

GREEN BAY/BROWN COUNTY PROFESSIONAL FOOTBALL STADIUM DISTRICT

Pursuant to Section 19.84, Wis. Stats., a meeting of the Green Bay/Brown County Professional Football Stadium District Board was held on **Monday, December 8, 2025**, at 2:00 p.m.

PRESENT: Leah Weycker, Keith Lucius, Mark Graul, Terence Bouressa, Sen. Cowles (via phone), David Charles, and Amaad Rivera-Wagner

ALSO PRESENT: Brian Dworak, Ken Kaszubowski, Pat Webb, Aaron Popkey, Kevin Marana, Bill Vande Castle and Joel Everts (via phone).

1. CALL MEETING TO ORDER

The meeting was called to order by Chair Weycker at approximately 2:00 p.m.

2. ROLL CALL

Roll call was taken. All Board members were present.

3. PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The Board recited the Pledge of Allegiance.

4. APPROVE/MODIFY AGENDA

A MOTION WAS MADE BY KEITH LUCIUS AND SECONDED BY MARK GRAUL TO APPROVE THE AGENDA. A vote was taken. MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

5. REQUEST FOR APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES – SEPTEMBER 22, 2025

A MOTION WAS MADE BY DAVID CHARLES AND SECONDED BY MARK GRAUL TO APPROVE THE MINUTES. A vote was taken. MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

6. LATE COMMUNICATIONS (if any)

There were no late communications. Mr. Dworak mentioned there would be handouts as they go over some agenda items.

7. ANNUAL MAINTENANCE ASSESSMENT PRESENTATION – SIGMA GROUP

Mr. Kaszubowski began with an overview of the purpose of the assessment and background on the process. He went on to explain in general they're really getting after two things; one, are the Packers organized to succeed to fulfill and attain the standards for maintenance; and then are they executing appropriately? Sigma assesses personnel assigned, including outside service providers to the Packers, in terms of who's doing what as part of the review in addition to the Packers' systems for tracking maintenance items which is predominantly contained in the monitoring software that use which holds the demand and preventative maintenance records that are provided quarterly to the District.

Sigma also does a top down once a year inspection of this facility and at the same time they assess whether or not the Packers are executing the annual testing requirements for safety system, emergency generator, and those types of things. They've uncovered some interesting things that don't necessarily fall into the maintenance bucket but deserved attention over the years. One of the examples would be

the precast clips that hold the panels to the outside of the stadium had severed. They were connected to the concourse concrete and during inspection a lot of those clips had been severed. They weren't allowing horizontal movement for expansion and contraction.

They also uncovered a bunch of other things that don't fall into the maintenance bucket so he feels there's added benefit that accrues to the facility because things get fixed that are beyond the maintenance obligation. The other two pieces that comprise the fulfillment of the standards for maintenance are a game day review and some other meeting. Sigma also receives a quarterly maintenance report from the Team and Sigma accumulates that information to look at trends – for instance, what's the trend in terms of how many maintenance work orders get obtained, are they preventative, are they demand, or are they considered other.

He reported this year they didn't see anything significant, with just over 80 findings noted. In the beginning, Sigma used to find hundreds of items but that diminished over time and in the last four or five years they are finding between 50 to 100 items.

By nature of the work, the assessment finds deficiencies or exclusions. When you look at a facility it's easy to say whether or not something's being properly maintained. One example they found was underneath the old bowl. A section of the bleachers from behind the bowl section shows some corrosion on exposed rebar. You see that all the time in any other structure that's got exterior exposure to the elements. This one's a pretty simple one, and he's sure the Packers will address it to make sure the rebar stays intact and doesn't lose structural integrity.

He added that this structure is always moving and they found an access panel hatch that moved downward from settlement of the block wall and it's leaving a gap between the block and the precast unit above it. This will be something that requires re-mortaring and possibly even caulking. He said they also found a wall where a duct is penetrating through that masonry block wall and found this block is very loose. It's not ready to fall but it's something that needs to be addressed. There are also many expansion joints in this structure and they saw a little bit of evidence of leaking up at the 300 level while standing on the 100 level. You can see evidence of water getting through because of power washing and those expanded joints have rubber seals in between them which deteriorate if the power washer happens to be hitting it hard. They found the same thing on the 600 level and went on top of the roof and found the same kind of thing. The expansion joint was leaking. It is sub-base washout and stairs going up in the loading dock area and water's coming down. It's pouring into a gap and the stone base is being washed away from there. Items like this are brought to Packers attention during the assessment so they get after that and prevent that water from entering in there and washing more out. He pointed out an escalator where the structural steel for a metal deck above it had some water dripping down while they were doing the inspection. They also saw the same kind of thing on an outside window that had an active leak. It looked to be a lot more than just condensation that was being created as a result of no thermal bridging between the outside and that steel piece, so they obviously alerted the Packers. He said they find stuff like that all the time, it's not any different this year. The good news is they didn't find anything that was of significant concern.

Since the full maintenance report is a really beefy document, like 400 pages, he supplied a copy of the slides from the report and a copy of all the observations so you can get a sense of the types of things that Sigma found during that assessment. He reported that overall the Packers do a really good job maintaining this facility and have a high standard for what the presentation of the building is both every day and for all events.

Mr. Kaszubowski asked if the Board had any questions or comments.

Mr. Charles asked how they determine a baseline for performance to determine if it was a good year or bad year from an analytic standpoint. He asked if there was a way to benchmark yourself against all the other stadiums or is that not part of the scope. Mr. Kaszubowski said that is not part of the scope. Mr. Charles said what about benchmarks against this one. Mr. Kaszubowski said they look to see if it's trending up or down. Mr. Webb said the report also shows the corrective actions the Packers took the previous year. Mr. Dworak said they wouldn't want to trend up and even if the number of findings goes down there's things that are more costly and there's a number of different elements to that. Mr. Charles said he's looking for the metric things – expenditures, etc. or even looking at other stadiums because \$15 million is a lot to spend on maintenance.

Chair Weycker mentioned that because of the age of the facility itself you might find more compared to other stadiums. Mr. Kaszubowski agreed the bowl is the oldest part and in general with age you tend to see more issues. Vice-Chair Lucius said he isn't interested in what other stadiums maintain. He only cares about what Sigma identifies and that it gets fixed. Mr. Kaszubowski said the Packers do a great job.

Mr. Dworak said the third quarter report from the Packers is in the packet to be presented under the Director's Report. Mr. Rivera-Wagner asked if the District covers the cost of the maintenance in addition to the repairs from inspections you see in the bowl itself. Mr. Dworak said the Packers under the Lease are responsible for all repairs and maintenance of the facility, and then there are funds available through the District to reimburse for those repairs and maintenance costs, but the District doesn't cover all of it.

Mr. Webb mentioned that it's not maintenance strictly-it's operations and maintenance. The difference between Lambeau Field and most other stadiums is that the Packers are totally responsible for the facility. If you go to Detroit or Chicago or Minnesota, they're all operated by a government and the team just rents the facility. Here, because of the unique relationship and also because of the way the legislation is set up, the Packers are totally responsible for this facility and all the operations and maintenance costs and everything else like that, except for the funds that the District puts aside according to legislation to reimburse them for a portion of that.

Mr. Rivera-Wagner asked if there is a simple set stat that they do 100% of every request every quarter? Mr. Kaszubowski said they report on what they do, but it's how many they do each quarter is a little bit contingent upon who they have and what time of the year it is and what they can do and what they can't do. So that's always kind of a fluctuating thing. The best thing you can do is kind of look at trends. Mr. Rivera-Wagner asked if 100% get done every year? Mr. Dworak said there some items like painting and other things that are ongoing - but yes, there are no items that the Packers just say yeah, we're not going to do that.

