

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE BROWN COUNTY ADMINISTRATION COMMITTEE**

Pursuant to Section 18.94 Wis. Stats., a regular meeting of the **Brown County Administration Committee** was held on Thursday, July 28, 2011 in Room 200 of the Northern Building – 305 East Walnut Street, Green Bay, Wisconsin.

---

---

**Present:** Tom Lund, Tony Theisen, Robert Miller, Mark Tumpach, Kris Schuller  
**Also Present:** Troy Streckenbach, Robert Heimann, Debbie Klarkowski, Bill Dowell, Ellen Sorensen, Karl Fleury, Kerry Blaney

---

---

I. **Call Meeting to Order:**

The meeting was called to order by Chairman Tom Lund at 5:30 p.m.

II. **Approve/Modify Agenda:**

**Motion made by Supervisor Theisen and seconded by Supervisor Tumpach to approve. Vote taken. MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY**

III. **Approve/Modify Minutes of Special June 15, 2011 and June 23, 2011.**

**Motion made by Supervisor Miller and seconded by Supervisor Schuller to approve. Vote taken. MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY**

1. **Review of minutes:**

- a. Facility Master Plan Subcommittee (June 16, 2011).

**Motion made by Supervisor Theisen and seconded by Supervisor Tumpach to receive and place on file. Vote taken. MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY**

- b. Housing Authority, June 20, 2011

**Motion made by Supervisor Schuller and seconded by Supervisor Miller to receive and place on file. Vote taken. MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY**

Supervisor Miller stated that he felt the time of day that the Housing Authority holds their meetings may prohibit the vast majority of taxpayers from attending the meetings or sitting on the committee. A note was made of this and this item will be added to the Administration Committee agenda for the August meeting.

**Motion made by Supervisor Schuller and seconded by Supervisor Miller to receive and place on file. Vote taken. MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY**

**Communications:**

- 1c. **Communication from Supervisor Miller Re: That the Administration Committee of the Brown County Board of Supervisors be expanded to include three Brown County High School students as non-voting members to participate in all non-closed session discussions. This would be done on an experimental basis for one year.**

Miller reported that he had spoken with the Green Bay School District with regard to this and they thought it was a viable idea. He felt this would be a good experience for students who would participate as non-voting members, similar to the student council members who sit on the Green Bay School Board. He thought that this may get students talking with friends and family about what they've been doing and would give them an idea of what actually happens in government. He felt it would be best if the students chosen were not relatives of board members or county employees.

Chair Lund stated he felt it may be best to start this in September or October and run through the school year. This could then be re-evaluated next June to see how it worked and see if it is something the Committee wished to continue. A notice to the schools could be sent out to see if they had any interested students and then the students could send resumes and the selections could be made.

Supervisor Schuller asked how the student on the School Board was selected. Miller stated it was his understanding that the School Board's selection was handled on an election basis from the student councils of the high schools.

Supervisor Theisen questioned how much interest there would be among high school students and also stated that he felt the School Board was a bit different as they are making decisions that specifically affect students. He did see the benefits of students gaining government experience but also questioned if Administration Committee is the appropriate committee to add students to or if perhaps a better committee may be Executive Committee. Supervisor Tumpach felt that the Administration Committee might be a bit tough for a high school student to comprehend, but he also felt that the idea is worthwhile and he would support it.

Miller stated that he felt that the Administration Committee deals with areas of technology and high school students may have substantial knowledge to offer in that regard. He agreed that there has not been an outpouring of interest from high school students at County meetings, but he felt that the workings of government are worthy of students' interests and it would be worthwhile for them to participate and may just spark the interest of some students and send them on a civics career path.

Miller stated that if there is interest, he will begin looking into a selection process and suggested that perhaps the County Board office could send letters to the school districts in the County and have the principals make some recommendations of students. A suggestion was also made that one student sit on each of the committees to get more participation.

County Executive Troy Streckenbach stated that he felt this was a great idea, especially in a time where there is a lot of distrust and discord in government. He felt that the County Board reaching out to the student population and showing them what it truly takes to run a government would show them that it is not as easy as one might think. He felt that extending an opportunity to bring students into the system would speak volumes as to the way our government needs to reach back to the public and show them that we are here for the best interest of the public. He stated that he would be more than willing to work with Miller on this and would support it.

