

**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 Thursday, April 1, 2021 at the Central Library, 515 Pine St., Green Bay, WI 54301.

---

**Present:** Supervisor Schadewald, Supervisor Murphy, Supervisor Vander Leest, Supervisor Hopkin, Supervisor Peters

**Also Present:** Corporation Counsel David Hemery, Assistant Corporation Counsel Brent Haroldson, Director of Administration Chad Weininger, Treasurer Paul Zeller, Technology Services Director August Neverman, Child Support Administrator Maria Lasecki, County Clerk Patrick Moynihan; County Board Chair Pat Buckley, Supervisors Brusky, Lefebvre, Van Dyck, Lund, Dantine, Schultz, and Coenen; and other interested parties

---

**I. Call to Order.**

The meeting was called to order by Chair Schadewald at 5:30 p.m.

**II. Approve/Modify Agenda.**

**Motion made by Supervisor Murphy, seconded by Supervisor Peters to approve with modification to take Item 13 after Item 5. Vote taken. MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY**

**III. Approve/Modify Minutes of March 4, 2021.**

**Motion made by Supervisor Hopkins, seconded by Supervisor Peters to approve. Vote taken. MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY**

**1. Review minutes of:**

- a. **Rural Broadband Subcommittee (February 15, 2021).**

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

**Comments from the Public** None.

**Communications**

- 2. Communication from Supervisor Brusky re: I request that the Administration Department report on the monthly cost of conducting each Brown County Board of Supervisor meeting from April 2020 through April 2021 including how the funding of each meeting was met, such as through the Brown County Contingency Fund, The CARES Act, etc. Please include what/if possible alternatives to these past monthly meeting expenses could have been and possible alternatives for future Brown County Board meetings.**

Supervisor Brusky thanked the committee for allowing her to speak as this issue has been causing her much stress. Since June, when they decided as a County Board to go to in-person for ongoing meetings, she found it to be remarkable that they would go against the advice of local and national health experts and their own Brown County Health Officer, who advised that they have virtual meetings if the work could be done efficiently. The work was done, there were some technology glitches, but they did well. She wasn't asking in real time, but during a worldwide health crisis.

As County Board Supervisors, Brusky believed most of them try to be frugal and spend taxpayers' monies wisely and not incur unnecessary costs and that's why she asked for the costs of each County

Board meeting from April 2020 through April 2021, so people can see black and white what these meetings are costing.

Since July Brusky has missed four meetings, she was allowed to attend four virtually and one she was allowed to vote but it didn't count, which she found demoralizing. Her constituents in District 14 are not pleased. She's asking for discussion on this and that they look at the cost of the meetings. She got some preliminary numbers from Director of Administration Chad Weininger, but they were incomplete as April, May and June of 2020 weren't included and PMI costs for February and March were missing.

CARES Fund covered the below (all of 2020 not 2021).

**Cost incurred for Meetings at Resch Center in 2020-21**

<u>Event Date</u>	<u>Vendor</u>	<u>Vendor #</u>	<u>Charge</u>
7/15/2020	PMI	106341	\$ 1,554
8/19/2020	PMI	106341	\$ 2,819
9/16/2020	PMI	106341	2,819
10/28/2020	Lighthouse Productions	116270	\$ 6,300
10/28/2020	PMI	106341	\$ 2,794
12/16/2020	PMI	106341	2,854
1/20/2021	PMI	106341	605
<b>TOTAL</b>			<b>\$ 19,745</b>

She noted the costs shown are for in-person meetings and/or a blend of in-person and virtual. In-person meetings have been quite costly at times and she was told that if they were virtual, at this point they would practically be \$0 in cost because the personnel needed to run these meetings have been already accounted for in their salary. They've shown that they can effectively do virtual and it seemed to be a matter of not wanting or willing to do it.

Brusky asked that further figures be assembled with a possible referral to the Executive Committee meeting for further discussion there.

Supervisor Lefebvre stated they talk about spending money and they have to watch their budgets because they weren't getting all the revenue coming in with Covid. She agreed that WebEx was doing fine, and they could do it. Out of 70+ counties three fourths of them either did it all virtually or a hybrid. There was no reason they couldn't done a hybrid for their County Board meetings for those that didn't feel comfortable, for Supervisors and staff. They were forcing staff to show up and that's not right. This was something they had set up already and it worked fine, with a few glitches. They had to be compassionate and thinking about others. This crisis was not over and have to be vigilant. Lefebvre stated they needed to know the full costs. She was told they don't pay anything for WebEx and questioned why spend money when they don't have to.

**Motion made by Supervisor Peters, seconded by Supervisor Murphy to allow interested parties to speak. Vote taken. MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY**

- Beth Rodgers – 311 W. Brian Ln., Allouez

Rodgers informed she emailed a communication to the Board office, it reads as follows:

ISSUE: Deprivation of voting representation for District 14 at Brown County Board meetings

LOBBYIST STATUS: I am not a lobbyist

I'm writing today to express my concern that District 14's representative, Joan Brusky, has not been allowed to vote at most County Board meetings since July, 2020 when meetings of the full Board were no longer accessible virtually.

The problem, I learned, was that she was following the CDC guidelines for older adults and those with certain underlying health issues regarding COVID-19. In other words, she was attending meetings virtually instead of in-person.

