All right. I—just real quick, I want to ask a question that's kind of pertinent to what was being mentioned here. With the trunk of ARPA funds that we're discussing here, I would like to know, Chief Olson or maybe if someone else can answer, if they're—I would assume that at some point in the last couple of years, there's been some ideas in the works or kicked around that would be seeking to use some of those dollars. Are you aware of any ideas? Is there any chance that if we were to go forward with this, that this would have impact on other potential programs or initiatives that have been currently under discussion? I think it would just be nice to know that level of detail if that is known, just so we can kind of fully grasp, you know, what's at play here. If there's tradeoffs that we have to make.

**Director Jeri Ohman (Finance) 34:34**

I did speak with Director Homan who's kind of putting all the different projects together under the different buckets and she did say that there is room for this within that that bucket.

**Alderson Brad Firkus (District 3) 34:47**

All right, thank you. And then I have Alder Hartzheim, Alder Croatt, and then I'll come back to you, Alder Fenton.

**Alderson Denise Fenton (District 6) 34:52**

And I was just—my point of order is that I was misreading my line—

**Alderson Brad Firkus (District 3) 34:56**

Okay.

**Alderson Denise Fenton (District 6) 34:57**

—that I was not following across because I have bad eyes. We still have a million dollars, none of which is obligated in community wellness, mental health, and violence prevention. So not a quarter, but still substantial.

**Alderson Brad Firkus (District 3) 35:13**

Thank you.

**Alderson Denise Fenton (District 6) 35:14**

Anyway, I was just correcting that.

**Alderson Brad Firkus (District 3) 35:15**

All right. Thank you. So now Alder Hartzheim.

**Alderson Sheri Hartzheim (District 13) 35:18**

Thank you, Chair. And thank you Alder Fenton for that. I understand that you're vehemently opposed, but if there's not a better place at this point at which we should spend \$125,000 of ARPA funds, there's no reason for us to say "Nope, we have to hold it. And we have to keep it there until we figure out what we're going to do with that." And especially because Director Ohman said that Director Homan—so many directors—Director Homan said, there's room for this. So, this makes it even more acceptable to me as far as a good way to use these funds. Thank you.

**Alderson Brad Firkus (District 3) 35:58**

With the Homan/Ohman, now you know how I feel when I have both of you in my line of sight. I have to get the name right. [Note: he was joking about how he has a difficult time keeping Alderson Hartzheim's and Alderson Alfheim's names straight.] All right, Alder Croatt.

**Alderson Chris Croatt (District 14) 36:07**

Thank you, Chair. I was gonna basically echo what Alder Hartzheim said is this is not draining the fund. There's plenty of money still in that fund for the other two uses that are listed. I think it's money well—ARPA money well spent. It's one of the reasons why we would use some of the money. The whole community does benefit from this. Maybe not directly, but indirectly, there's a lot of benefit to investing in this. So, I'm not opposed to taking the money out of that particular ARPA bucket. Thank you.

**Alderson Brad Firkus (District 3) 36:42**

Alder Wolff, you had your hand up before, okay. And then Alder Alfheim.

**Alderson Nate Wolff (District 12) 36:47**

Thank you, chair. While, not formally obligated, we did pass a resolution this year, indicating how we would spend that \$1 million in ARPA allocations for nonprofit organizations in our community. Just to put that out there.

**Alderson Brad Firkus (District 3) 37:07**

Thank you. Alder Alfheim.

**Alderson Kristin Alfheim (District 11) 37:10**

Thank you, chair. Everything that we're all talking about is for the good of our community. You know, we all are. We know that our APD is doing everything in their power to keep us safe. I don't care what bucket it comes from. My challenge on this is, we don't have a magic wand with a never-ending bucket of resources. And when the directors come to us at budget season, they have already gone through the pain to say we know we can't have everything, here's what we need. And that's what we approve the budget based on. So, with that in mind, I have to trust that Chief Olson knows that if we go with the original plan, they still can do a good job of protecting the city.

**Alderson Kristin Alfheim (District 11) 37:46**

I understand the concept of what the amendment is bringing forth; however, if we're taking the dollars utilizing the ARPA concept out of mental health and wellness, I have a challenge with that, because how much of the policing that the APD needs to do has to do with the challenge and the crisis that we have with mental health

and drugs in our community, which is the bucket that we're now taking money out of to have more monitoring of that problem. So, I understand and I respect very much what the APD is trying to do and what Alder Doran is trying to say "if we can let's make it happen if we can save a few dollars"; however, to take the money out of the pot that is actually addressing the problem which leads us to need more cameras, to me makes more sense. We're going to the source, which is people in need, and our community has worked very hard at bucketing these monies so that we're not just funding the management of the problem, but we're trying to solve the problem. So that's my concern in using the ARPA dollars. It's not that I'm against having the cameras. I get that I'm against taking money out of the bucket that's meant to prevent some of the crime that leads to it, and I don't think we should be doing that. I think that's a bad choice.