Mr. Charles asked about the cost of the assessment. Mr. Dworak said Sigma is paid \$18,000 a year for the maintenance assessment. Chair Weycker said it is a process that is critical to our legislative requirements.

A MOTION WAS MADE BY DAVID CHARLES AND SECONDED BY KEITH LUCIUS TO APPROVE THE MAINTENANCE ASSESSMENT. A vote was taken. MOTION CARRIED.

8. SPECIAL EVENTS & ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT FUND UPDATE:

A. Detail of Special Events and Economic Development Fund

Mr. Dworak gave a Special Events and Economic Development Fund update. He reported the fund balance is still right around that \$680,000 mark. The District has about \$41,000 in grants that were approved for 2026 that are committed for next year, along with funding for District operations. He said the amount that you see in there, that \$48,000 for 2025 while it is committed it is projected to be about \$23,000 which means they are projecting to come in about \$25,000 under and that was from lease negotiation amounts that were budgeted and were not needed during 2025. That District operations number will not be the full amount until the end of the year.

Mr. Graul asked about the \$283,657. Mr. Dworak said when the first payment went to the Team, it just got rounded to \$280,000 and that's why there's just a little bit hanging out there. Mr. Graul asked if the District had any obligations to WIAA at this time? Mr. Dworak said they do not.

Mr. Rivera-Wagner asked about the \$2 million of grant payments and if that was over time? Mr. Dworak said that is since the program started and it's the same thing for the special events listed on the

Mr. Charles asked about the rest of the Draft funding. Mr. Dworak said because there's no additional ticket tax, there is no formal amount that's committed to anyone as it relates to the fund statement. Mr. Charles asked about some kind of handshake agreement? Mr. Dworak said it's a written agreement for just under \$1 million because the commitment to the Draft was 50% of ticket tax revenue for events that were held through 2027 up to \$1.2 million. To date the District paid \$280,000 so there's just under \$1 million that if the District collects those funds in ticket tax would be due under that agreement. This amount is reconciling back to the actual bank balance and until we actually have ticket tax in from an event, we don't owe. So if there were no more concerts or no other events between now and 2027, we would not owe any more funds. Mr. Charles understands that but feels it doesn't make a lot of sense to have a million dollar obligation and then when you're working on things that generate revenue, it should be clearly looked at and stating we owe this. So even if we think we're making a bunch of money on something, we already spent it.

Vice-Chair Lucius said they have to accrue the revenue on the bottom part. Mr. Charles added, but it's an obligation and if you don't want to recognize obligations that are due, should we generate some revenue? That's fine. Mr. Webb said it doesn't become an obligation unless you collect the revenue. Mr. Webb stated if you owe somebody \$100, only if you collect this \$200, you wouldn't need to show the \$100 until you collected the \$200. Mr. Dworak mentioned that a footnote or just a side note would be helpful here. He added that the purpose of this document is to reconcile the history of the program revenues and expenses and grant payments to the current bank balance and those current balances don't require us or don't have an obligation to fund any additional debt. We just don't show the ones in which we're not required to pay unless the team does certain things. Chair Weycker thinks a footnote would be helpful. Mr. Dworak agreed to add one.

B. Post Event Report

- WIAA Volleyball, November 2025

Mr. Everts reported this was the second year of having the 32 teams at the tournament. WIAA added the Division 5 girls last year – so there were 32 (24 girls and 8 boys) teams. For the most part, everything was pretty much in line with last year as well.

The room nights and the economic impact are further down on the page. And then on the back side it shows each of the schools that won the Rush to the Resch along with the total numbers. He reported an interesting note was that the Division 2 girls semifinals set a record for attendance with over 4,300 people in the Resch Center for those two matches. That accounted for over 3,000 of those tickets that actually came through the Rush to the Resch campaign. That was a pretty good highlight.

Mr. Dworak reported on the three-year history of the Rush to the Resch program in terms of number of tickets sold. He also updated the history to date of the grant revenues. But in particular on this topic, we've got the Rush to the Resch campaign. And, as Joel noted, if you just took the Division 2 programs, each of the four schools there sold enough tickets that would have won any other all but one division. So always just an interesting note in how those numbers play out.

Mr. Everts reported on the history of the WIAA funding. They gave the WIAA \$25,000 to bring the Girls State Basketball Tournament here in 2013. And then over the next couple of years, they tried to identify ways that we could use some funds to generate more heads in beds and butts and seats, including various marketing ideas. But when you don't know which teams are coming until essentially the week before, that was a difficult task. They came up with this new program, which is Rush to Resch, and that gets each school in that division a link to sell the tickets to their volleyball or basketball matches.

Whoever sells the most tickets for volleyball, they get \$1,000. For girls basketball, they would get \$2,000 to each winning school. He referred to the history of the last three years of the campaign for both the girls basketball in March as well as the volleyball which was added to the Rush to the Resch in 2019 when the boys joined the tournament as well. This was a good way to show the WIAA that they were supportive and wanted to give the boys tournament an equally great experience and it has been very successful. The WIAA obviously greatly appreciates it as well as the schools that win their division check.

Mr. Rivera-Wagner asked if the area has strong enough volleyball teams to make it to the tournament. Mr. Everts said Bayport did make it last year. They are in a very competitive division with like Appleton North, Kimberly, and some of the teams that you do see are coming every year from at least this region.

Mr. Everts added there are some teams that are from the local area that have requested room blocks similar to they want the girls to have a tournament experience. They will sometimes get a room block for the team and stay the night before their game. Then the fans visit them at the hotel to kind of give them a tournament send-off. He remembered Kimberly did that one year and Luxemburg-Casco has done it in years past.

C. Discover Green Bay Request for Funding – WIAA Events 2026

Mr. Everts presented a request for 2026 for both of the tournaments. The amount allocated to each one would be the \$10,000 for girls basketball in March and \$6,000 for volleyball in November. They average about 37,000 attendees for the girls basketball and about 25,000 for volleyball. Economic impact is also listed. The boys volleyball tournament starts on Wednesday night in November and then their tournament concludes on Friday while the girls then start on Thursday morning and then the five divisions of the girls volleyball championship is that Saturday. We're averaging around 2,200 to 2,300 room nights depending on the teams coming. Volleyball is about 900 to 1,000.

He added that WIAA has been thrilled to have this event here and have this opportunity to have the Rush to the Resch program. They renewed the contract until March of 2030. That was some recent news that we announced at the volleyball tournament.

The extension has been made with the Resch Center and PMI that we will have both tournaments until March of 2030. This request is asking for the funds to continue the Rush to the Resch campaign.

Mr. Graul asked if the \$16,000 is the entire cost of this promotion? Mr. Everts agreed the Rush to the Resch gives the five schools in girls basketball would get the two and then the six schools in volleyball would get the six. So that \$16,000 is broken down that way.

Mr. Graul stated he's said this before but he struggles with this one because obviously the tournaments in Green Bay are fantastic for the economy and important. We need these funds to get the WIAA admitted, that sort of thing. \$20,000 would have been fine for that. For a program that I'm not sure is necessary to keep this here or get additional people here is a struggle. When you look at the overall funding that this Board has committed to this program over the last 10 plus years, it makes a significant share of the funds that we spend if you look at the running tab, the WIAA stuff is nearly \$200,000. He said getting the program and getting the tournaments here was awesome and he feels like that's not going to go away. He thinks WIAA should be very happy with it and he's just not sure it makes sense considering our limited funds to continue to fund something that would be happening without them.

Mr. Everts agreed WIAA has loved this program. They are looking at strengthening the relationship with the WIAA to look at other events that could be hosted here in Green Bay. They're in discussions for at least three different ones. Discover Green Bay spends money as well on these tournaments with welcome signs, gifts for the team, and those sort of things. This isn't the only money that is being spent on the tournament. It's hard to predict if the amount of ticket sales would continue if the campaign wasn't there. It varies, obviously, every year based on those schools that are attending and how well their programs are doing with the ticket sales.