The following was copied from the CDC website today (3/31/21). [Link: [Risks for Severe COVID-19 outcomes](#).] I have highlighted the pertinent section. The people who are most at risk for severe COVID-19 reactions are **older adults and those with certain underlying health conditions**.

#### Steps to Reduce Your Risk

It is especially important for people at increased risk of severe illness from COVID-19, and those who live or visit with them, to protect themselves from getting COVID-19.

The best way to protect yourself and to help reduce the spread of the virus that causes COVID-19 is to:

- [Wear a mask, when you interact with others.](#)
- **Limit your in-person interactions with other people as much as possible, particularly when indoors...**

Until January 15 of this year, I worked in the Technology Services Department at Brown County so I am aware that it is possible to hold meetings in an "in-person and virtual" combination format. Yes, there are sometimes issues encountered such as echoing, but the issues are not insurmountable and there is no technological reason that a Supervisor cannot have their vote counted.

There is absolutely no acceptable reason that Supervisor Brusky's vote has not been counted for approximately seven months. I am furious that all voters from District 14 have had their votes disenfranchised (by extension) by excluding the District 14 Supervisor's vote. This is clearly taxation without representation.

I wrote to Chairman Buckley regarding this issue in February and never received a response from him. Therefore, I am bringing this to the attention of the Administration Committee in order to escalate this issue. I would like this issue to be brought before the Executive Committee and to the Full Board.

Thank you for your consideration.

Sincerely,

Beth A. Rodgers

Cell: 920-362-9733

Email: [BethARodgers1@gmail.com](mailto:BethARodgers1@gmail.com)

**Motion made by Supervisor Murphy, seconded by Supervisor Peters to return to regular order of business. Vote taken. MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY**

Lefebvre called Public Health Officer Anna Destree and a nurse called her back and said even though Lefebvre received her two shots and she was almost a month out and she wears a mask, washes her hands and socially distances, it was still safer and a recommendation that if she can attend virtually, she should attend virtually.

**Motion made by Supervisor Peters, seconded by Supervisor Hopkins to direct Administration provide Supervisor Brusky with costs requested and refer to the Executive Committee.**

Van Dyck was under the understanding that this fell under the County Board Chairman, so there wasn't a reason to refer to the Executive Committee.

Corporation Counsel David Hemery wanted to correct the record to inform that the Public Health Department and Officer had approved the plan for every County Board in-person meeting. There was extensive timing that went into them. The Health Officer and other staff members would do walk throughs days before and typically the day of the meeting to make sure everything was in order and in place. Regarding voting, initially there were difficulties holding purely virtual meetings, then they attempted to hold both virtual and in-person hybrid and those were by far the most difficult to get the technology to work on. The comment that Supervisor Brusky was allowed to vote but the vote didn't count, that was at her own request. She was told prior to the meeting that members had to attend in person, that was a decision of a County Board Chair under their current code. She knew before the meeting that votes virtually would not count, it was a purely in-person and asked as a courtesy whether she would be allowed to say how she would vote if she were in person just so people would know and as a courtesy, the County Board Chair allowed her to do that. Certainly, any member of the County Board could seek to amend the County Code and provide for different rules regarding meetings.

**Motion made by Supervisor Peters, seconded by Supervisor Hopkins to direct Administration provide Supervisor Brusky with costs requested and refer to County Board Chair. Vote taken. MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.**

Weininger informed all the numbers he had were pulled, this was not an administrative function but a County Board office function, all of the bills run through the County Board office. He did pull all the receipts they had and that was the accounting of all the receipts at this time. He stated there were a couple items on the agenda that should have never went to this Committee but the Executive Committee.

Brusky vehemently opposed what Hemery said, she was not given a choice in December on whether she was okay with attending the December meeting and not having her vote count. She was told that's the way it was going to be so she agreed to it and she will never again, it was demoralizing. Lefebvre was with her, they voted and their vote would have changed the outcome of one of the votes that were cast. There have been some missteps on the part of the county on the whole matter of virtual meetings. She was told it would cost tens of thousands of dollars to have virtual meetings but then someone found an easy solution, misinformation was given. The County has obviously learned a few things but they had failed with technology and she'd like to know if they can change the prerogative of where the meetings will be and how they can be attended, not depended on the chairs? Schadewald stated yes, through the County code. He suggested putting in a communication.

Hemery noted this was a public meeting and there's information that they're not allowing supervisors to attend and to vote, any supervisor who has ever requested a reasonable accommodation to attend a County Board meeting has been granted one pursuant to the law. Supervisors don't always accept the reasonable accommodation, it's certainly preferable operating in regular fashion, he knew they have had supervisors that have accepted the reasonable accommodation and have appeared in person in a safe manner whether that was rows up in a box seat where they are 100s of feet from other members. It's not the case that board members have asked due to any type of condition that they may have that may qualify for reasonable accommodation, it's not true that they have asked for that and have not been granted, the county have always offered reasonable accommodations when requested.