**Alderson Brad Firkus (District 3) 39:08**

All right. Alder Hartzheim.

**Alderson Sheri Hartzheim (District 13) 39:11**

Thank you, chair. To address Alder Alfheim's concern, that bucket is not just for mental health. That bucket is for mental health—what are they again, please?

**Alderson Denise Fenton (District 6) 39:22**

Community wellness, mental health, and violence prevention.

**Alderson Sheri Hartzheim (District 13) 39:25**

Thank you. So, violence prevention—if we're going to say there are three things in this bucket, let's take that million dollars and divide it by three. This is actually less than that. So, I think that there's much to say about this without drawing away from the importance of the other problems that the city faces that we are—we have bucketed these ARPA funds for. I think this is a good use of a small, very small, portion (a 10th of it, if it's a million dollars, or a little over a 10th of it) to make this happen to assist our police department and keep our community—to help prevent some violence. This could be additional violence going to be prevented any day with the use of these Flock cameras. Thank you.

**Alderson Brad Firkus (District 3) 40:11**

Alder Meltzer, microphone number please.

**Alderson Vered Meltzer (District 2) 40:18**

Thank you. One of my concerns is the prudence of getting these additional cameras at this juncture. We know that the Flock company has this discount. We know that this is being rolled out in a lot of communities. A lot of communities are getting a lot of cameras. We're also all connected to each other on these systems. So as all the communities establish and bring their cameras online, in the future, there will be the ability to build efficiencies so that we're not being redundant. For example, the county could place one in one place, the city could place one—like there's a way in which, you know, do we really—should we really be saying, like, "19 cameras isn't enough; we really do need those other 10?" Or should we be saying, "How can we be more cost effective about the overall network of cameras in the big picture, with the money that we're spending and the money that other communities are spending?"

**Alderson Vered Meltzer (District 2) 41:13**

I think that, you know, as valuable as these cameras are, I think everyone would agree that we don't need four of them at every intersection. However, I'm pretty sure that if communities could be persuaded to do that Flock would offer discounts to help them get that set up. So, I think that, you know, while we do have this discount that we're looking at, I feel like part of—part of the whole reason why this resolution exists is because of this

discount situation. If I need a roll of duct tape, and there's a discount, and I can buy six rolls, great, but I probably shouldn't buy 60 rolls that are going to require me to buy an additional piece of furniture to hold them and compromise my ability to use a room.

**Aldersperson Vered Meltzer (District 2) 41:58**

So, like, there were budgetary decisions that were made and things that seemed reasonable when we decided to forego these 10 cameras. And I think that those are—you know, there are opportunities to improve the camera net, especially through collaboration with other communities. I don't think that leasing an additional 10 cameras right now, when we've already looked at our budget and said, "Okay, here's where we've decided to draw some lines." It just doesn't make sense to me. Thank you.

**Aldersperson Brad Firkus (District 3) 42:28**

All right, real quick. Chief Olson, could you kind of—could you describe to us what the relationship is with some of our neighboring community (because some of our neighboring communities are also on this Flock system and using these cameras) just to kind of give us a little bit of idea of what level of coordination and communication there is between your department and some of the neighboring departments.

**Police Chief Polly Olson 42:53**

Yeah, so what I can share is that the across the country, any municipality that leases Flock cameras from Flock and places them at strategic locations across their municipality, that any information that's gleaned from those cameras is accessible to anybody that has access to the system, which we have with the cameras that we have in place. So that means if, for example, we have an incident that happens here within the city, we have a license plate of a suspect vehicle, we can enter it into the system. And if that license plate is found at any—going through any of these cameras anywhere across Wisconsin, or the country in municipalities that have these cameras, we will get notice sent to us that this vehicle is in a certain location. And these notices are within seconds of a vehicle passing through this camera.