Mr. Charles said to Mr. Graul's point, any consideration to not funding this and focusing more on bringing new events in? Mr. Everts said he has a list that was growing. Brian had asked us before, are there other events that we are working on? Yes, we do have other events that we would be looking to bring to town that have not been in town before. Even with some of the other WIAA events, he doesn't know if that would require a bid fee or a host fee or anything like that. There are plans to go after other events as well and request funds from the stadium district.

Mr. Charles said that wasn't my question – his question was to Mark's point, shouldn't we take this money and steer it toward new events? Chair Weycker said they would have to come to the Board with new requests. Mr. Charles said so we just deny this? Chair Weycker agreed and stated an interesting timing thing is that what's happening first. I think part of Mark's concern is that we don't have any data to say that there is an impact on attendance at these events. If we hold off potentially and see how that first round goes, we would also reduce the ask by \$6,000. Do you see what I'm saying? Mr. Graul said he did, but thinks the better course of action on that would be to see how girls basketball goes. Is there a difference? Is there an appreciable difference? If there is, we'll then come back with those requests for volleyball which is in the fall, right? He feels there would be sufficient time to do that. He doesn't want this to be seen as negative for the WIAA tournaments and that is very important in this area, but he feels they'd be better off taking that 10 or 15,000 or whatever it is and putting it into getting a new WIAA or a new event of any kind. It feels to me like this is something we do because we do it and we're afraid to not do it because it may be a threat to our work. I just can't imagine having a kid who plays high school sports and I'm going to go when she makes state whether or not they're in state. If the state swim tournament is down in Waukesha, there's no rush to Waukesha incentive for me to go to a hotel. I just go because my daughter is swimming. I kind of feel like that is the case.

Mr. Dworak asked Mr. Everts what that conversation looks like with WIAA and what was talked about during the renewal process, if anything on this? It's obviously been a program that's been in place. He thinks they've had a similar conversation at this Board level the last time this request came through. To Mark's point, we don't want to be signaling to WIAA that it's not that we don't value the event. It's just that there may be a better use of funds for the overall area. He was looking for Mr. Everts' perspective on what that conversation is like. He answered that as part of the renewal discussions, the future of Rush to the Resch was never brought up and never committed the money. They obviously love that we have it. They ask us every year if it's still in play. We've requested the funds or where the funds were at if we had a multi-year but none of the discussions for the renewal involved Rush to the Resch.

A MOTION WAS MADE BY DAVID CHARLES AND SECONDED BY MARK GRAUL TO DENY THE REQUEST FOR FUNDING AT THIS TIME. A vote was taken. MOTION CARRIED.

Mr. Everts left the meeting.

D. Event Benchmarks and Capital Project Guidelines Review

The last item in this agenda section under the Special Events and Economic Development Fund is the Event Benchmark and Capital Project Guidelines. There was some discussion after the Luke Combs show announcement around the reduction of the ticket tax and maybe we should revisit or maybe there's a discussion around that part of the benchmarks and the guidelines that are currently in place. little bit of background on that. The benchmarks and guidelines are in the packet were approved back in 2018 and that ticket tax item came out of a couple of concert negotiations in that similar time frame. There's a 10% ticket tax on all events that take place in the stadium bowl, football games, and all events. A few early concerts really pushed back hard on that and basically said they wouldn't bring a show there if it's a 10% ticket tax and need it lowered. It was lowered to 5% for that show so it became the standard. It was brought to the Board to set that as a standard that the District staff could work with the Packers as those shows were coming in and agree to a 5% ticket tax rebate. Basically, the District would be getting half

of what they would do at a normal event in order to ensure that the concert event took place here. That's kind of how we got to where we're at. The document is Section 8D4 and there can certainly be a discussion around any part of this if anyone is interested.

Mr. Charles asked if Mr. Popkey had anything to add. He said Mr. Dworak explained it well. Back when we were talking to artists and the cadence of the Board meeting was not one that efficiently allowed for getting concerts. Mr. Charles said he stirred some of this up when we got it. This thing is old and in essence we've just created a policy that says we won't discuss it we won't look at it and he's not sure that should be a standard policy forever or that each opportunity should be looked at. To Mr. Popkey's point there's always a timing issue and we may want to consider a committee that has that authority or a subset of the group that can work with them but once you give them 5% these promoters are going to grab that. He's not sure why the District would give it up without consultation. Mr. Dworak explained that it allowed for the Team some certainty around what they were negotiating with the promoter for any given show and it allowed for discussion around the District was willing to do this and getting this concert event here is the most important thing we can do for the community.

Vice-Chair Lucius said he doesn't want to create a disincentive to have concerts here. He added they could just deflect the whole thing if that's that important like they did the first time we got this policy. The revenue and the things the District can do with it for getting the concert is important.

Mr. Charles said he didn't know how the Board justifies that but if it is then why would we charge a minimum. This way we get every concert that we can get here. He asked if the Packers could get a lot more concerts if we had 0 percent. Mr. Webb said the 5% doesn't make any difference and the Packers have never said they'd do more events if it wasn't 5%.

Mr. Charles said it's easy to just say leave it alone. The issue is if 0% or 5% isn't important and that's easy money to take, then 10% might be the same thing. It's kind of like the volleyball deal - is it the right place to spend the money but if there's a real value if the Packers can go get more concerts because we gave them a discount it's obvious to think if the first 5% helped them the second 5% might help them even more. It's sort of a which way do you want to go thing - do you want to give them more help and let them go get concerts which is important or do we want to make a little revenue to spread out to help a bunch of other things. Or shouldn't the Board be looking at each one individually.

Mr. Graul looks at it as an arbitrary number no matter what number it is 5 or 10 or 20 or 50. Five percent doesn't seem problematic as long as the Executive Director comes back and maybe there's a time when we don't need to negate that 5%, but he thinks Mr. Charles is probably right in that you only get 5% because the people are going to still pay 10% - and 5% of it just goes to the Packers Mr. Charles agreed and we're kind of helping them bury it.

Chair Weycker said she was present when the Board negotiated this back in 2018. Really it's the Packers doing the negotiations and we're just holding the money and playing with the money so unfortunately we have to make ours public. Can we even say secretly that we'll let the Executive Director negotiate between this percent and that percent or do we have to actually have a public policy that shows our hands. She added they haven't had a concert since Paul McCartney so this is a one-time thing but we're using it again right now. If it's put into a policy how do you negotiate and still be transparent. Mr. Vande Castle said the Wisconsin Open Meetings Law allows you to go into closed session when you negotiate and you can go into closed session just as we said in

the Executive Director's report. Chair Weycker said perhaps that's what our policy was instead of actually calling it out that way. Mr. Webb said that other than the first Chesney concert we did the second one and Billy Joel both used the 5%. It was negotiated with a long period and then it was decided at that time that because of the precedent we had set with more negotiations always ending up at this 5% why not authorize the Executive Director to do it, which was me at the time, to expedite the Packers' negotiations so that we wouldn't lose a concert because of prolonged discussions and or somehow the name of the act get out they get upset and they decide not to do it as a result of that. This was an expedited way of having the Executive Director have the ability to go to a rebate of 0-5% so that it could be faster and easier to get a concert without creating an adverse atmosphere with the promoter and have them pull out. He added that shortly after the concert we had with Paul McCartney we had COVID and the Packers had Lambeau Field going under renovation and we haven't had many events, but the chance of bringing one event and then turning it into two is a good way of negotiating this. The District still gets money, and this isn't money that was originally scheduled to be ours which will be discussed in sources and uses of funds, but this was done because it's going to probably end up that way because that's what promoters are comfortable with now. He said they should be able to expedite the process. Chair Weycker added that especially since we put it out there to the public that we only charge five percent of that. Mr. Rivera-Wagner asked if we have the flexibility to do that shouldn't we use this body and or the people we designate in this body to figure that out by case-by-case basis. Mr. Dworak said that's what we do but if you do it case by case you're going to spend a lot of time. He said they they have to ask for it and it's not just a given, but there's two or three promoters who actually do the big stadium shows so they know the rules.