Lefebvre informed they had to do that meeting on the phone, which she was told was different. If they have a virtual meeting, they are able to vote. She came to the last meeting in person because she was through her vaccinations but asked to be seated by those wearing masks and they accommodated that. The meetings where the accommodations were in the box, she was criticized for interrupting when she tried to get attention to speak. A lot of supervisors did not go to the mic to speak, she was up three floors and couldn't hear what they were saying. She was given a flashing want to wave around to get attention so she could speak, and she felt that was nuts. She's a spectator and not part of the meeting most of the time. It didn't work and that's the best they could

do which wasn't very good at all and she refused to go anymore if she can't do it virtually. She believed the Executive Committee directed the County Board Chair to look at venues and options of not just in-person but also virtually. Schadewald didn't know the answer but stated if she wanted to put in a communication to refer to the Executive Committee, she could do so. He was allowing a lot of the discussion because supervisors deserve the privilege to be heard.

**3. Communication from Supervisor Murphy re: Asking for a review of Brown County's membership with the Wisconsin Counties Association.**

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

**4. Communication from Supervisor Van Dyck re: Request that Corporation Counsel prepare a resolution, similar to the resolutions already adopted by a number of Brown County municipalities, requesting that the Brown County Treasurer continue the current practice of collecting the 1<sup>st</sup> installment of property taxes for all municipalities that desire such service.**

**Motion made by Supervisor Murphy, seconded by Supervisor Peters to hold until Item 15. Vote taken. MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY**

**4a. Resolution Supporting Consolidated Property Tax Collection Through the Brown County Treasurer's Office.**

**Motion made by Supervisor Peters, seconded by Supervisor Hopkins to refer to Corporation Counsel and Administration for proper format and fiscal and bring back to a special meeting before County Board. Vote taken. MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY**

**5. Communication from Supervisor Lefebvre re: Look into opening the door/Adams Street entrance and the inside door to the hallway of the Northern Building for handicap people.**

Lefebvre informed when she was going to the county office she ran into a visitor walking in and he was complaining that he had to walk around to the front of the building and he had a hard time walking. She informed there wasn't any close parking or handicap spots nearby. She was wondering if there was some way they could do something for handicap people?

Schadewald followed up and found a number of things. The Risk Manager doesn't recommend it for several reasons, the biggest one being security. When you go up past the 2<sup>nd</sup> floor, you can't get in and he doesn't want a handicap person walking up and having to walk down. There is no handicap accessible button on Adams like the Walnut Street entrance and there were general concerns with visibility. He will talk to them further but right now it was not their recommendation.

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

*Although shown in proper format here, Item 13 was taken at this time.*

**Legal Bills**

- 6. Review and Possible Action on Legal Bills to be paid.**
- a. For March 4, 2021 Meeting – Resubmitted for “Approval.”**
  - b. For April 1, 2021 Meeting.**

**Motion made by Supervisor Vander Leest, seconded by Supervisor Murphy to approve Legal Bills Items 6a & b. Vote taken. MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY**

**Technology Services**

- 7. Director's Report.**

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

**Child Support**

**8. Director's Report.**

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

**Motion made by Supervisor Vander Leest, seconded by Supervisor Murphy to suspend rules to handle Items 14 & 15. Vote taken. MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY**

*Although shown in proper format here, Items 14 & 15 were taken at this time.*

**County Clerk**

**9. Review Positions in the County Clerk's Office.**

County Clerk Patrick W. Moynihan Jr. stated 88 days ago he began his term as the 40<sup>th</sup> Brown County Clerk and one of the first things he was requested to accomplish by this committee was to review the positions of the County Clerk's office. This has been a carryover item held from last October. As such he offered the following, originally as he was told it was his predecessors' belief and intent to deputize the County Board staff as Deputy Clerks. Though this may be a noble goal to achieve in the future, he did not believe now was the time to do so. He believed they could address this scenario when the following accrues, if this committee and the County Board approve of technological advances encompassing agenda and meeting minutes administration thus eliminating the manual process of the affirmation, they could proceed to motion minutes. Doing so would allow for other duties to come fruition. Final technology recommendations should be before this committee at the next meeting, May 6, 2021. Second, at present, though under the umbrella of the County Clerk's office, the board staff is segregated in an adjacent office to that of the Clerk's office. It is his hope that they may garner American Rescue Act dollars to properly reconfigure the Clerk's office not only for covid related reasons but also for the incorporation of board office staff, only then could he see the possibility of deputization and reorganization realized. In addition to the remaining agenda items, he found another anomaly within the organization however he shall address that as part of the 2022 budget process in the coming months.

**10. Resolution Regarding Table of Organization Change for the County Clerk Department – Legislative Specialist Positions.**

**Motion made by Supervisor Peters, seconded by Supervisor Murphy to approve. Vote taken. MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY**

**11. Chief Deputy County Clerk Wage Adjustment Request.**

Moynihan noted as part of looking at the whole scope of the office, and in doing his research, he found a discrepancy with the Chief Deputy Clerk's salary. He referred to a letter he prepared, which was provided in the agenda packet material, and spoke to it.

Supervisor Borchardt questioned if the number two in the office got a pay raise last year? Moynihan responded he had more reports, yet he was \$1,629.00 less than his counterpart in the same paygrade. Borchardt added if there was a way to do it over time? Director of Administration Chad Weininger felt this was a philosophical issue. The County Board's preference in the past has been the belief in the free market system about saying what's the duty worth and that duty worth is worth a certain way, premarket principles, in which he briefly explained. He added, it was the philosophy of pay, were they going to pay people for their job and their wage or just pay it for everyone to keep everyone the same. There were experiments throughout the United States looking at paying

everyone the same and it's something the County Board could consider. Moynihan responded it was constitutional and not just a regular employment situation.

