



CITY OF WAUWATOSA  
7725 WEST NORTH AVENUE  
WAUWATOSA, WI 53213  
Telephone: (414) 479-8917  
Fax: (414) 479-8989

**COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT COMMITTEE MEETING**  
**Tuesday, September 26, 2006**

PRESENT: Aids. Birschel, Didier, Donegan, Herzog, Krill, Meaux, Sullivan, Treis -8

ALSO N. Welch, Community Development Dir.; A. Kesner, Interim City Admin./City Attorney;  
PRESENT: Chief D. Redman, Deputy Chiefs W. Rice, P. Nook, Fire Dept.; W. Kappel, Dir. of Public Works; Ald. Grimm

Ald. Treis as Chair called the meeting to order at 8:00 p.m.

**Fire Department Facility Study**

Referring to the committee's continuing discussions, the Chair stated that a final decision will probably not be made for some weeks to come as they go through the necessary steps in the decision making process. Chief Redman has suggested that the committee next consider whether to accept the study's findings concerning space needs.

Ald. Donegan asked Chief Redman to first clarify the department's position on a multi-story facility and on underground parking beneath non-apparatus areas. Chief Redman spoke of the need to determine engineering practicality but said there would be no objection to providing parking beneath the office or fire station sleeping quarters, having always assumed that a smaller site could dictate having a multi-story portion. Placing another story over the apparatus floor would take more engineering work due to the trusses needed for clear span construction, which is the desired type of construction for good long term usability and design that meets modern standards.

Ald. Donegan then asked if the department may be able to find a way to live with support columns inside the bays if necessary in order to build on top of the bays. Chief Redman said there are some things that may drive decision making farther down the road as we consider options. He would certainly look at other engineering designs for uses above the apparatus bays or other structural design options. He recommends using the ZDG study as a basis for consideration. If there are restrictions, then considerations such as cutting out some area, redesigning, or accepting center supports can be weighed against other demands and what the city is able to do. The issue of cost would probably require looking at square footage and finish materials, for example. Chief Redman said he believes ZDG applied thorough research and sound design principals as opposed to the 1998 study that had a built-in limitation of fitting the building on the current footprint. If a very favorable site is found that has space or layout limitations, reduction in total size might be considered. Chief Redman reiterated his suggestion to establish a finding that the 2006 ZDG study is a valid basis for considering space needs. The next issue would then be starting to evaluate the suitability of various sites.

Ald. Krill saw this as a very critical step and asked Chief Redman if adopting the space findings of the study would eliminate any of the potential sites including the present one. Chief Redman said that the sites included in the study are based on sufficient property to accommodate a 31,000 sq. ft. building. Some decisions on space would be needed if a smaller site is the ultimate choice. Acquiring one less residential parcel than recommended at a selected site, for example, would require some changes. Total lot size might drive that final decision on total

size, or the need to reduce the total cost might require decisions on a more efficient way to build a reduced size or a change in finish materials.

Ald. Birschel asked if buildings constructed in other communities were found to meet needs. Chief Redman said that he believes ZDG included other facilities largely to establish comparable costs and a comparative analysis to determine size of spaces such as bays, dorms, and offices. We could certainly ask questions of departments and legislative bodies with projects that were similar in scope within the past five years. Chief Redman pointed out that the recommended size of his own office is a standard of design, not something he requested or even felt was needed. They are seeking validation of the design standard.

Ald. Sullivan stated that he has found the study to be effective and fairly valid. He felt that it would be a worthwhile tool going forward to establish that the study's space recommendations are a valid basis for determining requirements for serving the emergency response needs of the city

Moved by Ald. Sullivan, seconded by Ald. Birschel to find that the study's space analysis is an appropriate tool for laying out future plans for the station –

Noting that space needs will drive the site discussion, Ald. Meaux asked about priorities if and when some of those challenging decisions or compromises are needed. Are there certain functions that are more critical in meeting space requirements? Chief Redman referred to charts comparing current space and unmet space needs based on what ZDG said would be a properly designed station. If a large enough site is not found, some of the ground floor area might be cut, perhaps in the maintenance and apparatus bays. If it is strictly a cost issue, he would probably look at scaling back finish materials. One of the biggest priorities is to not separate out the program areas. If necessary to fit the building properly and get the support needed for upper floors, they would certainly consider a center masonry wall with archways in between, which is a better design than columns. Decisions are really going to be based on what issue is driving the need to make adjustments. The department is aware that this is a significant cost in this community and never had an illusion of building the full proposal. Besides keeping program functions together, another strong priority is accommodating trucks in front of apparatus bays without blocking the street. They would accept a separation wall before giving up that maneuvering space in front of the station. If underground parking is efficient, then that should be done. If the current site is chosen, perhaps the answer is a two-level parking deck on the same space.