Mr. Rivera-Wagner said even at five percent it wasn't that we necessarily saw an increase in the amount of shows since we did the first time so he just wanted to point out that even though we did the five percent that wasn't necessarily an incentive that created more shows.

Mr. Popkey said it allows us to have those conversations and yes we have our show this year but in the past couple of years we have had shows that did not work out. He thinks he told this group previously that there's more competition now with Chicago, Milwaukee, and Minneapolis. Now they have Madison competing for the concerts.

Mr. Charles said maybe the District should go to zero. They should decide if getting a concert is the most important thing and possibly go to zero. If it's not then maybe another solution is let's go to six percent instead of five and see if that has any impact. That's why he's asking the question, how much do the Packers make as a percentage on a concert like this? Mr. Popkey said they haven't said. Mr. Charles said if you don't disclose that it's harder for the District to say we really want to be supportive because maybe they eat the one percent or maybe they eat the half rather than blame us for not bringing the concert in. He stated he thinks having an old blanket policy with inflation and the cost of these things and the amount of money everybody's making and the ticket revenue that's being extracted from the community, this might be a good opportunity to bring some of it back in if it doesn't have a significant impact. Mr. Dworak said that's why I would say the promoters have accepted the five percent, I don't think there's a need to go to zero.

Mr. Graul asked about concerts at American Family Field. Mr. Dworak said there is a charge on special events there. It is an amount per ticket - it is not a percentage of the ticket amount, so it's much less. Given what concert tickets are, a two dollar fee is way less than even five percent on that amount.

Mr. Rivera-Wagner said there may be an ability for this body to be more nimble in doing that versus a separate blanket. We don't know what it looks like. It depends on the act, the time of day, the types of things that are happening, the competition, is there any way that says can we empower you, can we empower this body. Mr. Dworak said the empowerment is just zero to five and that is actually our policy, our policy is we've empowered the Executive Director to take up to five percent off of the ten percent. The question for this group is are you still comfortable with that policy.

Vice-Chair Lucius said it doesn't bother him because if the Packers were making millions off of this we'd have more concerts than we have now. We made a commitment to the taxpayers when we did this stadium that we would have events in the bowl, and he feels his role on this Board and our Board's role is to honor that commitment and try to have some events in the bowl. If staying at five percent gets us events in the bowl and gets us some money to reinvest in the community, we should give them the ability to negotiate. He stated he's not qualified to negotiate with a contractor or with a touring group to know what the right amount is. It is given to the people who can negotiate it and get some events. He doesn't want to create another obstacle or spend a lot of time trying to look at percentages when we're making it up because none of us are comfortable. The other thing you have to remember is this ticket tax money that we're talking about and discussing was never intended to come to this Board. He said it's important to steward taxpayer dollars and try and incentivize more events at the bowl which is what we all want.

Mr. Rivera-Wagner thinks it's incumbent upon us to have a conversation about what helps with incentivization and if it is a percentage, if it's less red tape, as someone who's had to negotiate and do things with a giant government, you don't know what it is. It could be the right relationships, it could be the percentage, it could be something else. Mr. Graul said it's a little incredible if somebody says, oh, we want to make this work we need the full compensation. He thinks the language of it is maybe the issue is putting the cost of that in because everybody knows what it is the possibility is not to do that The problem I would be shocked, I don't know enough to know but the reason we haven't had more conversations is not because What I do think before us is sticking by the old policy which is to allow the executive director to negotiate between 0 and 5% reduction or 10% tax to tax Are we satisfied with that policy as is or not? Chair Weycker said it's not a policy, it's a guideline and it's what we've been following.

Mr. Rivera-Wagner said that as a new member he would support the idea that the Executive Director can negotiate between 0 and 5% reduction or 10% tax and if you need to go before they will come back to us for that If that is a current policy, I fully support that.

Chair Weycker wanted to look at the whole thing at this point. She stated she's always had issues with the questions we ask of the recipient. We ask if it's affecting the Titledown District but she feels it should say how is it impacting Brown County - where in the county is it impacting. She suggested changing it to read differently. Mr. Dworak said there's a reference to lodging impacts and number of hotel nights generated in Brown County but Chair Weycker's concern is the one bullet point around relationship to stadium related events and development in the Titledown District. She agreed it seems to incentivize that and not things elsewhere in the county and she feels the District's purview here is Wisconsin so she just wants it to be more open. She asked if everyone in favor of that?

Mr. Charles came back to if the Packers disclosed that they were making \$3 million on this event, would you say it's the same right now as if they were only making \$300,000. In other words, if

they disclosed what's going on he thinks they should jump in and support them wholeheartedly in getting what they need to do the job successfully, but if they're going to hide this from the District and then ask us to give them 5% he thinks it's silly policy to not know what you're talking about and he thinks they should sit down and either say guys, share the numbers and if you do, this makes good sense so we can make a decision or do not share the numbers and then, you know, we might as well raise the fee a little bit if we're not going to know what the numbers are. Vice-Chair said he would be okay with an after facts reconciliation that shows us what they made but added - in order to book these concerts, you don't have the time up front to be able to say what are you making because you don't know how much you can sell, you don't know a lot of the other things but he thinks something like that makes sense on the back end and could influence future decisions. However, right now he doesn't think they have the information and he doesn't want to slow up that process.

Mr. Charles agreed with that but stated if they bring us back the reconciliation, then we come back and revisit this and say okay you made all this money we didn't know you were making and next time we want 7% and you figure it out and then they can move forward with that because right now we're just in the dark. We have no idea what's going on. He doesn't have a problem letting them do it as long as it's disclosed.

Chair Weycker said this is a policy or a guideline that does have requirements for reporting and perhaps we haven't been very good at following through. Mr. Dworak that is in that section or the only post-event reporting but we only ask about event attendance, room nights generated, and economic impact. So we don't see that for concerts currently.

Mr. Charles said that doesn't really help us understand the economics of the decision. Again, whether we do it before or after, he feels the open issue is he's just asking for a little disclosure just like a little bit of a partner and figure it out and then we'll work with whatever. If it needs to be less, we can talk about it and if it needs to be more, we can make a good, well-educated decision instead of we're doing it but we aren't telling you what's going on.

Mr. Webb said the Packers don't publicly want to disclose their information to you on how much they make. If you do it in closed session you ultimately you have to report something out. So if the Packers have to report their revenue from this event and they don't want to do it and then they're doing this more as a community thing to have concerts here than they are for their own purpose. He said they have no desire to have concerts - it's obvious that they have no desire to have concerts here. If you talk to anybody they don't want them on the field, they don't want this, they don't want that. They're doing this because of the language to try to have them in the bowl as much as possible and as long as they do that and they can always come up with a reason not to have it. He explained he's been on this for 25 years and the Packers can always have a reason not to have it. The fact that they have them is an incentive for us to have these things going on in the community because we want them for the economic impact of the rest of the community. If you put on too many restrictions and force the Packers to disclose private, economic information they do not want to disclose, why would they ever have a concert here? Mr. Charles said they signed the same moral compass when they did this lease and they did this agreement and they took all of this public money. They said they would do this for the good of the community. So if we're going to sit there and kind of go well we need to be holier than thou but they don't have to, I don't think we have to mistrust them. They are going to meet their obligation to have concerts and it's a good thing. They're not trying to get out of it because they understood when they took the money they had to do it and it's probably good for their reputation and good for everything. But to kind of look at this thing and just say we're worried that they're going to

try and get out of it because we want to know what's going on. It's no different, you're going to have the same thing with the lease, right? When we get into this lease are we going to take the attitude that it's all a secret and we don't want to know about it or do we want to deal with these things from a point of intelligence and information?