**Motion made by Supervisor Miller and seconded by Supervisor Tumpach to postpone consideration until next month. Vote taken. MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY**

**Information Services:****2. Budget Status Financial Report for May, 2011.**

Information Services Director Bob Heimann stated that his Department is currently at 41.6% of the annual budget.

**Motion made by Supervisor Tumpach and seconded by Supervisor Schuller to receive and place on file. Vote taken. MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY**

**3. Resolution re: To Approve Expenditure to Complete Information Services Needs Assessment. Referred from July County Board.**

County Executive Troy Streckenbach stated that other options should be explored as far as utilizing some of our public institutions to help the county do the needs assessment. He gave an example of a meeting he had with the municipal administrators and one of them asked about the possibility of combining IS servers into one location. Streckenbach felt this would be a great opportunity and he had already discussed the future of our layout with Heimann. He pointed out a recent publication that indicated that Microsoft, Dell and other large companies were going to cloud computing to mitigate the hard costs of maintenance of infrastructures. Streckenbach stated that the county had a large investment in their infrastructure and they will potentially be replacing it prior to when the amortization schedule is finished. With this coming up in the future, Streckenbach would like a better idea of where the county should be heading.

Streckenbach continued that one thing that was clear in the IS Department was that they were understaffed and he felt there was a distinct need to deal with this. He does not question the need for additional staff, but does question if this was the right direction to be heading.

Streckenbach stated that Heimann had a very valid argument on what he needed to be able to operate his department. He hoped to be able to come back to the Board after the assessment and advise them with confidence that this was where the county needed to go. He would fight for Bob to get the additional resources he needed into the budget in order to make sure that he was running a strong IS Department. The purpose of the needs assessment was to help determine what the short term needs were as well as the future of Brown County. He explained that the funding was not to take out additional resources out of the budget it would stay within the line item of professional contracts. Streckenbach was willing to lower the amount of the needs assessment below \$50,000 or \$40,000; he felt it was very important to have the assessment done. The county may decide to go with the free platforms that are in the open market but the cost to be in the software agreement they currently are in was quite substantial.

Miller explained that he was not speaking with any authority as he operated on a minute scale compared to this but stated that he understood that there were 4,100 counties in the United States and some of these counties have had similar technology needs and have had similar studies done. He felt they could look at some of those studies, before spending more money, as a basis to have students and professors analyze them. Maybe student analysis is inadequate and they may have to hire professionals. He felt they could get those studies for next to nothing. He still supports the idea but would like to take those steps before spending the money.

Directed at Heimann, Schuller questioned if they could go out and take someone else's template and apply it within the county and are they at the point that they need to go outside to get professional advice from an outside consultant. Heimann responded that there were different aspects to this study. For the four years he had been with the county, he had been saying IS Department is drastically understaffed and they were dying and drowning. This year he had

gone to Executive Streckenbach seeking three people which is what got this going. He felt the staffing, salary and organizational type study can be achieved by looking at other counties as well as other businesses, because the county runs a series of businesses. He felt some of the information the county already had and stated that the Human Resource Manager had told him that the county had done studies like this before. From the technology perspective, he and Streckenbach had some good conversations on this. Heimann stated that he lived and breathed it, he had been doing it for 40 years now. He would welcome any of his peers to come in and look at what they were doing to see where they are on the technology curve and didn't feel the need to spend money to have someone come in and do the same. They are virtualizing servers and have a cloud computing, a private cloud. 80% of businesses out there are going to private cloud computing, the county is already there and have that. The public clouds are a different animal and not that popular for big businesses. He noted that he reported a year ago on cloud computing and they looked at Microsoft cloud for email and it would have been more expensive than when the county currently is on. From a technology standpoint he felt they didn't need an outside consulting opinion and would welcome students to come in. They have one unpaid volunteer student now and a second one starting on Monday. Whatever arrangement they could work out with the schools he would welcome. He felt there were some things that the county is not doing that he would like to do but don't have the resources to do it.

Miller questioned the downside of free email. Heimann responded that he didn't know if Gmail would give 2,000 public email accounts. He added by law the county had to have retention on emails. The county currently saves emails up to six months where other counties/governments save up to seven years however Brown County had not been able to invest in that.