Schadewald stated they have an HR policy for pay wage adjustments and they have to follow them.

Weininger stated the issue was, what about all the other departments? Bumping everyone up to a higher wage as opposed to what the market was. That's why he used an extreme example such as communism, not everyone should be higher.

Responding to Schadewald, Weininger explained that generally a department head will work with HR and HR will review the position. It's usually done during the budget process, not as a stand-alone. They don't just do wage increases. Item 10 had to do with pay inequities, so they went out and reviewed and that's why they brought that position forward. If it's a pay inequity they have a min, mid, and max, and it depends on several factors such as if the position is in market, it's a fair pay.

Schadewald added HR gives the board recommendations but the bottom line it's the County Board's decision.

Moynihan informed they had set a precedent here, just before the end of his last term, his predecessor changed the Deputy of Services and Deputy of Communications and lumped them all at the same pay scale with the Deputy of Elections, so it has occurred in that sense. Weininger interjected, that was different. If people are doing the same duties, they can group them together especially if they're in the same office. That's the rule as a department head and authority if it gets approved. When you take someone from a different department that's doing financial work verses someone doing election work as opposed to someone who is doing records management, those are not all the same duties and it goes back to the philosophy, do you believe in the free market or do you believe in one size fits all? Per ordinance it would have to be signed off by HR and the County Executive before it can go to the full board and is usually done during the budget process.

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

## **12. Clerk's Report.**

Beginning March 1, Clerk Moynihan was invited to participate in a Zoom meeting hosted by Wisconsin Assembly Majority Leader Jim Steineke regarding onslaught of election-related bills circulating throughout the state capital seeking sponsorship in February.

Moynihan participated in a WisVote general training webinar, a WisVote Absentee Ballot Review webinar and a Wisconsin Election Commission April Election Readiness webinar.

Chairman Buckley, Supervisor Van Dyck, Director of Admin Weininger, TS Director August Neverman and Clerk Moynihan met to finalize requirements for entities regarding agenda/meeting minutes administration and potentially the technological needs of a possible new meeting room for the County Board. Their recommendations to this committee and ultimately the County Board should come to fruition next month.

Moynihan also participated in a Wisconsin Counties Association Legislative Zoom meeting which covered the Governor's proposed budget, pending legislation, with the emphasis on election law.

On behalf of the Clerk's office, Moynihan was also fortunate to participate in a call regarding the November General Election hosted by the Office of the Director of National Intelligence, which also included the FBI and Homeland Security. The call was more of a Q&S session regarding election day and the event was very interesting.

Also, working in concert with the Planning Department, Brown County met its statutory

requirements with the Legislative Technology Services Bureau for the Ward Data Submission in the Census Bureau C-Bas program (Census Boundary & Annexation Survey).

Regarding the Census, there is no new news since his last report. The Census Data remains delayed, with all counties slated to realize their respective data on September 30<sup>th</sup>.

Working in concert with the county's municipalities, the election public tests were accomplished this week without issue and they are all set for next Tuesday's Spring Election.

Regarding the Clerk's office base administrative processing statistics, they're seeing a 170% uptick in marriage licenses in comparison to last March (73-43). As society slowly normalizes, he would foresee these numbers growing substantially especially in the typical marriage season, June through October.

Perhaps as a barometer of better days to come, work permits jumped to 50 in the month of March in comparison to this past February's high of 24.

Passport applications grew 188% in comparison to last year. Brown County processed 295 passport applications this past month to last year's 157, when COVID-19 became far more prevalent throughout the world.

Lastly, Moynihan continues to learn and develop new skills which he was not exposed to as a Municipal Clerk.

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

#### **Treasurer**

#### **13. Request for Preference to Former Owner to Purchase Brown County owned tax deeded lands.**

Treasurer Zeller informed state statute and the county code allows for preference to the former owner for repurchase. The repurchase option is subject to the Administration Committee Chairman's receipt of letters within a 30-day window. That window ends April 8, 2021. The County Board office received six former owner letters representing 13 of the parcels. When the Judge finds for the county and transfers title to the county, any liens, mortgages, any encumbrances on those properties are extinguished. The action of the committee is selling the property back to the former owner in the condition it is now. The Treasurer's job is to get everything that is owed to Brown County. The new owners are starting over with a clean slate at this point. Its not simply a return of the property to the former owner in the condition it was prior to the foreclosures, properties are free of encumbrances and liens.

Schadewald doesn't want to be the committee that someone doesn't pay the taxes, goes into foreclosure, and gets a house back without paying a mortgage or anything else. He questioned if the Treasurer notified them of such? Zeller stated that was not part of this process, every property has a title report that is done prior to foreclosure so that they notice everyone of the interested parties. They can come in and foreclose before the county to protect their interest but they have to understand they're returning property back to a former owner in a different condition that was when they foreclosed on it.

