

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE BROWN COUNTY**  
**ADMINISTRATION COMMITTEE**

Pursuant to Section 19.84 Wis. Stats., a regular meeting of the Brown County Administration Committee was held on Wednesday, March 7, 2018 in Room 200, Northern Building, 305 E. Walnut Street, Green Bay, WI

---

**Present:** Chair Schadewald, Supervisor Kneiszel, Supervisor Vander Leest, Supervisor Becker  
**Also Present:** Supervisor Linssen; HR Director Kathryn Roellich, Director of Administration Chad Weininger, Corporation Counsel Dave Hemery, Technology Services August Neverman, Child Support Director Maria Lasecki, Public Safety Communications Director Cullen Peltier, Register of Probate Cheryl Beekman, and other interested parties.

---

**I. Call to Order:**

The meeting was called to order by Chair Richard Schadewald at 6:15 pm.

**II. Approve/Modify Agenda.**

Motion made by Supervisor Vander Leest, seconded by Supervisor Kneiszel to approve the agenda with Item 19 removed. Vote taken. **MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY**

**III. Approve/Modify Minutes of February 7, 2018.**

Motion made by Supervisor Kneiszel, seconded by Supervisor Vander Leest to approve. Vote taken. **MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY**

**1. Review minutes of:**

**a. Housing Authority (January 15, 2018).**

Motion made by Supervisor Vander Leest, seconded by Supervisor Kneiszel to receive and place on file. Vote taken. **MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY**

**Comments from the Public** None.

**Communications**

**2. Communication from Supervisor Linssen re: To allocate up to \$150,000 for a study on options for regional Fiber-to-the-Premises development. Held for 30 days.**

Technology Services Director August Neverman provided a written response to Fiber-to-the-Premises Development in the agenda packet material. He informed the fiber was measurably expensive three quarters of a billion dollars to do fiber to the home. The next option was a shared infrastructure that would reduce the cost but was a half a million dollars. Third option was the shared 5G; it was more practical because it didn't require as much infrastructure in the ground. There would be towers placed throughout the county, similar to existing 4G cellular towers, newer technology, 10G to a cellphone. The main challenge was getting fiber to those. TS recommended that any proposal sought would be open to the public/private partnership where the County would fund infrastructure and the partner would operate a public 5G network and a closed County 5G network (two separate networks) as part of a service agreement.

Linssen questioned if there was any sort of ongoing plan for what they were going to use BCCAN for outside of the current uses. Neverman informed the current plan was to stay with the existing mission and charter, the County Board had permitted them to grow that infrastructure for basically government, municipalities, county, schools, higher education institutions, not-for-profit agencies,

economic development zones, telecommunication agencies so they can partner with them and healthcare so they could improve telehealth and funded by that agency. Another piece they offered was giving them the opportunity to offer security services to municipalities and individual townships, etc. He had a position that he posted and hopefully will fill shortly and can start offering those services if they choose to get their internet through the county and get that additional level of security, especially for smaller agencies.

Corporation Counsel David Hemery informed that there had to be a public purpose to be able to offer it to private partners. They had to analyze it to see if it was a permissible use of government. Weininger informed the closest they were getting to right now was doing it in economic development zones/HUB zones; if they were certified by the federal government as economically distressed areas. They had to research more before they got into the telecom business and competing against that had the fiber. The problem was they could easily change the state law to prohibit the county from doing it. It would probably be better to partner with 2 or 3 of them. The county didn't have the technical expertise to provide the technical service to do the packet delivery.

Weininger stated it wouldn't hurt to send an RFP out to the main telecom providers to see what the proposals were. He explained potential benefits to the county if investors had the opportunity to use county fiber and towers to provide service over Brown County such as there would be bandwidth to provide extra services. It would be a huge savings to the county. Right now, if they can't bond and there wasn't money for 6-years in sales tax, unless the board made a different policy decision, the county didn't have those funds right now available unless they tapped into the general fund. The county wasn't in a great position to do that right now. Linssen wasn't discussing financials at this point and understood the extent of the project.