Schuller questioned if Heimann had the answers Streckenbach was looking for. Heimann stated about every five years you need to replace and upgrade that hardware. The Executive was looking ahead and wants to make sure the county is on the right path. Streckenbach stated he respectfully respect the fact that the department head challenges him on this issue, he felt it was a mutual disagreement to some degree about the good work he had done. This is not meant to be that way. Reading from a report from the Commission that the Federal Government put out, it concluded: In a time when the government is seeking to do more with less and the commercial sector is being called upon to create jobs and grow the economy, now is the time to act on cloud. Cloud computing has ushered in vast improvements in the cost, agility and efficiency of computing. These benefits alone drive a strong business case; however, the more compelling return is the opportunity to leap forward. Streckenbach stated there were so many supporting documents that while the county was not at this point, there were 13 recommendations in this document on how to get there and as leaders how they should get there. This is about creating that roadmap for when they are making financial decisions that when they get to the point of the need to reinvest in infrastructure, they have an assessment as how they should go forward. They may decide that Brown County had the ability to go out to all the other municipalities and stated dump all your servers because we have the fiber optics already put in place. Come into our servers and we'll build another blade center. The county may then decide to go to Outagamie County and talk to them about connecting together through a 10 year plan. The sky is the limit. We're not talking about small dollar amounts, the county bonded for this infrastructure and he felt his position and what he was supposed to be challenging the departments and the supervisors is about what the future is so future leaders have been given a roadmap and the best ability to manage the county. He is willing to work however the confines that are dictated but the cloud is just one aspect. The county relies heavily on individuals. If someone is not to be with the county that is a programmer, the documentation of that process is not there, not to the capacity where someone could walk in and take over. Our networks, the complete grid needs to be studied and documented. There is a lot that needs to be taken care of and Heimann needs the tools to be able to do that. He felt

they really need to sit back and engage that. In the IS Department budget there are areas within that line item of the project, professional services, that they could allocate for this expenditure which fall within the line of what part of the core competency of what this assessment is about. It's not deviating too far away from what is within the IS budget already. Streckenbach stated he was trying to be very transparent to the board about where he felt they should head. The main thing was the cost and where the future was going. They advertise this bond for 10 years, and are replacing it in five years. To him it was fundamentally wrong on how they approach the information services, in a time when this needs to be the county's nerve center and will be the ability to be more modernized and efficient. Every department is being challenged on how to take the human component and move it into more of a process so that we can provide services to this county in a more economic, efficient manner. The only way to do that is to implement the proper technology. For example, payroll, this is a project that had been in the works since 2009, its 2011 and the county had yet to automate the payroll system. The assessment will tell them that the roadmap had a lot of bumps that need to be smoothed out in a period of time. Streckenbach felt Miller brought up a very important part about students. They are the ones that are diving into the technology.

Theisen stated it all made sense but felt first they needed to have some type of specifications. There were different types of firms that they could contract with but it was something they had to bid out for. He questioned how many details they needed to provide someone they want to hire and who would put together that detail. Heimann responded that the scope of the project would have to be put together in the RFP and they would have to figure out what that scope would be. Heimann felt Streckenbach, Administration and himself could work together on it. Theisen stated if they don't end up bidding it out they would need that info either way. He would like to see the RFP as much detail as they can do in-house so they can read it over. To him the resolution was way too general. Streckenbach interjected that the \$75,000 mark was elevated and his guess would be the \$40,000 mark. He stated he would be more than happy to come back with an RFP and would entertain the opportunity to come back with details of what they are looking for and what they are hoping to get. He felt they could do that potentially within a steering committee in house or utilize the services of the educators.

Miller questioned what specifically would they accomplish or do better in their IS function by having this study. Streckenbach responded that some of the things he envisioned was somewhat of an IS organizational structure in responsibilities, priority list of current and future IS projects, detailed IS budgets. One of the things that the county is struggling with in each department when doing their budget; they are very concerned with their chargebacks and how the county charges for IS assessment. The computer he received, there is a cost to it, and there is a depreciation that is charged onto it so there are adequate funds to be able to replace it over time. They differ on depreciation time frame on that component. One camp believed it should be depreciated over five years and another that felt it might go to six years. It is a valid argument both ways but fundamentally it costs the taxpayers a substantial amount of money in that difference of how you depreciate that money over time. Other areas would be a current IS performance reports, how are they performing and how do they assess what they do? Applications portfolio, what is everything that we have in our system, what software packages are we operating and what does it cost to maintain them and where are we going in the future. A hardware infrastructure inventory, what is it that we own? In 2009 or 2010 the Internal Auditor did an assessment and came across a room of computer equipment and hardware that is slowly being depleted. In Streckenbach's eyes that was a lot of money in inventory sitting there. He assumed that the county had buying power to purchase a lot knowing that things will be replaced out. The Internal Auditor assessed the need to for the county to start looking at how things are done. The former County Executive's Legislative Assistant's laptop had been sitting over at City Hall for over a year and no one knew where it was. The network

infrastructure inventory, something they need to know about. And finally, a context diagram of a technical infrastructure environment. These were things that were more complex than what he understood and whatever it is, it comes with a dollar amount. There are assets throughout county buildings and is in his mind a very large component where they will be in the future.