Senator Cowles wanted to clarify what Mr. Webb was talking about. He said when the referendum passed years ago, Bob Harlan made a promise he would attempt to get concerts in the bowl but that's not in the lease. Mr. Webb said it's in the lease that the District will have them - the language is that the District or City can have events. The problem is that you're not capable. Sen. Cowles agreed and said the District is at their mercy basically. Having been on the Board now for 13 years, he knows the District doesn't have the leverage. Mr. Webb agreed and said the District doesn't have the connections or somebody that's worked with promoters. He said the District tried to put on a snowmobile event but needed the Packers at every step of the event. There was no way that the Stadium District or the City could put on an event in here and I think that's what people thought would happen when the lease was negotiated. He remembers mayor at that time talking about having an event once a month. However, the months are January, February, March, April, May and June which aren't even good months to put an event on. So, automatically the District was in trouble for this because of the months and were totally dependent on the team for everything for the snowmobile event. If the Packers hadn't supported us or said we don't have staff to blow snow in here, we would have been done. Sen. Cowles said if there are discussions with the Lease, if that ever happens, that's probably where we would generate more leverage to make these happen.

Mr. Rivera-Wagner said it sounds like we want to make at least one change to the bullet that says downtown district to Brown County and then we're just reaffirming our current policy which is that we allow our Executive Director to negotiate with the Packers and the options of us being there with 0-5% and if it's over that change, then they would come to the Board but it also sounds like Mr. Charles mentioned having some form of reconciliation or reporting on that which is what we're debating now.

Mr. Charles said roll it into one motion and the motion should be that we include the Brown County change and that we require reconciliation after the fact and then the 5% authority is subject to that reconciliation. So, if we don't get reconciliation it goes away. If we get reconciliation then we can come back and look at it and deal with it. We don't want to do anything to hurt them, but just doing it in the dark is silly. Mr. Graul asked if he was saying that we would have to negotiate concerts and they would negotiate giving them the 5% and the 5% would not transfer until the reconciliation. Mr. Charles said no - everything is in arrears. Today we leave everything the way it is. They go put together a concert then they bring it to us after and they say here's what we made, here's what happened. Then this 5% that's in the guideline is on a concert by concert basis in arrears. He suggested that after the concert is over they meet with us and they say oh look we lost money, it was terrible and we go okay we'll leave the 5% set. If they bring it back and they say oh we made \$4 million and knocked it out of the park, we would say okay, next time we want 7% instead of 5%. Mr. Dworak said this is not the Team paying, this is not the Team benefiting from that rebate. This is going through to the promoter and to the artist. Mr. Charles said it's going through the promoter but it's money and it is fungible. Wherever it goes it doesn't make any difference. I'll take it out of this pocket and move it to this pocket. It still depends on what happens when they're done - did it work or didn't it work? We don't know now.

Mr. Dworak said, from that perspective, we open ourselves up to the Team saying well that event was a disaster, we lost money on it and so we want your 5% now. Mr. Charles said it's not for

that event, it's for the next event. He wants to do it when this concert is done and sit down and take a look at what really happened. Then we make a decision to continue the existing 5% flexibility or we make a decision to do something different. We could say concerts are a mess, we want to do less to draw more concerts. Or we could say it really went well and that market is great and we want another 2%. But you make a decision after you see the information.

Mr. Bouressa asked if the 5% is based on the price of the ticket and how is all of the profit and loss and all of that relevant to whether we put 5% on the ticket price or do we just need to know how many tickets have been sold?

Mr. Dworak said what Mr. Charles is saying is if the District is contributing a portion of the ticket tax but the Team is making even more on those events, then maybe that's out of balance. Mr. Bouressa said that should be two separate considerations.

Mr. Charles said right now we're giving the team 5% of our money. The ticket tax is 10% That's what it is in writing it's 10% and we, because the Board believes this is a good thing, we have in essence in every case given them 5%. Do they need the 5% is the question. Of course they're saying they do and all we're asking for is they show us if they need it because they're not making any money or they can't book acts then they should. They should show us that if they need it not give them whatever they need because we want the taxes. Vice-Chair Lucius said the difference is the promoter is getting the money.

Chair Weycker said they should consider tabling this so we can have a conversation with the Team between now and the next meeting. Then they can find out who's doing the negotiating, what that might look like, and determine how we could move forward. She didn't think this is critical at this time because they already have a contract tabled so we're talking about the next contract anyway.

Mr. Popkey said we could have a conversation even in a closed session. He also introduced Kevin Manara – the Team's new general counsel. Mr. Popkey said that concerts are based on a range of information analytics that we now add to various platforms. They know the impact for a concert is a number that everyone has historically discussed in terms of how that actually takes place. He said he and Mr. Charles have talked about this and he thinks the Packers focus to get concerts was reiterated to leadership that we would like to have concerts and we've got a window of time in which we can do it. The Packers have one of the highest rated surfaces in the NFL so they have to keep that in mind. He said the Packers have a process that works and the competition is there. They have staff members with a background in securing concerts and are confident that they are casting a wide net to get concerts. He just doesn't know that some of the finer details will make a difference.

A MOTION WAS MADE BY DAVID CHARLES AND SECONDED BY SEN. COWLES TO TABLE THE GUIDELINE DISCUSSION. A vote was taken. 6 AYES – 1 NAY – MOTION CARRIED.

A MOTION WAS MADE BY DAVID CHARLES AND SECONDED BY SEN COWLES TO CREATE A THREE-PERSON COMMITTEE CONSISTING OF THE EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR AND TWO BOARD MEMBERS TO MEET WITH THE PACKERS TO SHED MORE LIGHT ON THE GUIDELINE DISCUSSION. A vote was taken. 6 AYES – 1 NAY. MOTION CARRIED.

Mr. Dworak suggested that the Chair would have discretion as it relates to who is on the committee. Mr. Vande Castle agreed that Board members could let the Chair know if they are interested. Mr. Charles said he would be happy to sit on that committee.

9. SOURCES AND USES OF FUNDS

Mr. Dworak said it has been a while since they've gone through this. When we talk about fund accounting and our financials, he thinks it's helpful to have the background on what goes into each fund, how they move between each other, and he turned it over to the expert, Mr. Webb, to do an overview of that.

Mr. Webb explained that this is kind of a unique organization in that when it was set up, every fund had a designated purpose. He had approximately 50 bank accounts when the District started. But he's basically been able to boil this down into five major funds for the District. The difference between this District and many other organizations is that instead of having, like at Miller Park who shares capital improvement costs - the public versus the stadium, this District shares them at a percentage.

Mr. Webb feels that because they were created after Miller Park District, they looked at all the stuff that they wanted to change about what was Miller Park at the time, and they changed it in ours. And so instead of having us share in the cost of the stuff, they created funds that we would collect money and use it for the sole purpose of what it was designated to accomplish. So when you look at the referendum, it didn't only say create sales tax to fund the new stadium, it said create a sales tax and provide additional sales tax money to fund the operation and maintenance of the team.

So with that in mind, he started with the general fund, and it is pretty straightforward in that we were given only \$100,000 a year to cover our costs, and that's where we get the escrow. So when we retired the sales tax in 2015, we had to put enough money away so that every year we would get \$100,000 from our escrow. So where do we get the extra money? Well, we found some interest that wasn't allocated that we were able to fund this partially, but then we wouldn't have that money, except that in 2006, when you look at the ticket tax on the special events, which we were just talking about, in 2006, right before the hockey game, we were able to negotiate with the Packers that this ticket tax would no longer just go into O&M, but it would go to the district to be used originally for a reduction of the sales tax and or other things, and then we found out it couldn't be used for the sales tax, so we had to use it for, it was, so we had to create this economic development fund, which allowed us then to do these other things.

