

**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, June 23, 2011 in Room 200 of the Northern Building – 305 East Walnut Street, Green Bay, Wisconsin.

---

**Present:** Tom Lund, Mark Tumpach, Kris Schuller, Robert Miller

**Excused:** Tony Theisen

**Also Present:** Supervisor Andrews, Supervisor Fleck, Debbie Klarkowski, Jackie Scharping, Troy Streckenbach, John Luetscher, Carolyn Maricque, other interested parties.

---

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 Tumpach and seconded by Supervisor Schuller to approve. Vote taken. MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY**

III. **Approve/Modify Minutes of May 26, 2011:**

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

At this time Chair Lund welcomed Robert Miller to the Committee.

1. **Review of minutes:**

a. **Housing Authority (May 16, 2011)**

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

Supervisor Tumpach questioned the portion of the Brown County Housing Authority (BCHA) minutes with regard to election of officers and indicated he thought the County Board was hoping to have representation on the BCHA committee. Lund also recalled the Board had indicated that if there were openings on the BCHA committee that they would like to see Board supervisors appointed due to the fact that the BCHA exists by Board authority. County Executive Troy Streckenbach stated that he intended to look at the structure of the BCHA in more detail and is hoping to have a meeting with Human Services Director Brian Shoup and Sheriff Gossage to take a look at the BCHA overall and the direction they are heading. Streckenbach stated that as he reviews this committee, there may be an opportunity to add supervisors.

Rob Miller stated that he was pleased that Ann Hartman had been appointed as a representative of the BCHA as he felt it was beneficial to have someone on the committee who actually resided in an area where a significant amount of Section 8 housing existed. Miller also was impressed at the rate BCHA has been going after fraud which he felt was opening up dollars for people who actually need the funds. Streckenbach indicated that he agreed with Miller and also stated that Supervisor Nicholson was pleased to see the appointment of Ann Hartman as well. Streckenbach also stated that the root of future discussions would be along the lines of how the funding is allocated and then how the funds are utilized.

Supervisor Schuller recalled from past minutes that the County Board has no authority with regard to the BCHA and Lund stated that this was because the BCHA operates on federal funds. Corporation Counsel John Luetscher confirmed that the County Board has no purse string authority because the County does not fund that agency. He stated that the County's authority is indirect through appointments to the board that oversees the BCHA. The BCHA board has control and true oversight management of the BCHA. Luetscher went on to state that under Wisconsin law it is clear that the Housing Authority is supposed to have an independence from the governmental entity that created it. Luetscher felt that in fairness to the BCHA, they have been pretty responsive to the County Board and he felt that they are willing to cooperate and provide information.

**b. Facility Master Plan Subcommittee (May 19, 2011).**

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

**Communications:**

**2. Communication from Supervisor Lund re: We need to explore separating the position of Affirmative Action Officer from the position of Human Resources Manager.**

Corporation Counsel John Luetscher spoke on this in general terms and stated that he felt these responsibilities could be divided. He was not able to find any federal or state law that mandates that the County have an Affirmative Action Officer. However, if the County receives federal aid in the form of grants, or if they contract with the federal government, which Brown County does, there is a requirement to have an affirmative action plan and it could be that as part of that plan there is a requirement to have an Affirmative Action Officer. Luetscher felt that beyond that, given the array of antidiscrimination laws, both at federal and state levels, and the fact that Brown County employs over 1,600 people, it would be well advised from a risk management standpoint to have an Affirmative Action Officer. He does not believe there is any requirement that the Affirmative Action Officer has to be the head of the Human Resources Department. Luetscher also stated that the County Board would have the authority to say that the Affirmative Action Officer is some individual other than the head of Human Resources.

Lund questioned the best way to handle this. Luetscher felt that the best way to go about it would be to have the County Executive make an appointment and have the Board confirm it.

Miller asked if there was some reason to believe that the County's current affirmative action performance is inadequate. Luetscher indicated that there are currently pending complaints on the basis of gender harassment/sexual harassment. Lund indicated that the reason he brought this communication forward is due to these complaints and he felt that maybe we need to have an Affirmative Action Officer so there is someone that an employee can take a complaint to and have more people involved.