If the committee is going to start looking at strengths and weaknesses of potential sites, Ald. Meaux said, he would like to know what would potentially have to be given up in terms of space needs. Is there a way to determine that without necessarily knowing what space we have? Are the apparatus and maintenance bays more a priority than the current administrative space? Chief Redman explained that there are four front-line emergency vehicles with an apparatus bay behind one of them, which they believe is not adequate. He would try to achieve four emergency response bays with the added ability to accommodate some reserve apparatus and try to accomplish a separate maintenance bay as included in the proposal. If it gets to a decision point, they could end up with a combined response and maintenance bay, as they have now but something that is better sized. If an apparatus bay were eliminated, it would be handled operationally by putting a response vehicle in front of the maintenance bay rather than putting one response vehicle in front of another.

Deputy Chief Rice said that he, the Chief, and the consultant painstakingly went through every room and space when working on this report and talked about square footage for each function. There is nothing that is beyond the bare minimum or was added simply as fluff to allow for later reductions. These are the basics that are required in a station of this scope and there is not much to take out. The hallways are wider because of codes and current

standard. They don't want to make doors narrower or shorter or stack equipment. They do not want to go back to the things that are wrong with the current station that they are trying to fix.

Ald. Meaux indicated that he would still like some framework on what the number one priority is to keep in mind when considering the strengths and weaknesses of a particular site. Chief Redman said that he would probably accept some type of a separation between bays before he would give up the separate maintenance bay. The only really meaningful area to address is the four emergency response bays. He believes that the police substation room is valid space since officers are in and out every day. He believes a larger training room is valid and would rather make the maintenance bay a little narrower than give up space there.

Ald. Herzog commented that the site depends on the building and the building depends on the site, plus the cost factor also should be kept in mind. A baseline is needed for space requirements and seems to be a logical step as a finding. It will likely be used as a bullet point when making final recommendations. It will still be possible to eliminate some square footage, he said, but felt that the earlier finding on programs makes it unlikely that any would be eliminated, although there may be some room for movement.

Ald. Krill agreed that this is logical as a non-binding next step. He noted that there are still concerns about issues such as where and how to build as well as cost and said that ultimate priorities could change.

Ald. Didier commented that all discussions are based on size. She advocated determining where to build and then determine what will support the department and the community. She felt that valuable time is being wasted on making decisions about a tool that we have actually been using for a long time now.

Ald. Meaux indicated that he disagrees but will support the motion. He felt that there will be challenges with the space requirements.

Linda Craite of Cody & Company, 1457 Underwood Avenue, and Becky Rudell, 1531 Underwood Avenue, questioned the intent of the motion, asking if that means the square footage is being adopted. The Chair explained they would be adopting the concept that is included in the study. To explain further, Ald. Donegan read Chief Redman's recommendation in his September 21, 2006 memo to the committee: "...to establish a finding that the ZDG 2006 report on recommended space needs is a valid basis for determining the total requirements for a long-term facility to serve the emergency response needs of the city." The Chief also wrote that the finding "...would not establish exact design sizes or whether it might be necessary to relocate some functions in order to fit available lot sizes." It would establish that "...there is no evidence that the ZDG recommendations are excessive and can therefore be used for guidance."

Vote on the motion, Ayes: 8

Chief Redman distributed a site analysis matrix that he suggested each alderperson complete independently prior to the next meeting. He included his own scores for each of nine sites—the current site, the three sites in the ZDG study, and three other sites that have been discussed or considered. His own scores are subjective judgments, he noted, and others may come up with totally different results.

Ald. Herzog spoke of the need for public participation somewhere near the end of this process, perhaps as a public forum that would be well publicized and hopefully have this issue as the only agenda item. He commented that it is important to the committee, as citizens themselves, to get public input along the way, although there may be times when a tight meeting schedule does not allow much time for that purpose.