So, and then it goes, we also get money from the O&M fund, which is the money that's used. We were able to negotiate with the Packers to have our insurance costs come out of there, to have our share of what we do for MB&E, you know, with the minority businesses, we do an audit of that, so we have certain expenses that get reimbursed from the O&M fund, so that we don't have to pay for them out of our \$100,000, and then part of the Administrative Specialist's salary is covered by the brick fund, which is the 8257 transfer. So that's where the District operations comes in.

The capital project funds were originally set up with some user fee dollars that were above and beyond what was needed for the project, plus now we collect additional user fee funds based on the difference between old user fees when they were 14 and 7, and now they're currently 21 and 9, or 14 and 6, and now they're 21 and 9. So the difference between that when somebody turns in an old user fee, and we reimburse them, ours is not a ticket tax, or I mean a license fee like all the other stadiums, ours is a user fee. So when somebody doesn't want their tickets anymore, they have to turn them in to the team. And then they're resold, and the difference between the \$1,400 that was before and the \$2,100 that we get

now, becomes a user fee that flows through the capital projects fund because we don't use it for reimbursement of the old one.

And then there's interest on the funds, and then we have a current balance of about \$5 million in the account. But if the Packers have a \$100 million project, and they want part of it reimbursed for us, we are only responsible for \$5 million at any point in time. And that's what I'm saying.

And then we collect license plate revenue from every Packers plate. We get a renewal fee every time that one is renewed, or we get new ones. That is typically about \$400,000 a year, but it's down to about \$360,000 now.

We have the brick and tile program. That nets us about \$50,000 to \$60,000 between the gross revenue that we earn and the cost of the brick and tile. And then we have the interest on the funds.

And then the same thing we did in 2016 for the operations and maintenance to have \$100,000, we needed to put away X amount of dollars so that through 2031 we could fund whatever the formula determined we needed to fund for that. So all these other revenues going first, the formula tells us how much the gap is, that comes out of escrow. And then at the beginning of every year, that's transferred to the O&M fund.

The O&M fund is made up of the football ticket tax, the transfer from the 8257 fund and the interest, goes to fund not stadium maintenance, but stadium operation and maintenance. So the Packers spend about \$35 to \$40 million on operation and maintenance every year, at least on this organization. And we reimburse them whatever is in the O&M Fund. Lately it's been about \$15 million, this year it might even be \$16 million. But we are not required to reimburse half, a third, a quarter. That's to protect us so that we're never short of money. These funds were set up for the legislation and even the referendum, so that this facility would be taken care of properly, so that when Sigma did their stuff, we would know that it's being taken care of.

The final one is the Special Events and Economic Development Fund. This was created out of some excess interest originally, and then in 2006, right before the hockey game, the District staff negotiated that the ticket tax from special events would flow to the District because we realized that the ticket tax, like from a snowmobile event, even though that was able to come to us originally, stuff that the Packers put on wouldn't come to us. It would have gone just to O&M, and we realized there aren't many events that we can put on. It was a fallacy in the thinking process that the City or the District could find an event or even put on an event here. It all has to be in cooperation with Packers.

So, we have the ticket taxes on the special events and interest on those events, and then we have funded over the years the \$3 million that you saw on that schedule, and we have also funded about \$100,000 or so every year of the District shortfall, because it's about a \$200,000 cost to run the District. The next page shows a little bit more detail of how the 8257 fund works. Those three revenues go in to the 8257 fund, and then the escrow, whatever's needed, because that's determined by the formula, how much is needed in the 8257 fund, that's brought in from the escrow, and then the ticket tax goes directly in the O&M, and then it's transferred to the team for the lease agreement.

There were no questions on the sources and uses of funds.

10. 2025 FINANCIAL REPORTS THROUGH OCTOBER 31, 2025

Mr. Dworak reported on the year-to-date financials through October. There were no significant anomalies. The two or three that are showing as anomalies in the budget are things we've talked about with regard to the user fee and how that played out this year.

You'll see a variance in the projected operations and maintenance expense that's offset by the variance in the ticket tax collected. So those things are hand-in-hand. The operations budget, which is the \$220,000 budget, is really the only discretionary section that we've got.

We are projecting to come in under budget, primarily because we had a closed budget in the lease negotiations.

A MOTION WAS MADE BY DAVID CHARLES AND SECONDED BY MARK GRAUL TO APPROVE THE FINANCIAL REPORTS. A vote was taken. MOTION CARRIED.

11. DIRECTOR'S REPORT

Mr. Dworak presented the Special Revenue Fund statement. This is a combination of a couple of different funds here, but this is similar to that Economic Development Fund page where we're taking into the history of the program and reconciling down to the current fund balances at the very bottom with regard to 8257, Operations and Maintenance, and the Economic Development Fund.

Mr. Rivera-Wagner asked about the totals on the bottom isn't the total over every year – it's what there right now. Mr. Dworak agreed but the revenue, like what you see in collected of ticket tax and all of those things, that's total.

Mr. Dworak presented the 2025 interim operations and maintenance reimbursement request from the Packers. There are a number of pages within that, detailing and supporting expense reimbursements for year to date of about \$15 million.

Mr. Graul feels this has been a vast improvement on how it is presented. He said there is a big chunk of insurance expenses. Mr. Dworak said that insurance amount is general liability and excess liability and property coverages for the stadium complex property. Those are kind of lease required that the Packers hold them and they also, by way of holding them, include the District and the City of Green Bay as additional insurers. These are really about the operation of the stadium complex. It's not like cyber liability or something like that or business specific. There is some terrorism coverage. The way some of the property coverages get layered here it's property coverage but because of the nature of a stadium itself, there are specialized coverages that sit above just the basic property insurance.

Mr. Dworak added that it may not be in a typical landlord relationship. But that's the definition in the lease is operations and maintenance and cleaning and that is also part of maintaining and having a facility. Mr. Graul said he thinks if we ever do have these discussions, I think a smart thing to do is I understand very vague what operations is. Mr. Dworak said it is specifically very broad to ensure that you can capture and use all of the available funds. When these kinds of things are put together, the idea is how are we helping the team maintain a larger expanded facility, and cleaning, security, maintenance staff, all of those things that were included in the application.

Mr. Graul asked about labor costs. Health insurance, salaries, things like that. Again, I don't know what it is. Mr. Dworak said there's three different categories of the staff and the way the descriptions are on

the detail don't always translate through but if you look at this second summary page. It has these categories listed. So the labor, the salaries, comes back to facilities, which is the staff that are on site every day, maintaining the building, security, and then cleaning as well. And so then the health insurance categories relate to those three salaries categories. Mr. Graul said they don't get to disclose your information and we're just taking them on their word. Mr. Dworak said there's a certification that they make that these expenses are true accounting of the expenses and that they're combined with the lease as it relates to what is allowed for operations and maintenance.

Mr. Rivera-Wagner wanted to follow up on the City of Green Bay requires extended types of insurance. Mr. Dworak said the lease requires the insurance and that the Packers pay it and the District reimburses them for a portion of that as part of the operations and maintenance.

That's part of the operations and maintenance reimbursement. In the same way that we require them to fully maintain the stadium and they have all the responsibility for maintenance and repairs.

Mr. Webb said it's not general taxpayers funding it. For the most part it's the ticket holders. Mr. Rivera-Wagner was curious about the District covering insurance that they were required to have. Mr. Dworak said the reason for that is if the Packers weren't required to fully insure, the Packers could only be required to insure their portion of the investment in the facility and then the Stadium District would be required to insure its portion of the investment in the facility. Those kinds of things get really complicated if you've now got two or three parties insuring different parts of the facility. So the idea that the Packers and one entity holding all of the insurance makes that a much more efficient bundle of how that works and this is just around the stadium complex insurance which is deeply unique.