Executive Streckenbach asked if there was an actual position for Affirmative Action Officer in the table of organization and Luetscher stated that the head of Human Resources is currently the Affirmative Action Officer. Luetscher felt it was probably just a matter of designating an employee to be the Affirmative Action Officer and giving that person those responsibilities and some resources to administer the policies.

**Motion made by Supervisor Tumpach and seconded by Supervisor Miller to refer to the County Executive to make an appointment or recommendation of an Affirmative Action Officer. Vote taken. MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY**

**Facility & Park Management:****3. Budget Status Financial Report for April, 2011.**

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

**4. Director's Report.**

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

**Information Services:****5. Budget Status Financial Report for April, 2011.**

IS Director Bob Heimann stated that the IS Department is currently at 33.3% for the year and their costs going out are at 29.2%.

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

**6. Resolution re: To Approve Expenditure to Complete Information Services Needs Assessment.**

County Executive Troy Streckenbach addressed this resolution and indicated that at a point where budget cuts are being looked and attempts are being made to save money, the last thing anyone wants to do is spend money on a study. Streckenbach stated that he is looking toward the future of Brown County and he felt that technology is key to the ultimate success as far as finding efficiencies. Through his discussions with department heads, it has become apparent that Brown County has made investments in technology, however some of these investments have not been fully implemented, such as the payroll system. Streckenbach did acknowledge that the system is large and it does take some time to implement these things to some degree.

It has also become very apparent to Streckenbach that the IS Department staff is backlogged and stretched very thin for a number of reasons. He felt that IS is currently operating in the best capacity that has been given to the IS Director and his team, however, it is clear the IS Department is taxed and needs help. Streckenbach believes the IS Department should be the nerve center of the County in its future investments and he also commended Heimann and indicated that he has saved the County quite a bit of money through his findings.

Streckenbach felt there might be an opportunity that may have not have been looked at and this is utilizing the infrastructure that the County has become very heavily invested in and the possibility of using fiber optics which technically would bring us to the next generation. Streckenbach also wants to be sure that planning is taking place for what is happening in 5 – 10 years from now. He is concerned that the IS department was not involved in the interoperability process and he felt that another area of concern is the report from the internal auditor from April, 2010 with regard to how information is not being brought to one centralized location with the discussion of how it is going to be deployed, allocating the necessary resources to it, and then making sure that it is followed through. There are a number of areas that he feels the County needs to look at from an IS standpoint and then be prepared to make the financial allocations to support it because right now we have an area that is ultimately essential to the success of the County and Heimann needs staff, however, Streckenbach is not prepared to make an investment in more staff until he feels the County has made the right investment in the overall long term strategic plan.

Streckenbach felt that IS needs to give the County Board a picture of what the future looks like and what the costs of maintaining it looks like. He was also surprised to learn that we made a large capital investment in our infrastructure which was amortized over 10 years but we are going to replace it in five years. Streckenbach stated that this is by no means an attack on Heimann or his department, but rather it is about making him better and stronger in the vision that he has. Streckenbach felt that Heimann is doing the best he can within the confines that he has been given by the County.

As Streckenbach is making this budget decision for the County regarding adding more to the IS budget, he wants to reassess where we're headed and then allocate funds where necessary.

They are not asking for additional general fund money for this study. The money would be taken out of the existing professional services balance. Each year there is a small carryover and Streckenbach is confident that they will be able to continue carrying over some funds to do some of the projects on the IS list such as external audits, security and PCI compliance. Streckenbach concluded by stating that as a County we are facing the time of looking at replacement of the infrastructure with a private cloud. The fact remains that at some point we will need to bond a lot of money to replace the infrastructure and before that decision is made, Streckenbach felt we need to have a plan as to whether or not we are going to that phase or we are going to go to where the private sector is directing us and that is to eventually look at cloud computing. Streckenbach is not arguing for either one of those at this time, but is simply saying that we need to take a step back and see where we are headed. Streckenbach felt that the study would cost between \$40,000 - \$75,000.

Miller asked about the possibility of using some sort of free software instead of purchasing Microsoft. He currently uses free software, Open Office, which is updated automatically and he is very happy with it. He understands that some people may not think this is as good as the Microsoft product, but he felt it could be used without any problems. He suggests that we start looking in that direction and he reported that he is aware of several municipalities able to run their entire municipal operations on versions of Linux, which is also free.