Kneiszel believed there were municipalities and counties that turned into a public service and stated there was a payback to doing something like that because even if it cost money overall it cost the consumers money and provided better uniform service. Neverman informed that in Northern Wisconsin, they were not already being served high speed internet by some other service so they were getting federal grant money, FCC money to grow their infrastructure because they don't have fiber in the ground already. There were a couple spots in Brown County where they could potentially apply for grant money but it won't pay \$220 million dollars. Weininger informed the City of Shawano tried it, they did the infrastructure but they didn't have the core support so they turned it over to Nsight. Kneiszel noted there were progressive areas in the country where this was happening, Weininger agreed, it was done with the Wi-Fi too. Neverman stated Atlanta did fiber to the home and invested \$597 million and had made back theoretically all of it but it was a huge gamble for them because there was no guaranteed for payback.

Neverman stated that wireless will continue to improve because it required fewer infrastructures so everyone was developing it. If the Federal Government released more frequencies, that would make a massive difference in wireless infrastructure. The problem right now was the interference. The new 5G was a higher frequency so it had a shorter range and you have to have more towers but it was not in competition and they could send more data at once. They were proposing such a big investment to make sure there was a ton of bandwidth on the back end so the traffic can get somewhere instead of bottlenecking. From his perspective, if he were a company very dependent on the internet, he wasn't coming to Green Bay because the bandwidth wasn't here. The highway infrastructure was very similar whether it was physical world highway or fiber in the ground capacity so one of the things they were also trying to negotiate with the State of Wisconsin to try and get fiber down 41 and potentially tie down to Outagamie also.

Further discussions ensued with regard to cost; Neverman stated they were trying to give an idea of initial up front expenses. He would have to contract with someone if they wanted to do estimates and informed there were examples out there if it were to be done private sector. He suggested they focus on building infrastructure that they could then leverage for any provider, get engagement to try and get them to the community and work something out to get 5G.

Linssen informed his original intent was that they look at the numbers and putting them to estimates. He would still be curious to see numbers. Neverman questioned if it were the numbers to provide the internet access or provide the infrastructure that allowed the internet access. He informed they were putting 30 miles of fiber into the ground for the Green Bay School District. Linssen asked if it was so clear that one was the better option that it wasn't worth having someone come in and look at the budget numbers. Schadewald's experience with technology changes and the way things were going, as a county he would say they just look at the roads. Linssen stated that was part of the intention. Schadewald felt if they did the RFP or RFI they would get some parameters for the studies later on.

Linssen stated when they looked at large expense items, it helped to have some sort of grounding as far as the return to the community so they knew how much it was worth investing in and how much they should or could invest in to justify the project. Neverman reiterated he needed clarification.

*Supervisor Becker arrived at 6:29pm*

Kneiszel felt it would be worthwhile to ask the Chamber to tell the county what this would do for them as far as attracting new business, speeding things up for existing businesses, etc. He wouldn't go forward and authorize a study until he had a better grounding at what this would do and how much it would help. Becker informed he had been part of round tables in his community about this issue and Pulaski homework was given on an iPad and everything they had was electronic and kids in the country had to go into the parking lot of the library for Wi-Fi at night. To bring this out to their businesses would be huge and rural families would benefit from this. Kneiszel felt they needed to blue-sky this and look at what was possible.

Linssen was curious to know what those numbers would be with the various different options proposed, how much they would have to invest, what kind of returns would they see, what companies might jump on and suggested looking to see if the Chamber would be willing to chip in some money for this type of study with certain tie-ins. Neverman didn't know the businesses that would want to move here that would love the high speed internet; he didn't know the school situations it would impact or small business impacts. He couldn't well predict it and even if they paid someone a lot of money, ultimately this was a big risk that had potential big reward. He was proposing taking the middle road to see if they could get someone or multiple telecom companies to come in and build a 5G infrastructure which they were probably going to build anyway but possible 5 years or 10 years from now after the rest of the US had it.

Linssen reiterated he would be curious to see what types of buy-in might be available in the community. Weininger informed the Green Bay Chamber and Advance went through a large comprehensive study and part of it was ensuring there was high speed access. A component piece was creating a high speed internet for development. It was going to come down to what infrastructure they need to put in place and who were the players and suggested an RFI.