**Motion made by Supervisor Peters, seconded by Supervisor Vander Leest to sell back parcel numbers 6-97, 6-97-D, SU-752-11-1 to former owner Matthew J. Tucker for cashier's or certified check made payable to the Brown County Treasurer in the total amount of \$40,502.49 to be received at the Brown County Treasurer's office, located at 305 E. Walnut Street, Room 160, Green Bay, WI 54301, by 4:30 pm on or before April 9, 2021.**

**Motion made by Supervisor Hopkins, seconded by Supervisor Vander Leest to sell back parcel**



number SU-399-1 to former owners Steven Peot and Laura Peot for cashier's or certified check made payable to the Brown County Treasurer in the total amount of \$19,564.91 to be received at the Brown County Treasurer's office, located at 305 E. Walnut Street, Room 160, Green Bay, WI 54301, by 4:30 pm on or before April 9, 2021.

Motion made by Supervisor Murphy, seconded by Supervisor Vander Leest to sell back parcel number 3-277 to former owner John L. Raymaker for cashier's or certified check made payable to the Brown County Treasurer in the total amount of \$13,085.55 to be received at the Brown County Treasurer's office, located at 305 E. Walnut Street, Room 160, Green Bay, WI 54301, by 4:30 pm on or before April 9, 2021.

Motion made by Chair Schadewald, seconded by Supervisor Hopkins to sell back parcel numbers HB-1462 and HB-1463 to former owner Simon Decoteau for cashier's or certified check made payable to the Brown County Treasurer in the total amount of \$5,172.47 to be received at the Brown County Treasurer's office, located at 305 E. Walnut Street, Room 160, Green Bay, WI 54301, by 4:30 pm on or before April 9, 2021.

Treasurer Zeller requested that all five parcels must be bought and paid in full together by former owner Kenneth McCoy, based on the experiences they had with owning these parcels for the month and the law enforcement calls and ordinances violations, etc.

Motion made by Supervisor Vander Leest, seconded by Supervisor Peters to sell back parcel numbers 14-886-A, 14-900, 18-117, 4-8, and SU-681-8 to former owner Kenneth McCoy for cashier's or certified check made payable to the Brown County Treasurer in the total amount of \$150,543.84 to be received at the Brown County Treasurer's office, located at 305 E. Walnut Street, Room 160, Green Bay, WI 54301, by 4:30 pm on or before April 9, 2021.

Motion made by Supervisor Peters, seconded by Supervisor Hopkins to sell back parcel number SU-568-1-2 to former owner Michael Magnuson for cashier's or certified check made payable to the Brown County Treasurer in the total amount of \$15,696.19 to be received at the Brown County Treasurer's office, located at 305 E. Walnut Street, Room 160, Green Bay, WI 54301, by 4:30 pm on or before April 9, 2021

*Back to Item 6 at this time.*

**14. Discussion/Possible Action RE: Municipal Tax Collection, Table of Org Change, and Intergovernmental Agreement.**

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

**15. Resolution Authorizing Tax Collection Parcel Fee and Changing the Table of Organization for the Treasurer's Office.**

Zeller informed in January they sent out tax bill preparation agreements to all 24 municipalities indicating that the county would be willing to prepare and mail tax bills at no charge as done in the past but the county would not be providing winter property tax collection starting December 2021. Feedback received from municipalities, that towns would have great difficulty with that, and they were logistically and financially unable to do so. Other municipalities didn't want to carry out their statutory duties. They also heard there were municipalities interested in paying for the service. A concession for the towns was they would provide that service for one more year with the understanding in writing that they transition starting winter 2022. Following that they had requests from County Board Supervisors and municipalities that the county provide this service within the scope of their abilities for the winter collection for a fee. He was asked to provide a proposal for the service and that's what this is. That service won't be extended to every municipality because they have capacity issues and not able to because they are no longer using banks to collect property taxes

for municipalities. If the committee wants to provide this service, they can provide it for the villages and towns that they have provided for last season 2020-2021 for a fee, a one-year agreement to see how it goes. If they pass this agreement, then they will carry out the service for those that choose.

Schadewald informed this was a moving target and like with all compromises, not everyone is happy. This decision is not this committee's decision about collecting taxes, it was a state statute. This committee tried to work it out the best they could to reach some kind of an agreement.

Van Dyck stated the resolution indicated the Treasurer was going to have to collect an additional 12,775 parcels because of the elimination of banks but didn't note the elimination of 35,650 City of Green Bay parcels and 8,942 De Pere parcels or bills that they used to collect two years ago and asked if it could be added. The amount of bills they are potentially collecting has dropped in half. He doesn't necessarily agree that they will have additional work.

Schadewald felt that was apples and oranges, a totally different experience. A bank has a parking lot, the personnel, and handled the money.

Zeller informed they collected for the City of De Pere right up through this year. It was the Village of Howard that left at the same time the City of Green Bay did. The 12,775 parcels were what the banks collected this past winter. Associated Bank had 13 locations and did not collect at all last year, so they had 8 bank locations that voluntarily collected 12,775 parcels. If Associated Bank had also collected, they would have that many more parcels that the banks would have collected. When one of the banks drops out, the other banks feel an impact and may choose to drop out based on that impact. Banks have the staff to provide labor essentially for the municipalities. This is where he was drawing the line. The property taxes, if he's going to collect, are going to be under control of the Treasurer's office in his office. How are they going to take 12,775 in person payments and put them at the Northern Building in December and January?