Chief Redman listed the sites as follows: 1) 68th & Milwaukee – southwest corner, involves commercial property and 2-3 small residential properties; 2) Underwood - the current site, assumes the need for some adjacent property acquisition; 3) North Avenue residences – residents west on North Avenue west of Wauwatosa Avenue have offered to make their properties available, if suitable; 4) Gully soccer field – low lying area on the east side of the parkway between Charles Hart Parkway and Harmonee; 5) Blanchard Triangle - property with three residences and two small business or industrial occupancies at the southwest corner of Blanchard and 74th; 6) State and 74th – northwest corner just south of the Blanchard triangle, involving large parking lot and rather large multi-story mixed occupancy building including George Webb's; 7) Greek church - Sts. Constantine & Helen site at 2160 Wauwatosa Avenue; 8) Mower & Harwood – southwest corner, two commercial properties and 3-4 residential properties; and 9) Blanchard parking lot - multi-level city parking lot at Blanchard and Wauwatosa Avenue, would not require any acquisitions since wholly owned by the city, would require leveling the lot. Chief Redman commented that there is a conceptual idea about the Blanchard lot that may or may not be brought forward to the committee.

### **Conditional Use – 255 N. 121st Street**

Held from the previous meeting, the committee again reviewed a request by Allen M. Orville and Richard Eisenmann for a Conditional Use in the AA Business District at 255 N. 121st Street for the installation of audio visual/automotive accessories. Ms. Welch reported that concerns about safe overnight storage of cars inside the building have been addressed by the Fire Marshal, who no longer feels it is necessary to place any restrictions on such use given the building's concrete block construction and the fact that it is designed to operate as a garage. Allen Orville, 815 Verdant Drive, Elm Grove, said that he is fully comfortable with the consensus reached with the Fire Marshal.

Moved by Ald. Sullivan, seconded by Ald. Krill to recommend to Council approval of the Conditional Use. Ayes: 8

(The committee recessed at 9:07 p.m. and reconvened at 9:15 p.m.)

### **Conditional Use – 11702 W. North Avenue**

The committee reviewed a request by Christina Roldan and Stuart Hoffman for a Conditional Use in the AA Business District at 11702 W. North Avenue for a drop-in child care center. The Plan Commission recommended approval. Ms. Welch reported that the proposed 1,500 sq. ft. child care center would provide care for limited periods of time not to exceed four hours. Hours of operation would be 8:30 a.m. to 7 p.m. Monday through Thursday, 8:30 a.m. to 11 p.m. on Friday, and 10 a.m. to 11 p.m. on Saturday. Ms. Roldan was present and indicated that she plans to pursue state licensing as the business grows; licensing is not required for the proposed short-term-care operation.

Moved by Ald. Krill, seconded by Ald. Meaux to recommend to Council approval of the Conditional Use –

Ald. Birschel reported observing that not too many employees park to the rear of this building, and he suggested that parents be urged to drop off children in the back and walk through an opening to the front when possible.

In response to questions, Ms. Roldan said that parents will be charged a late fee of \$5 per minute to encourage on-time pickup. She agreed that this operation would be similar to Club Tosa farther to the east on North Avenue, but that business closes at 5:30 p.m.

Ald. Herzog said that his concern with the 11 p.m. closing would be the proximity to residences, but he noted that the fact that this is a Conditional Use would allow the Council to address any problems that might arise.

Vote on the motion, Ayes: 8

### **Conditional Use – 8316B W. Blue Mound Road**

The committee reviewed a request by Marie Mesrobian and Terry Zastrow for a Conditional Use in the AA Business District at 8316B W. Blue Mound Road for sales of secondhand previous metals and gems. The Plan Commission unanimously recommended approval. Ms. Welch reported that staff received an allegation of illegal activities, but the Police Department has indicated that they have no significant concerns about this business.

Ms. Mesrobian said that, with the price of gold escalating, this would allow them to accept coins, scrap gold, and other jewelry as another aspect of their jewelry business. Customers are paid by cash or check or may upgrade to other jewelry, but she emphasized that they are not operating in any way as a pawn shop.

Moved by Ald. Krill, seconded by Ald. Donegan to recommend to Council approval of the Conditional Use --

Based on his personal knowledge and patronage, Ald. Krill endorsed the applicants and their business and said he is happy they relocated from West Allis to Wauwatosa.