**Motion made by Supervisor Becker, seconded by Supervisor Kneiszel to direct staff to develop an RFI for a public private partnership for wireless services throughout the county. Vote taken.**  
**MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY**

3. **Communication from Supervisor Linssen re: To have the County Clerk report to the County Board regarding citizen reports of Election Day deregistration issues. Referred to the County Clerk at February County Board; Also appears on this agenda at the request of Supervisor Linssen.**

Linssen informed he still wanted to have some conversation as there may be potential action that he wanted.

**Motion made by Supervisor Becker, seconded by Supervisor Kneiszel to hold for one month. Vote taken. MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY**

4. **Communication from Supervisor Hoyer re: Pursue contracting or hiring a grant specialist to find and complete grant applications in the area of Human Services. Held for 30 days.**

Schadewald informed the whole idea of a grant specialist had been going on for forever, some counties had them, some don't and the county had one at one time. They were looking at revisiting the idea of having a grant specialist to find and complete grant application. There were so many grants in the Human Services area and now that it was Health and Human Services, there were a lot of opportunities for grants.

Weininger informed that one misnomer was that there was free money out there and the grant will pay for the person. Usually there was a match but the county will be at their levy limits in 2019. He suggested rather than adding an extra person, Admin could work with Health and Human Services to apply and help write some of it. Schadewald noted that NWTC offered a grant writing class for \$129, he felt it may be fiscally prudent to expense some money to train employees in writing grants.

**Motion made by Supervisor Kneiszel, seconded by Supervisor Vander Leest to receive and place on file. Vote taken. MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY**

#### **Budget Adjustment Requests**

5. **Budget Adjustment Request (18-38): Reallocation between two or more departments, regardless of amount (Sheriff).**

**Motion made by Supervisor Becker, seconded by Supervisor Kneiszel to approve. Vote taken. MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY**

6. **Budget Adjustment Request (18-44): Reallocation between two or more departments, regardless of amount.**

Public Safety Communications Director Cullen Peltier was present; Weininger spoke to the carryover.

**Motion made by Supervisor Vander Leest, seconded by Supervisor Becker to approve. Vote taken. MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY**

7. **Budget Adjustment Request (18-45): Reallocation between two or more departments, regardless of amount (Circuit Court).**

Weininger informed that when they were budgeting for this, they believed there was enough money but when the bids came in they were short. The next step was to offer a carryover request and they didn't have any money to carryover. The only money left was contingency or general fund.

Responding to Kneiszel's questions, Register in Probate Cheryl Beekman informed the request was for her office and Family Court. Court Security could give several instances where they had to get involved. Their office dealt with family dynamics, estate/probates, and people with money, mentally ill individuals and people under guardianships. They were on the first floor, first line of attack per se. There were times where they didn't feel safe in their office and would like the barrier to feel more secure and protected. Last week they had to lockdown their office because of an incident occurring outside the hall where several security officers had to be deployed to diffuse a family situation. Kneiszel stated there was a study being requested in courthouse security and questioned why this was being done before the study? Weininger replied, before this went to Public Safety he talked with the Sheriff and he and the court group stated they would still like to move forward with this specific one. The issue was that there were channels where you could actually walk in the office and have access outside as opposed to the front counter and there were no barrier within the office.

Kneiszel didn't have a problem with this but he felt wherever possible they needed to look at keeping things as open as they could. He didn't want to interact with people between glass, but understood the situation. Beekman didn't want to but for the safety and security of her staff, she felt like she had to ask for this.

**Motion made by Supervisor Vander Leest, seconded by Supervisor Becker to approve. Vote taken.  
MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY**

**Resolutions & Ordinances**

8. **An Ordinance to Amend Section 2.13 (Closed Sessions and Minutes) of Chapter 2 of the Brown County Code of Ordinance.**

Corporation Counsel David Hemery informed there were two main changes regarding closed sessions and minutes. The Executive Committee felt things should be defined; Hemery agreed and gave a brief explanation of the changes.

Speaking to (5), it states minutes may be approved or amended and approved by the body they regard, any amendments had to be for corrective purposes only. If they amend those minutes they had to keep the original phrase they were correcting but have a strikethrough in it and the correction would appear immediately after and underlined to indicate the correction. Simple grammatical errors were referred to as scrivener errors and can be corrected without permission or authority and that was general in the law.