Heimann stated the bulk of roughly 1,400 machines sit on people's desk tops. 140 PCs are public PCs at the libraries, there are PCs at the airport, the zoo, the golf course, and they are on people's desks everywhere. The Human Service's group and the ADRC had a number of laptops. He informed that they had a very good process in place. When the auditor did audit their process she made some tweaks to the process but no discrepancies were found. He added that if they wanted to talk about the missing laptop he felt they should do that somewhere else. He informed that every department had different software packages; there were about 200 different ones that support the different aspects of the county. Streckenbach stated that this brought up one of his points, currently when a notice pops up on a computer for updates a staff member had to go to that computer, 1,400 computers from all over the county, and physically do it. When asked for additional resources, he felt the county had to ask are we doing what we are supposed to be doing. Cellphones, the county paid for the cellphone and the training of the cellphone (Blackberries and Smart Phones). This is currently not the practice, the county trained in-house if someone needed training. If we are paying for something that is already there why aren't we utilizing that source for the training purposes if need to be. Streckenbach felt that sometimes it's required and is helpful to have someone from outside that's in this business of assessment and looking at where large corporations or institutions are headed and give a fair critique. Constructive criticism and ideas are not bad. Miller informed that he agreed with Streckenbach

Heimann stated four years ago they had started down a path of modernizing the technology that is used. It started with the infrastructure and had to get fiber connective to build these because they did have T1s. There was a cost justification put together that said that the county could pay for the fiber over time and get 100xs better performance with the fiber. The county said ok that's the start, start building the infrastructure. The county had roughly 70 servers all independent servers scattered across buildings, some in data centers, some in closets and as they were going into the new financial management package they said it was not the way to do this so they went into an IBM blade center and their data center and started virtualizing where they took a server and started carving it into pieces and run things that way. Much better cost savings. They had been going down that path for four years and have had a lot of cost savings. The county with what they have grown with the new jail feather management system, the law records management system which is going in now, the electronic medical records system going in, the new library systems that have gone in, and the new Cronos, all that is going into this new environment very cost effectively and efficient. They are not done going down that path. Of the 70 original standalone servers they probably still have 20-25 that are still out there, stand alone, at risk type servers and they are still migrating into this new environment and are going down the path they have been on for four years. Some of the equipment will be coming up the cycle soon but the path they have been going down is a modern path. Heimann stated he wasn't in disagreement with a lot of the examples that the Executive had been using but it's not because they are on the wrong path, it's because some of those things they haven't had enough time to convert. These are things are on his list. They are not even done going down the path they are on and now they want to have it reevaluated and that's where they struggle. Streckenbach interjected that he wanted to give Heimann the full confidence as the Executive that the path that he is on is the right path. The one thing that he would last entertain for consideration, in an attempt to look for the future, there are projects that are intended to take care of needs of the county and every year they have carryovers because they haven't been able to get to set projects. He would like to say let's stay away from the carryover, if they are going to budget for

the project, let's do the project. If that required hiring someone from outside the county, then let's do it. If it required the county to hire someone and put them into the system, let's do it. If you look at the list, everything on the list that needed to get done are important. They are important for liability, for security, for archiving, etc. This is where the assessment was important for Streckenbach, if they kept failing to get to these projects, its stating that fundamentally they are not in the right position. His argument would be to hire more people, which could be the valid resolution to the problem but when facing economic times and suggesting cuts to every other department but yet seeing efficiencies the county is currently operating under, he wants to be able to sit in front of this board and eventually the County Board with confidence as to where the county is headed. Technology is ever changing and moving really rapidly.