Vote on the motion, Ayes: 8

### **Conditional Use – Approximately 7801 Portland Avenue and 6765 Honey Creek Parkway**

The committee reviewed a request by Kevin Shafer, Milwaukee Metropolitan Sewerage District (MMSD), for a Conditional Use in the Parks and Open Space District at approximately 7801 Portland Avenue and 6765 Honey Creek Parkway to install remote telemetry units and antennas. The Plan Commission unanimously recommended approval. Ms. Welch reported that the Board of Public Works has approved installing one antenna on a city light pole, and Mr. Kappel noted that there are similar installations along Fisher Parkway and Menomonee River Parkway.

Bill Farmer of MMSD, 260 W. Seeboth Street, Milwaukee, displayed color photos of the proposed installations, which are also being coordinated with the county. In answer to questions, he explained that the telemetry units are used to measure levels and calculate flows in the interceptor sewers conveying waste water. These two locations are relief points where MMSD is required to continuously monitor levels in the event that a bypass occurs during a wet weather event. The forest green enclosures are 36" high, 24" wide, and 12" deep and will be tucked in along the vegetation line. The antennas will be at the top of city and county-owned street light poles.

Moved by Ald. Herzog, seconded by Ald. Krill to recommend to Council approval of the Conditional Use. Ayes: 8

### **Business Planned Development at 6745 W. Wells Street**

The request by William Ibach for Preliminary Plan Approval of a Business Planned Development for a mixed use development at 6745 W. Wells Street returned to the committee following referral to the Design Review Board for

a report. Ms. Welch reported the following comments by the Design Review Board at their September 21 meeting: the sound of rooftop mechanicals should not be a problem; streetscaping should not be a problem; i.e., it should work; materials are more pedestrian friendly and intimate than in previous submittals; concealed parking is a plus; and mass is still an issue; i.e., the building is too massive for the site.

Referring to her memo of September 20, 2006, Ms. Welch noted that Business Planned Development is often used for sites that are difficult to develop or in order to overlook some setbacks or requirements of other zoning districts in order to allow development to occur. New renderings comparing the proposed building with others in the area were displayed as well as an illustration of how the building fits on the site. Ms. Welch pointed out the areas of greenery along the edges that are actually in city right-of-way and would require execution of an encroachment agreement.

William Ibach, 2347 N. 100th Street, distributed packets that included minutes of the public hearing on October 18, 2005 and various communications documenting support for the project. He read some of the comments and said there was a favorable 4:1 ratio in support at the hearing. A roomful of people appeared in opposition two years ago, but he felt that the fact that only five or six are here tonight speaks well of efforts to make this acceptable. When the present building on the site was built 50 years ago, it was probably a mistake to classify the property as medical. Now there is an opportunity to take it back to residential and commercial use. Mr. Ibach concluded that the project deserves approval and acceptance.

In response to questions, Ms. Welch clarified that Business Planned Development zoning would be placed on the site. In approving a preliminary plan, the committee should identify any concerns or conditions to be placed on the development, which the developer would have to address in the final plan. She reiterated the conditions outlined in her memo: 1) storage of recycling and garbage to be adequately screened from view; 2) grading along the sides of the property to avoid runoff onto adjacent properties; 3) submission of hard engineering related to parking, lighting, grading, and utilities for approval by the City Engineer; 4) approval of sewer plans and adequate sewer credits approved by the City Engineer; 5) determination by the Water superintendent that there is adequate water supply; 6) an encroachment and maintenance agreement for the city right-of-way subject to approval by the City Attorney. Ms. Welch noted that debate about mass and the number of units has made it difficult for staff to make final determinations on some of the foregoing.

Asked how to address mass, Ms. Welch said the only way is to reduce the size, setback, or change the design so that it is less of a rectangle on the site. There is nothing that staff can impose unless the committee chooses to recommend a change. Mr. Kesner explained that the committee has the power to define conditions when approving a preliminary plan. Applicants, in turn, can choose not to proceed if they don't think they can meet the conditions. This is the only type of building permit that is issued without specific approval of the Design Review Board; only a report is required. Ms. Welch added that the Design Review Board provides technical expertise to this committee much as the city engineer will advise on technical issues. Although she has stated her view that the project isn't in keeping with the massing and scale of the neighborhood, she felt it advisable for the committee to seek a report from those with specific aesthetic expertise.