**Motion made by Supervisor Becker, seconded by Supervisor Vander Leest to approve. Vote taken.  
MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY**

**Child Support**

9. **Departmental Openings Summary.**

**Motion made by Supervisor Vander Leest, seconded by Supervisor Becker to receive and place on file. Vote taken. MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY**

10. **Director Summary.**

Child Support Director Maria Lasecki informed it was a very busy time; Monday they had three individuals answering 249 calls. On an average day they normally got about 100-120 calls. In addition to tax season it was the beginning of the month, letters were going out, they were doing license suspension, small arrears letters, etc.

**Motion made by Supervisor Kneiszel, seconded by Supervisor Vander Leest to receive and place on file. Vote taken. MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY**

**Technology Services**

11. **Budget Status Financial Report for January 2018.**

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

12. **2017-2018 Carryover Funds.**

**Motion made by Supervisor Kneiszel, seconded by Supervisor Vander Leest to receive and place on file. Vote taken. MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY**

13. **Technology Services Monthly Report.**  
a. **Response to Fiber-to-the-Premises Development.**

**Motion made by Supervisor Vander Leest, seconded by Supervisor Becker to receive and place on file. Vote taken. MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY**

- b. **2018 Cyber Security Report.**

Neverman informed they wanted to be as open as possible; this report included all the material they could publicly disclose. He pointed out that in the last 90 days they were getting 58,000 attacks a day. They had roughly \$390,000 annually invested in cyber security infrastructure. That was 7% of the TS budget. He will be filling the full-time security person position within the next couple of weeks.

**Motion made by Supervisor Vander Leest, seconded by Supervisor Kneiszel to receive and place on file. Vote taken. MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY**

Neverman informed that next month he will have reports and proposals with regard to the Brown County website and closed captioning.

#### Treasurer

**14. Treasurer's Report - Department Update.**

Treasurer Paul Zeller stated their 2014 property tax foreclosure action culminates in a circuit court hearing and that hearing was adjourned to early April 2018, affectively giving taxpayers an extension to pay due to Judge Zakowski's calendar.

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

**15. Discussion and possible action on the sale of the following tax deed parcels:**

- a. **Parcels SU-796-3, SU-796-4, SU-796-5 at E. Deerfield Ave. in the Village of Suamico (discuss results of meeting with Village of Suamico officials and BC Corp Counsel).**

Zeller stated they attempted to sell the adjacent parcels twice last year, in an open surplus auction format and in a sealed bid format. They were not successful in selling the parcels. What was hanging over the parcels was the possibility of the village imposing retroactively hundreds of thousands of dollars of special assessments which were incurred when the public utilities were provided to the parcels and at that time there was a tiff district created. This committee directed Corporation Counsel and Zeller to meet with village officials. They met with the Village Administrator and their legal counsel in February. The village board took up the issue in closed session on Monday night, March 5<sup>th</sup>. Zeller heard from Village Administrator yesterday. Zeller was asking and recommending that the committee provide him the ability to sell all 3 parcels according to state statute to the Village of Suamico, the municipal entity, for \$21,474.39. This will make the county whole and would not be on the tax role until 2019, exempt status was based on January 1<sup>st</sup>.

**Motion made by Supervisor Becker, seconded by Supervisor Kneiszel to approve. Vote taken. MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY**

#### Corporation Counsel

**16. Discussion Regarding Options to Revise Chapter 32 of the Brown County Code of Ordinances entitled "Equal Opportunity in Housing," Including Discussion on: 1) Entirely Revising Ch 32 to Utilize Existing State Enforcement Mechanisms (WI Department of of Workforce Development); and 2) the Implications of Adding Gender Identity as a Protected Class to Ch 32.**

Hemery informed they looked previously to add transgender to Ch. 4, the Employment Chapter which controlled what the county did when it hired, fired and promoted individuals. Chapter 32, Fair Housing, involved what Brown County did and any landlord in the County of Brown would be subject to and that's where they had to be careful, when requiring other people to do or not do something and the law was unclear. Referring to the packet material, Hemery wanted to see what other comparable counties were doing. In his experience, he was surprised at the ordinance, how it basically created a commission locally to enforce basic federal discrimination laws. He found Ch. 32 was pretty aggressive in its timelines and what it was requiring an appointed commission to do. He'd be really suspect whether the commission was aware of its duties. Should someone file a complaint under Ch. 32 stuff had to happen quickly. Hemery went over Ch. 32.06 Enforcement Procedure,