Supervisor Theisen briefly explained his concerns for contracting out and noted that they should be aware that there were experiences out there and ended up with what they thought they were going to have, there are no guarantees. Lund added that with any needs assessment they had to ask what they wanted accomplished as a county and have to have goals with what they want to do with their technology. If you want status quo you would just hire two or three more employees and continue with how you have been working. You need more detail when putting together an RFP and what you want to accomplish. He felt they needed to come back with a more concrete plan if they are going to pass on the dollars. He is in favor of referring this for more details and look at other studies out there and ask other department heads what they think the needs are of the county as to technology and go forward with that.

Miller felt some of the County Executive's ideas could be tried in some of the smaller departments. He would like the County Executive to propose specific ideas to try with specific departments and show some potential results. Strechenbach informed that the county was already using cloud. Lund stated if they were talking about metro service and saving money for the county and possibly for the municipalities, he felt it was a great thing to start looking at. He felt it wasn't too late to start looking at the 2012 budget for municipalities. It would be a revenue source for the county without having to add a lot of additional people. Streckenbach agreed. He added that he will come back with other studies that had been done and a more detailed RFP.

**A motion was made by Supervisor Miller and seconded by Supervisor Theisen to have the County Executive obtain reports from similar entities and revisit after they review what other entities are doing. Vote taken. MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY**

**4. Director's Report.**

Heimann reported that the Sheriff's Department moved and everything went well. That was a big push by the IS Department.

**Motion made by Supervisor Tumpach and seconded by Supervisor Schuller to receive and place on file. Vote taken. MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY**

**Motion made by Supervisor Miller and seconded by Supervisor Theisen to modify the agenda to take item #7 at this time. Vote taken. MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY**

**Facility & Park Management:**

**5. Budget Status Financial Report for May, 2011.**

Handout provided and attached.

**Motion made by Supervisor Theisen and seconded by Supervisor Miller to receive and place on file. Vote taken. MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY**

**6. Budget Adjustment Request (11-88): Interdepartmental reallocation or adjustment (including reallocation from the County's General Fund).**

Dowell informed at the board meeting where they discussed funding for the Sheriff's Department there were some items that weren't covered in the bond so there was a recommendation to look for other funding for a couple other items else ware. The funding for security cameras at the new Sheriff's Facility was identified to come from the Facilities Upgrades Capital Projects Fund. This budget adjustment transfers the funds to the Sheriff's Facility Capital Project Fund.

**Motion made by Supervisor Theisen and seconded by Supervisor Schuller to approve. Vote taken. MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY**

**7. 2012 Capital Improvement Plan – 5 year Outlook Summary.**

Facilities Director Bill Dowell explained that the Facility Master Plan Subcommittee a few years ago worked on upgrading the plans for various subgroups and Public Safety was a major effort. They looked at the various departments in Public Safety and there were several good projects that came from this such as the relocation of the 911 center to the jail as well as the Sheriff relocation. Jail pods had been discussed in that plan. Part of that analysis was jail projections; those were made during the construction of the jail. It showed escalation over the years and the actual numbers were being tracked. What they did was extend that out at the same growth rate and it was showing they would need additional capacity in future years, about 2015. When these discussions occurred a few years ago the jail was at capacity and followed the projections. Over the years they were implementing the various components of that which the board opted to approve as they move forward. They wanted to make sure they have the right number and had an initial number and also had a study that the board approved a couple years ago. They brought the designer of the jail back in and asked for a pre-design so they would know what the jail pods would look like and what they would cost and they were quite surprised of the cost. The numbers in the 2012 Capital Project 5-Year Outlook Summary had been projected up a few years.

Streckenbach informed that previously there were two new jail pods in the capital projects, he took one out and wanted to take the second one out but based on his discussion with the Sheriff. The Sheriff had asked him to keep it in but push it back as far as he could so in the event if they ever had to add it in the supervisors would understand roughly what that cost would be. He also felt that it was important to keep it in in the event they were forced by the state to house more inmates. It looks like the state might be moving forward with not prosecuting as fast which would require the jail to hold inmates longer in our jail system which could put them closer to capacity. Sheriff Gossage was looking at allowing electronic monitoring to assume capacity but he had to stay within his max capacity of what the jail could have in the event that those inmates would all have to go back into the jail pods.

Streckenbach added that at one point there were a series of roofs that were going to be repaired in 2014 but they had been removed. The purchase of land by the fairground had been removed. The repaving of roads for a parking lot out there had been removed. He stated that he was of the camp that these type of things need to be done in their general budget and it was his position that as he propose the annual budget to the board that these capital outlays will be contained within budgets to be taken care of.