Jack Shepherd, 500 N. 99th Street, noted favorable comments by the Design Review Board on underground parking being significant and possibly accounting for the mass. He said that they have done most of the things the Design Review Board requested in the past. The site has 22% green space, which is higher than any other commercial property in the neighborhood. He displayed photos comparing 68th Street facades of Balistreri's Pizza and Rose's Flower Shop with the proposed building. The mass in square footage of the proposed building is within 1% of the mass of those two buildings. The difference is the asphalt surface parking behind Balistreri's and

Rose's that extends right up to the adjacent residential sites. Perhaps the tradeoff here is the landscaping that they have managed to fit in, Mr. Shepherd suggested.

Mr. Shepherd clarified that the encroachments result from placement of sidewalks and landscaping. They would assume responsibility for those areas. An existing asphalt area between the sidewalk and curb would be eliminated, and there would be a concrete area for the bus stop and along parking spaces on Wells Street. The landscaping is varied and street sensitive, and the building does not actually go up to the property line on the street side in all cases as the Balistreri's and Rose's buildings do. They have provided underground parking for 38 cars, enough for two spaces for each unit, and another 12-14 spaces for business owners and customers. Trash containers will be inside behind a wall. Ground lighting will be used, some behind masonry piers. The project is a step forward, Mr. Shepherd said, and an appropriate way to accomplish things that can never be accomplished in another way.

Mary Guentner, 5723 W. Wells Street, observed that massing has been a concern but the aesthetics have been cleaned up somewhat. Her real concern, she said, is that the garage would not be secure. She would not feel safe walking on either side of the street there because of fears that someone could hide in that area. She was also concerned about the impact of additional traffic and feared that ventilation would generate a lot of noise. Ms. Guentner later suggested consulting with the police about security issues. Regarding noise, she commented that traffic is not there 24-7 but ventilation noise is.

Steve Raasch, 6830 W. Wells Street, said he believes mixed use is appropriate on this site but would like to see appropriate density, massing, and lot coverage. Although only four or five residents are present tonight, others have shown up and voiced concerns over and over again but are simply tired of the process. The owner and architect have not come up with a design acceptable to city staff and the neighbors, as requested nine months ago. The Design Review Board has denied acceptance a number of times because of the massing issue. Under Residential Planned Development, medium density would require a lot this size just for the residential portion. Eight Family Residential zoning would require close to three-quarters of an acre to support 12 units without commercial space. This building does not transition in height as it approaches residential, and it will increase traffic and on-street parking in the neighborhood. Mr. Raasch asked the committee to exercise their power to recommend reduced density, address massing, and find creative solutions to limit traffic and street parking and a design that is acceptable to the Design Review Board. Mr. Raasch later commented on the use of traffic levels on a particular street as one factor in determining a property's fair market value. He spoke of concerns about traffic on his "lightly trafficked street" and urged consideration of the effect of the project on those traffic levels.

Fred Haase, 6614 W. Wisconsin Avenue, said that this building would have as many people as in his entire block, which is an indication of its mass and size. A six-eight family building or townhouses would better fit the land and the neighborhood. The applicants did not work with neighbors as instructed and came back with the same size building with some design changes. They should be instructed to come back with something that fits within the neighborhood.

Louis Corrao, 6742 W. Wisconsin Avenue, also complained that the applicants did not come back with a better plan. Although committee members spoke at the last meeting about taking into consideration the overall effect on the rest of the city, he emphasized the need to consider how individual neighbors feel as well. Most of the people who want this development here do not live in this area. A petition signed by neighborhood residents is part of the record and should be considered.

Ken Loeffel, 6128 W. Wells Street, commented that Mr. Ibach and Mr. Shepherd have been very patient and have responded to the Design Review Board's requests, and this committee and the Design Review Board have

also been patient and listened to the neighbors. The residential units have been reduced from 14 to 12 and the commercial space reduced also. The security issue is beyond the scope of this development, as are traffic and parking, he felt. Reducing the size gets into the economics of the investment being made.

Ald. Grimm raised concerns about air conditioning units, engineering approval for sanitary and storm sewers, and carbon monoxide from the underground parking area. He asked the committee to consider the concerns of the great majority who are opposed to the project and have been at all the meetings. He read portions of a September 6, 2006 memo from Ms. Welch recommending against approval of this design.