Mr. Webb said the Packers don't own the stadium, so the District is requiring and carrying insurance on our building. Mr. Webb said the District was set up to collect this \$15 million and pass it through to the Packers. We collect it because we're a government and then we can pass it through them to cover expenses, so it doesn't show up as income to the team. So, they create these funds for us to collect this for them technically and funnel it back to them. And that was part of the referendum – We collected \$11 million worth of ticket tax this year. That money isn't money that is generated from general property. It's only coming from the games and we collect that because it allows money through, because of the rules of the NFL and because of the rules of the IRS. Because of these different rules, it makes more sense for us to collect that and pass it through to the Team than to have them collect it because you get into the NFL stuff and you get into the IRS stuff and then it changes the game.

Mr. Rivera-Wagner said he thinks it's part of our job and incumbent upon us as a board to decide when the right costs get allocated. People are going to pay a lot of money to figure out those allocation costs everywhere else. He stated it's very clear what you all are doing and he thanked them for all the work but he thinks they're asking some questions about if it's not this cost, maybe it could be this cost or maybe it could be something else and feels that's part of their job. Mr. Webb said the Lease is very clear. All the revenue from operations and maintenance has to come through the District and go right back to them.

Mr. Graul said there's nothing wrong with asking questions about how that's taxed. He thinks it's totally appropriate for them to question. Chair Weycker asked if they knew what the total was for asking us for \$15 million. She said that is not their entire budget there and Mr. Graul's been diligent about getting it in Excel to be able to look at it differently. But it's not a total amount and perhaps we can get that number.

Mr. Webb said you see the total when they give you the financials they present at the board meeting at the shareholders meeting. They have a line called operations and maintenance and they have a little

asterisk by it. If it says it's like \$20 million, they state this is net of the \$15 million the Stadium District gave them. Or if it's \$30 million, it's a net number in their financials.

Mr. Marana left the meeting and thanked the Board for letting him sit in.

Mr. Dworak reported on the District User Fee Fund Statement - similar to the Special Revenue Fund Statement. This is the user fee over its history back down to the current balance. It currently has about \$5.6 million in it. The last draw was this past year when the District held the third locker room project. And previous boards have expressed a desire to keep \$2 million in this account and not have the balance go below that in case something came up along the way.

The next item presented was the Third Quarter Maintenance Report from the team. Again, every quarter they submit a summary of activities. This is the report then starting on 11-28, where if you look toward the back end of this report, starting on 11-36, that starts 11 pages of the 2024 cycle of observations. This is where the team either has a completion noted or some other notes as it relates to what's going on there. Mr. Rivera-Wagner asked about Central Restoration City. Mr. Dworak said that is a contractor that is in the bowl doing concrete restoration and the City helps coordinate some of those services because it's the original bowl. The City has some responsibility for continuing that process but the Packers contract for all of it and they pay for all of it. Some of the bigger numbers that we see in the operations and maintenance reimbursement are from Central Restoration for concrete maintenance and that contractor just happens to coordinate with the City because of the ownership of it by the City.

This is the first posting of the meeting dates for 2026. He made a change in June because he couldn't get any Mondays that really worked with his schedule so he picked a Tuesday. They can certainly move those around if they don't work for the group and he thanked the Board in advance for anyone's flexibility.

A MOTION WAS MADE BY DAVID CHARLES AND SECONDED BY MARK GRAUL TO APPROVE THE DIRECTOR'S REPORT. A vote was taken. MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

12. CONSIDERATION OF RESOLUTION 118 – AUTHORIZING APPROVAL AND ADOPTION FO 2026 BUDGET

Mr. Dworak spoke about the budget assumptions and narrative around that along with a couple of budget documents. I can just hit on some high points.

The primary fund that this body has discretion over is the operating fund. That's really where our staffing expenses come from. All of the other funds, operations, maintenance, capital projects, those are all driven by lease and legislative requirements, funds available versus other items. So as it relates to the operating fund for 2026, we're generally budgeting a pretty similar operation as this year. The Administrative Specialist is at the current time the only District employee. Her salary is budgeted in there and about 60% of that gets covered by the 8257 Fund as part of the brick and tile program so that is a net 40% of the actual District budget. Regarding Sigma's costs, the staffing cost is slightly down from the budget last year. It maintains himself as the Executive Director, Pat as the Finance Director, and Greg Kuehl, who's continued on as a consultant. He would consult on Lease matters primarily given his long history but we've dialed that back to an on-call as needed number for next year. Then there are some additional costs including a budget for some Lease negotiation time just to be ready for that if and when it comes up again.

Mr. Graul asked about the contract that we have with Sigma and whether or not it is one number. Mr. Dworak said the contract doesn't necessarily include a specific number for each year. The contract is a services agreement that requires us to present a budget each year for approval by the District Board such that it's not tied to in two years maybe we only need \$80,000 for some reason. He feels Sigma is pretty efficient in terms of the number of hours that they're using right now.

Mr. Graul asked about Greg Kuehl. He wasn't sure if he's been on the Board long enough but he didn't see him at a Board meeting and wondered why they're budgeting money for him. Mr. Dworak said Mr. Kuehl has been involved with both helping early on in the year when we did have a couple of lease items that were taking place and again his knowledge is really around the whole history of the District whether it's resolutions that we need to revisit or create or Lease items. Those are really the two particular ones that he's been very valuable on. This number that is budgeted for next year is not kind of assuming any number of set hours - it's simply if we need him we will call and that's it. Mr. Graul asked if he has a contract with anyone for an hourly rate. Mr. Dworak stated it's an agreement for \$100 hourly rate on an average basis.

Chair Weycker asked where the Sigma contract is in the budget. Mr. Dworak said it is under Professional Services and it's easiest to look at this under the District Operating Fund and the Sigma number would be on page 12-15.

Mr. Charles asked about construction draws and thought he said they drew \$3 million from it. Mr. Dworak said they drew \$3 million but now it's down to \$5.5 million. Mr. Charles asked what the logic was on the \$2 million balance. Mr. Webb said it was just to have something available because when they started making requests and it got down lower, the Board was concerned that if there was a project that the Board thought needed to be done and if there was no money in there, there was no way to encourage the Packers to do it.

Mr. Charles asked why they don't we lock it in at \$5 million. Chair Weycker said it's because we're getting down to \$0 happen to agree the minimum needs to be there because you have issues. Mr. Charles was asking if you lock it at \$2 million, they know there's \$3 million there and they're going to find a reason to come get it. If you lock it in at \$5 million, you get a little more security there. Mr. Webb said there was no reason. It was just what the Board was comfortable with at the time. As was explained in the sources and uses of funds, this money comes in only on the difference between the ticket tax. Mr. Charles thinks they should think about considering locking that in at \$5 million at a future meeting. There doesn't seem to be any reason that gives us more security and someday when we go to negotiate a new lease that's a good time to make those adjustments.

Mr. Webb said there's no written rule that says \$2 million it is just what the Board felt comfortable with at that time. When the finance people from the Packers ask Mr. Webb how much is available, he explains they don't want to go below the \$2 million and that's what the Board has been comfortable with. The Packers have the right to go to \$0 if they want because it's not a policy.

Mr. Graul mentioned the ticket fee is about \$11 million. We're expecting more next year and then obviously the answer is \$5.6 - that is \$16.6 million. There's been a question about \$15 million and he thought he saw \$12 million on that and \$15 million is the year-to-date number. As of right now there's still two games so the projected is \$17 million. They've asked \$15 million and there will be a final request.