**Police Chief Polly Olson 43:55**

That being said, as far as our other municipalities around the city of Appleton having these cameras, they all have varying levels of coverage through their cities. So you know, there might be Menasha say, for example; I would guess they have about six to eight cameras in their city. Now these cameras don't cover an entire intersection the way the existing [Vigilant?] cameras cover. They're not like Tilt Pan Zoom type of cameras. They're stationary, and they're pointed in one direction covering one lane of traffic. So, when you talk about 19 cameras in the city of Appleton, we were very strategic in—I mean, we had 29 obviously now narrowing those down to 19. We had to be very strategic about which ones we decided to stay with given the size of our city and trying to get the most bang for our buck. But it is true that just by having the Flock system in place in the city of Appleton we do glean a lot of benefit due to the cameras being placed across the state and across the country.

**Aldersperson Brad Firkus (District 3) 45:04**

Alright, thank you. Sorry, I've lost track of if anyone had hands up before. Does anyone have any questions. Oh, Alder Hartzheim.

**Aldersperson Sheri Hartzheim (District 13) 45:12**

Thank you chair. I think it's also important that we go back to the question that Alder Alfheim proposed that, you know, shouldn't we just let Flock be negligent in their placement and assume they're never going to remove these cameras and hope that we continue to be able to use them. I understand where that question was coming from, but I also feel like that is—it just feels inappropriate. And what that discussion brought up then was, should we want these two—10 cameras again, which, my first question to Chief Olson was, "Will we eventually

want these additional 10 cameras?" And the answer was "Yes." We would have to then have them replace them, which would be an additional costs. So, it's not just a cost savings. That's not—I don't believe that that is why this—that's the only reason that this resolution exists. I think the importance of the flock cameras and the full network of them that we've trialed is the reason or is the primary reason for the resolution, although of course the resolution's author can make that statement. Thank you.

**Aldersperson Brad Firkus (District 3) 46:23**

Anyone else? Chief Olson.

**Police Chief Polly Olson 46:27**

I could share that as we have been sitting here, I was able to pull up a spreadsheet from Flock that talks about those additional costs that you were asking about Alder Alfheim. The additional installation fee is \$150 per camera. The flockpole installation is \$500 per camera. If we would look at signing a separate contract for those 10 cameras down the road and not signing the contract before the end of this year, it would be \$36,500 for the first year, versus the 30,000. Versus I should say the \$2,500 times the 10 cameras, the cost that we would get if we would do it before that. If we were to wait, then it would be an extra cost—\$3,000 a camera, \$150 per camera for installation fee, and \$500 per camera for the installation of the Flockpole.

**Aldersperson Brad Firkus (District 3) 47:31**

All right, thank you. Anyone else? All right, we will go ahead and vote on the amendment then. This is the amendment—sorry?

**Aldersperson Chris Croatt (District 14) 47:39**

State the amendment.

**Aldersperson Brad Firkus (District 3) 47:40**

Yes. Yes. So, the amendment states that this would be \$125,000 versus the original 25,000. And it would also come from the Community Safety, Violence Prevention, and Well-Being portion of the ARPA funds.

**Aldersperson Chris Croatt (District 14) 47:57**

Would it also addressed the issue of purchase versus lease.

**Aldersperson Brad Firkus (District 3) 48:00**

Sorry, it is lease. Yeah, I—again, sorry, we do keep saying the word "purchase", but this is in fact the lease.

**Aldersperson Sheri Hartzheim (District 13) 48:07**

Maybe attorney Abshire can read what she's got.

**Aldersperson Brad Firkus (District 3) 48:10**

Sure. Three, okay.

**Attorney Amanda Abshire (City Attorney) 48:14**

What I've memorialized is that we would—there's the motion to amend the resolution to reallocate ARPA funds within the community wellness, mental health, and violence prevention fund, to move \$125,000 to the lost revenue fund to allow for the leasing of an additional 10 Flock cameras.

**Aldersperson Brad Firkus (District 3) 48:32**

Alright. Are we satisfied with that? All right, so then we will—

**Attorney Amanda Abshire (City Attorney) 48:39**

And we have a motion by Alder Arts—by Alder Hartzheim, seconded by Croatt.

**Aldersperson Brad Firkus (District 3) 48:44**

All right, thank you. So, with that we will vote on the amendment. All those in favor? Aye. Opposed?

**Aldersperson Denise Fenton (District 6) 48:50**

Nay.

**Aldersperson Brad Firkus (District 3) 48:51**

That amendment passes three to one. So, we are now to the item as amended. Do we have any further comments or questions? Discussion on this? Alright, seeing none, then we will vote on the item as amended. All those in favor? Aye. Opposed?

**Aldersperson Denise Fenton (District 6) 49:09**

Nay.

**Aldersperson Brad Firkus (District 3) 49:10**

Abstentions? Motion passes. 3 to 1.