Van Dyck felt the point they're missing was the fact that three years ago, the county was collecting 100% of the taxes for Brown County, 53,000 parcels. At least a percentage of those were walking into the door and paying their bill. They're making it sound like the ones paying at the bank were now going to come here and were additional but the 1000s that used to come and pay their bill, that no longer come here, those they were going to ignore? He wasn't quite sure he understood where they picked up any additional people coming in the door, they were assuming, and in addition, if you go back and look at the budget, the staffing level has been the same for the past 8 years.

In addition to the 50,000 not being collected, Van Dyck had to believe the percentage of people paying online has gone up tremendously over the last few years but now they need an additional 1.2 people to collect taxes all of the sudden.

Van Dyck noted at the last meeting, the Treasurer said there was no concern about staffing or anything else. He didn't have to collect by state statute, and he didn't want to. This office has collected taxes for how many years, if Zeller didn't want to take the taxes, then Van Dyck felt he shouldn't have run for the position. Or if that was the position he was going to take, then maybe he should have made it known before he ran for office and before he petitioned this board for a much larger raise than what they actually gave.

Van Dyck would ask that they receive and place on file the resolution from the Treasurer and go back to doing what they've done for how many years. He didn't understand logically or has heard any arguments as to why this made any sense or heard that there was a problem. County Board didn't ask the Treasurer to find revenue or cut his budget and now he was going to charge because he feels like that does something for the county. That was like taking \$1.60 out of your right pocket and shoving it in your left pocket because as a whole for Brown County they haven't gained anything. If they have all the municipalities collecting their taxes and they're paying for software and bonding, this will cost the county more money. It seems to be an issue for one individual, and they're going through an awful lot of pain because of that. He felt this County Board can through the resolution he

proposed at least show the public in the county that they support to continue to do something that they've been doing and if the Treasurer chose not to do it, it was his prerogative.

Supervisors Lund, Dantine, and Schultz agreed with Supervisor Van Dyck and urged the committee to support Van Dyck's proposed resolution. Lund felt Zeller blindsided the committee by sending out the letters. He suggested telling their constituents how they feel about it. Most people probably do their taxes electronically, but some people don't and now people have to figure out where to go. It's causing municipalities to hire additional people and they don't have it in their budget. They did it for years and it worked, and he never had a complaint until now. Dantine stated he's been in politics for 40 years and every year they're told to consolidate services because it saves dollars and was more efficient. It made no sense economically. The Planning Department was a good example, saving tons of money by putting stuff together. Townships and municipalities made a concession 10-12 years ago to allow Brown County to collect the taxes and it was a travesty to go backwards and make them all pay to collect their own taxes. You can't go back and forth like a yo-yo. Did towns and municipalities have to buy the county's program? The statutes don't say that. He wished they would reconsider. It was a good system. He talked to Denmark State Bank and they were in favor of keeping them, but the county didn't want them to do it anymore. Schultz agreed with the common sense of the efficiency. They combined Public Safety Communications and the dispatch center to be more efficient with tax money while providing a safe and effective service.

County Board Chair Buckley wanted to look at it from another approach. When this first came about and the county wasn't going to collect for anyone, there were a lot of issues raised at that time. Certain people sat down with the Treasurer and got to a compromise to where the resolution was today. They looked at the information that was brought forward, as far as the banks, with the understanding they would have to staff up, purchase parking from the city, have equipment needs, and figure out how to handle the traffic flow at the Northern Building. He doesn't want to see this killed tonight. If the Treasurer so chooses, he doesn't have to do this, but they might be leaving a number of towns and villages that want the service with no collaborative effort. Personally, sending taxes to one place would make sense, but times have changed. Just like the banks, it's not cost effective for them to do it anymore. He was happy to see that they could get the Treasurer to at least budge a little bit.

Coenen appreciated the movement but needed clarification on the parking and noticed within the resolution the pay raise. Schadewald informed Green Bay was paying \$15 an hour plus parking for seasonal staff. The proposal the Treasurer gave was to be competitive with the personnel so instead of them going to Green Bay to work they could get qualified people at the county. Also, years ago, the county got 4-spots on Adams Street to use during tax season, then it went down to two, then it was moved to Jefferson. Parking has always been an issue because of the other businesses on Adams Street. It's been an ongoing issue for years and costs about \$460 to reserve meters during tax time. The parking costs came out of the \$1.60 fee, which was per property tax bill produced for that municipality and processed.

Lefebvre stated it wasn't much of a change for the City of Green Bay, they had personnel, but she was concerned about the small communities and the cost for them. To her it wasn't fair to put the cost onto them and it worked before so she didn't see the need for change.