Streckenbach stated that the Capital Improvement Plan from 2011 to 2012 had been changed quite a bit. Lund responded that there used to be a lot of things on there at one point. One time they were looking at \$58,000 for a parking lot for Fonferek Glen Park and it would have been bonded over 15 years. He explained that he was totally against that and if its affordable and worthwhile put the \$50,000 in the budget and pay it off. Don't bond for everything that needs to be done. He felt they needed to start putting money into the facilities for repairs so the money isn't added to the bonding. Streckenbach stated his goal for departments in working with facilities is to put together essentially a five year infrastructure maintenance program so when they go to budget that in the capital outlay they can identify what is going to be repaired this year. He hoped that they can change the direction of the county and how we finance infrastructure needs and capital needs. They can migrate this back into the general budget. He felt it took the leadership of the board to allow for those needs to be fulfilled and not pulled out or stop that funding mechanism because assets are falling apart.

**Motion made by Supervisor Thiesen and seconded by Supervisor Schuller to receive and place on file. Vote taken. MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY**

*The committee went back to item #5 at this time.*

#### **8. Directors' Report.**

Dowell reported that the Facilities Department was very involved with the Sheriff Office move. They funded the movers. Initially there was an estimate of \$70,000. He estimated \$20,000. They decided to do it a little different; they rented 27' vans and contracted with day movers. County facility workers loaded and unloaded and drove the trucks for \$7,400 vs. a \$20,000 project. They moved the Drug Task Force with the same process and got some reasonable rates. There are plans to relocate some of the DA functions as well as some of Corporation Counsel which may be implemented late August.

With regard to the former Mental Health Center, they are going forward with the plan to demolish. A decision had not been made to demolish but they want to get into a position to do that. They would like to develop a bid. There had been a debate on the cost to demolish ranging from \$1 to 1.5 million. With regard to the leftover furniture they are working on a plan to auction it off with an auctioneer for late September. Some of it will be put on a specific website in which they had very good luck with in the past. At the same time they continue to market the MHC and if they have any interest or potential buyer they will slow this process down. There was a visit a couple weeks ago from an organization out of Milwaukee that had taken over buildings and had built veterans support facilities. He felt it was a very positive meeting and had hoped to continue that discussion. He sent drawings and other information so they could develop a plan. It's still open if they are interested or not but he had plans to make addition contact to firm it out.

Dowell introduced the new Facility Engineer Doug Marsh to the committee. Marsh had been brought on mid-June.

**Motion made by Supervisor Tumpach and seconded by Supervisor Theisen to receive and place on file. Vote taken. MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY**

#### **Human Resources:**

#### **9. Activity Report, June, 2011.**

**Motion made by Supervisor Theisen and seconded by Supervisor Tumpach to receive and place on file. Vote taken. MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY**

**10. Budget Status Financial Report for May, 2011.**

**Motion made by Supervisor Schuller and seconded by Supervisor Tumpach to receive and place on file. Vote taken. MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY**

**11. 2<sup>nd</sup> Quarter, 2011 Report.**

**Motion made by Supervisor Theisen and seconded by Supervisor Schuller to receive and place on file. Vote taken. MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY**

**12. Update on Chapter 4 Revision (standing item).**

HR Manager Debbie Klarkowski stated that they continue to make progress and at the last Executive Committee meeting the committee gave Attorney Fred Mohr the authority over coordination of the rewrite of Chapter 4 and the policy. Mohr told the Executive Committee that they would be bringing a draft of Chapter 4 rewrite to the next Admin and Executive Committees. She informed that they had focus groups and had input from managers and supervisors that attended those meetings. The pay recommendations are drafted and similar to the recommendations that they were going forward with in March when they were going to extend the contracts. The County Executive has had those for quite some time. In addition to rewriting the ordinances they have to rewrite the policies because they intertwine.

**Motion made by Supervisor Theisen and seconded by Supervisor Tumpach to refer back to staff for updates. Vote taken. MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY**

**13. Director's Report.**

Klarkowski stated she had nothing further to report.

**Motion made by Supervisor Schuller and seconded by Supervisor Theisen to receive and place on file. Vote taken. MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY**

**Department of Administration:**

**14. Budget Adjustment Request (11-85): Interdepartmental reallocation or adjustment (including reallocation from the County's General Fund).**

A brief conversation ensued with regard to the type of cars used.