Mr. Shepherd reported being told by someone from the former clinic that they had an average of 117 people per day plus staff at the site. This project will not generate traffic anywhere near that level. Also, the Design Review Board recognized that significant progress was made in the HVAC system design and commented that cars driving by would create more noise than any air conditioners. Regarding density, he said there are usually less than two people per unit in condos. At Serafino Square, he designed 312 units on 10 acres, or 31.2 units per acre. The subject one-third acre site would translate to roughly 10.5 units per acre. There may be some on-street parking, but not very much because adequate parking is provided. Residents will use a locked overhead garage door. They could lock the access for commercial tenants at night make an agreement with merchants for use of the spaces in order to make room on the street for customers.

Ms. Welch discussed the approval process, noting that the rezoning and preliminary plan could move forward together. She reported that the Balistreri's building is 37 ft. 8 in. in height, and the proposed building is 37 ft. 2 in. Both seem to be about two full stories. She addressed the question of new urbanism, noting that many of the concepts seen here are what new urbanism would promote. It is a concept that allows for higher density. At a busy corner with a lot of businesses, there is an argument that some massing is appropriate as a way to hold the street edge. Mass is more than height and width but also how a building meets the street. Another aspect of mass here is the fact that the building foundation pretty much covers the entire site. The foundation/parking level is a little over 13,000 sq. ft. To reduce that at the ground level, there is a section along the rear with grass planted over the parking garage.

Ald. Herzog commented that cutting back on underground parking raises other issues. The Design Review Board felt it was a plus, and he thinks it is more than that. No one has said they don't want a change at that corner, and the best use seems to be mixed use. In his neighborhood, they are looking forward to the new building on the Locker's site, which was the subject of some controversy and has a lot more square footage for commercial use than the proposed building.

Mr. Kesner reiterated that approving a plan with conditions would require them to come back with a final plan that meets those conditions and provides another opportunity for the Design Review Board to report back and make a recommendation. The applicants would have up to six months to come back with a final plan.

Ald. Krill said that there are going to changes here as well as other places in the community. The plan was scaled back from 14 to 12 units and does seem to be the type of project that is not only needed here but is an example of things we need to start to do in the city to keep up with other nearby communities.

Moved by Ald. Krill, seconded by Ald. Donegan to recommend adoption of an ordinance rezoning the subject parcel to Business Planned Development –

Asked about any prohibitions under the recommended zoning, Ms. Welch said that anything allowed in Business District zoning plus multi-family housing would be permitted. Asked specifically about check cashing and similar businesses, Mr. Kesner said that the current moratorium would address that type of use at this time.

Vote on the motion, Ayes: 7; Present: 1 (Didier)

Moved by Ald. Krill, seconded by Ald. Donegan to recommend approval of the preliminary plan subject to the conditions outlined in the September 20, 2006 memo from the Director of Community Development –

Ald. Sullivan commented on the extensive involvement of neighborhood residents and explained that it is not an easy process to make decisions of this type. He would be concerned that requiring less units could hinder the project, leaving the neighborhood with a dilapidated medical clinic that could be reopened as a permitted use without any Council input. Although there are some aspects he doesn't like, interjecting his individual perspective could cause the overall project to fail. He added that he is also comfortable with not going with the staff recommendation and would have liked to see Design Review Board approval.

Ald. Herzog asked about an encroachment agreement, which it was explained would hold the property owner responsible for liability and maintenance and for any costs associated with restoration following any needed work within the right-of-way.

Ald. Birschel commented on the lack of Design Review Board or staff endorsement and differences in setbacks between Business Planned Development and AA Business zoning.

Vote on the motion, Ayes: 6; Noes: 1 (Birschel); Present: 1 (Didier)

### **Development Proposal by Cobalt Partners for City Yard Site South of Walnut Road**

The Chair reported that his conversations with the parties involved and with the City Attorney/Interim City Administrator indicate that a closed session discussion is warranted.

Moved by Ald. Krill, seconded by Ald. Donegan to convene into closed session per Wis. Stat. 19.85 (1)(e): Deliberating or negotiating the purchasing of public properties, the investing of public funds, or conducting other specified public business, whenever competitive or bargaining reasons required a closed session; with the option of reconvening in open session. Ayes:

The committee convened into closed session at 11:03 p.m. and reconvened in open session at 11:56 p.m.

The committee reported that they approved in closed session a 60-day extension to the Memorandum of Understanding with Cobalt Partners.

The meeting adjourned at 11:57 p.m.

es

Carla A. Ledesma, City Clerk  
Wauwatosa, Wisconsin