**Motion made by Supervisor Peters, seconded by Supervisor Vander Leest to suspend the rules to allow interested parties to speak. Vote taken. MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY**

-Mary Kardoskee - President of Village of Ashwaubenon

Kardoskee stated at the last meeting they asked for one year. Zeller agreed they wouldn't have to pay until January, but they will have to pay twice in 2022 and they will also have to hire people. These costs were in the Treasurer's 2021 budget to collect taxes. It will cost their village about \$12,000. She spoke to an individual who has collected taxes for the county and since Green Bay, Denmark and Howard do their own taxes, it was much less busy, and a lot of people were paying online. If she didn't want to stand in line to pay her taxes, she would mail them, which is what she

does anyway. She questioned out of all the municipalities why one was selected to not do it. It was not right, in her opinion. She knew this committee had no say, she understood it, but it was something that needs to be in the public as they need to know. The county will still be getting the money but then it will just look like the municipality was paying so their taxes will have to go up. She was still advocating to give them one more year to get it figured out.

-Tom Kempen - Chairman of Town of Morrison

Kempen stated it was indicated to the towns that if they collect the taxes that they would have to license this software but if they added \$1.60 a parcel would they still be required to do that? Schadewald informed the county would pay for the license. If the town decides they don't want to pay the fee and collect their own taxes, will the town then need to license the software? Zeller stated he had not been assured for the next tax season that the software will continue to be enabled to allow the loading, so he cannot answer that question. If the town wishes to provide the Treasurer a spreadsheet everyday with the payments, they will attempt to load them into the county's system. If the town chooses to collect in that manner, they will not be able to provide a receipt from the tax system that shows the taxes are paid. Kempen felt by asking a town clerk to use this software once a year, they're going to struggle with it, and they will have all kinds of mistakes and errors. If they were provided a template for an Excel spreadsheet, the town would be happy to fill that out. Personally, he paid his taxes by mail and didn't deal with situation downtown. He supports what Van Dyck stated and would like to keep things the way they were.

Zeller informed this entire function was a municipal Treasurer duty by statute. They would determine the method of collection and if they accept online payments, checks, hours, etc. If they choose to send them the information by spreadsheet, they will do everything within their power to load those payments up as soon as they received them so that the land records system to the public would show that payment.

- Joe Zegers - City of De Pere Finance Director and Treasurer

Zegers knew this was a difficult job and time consuming to collect taxes but he felt the underlying theme when they met last month, they can say that veering off what the county is doing right now was going to cost the county taxpayers as a whole more money and it would hard to challenge that. The other item was the timing and time of communication of this. He felt it not only put the municipalities in a pinch and nervous about what's going on December, but it puts the County Board and the Administration Committee in tough spot. He's asking that things stay the same because it was in the best interest of taxpayers and a great service of the County Treasurer. He was looking at, at the very minimum, if they could have this pushed off for a year and get more data on it, especially the bank collections falling off. How much that really would affect the county collection for this year and was it falling off totally because the bank didn't want it or was it because the banks were not being asked too? The services provided are fantastic and provided for all taxpayers and he'd like it to continue.

**Motion made by Supervisor Peters, seconded by Supervisor Murphy to return to regular order of business. Vote taken. MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY**

Peters questioned the exception for the City of De Pere and the root cause of the Treasurer's decision, the drivers for this change? Zeller responded the City of De Pere was not included in the collect for a fee proposal, for the municipalities they collected for this past winter, there are roughly 61,000 bills total. City of De Pere represents roughly 9,000, every year parcel counts go up. He was asked to determine a collection for a fee proposal based on what he could reasonably handle at the Northern Building in his office, given the constraints of the building, the parking, the staffing and workstations and he determined at tops they can handle about 50,000 parcels. The City of De Pere, they're a city, they have locations, staff, and office hours. For all these municipalities, to his knowledge, they have utility bills that they send out in similar scale to this collection operation. If not collecting their own bills, they are paying someone else to do it. In terms of the decision to move this function, the statute is very clear and has placed property tax collection nearest to the property taxpayer. It's the municipalities money to be collected and held and used in any way they wish to

until they distribute it. For the county, with no real physical office to collect these taxes, with no parking and take on this responsibility and to partner with private partner banks, who are not in any way committed to provide this service, and can back out at any time, act as a third layer intermediary between the taxpayer and the municipality where the payment goes, makes no sense. As the result of many problems and difficulties they had in collection, he made the decision on New Year's Eve when they were still in the office collecting property taxes for the municipalities at 6pm, issues compounded by 1000s of pieces of mail in one day because a mortgage escrow company chose to send individual checks in individual envelopes for 3,300 payments. This is not a county responsibility. He informed the committee in January that Corporation Counsel was drafting documents to prepare to send to municipalities. Again, there's 1,740 municipalities in Wisconsin that are conducting their own property tax collection duties, 95+%. He explained how he came up with a compromise for collection and had to calculate labor and fees and they evaluated all the potential costs and came up with the \$1.60 fee. If County Board Supervisors want a municipal duty to be transferred to a county Treasurer duty, those resolutions should be sent to their legislators, as they're the only body that can move that responsibility to the county. If they acted upon that he would be the first one to start planning for carrying out that statutory duty.

Peters supports the Treasurer's position, the whole concept of representative government is you push it down closest to where the action is so the municipalities to him, it seems appropriate for them to do what he's suggesting. In addition, it seems as though there has been some give and take, some compromise that would get them through this transition period.