within 10 days of filing someone had to investigate and make a determination whether or not there was probable cause. In 30 days they had to make written findings of facts and an order of to be taken. Penalties were huge which in terms of powers of this commission were huge; they were looking at \$25,000 to \$50,000 penalties. Based on Corporation Counsel's experience, if a complaint came in about housing discrimination it should be forwarded to the state DWD, they had a whole staff of attorneys, hearing officers, procedures, hearing rooms, court reporters, and they know the law unlike the county commission, especially if they were talking ground breaking litigation such as is the current state of transgender/gender identity types of issues. Like Outagamie, Calumet, and Racine County, Brown County could assist with filing complaints to the State DWD who was fully set up to do this and did this day in and day out. Hemery's recommendation would be to refer this to Corporation Counsel to do a rewrite and bring back to committee. Linssen spent time looking at Ch. 32 and he was at a loss for what most of it even did. He understood where Hemery was coming from and a rewrite of Ch. 32 made sense.

Responding to Kneiszel's question about listing transgender under 32.05 PROHIBITED ACTS, Hemery would leave it up to the State DWD and reference the statute as it existed or as it may be amended in the future so they don't have to come back every time another protection was added or something was taken away. If the State of Wisconsin found probable cause, they don't look at what the county's list was, they look at what the law was. Kneiszel stated the state didn't specifically address gender identity. Hemery stated it wasn't an option the state had and they would look through reams of federal case law on gender identity. There was great momentum for the county to opine that gender stereotyping was discrimination, it was something that could apply to gender individuals but again, let the DWD sort those things out.

Schadewald stated their goal was to fix 32. They weren't trying to diminish the efforts but the way Ch. 32 was currently written was a nightmare and they could be sued for missing timelines.

Linssen noted that counties didn't specifically state gender identity or gender expression but site the Wisconsin statute. Hemery informed probably because they don't want to be sued before the law was fully established. Instead they ensure that you have full discrimination protection by referring the complaint to the state that looked at current law and made a determination. He reiterated that it was wise to rewrite Ch. 32 that recognized any type of illegal discrimination was prohibited in Brown County. If they felt discrimination occurred the county would assist with filing a complaint with the DWD. He had no doubt that they actively prosecute and brought these cases forward as the law existed as of the time the complaint was filed. It was a legal analysis they need to do based on the specific facts of that complaint.

Hemery further spoke to the highlighted portion of the HUD.GOV handout from the agenda packet. He informed you can't just in general add the term in because not every type of transgender discrimination at this point in our time and history was prohibited under sex discrimination. If they were to recognize transgender as a protective class, then it would be that you can't discriminate based on sex and on transgender. Currently only certain parts of transgender discrimination were currently recognized in the law as expressed on HUDs own site.

Becker reiterated Kneiszel's idea of adding transgender to the list; Hemery informed that once they throw it in the county was prohibiting discrimination that wasn't clearly prohibited, some were and some weren't under federal law and the county could get sued. Becker stated he would stand up for that. Hemery responded he was more than happy to do it but would need more staff; it was a full time job if they got into federal litigation on constitutional issues. There were all kinds of damages that could be alleged and asserted against the county. These things lead to hundreds of thousands of dollars of suit. This was federal constitutional stuff; there was probably nothing more expensive to litigate than that especially in an area where the law was not developed.

Becker felt the reason this took so long was because no one had the courage to step up. He felt what Linssen was trying to do was the right thing. If it came down to the county might be sued, he would take his chances. Hemery's opinion was not that it came down to whether or not they may be sued, it was based on what the current state of the law was today. You won't get a legal opinion from him

based on something other than the law. He would take a bit of offense to lack of courage or based on the fear of being sued, it was based on an objective review of the law. Becker was saying many times at the County Board level they were frozen by fear of an action, fear of spending money, etc. He saw it blatantly.

Linszen would like it to reflect specifically those situations as it was in Milwaukee and Dane County. Technically they could get sued but he felt the risk was very small or large amounts of money. It was a risk he was willing to take. It was a principle reason he brought it up, not an economical one. The message he wanted was that Brown County was open to these individuals living here. He felt they could address the concerns with an enforcement mechanism. Hemery corrected Linszen, it 17 out of 50 states that have enacted those protections.