A MOTION WAS MADE BY DAVID CHARLES TO APPROVE RESOLUTION

A MOTION WAS MADE BY DAVID CHARLES AND SECONDED BY AMAAD RIVERA-WAGNER TO APPROVE RESOLUTION 118 – AUTHORIZING APPROVAL AND ADOPTION OF 2026 BUDGET. A ROLL CALL VOTE WAS TAKEN – 7 AYES. 0 NAYS. MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

13. REMOTE MEETING POLICY

Mr. Dworak explained that at the last meeting one board member was attending via Zoom and it just generated a discussion around having a policy. He supplied a couple examples of policies in the materials today. He also pointed out that as the way the bylaws are currently written, they state that the District allows for electronic participation, which at the time of their creation would have been just via phone, but they used a broad term that didn't have a number of different meanings at that point in time. He asked the Board if anyone has an opinion or preference on how to approach this or if they need to approach this.

Mr. Graul pointed to the examples and said they honestly believe that all of you should be on Zoom and that it should be an option for Board members to kind of be in the room. So if that's the case, that's what he would do. He believes there should be a policy that every meeting should be available via a video conferencing platform and that Board members can attend as necessary if they are traveling or unavailable. One of the hard things is there's only four meetings. So it would be nice if you are unavailable, but you can do it via Zoom and still be part of the meeting. He said in the legislature, they do Zoom hearings where they have members on Zoom meetings and things of that nature so he thinks it's just a matter of adapting to the times and the technology that's available and that we ought to have a policy for all of our video conferences in some way and that Board members who are unable, obviously in person still be ideal, but there are some times when that doesn't work.

Sen. Cowles asked if he wanted every meeting publicly broadcast. Mr. Graul answered yes.

Mr. Vande Castle said that he and Brian worked on this document, but he's seeing multiple communities are now going to do this using Owl. It's popping up everywhere and it does make things easier.

Mr. Graul said he would choose the third example in the packet. It is his perspective that with the technology available that it wouldn't be difficult to offer a video conference option. Of course, he feels attending in person is best.

Mr. Vande Castle said that just because you have it on Zoom it doesn't mean you have to open the floor to everybody in the public that is sitting in. You could, but it's not required.

Mr. Graul said he's open to the public viewing it to allow anybody to come and go and there might have to be a public comment provision. Mr. Vande Castle said you don't have to put a provision in your agenda for public comment. You can keep doing things exactly the way you're doing now, except these meetings can be broadcast and be available for people to watch on Zoom or in the archive.

Mr. Rivera-Wagner is in full support of that policy. He thinks it's more participatory and easier for people with their complicated schedules, especially as families grow and people's geographic responsibilities change. Not because of the bias that might be called to it, but just so you know, the City of Green Bay already does a version of this.

Chair Weycker wanted it to be clear that, because we are a single government, we're obligated by open meeting law, so all of the meetings are open and have to be noticed. So if anything changes, then we'd report it. Mr. Charles said it's not just about open meeting law it's about remote attendance.

Mr. Webb suggested they let Brian bring back something to the Board. Mr. Dworak would propose options to offer the ability to use a platform for using a Zoom or a Teams type virtual meeting and having that be the Board's option for meeting attendance with in person attendance being the preferred option.

Mr. Charles asked if this means you never have to come to a Board meeting. Mr. Webb stated the preference is to be in person, but if there's an unavoidable conflict or something that prevents you from being there, this would be offered. Mr. Charles said he's just old school and believes people should not commit to something if they're not prepared to be there 100% of the time. I think the world is changing and the new world says I want to do other things at the same time. He stated there's a difference in the ambiance of people being in the room to commit and talk and work as the committee was intended to be. It's very difficult with the electronics to get feelings and coordinate, but he will have to adapt.

Vice-Chair Lucius has one concern about this and it is regarding closed session. Do we allow somebody to remotely attend the closed session? Because that's not a public vote. How do you know who's in the room? How do you know who's there if they're virtually attending?

Mr. Vande Castle said it's an option in the system to allow you to create rooms and you can remove people who are not to be in the closed session. Vice-Chair Lucius knows this but, if I'm remotely attending and I'm representing the Village of Ashwaubenon, how do I not have others sitting in there listening to the closed session and feeding me what they want me to do or say. That's my only concern with closed session virtual attendance.

Mr. Vande Castle said that's a concern that everybody that uses Zoom or Teams faces. The consequence of that were discussed at the Attorney General's conference. They state if you allow somebody in that's not supposed to be in you are in a violation of the open staff rule and you're subject to the sanctions and penalties that go along with that. So as a Board member, you're on your honor to be in a group that nobody else has access to.

Mr. Charles mentioned the idea of creating a caveat that says you can participate remotely, maybe a limited number of times in a year before you're asked to leave, but if we go into closed session, you don't participate. I don't know if you can exclude someone.

Mr. Vande Castle said that did come up and it was addressed by the Attorney General's office that if you are a sanctioned member to be in this body you can't be excluded from a closed session unless there is some specific reason to do so. Otherwise, you're entitled to be there in every session whether it's open or closed.

Vice-Chair Lucius thinks something that states that when we start a closed session, we say you should be in the room alone and feels talking about the sanctions should be in the policy. He's fine with not attending in person but said he would rather have everyone in person at the meeting and just wants to make sure we have the right security in the closed session.

Mr. Charles mentioned he's been on a board where they said you couldn't miss more than 25% of the meetings. He doesn't have a problem with that but wasn't sure if you can a policy that says you must remove this member. Mr. Webb said that decision goes back to the municipality of what their appointing requirements are. He said in the past a couple Board members just weren't coming to meetings and the

District notified the appointing authority and said you're not getting any representation. Or the appointing authority realized they weren't getting any representation. Mr. Webb added that they had these periods where we had all of this stuff happening and then all of a sudden 2016 happened and we really hadn't kicked the economic development thing into full gear so there was kind of a lull where meetings were shorter because of all of this behind the scenes work like verifying the maintenance and things like that were happening. People weren't coming and you almost didn't have a quorum sometimes so you couldn't even approve stuff. That is when we started to notify the appointing authorities.

Mr. Rivera-Wagner wanted to make sure we include ensuring empowering staff to come back with a policy that will also ensure that we have security protocols for people participating electronically. It does sound like there were some questions about whether to add an attendance policy but he wasn't making that part of his motion.

A MOTION WAS MADE BY AMAAD RIVERA-WAGNER AND SECONDED BY KEITH LUCIUS TO PERMIT THE EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR TO BRING A REMOTE ATTENDANCE POLICY TO THE BOARD FOR APPROVAL. A vote was taken. MOTION CARRIED.

14. OTHER MATTERS AUTHORIZED BY LAW

Mr. Vande Castle noted that the District received a public records request. It was related to a request from a contractor for all of the records for relating to the South End Zone construction, and then also for every other construction project that was done in the stadium in the last four years. We denied that request because we don't have the records. But we were talking about this before the meeting that started today.

He stated that in the other municipalities he represents, he's seen this as an ongoing problem. He's responded to two of them in the last month, besides this one, where contractors are making public records requests to municipalities for their contractor records from projects. He said they may see more of these and it seems to be a trend right now. In the last six months, he's probably responded to eight for various municipal projects that municipalities he represents have been involved in.

The Packers are responsible for the maintenance and construction projects within the stadium and that is their private, proprietary information. Outside parties have no ability to request that from them directly but we don't want to have those records and we don't maintain them.

15. MOTION TO ADJOURN

A MOTION WAS MADE BY DAVID CHARLES AND SECONDED BY KEITH LUCIUS TO ADJOURN THE MEETING. A vote was taken. MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

The meeting adjourned at approximately 4:30 P.M.

Respectfully submitted,

Diane Roskom
Administrative Specialist