Going back to what Mr. Zagger stated, and probably why Van Dyck is passionate about this, the county provides a great service to the citizens of Brown County and the Treasurer's office does a great job. He understands that maybe by statute their office doesn't have to do it but just because the rest of the counties do it that way, doesn't mean it's the right way to do it. Legislation doesn't have to change to allow them to continue to do what they've been doing for the last how many years. What's the problem? He felt the biggest problem in this community is no one seems to cooperate with one another when it comes time and they have to have facilities in every corner in this community. Here is an opportunity where they have a service that they're providing citizens in an economical and efficient manner and now they want to blow it up. They're making an erroneous decision that 12,775 additional parcels and people are going to walk through the door. He believed a lot of the people they're collecting for that are going to the bank won't drive downtown to pay their tax bill. The idea that they have to cost to pay for in person parking downtown, don't make it convenient, there's many ways of paying your taxes. He appeals to the Treasurer in the sense that he provides a great service and it works and he's not quite sure why they want to go back on it and he felt the story keeps changing, like with the banks. This whole thing defies logic and all he's asking for was to apply some logic and let's keep doing something that works in Brown County.

Zeller responded payments being paid at a bank should be made to their municipality and not to a bank. Regarding parking, Van Dyck wants to make it inconvenient so that they chase people away so they pay in a different fashion. If they pay by check to the county, the county turns around and sends the money to the municipality. Why pay a check to Brown County to turn around and send the money to the municipalities, why not send it directly to the municipality, where it's supposed to be? Zeller felt Van Dyck's argument made no sense.

VanDyck stated people have been paying their taxes at a bank for numerous years and it's never been a problem. Now all of the sudden they're telling taxpayers they shouldn't pay their taxes at the bank and not give any other alternative because of state statute. Zeller stated three times in the last six years their primary bank partner, with no obligation, pulled out at the last hour so they're scrambling to find a replacement. Zeller is going out and finding bank partners to collect for the municipalities and he's basically an intermediary. If the municipalities want to have banks collect, they can ask their own bank to collect, why is that a county responsibility? They have banking relationships. He's out trying to find banks who the county does not bank with to collect on behalf of the municipalities, who have their own banks. They can ask their own bank to assist their bank collection. Why were they in between?

Supervisor Vander Leest questioned how the 2<sup>nd</sup> half affected their office? Zeller noted the 2<sup>nd</sup> installment and all delinquent taxes were the responsibility of the County Treasurer. On the day that the grace period ends, the 5<sup>th</sup> business day of February, the tax roll becomes the county's, they are then responsible for collection, including the July 31<sup>st</sup> payment. In his budget he has tax collection help for that period of time, to provide for the 20,000-25,000 taxpayers that elect to pay in second installment. That's already in his budget to collect those taxes. Only about 20% of taxpayers pay in installments. Roughly 80% pay the entire bill in the first installment collection.

Schadewald stated this has been brought up multiple times in the past. There was no big discussion when Green Bay and Howard left. He knew this was going to be a firestorm in January when it was brought up. The job of this committee was to provide options to the County Board because they make the final decision as what they see to be the best possible course of action and for that reason he would support the motion that they at least have the option because if the County Board doesn't want the option of letting the Treasurer charge for tax collection, the Treasurer can go back to his original position that municipalities have to do it. He didn't feel that was the right course right now.

Schadewald furthered, they don't know what the costs will be but he understands the Treasurer's costs are ambiguous and unknown, there was no perfect way of knowing. He felt the best they could do was approve all the resolutions because when the Treasurer signs an intergovernmental agreement, he must collect the taxes. Zeller noted he had been told previously that he didn't have the authority to sign an intergovernmental agreement. Schadewald stated that once there's an intergovernmental agreement, they have to fulfill their part. If tomorrow the Treasurer says he was not collecting taxes, by state statute, he can say that. Corporation Counsel David Hemery stated they would also have the Treasurer sign the IGA. Zeller stated that was based on offering the agreement to the municipalities that they've established so they are within their capacity.

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

**Motion made by Supervisor Vander Leest, seconded by Supervisor Hopkins to suspend the rules to take Item 4 & 4a. Vote taken. MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY**

**16. Treasurer's Report.**

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

**Administration and Human Resources**

**17. Budget Adjustment Log.**

**Motion made by Supervisor Hopkins, seconded by Supervisor Murphy to approve. Vote taken. MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY**

**18. Director's Reports.**

Director of Administration Chad Weininger informed room tax continues to lag and will have to dip in the reserve set up and look at stimulus money to cover that loss of room tax revenue which will plug the hole.

**a) Discussion and Possible Action re: Director's Reports.**

**Motion made by Supervisor Murphy, seconded by Supervisor Peters to approve the IRS guidelines to allow employees to rollover more than \$500 in their flex accounts from 2020 to 2021. Vote taken. MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY**

**Motion made by Supervisor Hopkins, seconded by Supervisor Vander Leest to forego the spousal PHA requirement. Vote taken. MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY**

**Corporation Counsel**

**19. Oral Report.** *No report, no action needed.*

**Other**

**20. Audit of bills.**

**Motion made by Supervisor Peters, seconded by Supervisor Murphy to acknowledge receipt of the bills. Vote taken. MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY**

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

**22. Adjourn.**

**Motion made by Supervisor Hopkins, seconded by Supervisor Vander Leest to adjourn at 8:52 pm. Vote taken. MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY**

Respectfully submitted,

Alicia Loehlein  
Administrative Coordinator