Streckenbach stated that he hoped the study would at least investigate this as it is also his understanding that there are municipalities that use free software. He is in favor of investigating this and considering if it would be feasible. Streckenbach stated that he is hoping the study will help dictate whether or not we are going to get into the large expenditure internally or if we start to migrate in a different direction. Miller pointed out another benefit of using different operating systems is that you can use older computers so computers could be used longer and as a consequence would be replaced less often.

**Motion made by Supervisor Schuller and seconded by Supervisor Tumpach to approve moving forward with the study. Vote taken. MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY**

## **7. Director's Report.**

IS Director Bob Heimann wished to update the Committee on two points contained in his director's report. The first was that the ADRC will be replacing their financial management software from FUNDWARE with another copy of the New World System Logos that Brown County uses.

Secondly, the Health Department will be replacing their old DOS based PC software package CHAMPS that was used for client management with a new module within the Netsmart software currently being worked on for Human Service Electronic Medical Records.

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

**Child Support Agency:**

**8. Budget Status Financial Report for April, 2011.**

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

**9. Establish a fee structure for NIVD Fees. *Referred from May meeting.***

Child Support Director Jackie Scharping asked the Committee for approval to work with Corporation Counsel to draft an ordinance for a fee schedule. She has come up with several proposals to charge fees as follows:

- \$35.00 fee for issuing income withholding notices
- \$35.00 for account reconciliation
- \$35.00 for reconciliation of PEOs

These are activities that can be specifically identified and for which charging a fee is allowed. Lund stated that the reason it is becoming necessary to charge for some of these services is due to the fact that the County is getting less money from the state and federal government. NIVD cases are identified as cases that do not have applications on file with the Child Support Agency. There are situations where parties have not applied for services but the Child Support Agency is still statutorily required to maintain the information on their system.

Miller stated that he was under the impression that child support issues were handled by a system in Milwaukee. Scharping indicated that there is a statewide system that uses the state designed KIDS software, however, every county is still required to maintain their court orders within that child support system. Brown County currently has about 14,000 cases that have applications on file, either by referral of economic support or the individual comes in and applies for services. There are 5,000 NIVD cases in Brown County and these are the cases in which Scharping would be asking that a fee be charged for doing certain work. Scharping also stated that revenue is reduced by these NIVD cases because the federal government has said that they really should not be doing work on these cases, but the Wisconsin Statutes require them to.

Miller asked for additional clarification on the Milwaukee disbursement unit. Scharping indicated that the disbursement unit is a company the state contracts with to run the financial program. They accept all child support payments and disburse child support payments, but they do not handle the ins and outs of issuing notices to employers. If a payer has a question as to whether a payment was credited, they contact the Brown County Child Support Agency. Scharping also stated that these payers can look up their account online or at a kiosk in the Child Support Office. Miller questioned charging a fee for a misapplied payment and he is concerned that a person would be asked to pay a fee of \$35.00 to get it straightened out. Scharping clarified that what she is referring to as far as reconciliation would be cases in which a person is indicating they are in child support arrears that might not be correct. In some instances the court or a party may ask the Child Support Agency to go back a number of years and verify payments and it takes a lot of time and effort by staff to reconcile the account. This is time spent that actually reduces the amount of money that they receive as revenue because they are able to claim their expenditures to the state and they get reimbursement for that. However, the federal government has said that they actually should not be doing that work so they reduce

the amount of time that workers spend on those situations. Miller asked if someone requested a reconciliation and the reconciliation came out to agree with what the requester felt, if those people would still be charged for the reconciliation. Scharping indicated that they would still be charged as the work would be done regardless of the outcome. Miller's concern is that he does not feel a person who justifiably finds a mistake made by the Child Support Agency or the company in Milwaukee should be charged a fee for bringing it up. Scharping stated that it is not normally a mistake that was made, but many times there is a difference in calculations from when a court order started to when a payment was received, especially in percentage reconciliation situations. Many times it is not necessarily when a court order was started, but more a matter of providing what the income was at a certain time and what payments came in at a certain time. Many, many times the reconciliations are not based on an error, but rather on the commencement date of the order and the date the amount was paid and changes in the orders between that time. Scharping stated that if there is a justifiable error made on the part of a staff member, the fee would still be charged as the work on the reconciliation was done. If an error is found, the record is adjusted accordingly.