**Motion made by Supervisor Theisen and seconded by Supervisor Tumpach to approve. Vote taken. MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY**

**15. 2011 Budget Adjustment Log.**

Director of Administration Ellen Sorenson explained that most of the adjustments were housekeeping issues or grants that were unanticipated in the budgeting process. The transfer from Hwy to IS Department was something the committee discussed earlier this year in structuring the financing for the communication system.

**Motion made by Supervisor Schuller and seconded by Supervisor Miller to approve. Vote taken. MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY**

**16. Government Financial Officers Association Certification of Recognition for Budget Preparation.**

Sorenson stated that this was an award they get every year. They have a very good team on budget and they work very diligently to adjust and improve each year.

**Motion made by Supervisor Tumpach and seconded by Supervisor Miller to receive and place on file. Vote taken. MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY**

**17. Resolution re: To Establish Loan and Public Safety Radio Equipment Purchase Program.**

Sorenson explained the borrowing piece; Director of Public Safety Karl Fleury was available for questions. Sorenson stated that with the purchase of the radios for the end users for the communication system a better way to purchase would be to borrow from the State Trust Program which is a flat rate and you can pay it off early with no penalties and there is no cost for the financing. Right now it's at 3.25%. The borrowing had to be done in two parts. Her proposal would be to bring the final resolution to the County Board authorizing the borrowing. She would fill out the paperwork and send it to the trust. They would then approve it. The county didn't have to borrow the funds but it would lock in the interest rate for March of 2012. This wouldn't get into the bonding cycle because they are good for at least 10 years.

Fleury informed that they explained to their users and made them aware that there could be a potential upgrade in 2017. He noted some users have funding in place but will take advantage of the buying volume purchasing component of the program. The ones that are taking and using this program, Brown County will administer that so there is a guarantee purchase. Fleury explained that they had planned to go to the Public Safety Committee. He had advised the Executive and Sorenson that they need to have a meeting with representatives from various entities to get components in place, the commitment, signatures and explain what the process will be. Sorenson stated they have been working with Corporation Counsel to make sure they have legal contracts that bind those municipalities. It had been explained to entities to start setting money aside for the program and some are already able to cover their needs. The payment return is five years and there is no prepayment penalty set up. It's whatever the interest rate is and the cost to the county. A key component is that the interest from the trust fund goes back to help fund public school libraries in Brown County.

Sorenson informed that some municipalities may do the borrowing but pay up front instead of taking advantage of the five year plan in which they would pay off the borrowing early.

**Motion made by Supervisor Theisen and seconded by Supervisor Miller to approve resolution. Vote taken. MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY**

**18. Director's Report.**

Sorenson stated in addition to the Director's Report in the packet, Sorenson handed out (attached) the unaudited financial statement results from the first half of the year. Under Human Services it shows an underage of \$3,184,160 and there reporting that they have savings in contracted services. She cautioned that there will be expenses that will offset that and that total will not stay throughout the end of the year.

She informed that they were working on the financial system implementation as well as Cronos. The airport had a successful implementation of Cronos in June. The airport and CTC are done and now they were working on the highway department and will be done by the end of the year. The ADRC had purchased a module so their finance software is compatible.

Department Heads are working diligently working on their budget. There are some questions because there is a significantly reduced levy target because of the Wisconsin retirement. Department Heads continue to do well with managing their budgets.

**Motion made by Supervisor Theisen and seconded by Supervisor Schuller to receive and place on file. Vote taken. MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY**

**Treasurer:**

19. Budget Status Financial Report for May and June, 2011.

**Motion made by Supervisor Theisen and seconded by Supervisor Schuller to receive and place on file. Vote taken. MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY**

20. Treasurer's Financial Report for the Months of April and May, 2011.

**Motion made by Supervisor Theisen and seconded by Supervisor Schuller to receive and place on file. Vote taken. MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY**

**County Clerk:**

21. Budget Status Financial Report for May 31, 2011.

**Motion made by Supervisor Theisen and seconded by Supervisor Schuller to receive and place on file. Vote taken. MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY**

**Child Support Agency – No agenda items.**

**Other:**

22. Audit of Bills.

**Motion made by Supervisor Theisen and seconded by Supervisor Schuller to receive and place on file. Vote taken. MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY**

23. Such other matters as authorized by law.

Respectfully submitted,

Alicia A. Loehlein  
Recording Secretary