Vander Leest didn't personally felt the county didn't need any more risks. If the State of Wisconsin was equipped, Hemery should write it as what would be the least risk to the county. A lot of good things said but he felt it was all covered by referring it to the State DWD.

Kneiszel felt if it helped that he would join Linszen in a resolution to the state legislature supporting the idea of adding transgender persons as a protective class. He would like to see what Hemery comes up with in the rewrite, taking into account the sensitivities of everyone in the situation.

Kneiszel was a housing landlord, Vander Leest was a commercial landlord and there may be conflicts when voting to move forward therefore, no action could be taken.

*Supervisor Becker excused at 8:35 pm*

**17. Corporation Counsel Report.**

Hemery informed that the City of Green Bay had signed the Tax Collection Agreement and provided the county with two parking spots on Adams Street and six on Jefferson Street.

**Motion made by Supervisor Vander Leest, seconded by Supervisor Kneiszel to receive and place on file. Vote taken. MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY**

**Human Resources**

**18. Budget Adjustment Request (18-37): Reallocation of up to 10% of the originally appropriated funds between and levels of appropriation (based on lesser of originally appropriated amounts).**

**Motion made by Supervisor Kneiszel, seconded by Supervisor Vander Leest to approve. Vote taken. MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY**

**~~19. Resolution re: Establishing the Salaries of Certain Elective Officials Clerk of Courts and Sheriff.~~**

**20. Budget Status Financial Report through December 2017.**

**Motion made by Supervisor Vander Leest, seconded by Supervisor Kneiszel to receive and place on file. Vote taken. MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY**

**21. Turnover Reports.**

**Motion made by Supervisor Kneiszel, seconded by Supervisor Vander Leest to receive and place on file. Vote taken. MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY**

**22. Department Vacancies Report.**

**Motion made by Supervisor Kneiszel, seconded by Supervisor Vander Leest to receive and place on file. Vote taken. MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY**



**23. Health & Dental Plan Reports.**

Roellich informed in 2017 the county went about \$3.5 million over and had a negative equity in it. She received the February report (provided and attached) and the county was doing a little better but didn't have a firm number and anticipated another increase in the premium for health in 2019.

**Motion made by Supervisor Vander Leest, seconded by Supervisor Kneiszel to receive and place on file. Vote taken. MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY**

**24. Director's Report.**

Roellich informed they hired a new Benefits Specialist, she started Monday. The HRIS Analysis that oversaw Payroll had resigned and her last day was Friday. In reviewing the positions and what they needed they looked at hiring a Payroll Manager and that's how they posted it. Same pay level just a job title change. The former analysis had agreed to act on an interim basis until they fill the position.

**Motion made by Supervisor Kneiszel, seconded by Supervisor Vander Leest to receive and place on file. Vote taken. MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY**

**Department of Administration**

**25. Budget Adjustment Request (18-43): Any allocation from a department's fund balance.**

**Motion made by Supervisor Vander Leest, seconded by Supervisor Kneiszel to approve. Vote taken. MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY**

**26. Budget Adjustment Log.**

**Motion made by Supervisor Kneiszel, seconded by Supervisor Vander Leest to receive and place on file. Vote taken. MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY**

**27. Director's Report.**

**Motion made by Supervisor Vander Leest, seconded by Supervisor Kneiszel to receive and place on file. Vote taken. MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY**

**Other**

**28. Audit of bills.**

**Motion made by Supervisor Kneiszel, seconded by Supervisor Vander Leest to acknowledge the receipt of the bills. Vote taken. MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY**

**29. Such other matters as authorized by law. None.**

**30. Adjourn.**

**Motion made by Supervisor Kneiszel, seconded by Supervisor Vander Leest to adjourn 8:58 p.m. Vote taken. MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY**

Respectfully submitted,

Alicia A. Loehlein  
Recording Secretary



# Health Plan Performance Monitor Prepared for Brown County February 2018



### I. REPORT PARAMETERS

- A. Medical Administrator: UMR
- B. Prescription Drug Administrator: Single
- C. Reinsurance Carrier: Family
- D. Specific Stop-Loss Deductible: \$350,000

- Employer Rates used for Calculating Health Premiums\*: \$603.65
- Single \$1,548.38
- Family

\*Represents a weighted average of Actives and Retirees based on enrollment.