Schuller asked if there are any agencies that have policies in place to address the issue brought up by Miller. Scharping stated that the work is done regardless and she is not aware of anyone who would give a refund if an error is found. The mistake would be corrected but the fee would still be charged because the work was done. Schuller also asked if the fees being proposed are in line with other counties and Scharping stated that they are similar to what other counties are charging. Scharping is also not aware of any county that waives a reconciliation fee if an error is found.

**Motion made by Supervisor Miller and seconded by Supervisor Tumpach to approve an NIVD fee structure. Vote taken. MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY**

**Human Resources:**

- 10. Budget Status Financial Report, April, 2011.**

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

- 11. Human Resources Activity Report, May, 2011.**

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

- 12. Budget Adjustment (11-70): Increase in expenses with offsetting increase in revenue.**

Human Resources Director Debbie Klarkowski stated that the original allocation for this included all of the employees at Syble Hopp but should have only included one employee. This budget adjustment is to pay the money back and it is coming out of the short-term disability fund.

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

- 13. Update on Chapter 4 Revision (standing item).**

Klarkowski indicated that the focus groups have completed and they are working on compiling data. Work is continuing on updating Chapter 4 along with the HR policies. Streckenbach wished it be noted that this revision would take the place of any labor contracts.

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

**14. Director's Report.**

Klarkowski indicated that the quarterly report will be available for the next meeting. The only thing that she had to report this month is that effective June 1 Reliant Standard began administering the County STD and FMLA.

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

**Department of Administration:**

**15. Budget Status 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**

**16. 2011 Budget Adjustment Log.**

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

**17. Ordinance To Create Sec. 3.31 of the Brown County Code Entitled "County Procurement".**

*This item was removed from the agenda at the request of Corporation Counsel John Luetscher.*

**18. Budget Adjustment Request (11-78): Increase in expenses with offsetting increase in revenue.**

Finance Director Carolyn Maricque indicated that this resulted from the bonding issuance in 2011. When the County had the levy for the bonding issuance there was more money because of the extra interest that was expected for 2011; however, since there will not be as much interest they are able to use some of these funds for closing costs so they did not have to take as much out in bonds.

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

**19. Budget Adjustment Request (11-83): Interdepartmental reallocation or adjustment (including reallocation from the County's General Fund).**

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

**20. Director's Report.**

Maricque added to the director's report in the agenda packet that the update to the airport Kronos system will be done this weekend and they should be live on the new system on Monday, June 27, 2011. Schuller asked the timeline for the other departments to go online with Kronos. Maricque stated that the next department to be on will be the Highway Department and this is expected to take the remainder of the year. Streckenbach indicated that the target date for completion was 2014. Heimann indicated that the payroll will go live on January 1, 2012 and the remaining departments will be added in 2012 and 2013. Streckenbach stated that at the Public Safety Committee meeting there were some supervisors who were surprised that the Sheriff's Department was not already online to save overtime costs. Streckenbach wanted to make sure the Committee understands that they are not sitting back waiting for it to happen and that this is a time consuming process.

Schuller asked if there was any estimate as to what the cost savings will be once this system is implemented. Klarkowski indicated that she is not aware that an estimate has been made. Right now there are two payroll specialists who process the payroll for all of Brown County with the exception of the CTC. Klarkowski does not know at this time if it is expected that some of the payroll specialist's time can be reallocated. Streckenbach stated that he felt there would be a short-term savings that will be realized during the first two years and after that the savings will level out. Streckenbach feels the system will provide better accountability of employees' time and will be able to find discrepancies in our system and more importantly will provide a better check and balance system on the staff.

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

**County Clerk – No agenda items.**

**Treasurer – No agenda items.**

**Other:**

**21. Audit of bills.**

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

**22. Such other matters as authorized by law.**

**Motion made by supervisor Tumpach and seconded by Supervisor Schuller to adjourn at 6:49 p.m. Vote taken. MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY**

Respectfully submitted,

Therese Giannunzio  
Recording Secretary