### II. PLAN EXPERIENCE

Month	FIXED COST ANALYSIS			VARIABLE COST ANALYSIS			ENROLLMENT		TOTAL CONTRACTS		
	Provider Network Fees	Administration and Plan Expenses	Stop Loss Premiums	Medical Claims Paid	Prescription Drug Costs	Stop Loss over Deductible	TOTAL VARIABLE COSTS	Single Contracts		Family Contracts	
January 2018	\$22,100	\$67,883	\$50,212	\$1,206,959	\$228,578	\$0	\$1,435,538	458	852		
February 2018	\$21,880	\$67,209	\$49,629	\$1,109,672	\$228,406	\$0	\$1,338,078	456	841		
March 2018											
April 2018											
May 2018											
June 2018											
July 2018											
August 2018											
September 2018											
October 2018											
November 2018											
December 2018											
<b>TOTALS</b>	<b>\$43,980</b>	<b>\$135,091</b>	<b>\$99,841</b>	<b>\$2,316,631</b>	<b>\$456,984</b>	<b>\$0</b>	<b>\$2,773,615</b>	<b>914</b>	<b>1,693</b>	<b>\$3,052,527</b>	<b>2,607</b>

### III. KEY INDICATORS

Average Single Enrollment:	457	Fixed Costs per Employee per Year:	\$1,284
Average Family Enrollment:	847	Variable Costs per Employee per Year:	\$12,767
Average Total Enrollment:	1,304	Total Costs per Employee per Year:	\$14,051
		Total HRA Disbursements per Employee per Year:	\$335
		Total Cost PEPY including HRA Disbursements:	\$14,386

Total Plan Costs:	\$3,052,527
Projected Plan Costs:	\$3,173,143
Dollar Difference:	\$120,616
Funding Ratio:	96%
YTD HRA Disbursements:	\$72,875



# Dental Plan Performance Monitor Prepared for Brown County



## I. REPORT PARAMETERS

A. Dental Administrator: Delta Dental

Monthly Rates used for Calculating Dental Premiums:  
 Single \$40.72  
 Family \$114.62

## II. PLAN EXPERIENCE

Month	COST ANALYSIS		ENROLLMENT		TOTAL CONTRACTS
	Administration	Paid Claims	Single Contracts	Family Contracts	
January 2018	\$4,205	\$115,584	330	822	1,152
February 2018	\$4,168	\$92,619	329	813	1,142
March 2018					
April 2018					
May 2018					
June 2018					
July 2018					
August 2018					
September 2018					
October 2018					
November 2018					
December 2018					
<b>TOTALS</b>	<b>\$8,373</b>	<b>\$208,203</b>	<b>659</b>	<b>1,635</b>	<b>2,294</b>

## III. KEY INDICATORS

Average Single Enrollment	330	Total Plan Costs:	\$216,576
Average Family Enrollment	818	Projected Plan Costs:	\$214,238
Average Total Enrollment	1,147	Dollar Difference:	(\$2,338)
		Funding Ratio:	101%
		Total Costs per Employee per Year:	\$1,133

3/6/2018

**ADMINISTRATIVE SERVICES DIVISION  
2017 TO 2018 CARRYOVER FUNDS**

<u>DEPARTMENT</u>	<u>ACCOUNT #</u>	<u>PURPOSE</u>	<u>AMOUNT REQUESTED</u>
<u>Administration</u> Professional Services Contributions	100.032.030.5708	Professional services	69,000
	100.032.001.5850	Digital Counties Summit	5,000
			<u>74,000</u>
<u>Board of Supervisors</u> Supplies Technology Special Events	100.006.001.5300.003	Additional computer tablets for supervisors	16,460
	100.006.001.5365	Private donations for veterans recognitions	1,300
			<u>17,760</u>
<u>Time and Attendance Capital Project</u>	422.032.XXXX	Continuation of project implementation - Kronos	<u>19,975 *estimated</u>
<u>Financial Management System</u>	423.032.430.XXXX	Continuation of project implementation - Financial Management System	<u>600 *estimated</u>

Approved by County Executive:  \_\_\_\_\_  
Signature

3/7/18  
Date