

PROCEEDINGS OF THE BROWN COUNTY EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE

Pursuant to Section 18.94 Wis. Stats., a regular meeting of the **Brown County Executive Committee** was held on Monday, February 11, 2013 in Room 200 of the Northern Building – 305 East Walnut Street, Green Bay, Wisconsin

Present: Chair Tom Lund, Supervisors Patrick Moynihan, Jr., Bernie Erickson, John Vander Leest, Steve Fewell, Patrick Evans
Excused: Patrick Buckley
Also Present: Supervisors Robinson, Steffen, Van Dyck and Williams; Executive Streckenbach, Brent Miller, Barbara West, Juliana Ruenzel, Kristen Hooker, Dan Process, David Hjalmsquist, Brian Shoup, Lynn Vanden Langenberg, Devon Christianson, Jenny Hoffmann, 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 Erickson, seconded by Supervisor Vander Leest to approve. Vote taken. MOTION UNANIMOUSLY APPROVED.

III. **Approve/modify minutes of January 7, 2013.**

Motion made by Supervisor Moynihan, seconded by Supervisor Erickson to approve. Vote taken. MOTION UNANIMOUSLY APPROVED.

Comments from the Public None.

Supervisor Fewell arrived at 5:35pm

Communications

1. **Communication from Supervisor Robinson re: Request that the County Board (1) hold a special visioning session or series of visioning sessions and (2) consider putting together a Master Plan to guide the work of County Government. *Held for one month.***

Supervisor Robinson informed that he had sent out a copy of what had been put together by a subcommittee re: Proposed Strategic Planning Process for Brown County (attached). It laid out goals and timeline suggestions to embark on as a county. Robinson briefly went over the "Goals" and "Timeline" on the handout with the committee.

With regard to the January - May, Timeline, Erickson informed that he was a member of the Harbor Commission and Port & Solid Waste Director Dean Haen had presented his Annual Report today and it addressed in a real concise manner what they accomplished in 2012 and the goals for 2013. It summarized where they had been and where they had planned on going. It was his understanding that a request had been put out that all department heads come up with this report. If it was done the way Dean Haen had done it, it would take care of the first thing of the timeline. The format was very good and it might not hurt to get a copy and distribute to all the respective department heads.

Vander Leest questioned what the end goals would be by doing the strategic planning. Robinson reiterated the goals on the handout. The idea being that the county could make better decisions

when it came to budget matters because they knew where they were going to go. If they could get everyone in the county rolling in the same direction the county could be a lot more efficient and make a lot better decisions. Vander Leest felt there were a lot of good ideas with this proposal but felt they had to have the ability to know that things change at different times, different priorities and have the ability to deviate from or be able to bring in new ideas and issues, make decisions as need be. Robinson stated that it would be a rolling plan and they could always adjust in the midst of it. It allowed for flexibility. Whether this board or County Executive stated that this was written in stone, if a new County Board or County Executive came on, they would be the ones making the decisions on how it was used. Vander Leest stated that the board itself and the elections shaped the County Board and from there, that shaped some of the direction. This should not be used as a way to grow government or take on additional responsibilities that were outside of county government. He felt they had a lot to focus on already and they do a lot of good things and they should do the most good that they can for county citizens with the money they have. He was in favor of using this to talk about priorities and/or talk about putting more emphasis on areas in the county where they should be doing better. Robinson stated that what this ended up being was not up to any one person but the County Board and the Executive working together. A good strategic plan does not set in stone where you are headed for the next five day or five years. Vander Leest questioned the cost impact, were they doing this in-house or hiring a consultant? Robinson responded that as this was written, the only instant that there would be an outside involvement would be at the June session as a facilitator and there were people that they could get to do that for low or no costs, for example the Wisconsin Counties Association. Vander Leest stated that in some way he was in favor but wanted to make sure that it was understood that these were ideas and suggestions and that they could always bring new ideas forward. He didn't want it to become a rigid document or something that stopped the County Board from making decisions.

Moynihan stated that it was a tool for future boards as well. He thanked Supervisor Robinson for bringing this forward, he embraced it and hoped the committee embraced it as well as the County Board unanimously. Pertaining to the June meeting, assuming the board was on board, the meeting was scheduled for June 12, 2013 @ 6pm.

Lund didn't understand why they were going out to the next board asking them to approve the planning when this board would do all the planning. To him it seemed that this could be tightened up before April of next year. It seemed to him to have the new board react to what they put together seemed a little goofy to him. Moynihan interjected that they needed a starting point and that was how the timeline laid out. Robinson added that the work of the County Board in terms of formulating a plan would be done according to this timeline, September of this year; the plan itself would be finished in February. The only reason they put the mention of the next county board on there was because there would be an annual process of evaluating that plan, whether an old board or a new board. So in a sense the last step wasn't a formulation of a plan, it was the beginning of an annual review that happened every year.

Erickson stated that within this framework they already had these things in place. They had a five year capital plan and a capital expenditure plan. The Planning Department had a long range plan for the county. A good starting point was with the annual reports, compiling them, and also including long range plans they already had. Then they wouldn't be putting things on top of each other.

Supervisor Evans arrived at 5:50pm.

Evans felt it was a good idea.

Fewell stated that he was being a realist, there was a Facility Master Plan Subcommittee that spent time putting together what they were going to do in facilities, how they were going to handle facilities, what they should be heading for and directing and setting goals. He understood that no

matter how much comprehensive planning they do, there was going to be a County Board that would walk in and say, I don't care about that and will do whatever they want. They won't have to challenge anyone and will vote it out. So in reality it was a nice way of saying ok we'll put together a comprehensive plan but in all likelihood the County Board will do whatever they want anyway. He was in agreement with Robinson and would much rather see more structure, more direction, more planning because he felt that was the right way to go, and he would support that, but he didn't want to put so much stock into the comprehensive planning thinking that there was going to be a County Board that will do whatever. He would love to see this tied to budget, come into budget with some really good ideas about what they were doing. Lund responded that he somewhat agreed with Fewell. He almost would rather have a speech on the budget like the President and then hopefully put a budget together and give it to congress and they were going to deal with the budget. He felt that was how it should be done. Any timeline should state in September there is an Annual State of the County, it was tied to budget, the Executive gives over the budget to the board and the County Board reacts to that and any ancillary things in the five year plan would be discussed also. Maybe at the November budget hearing they discuss the five year plan and not have a regular meeting with all sorts of other resolutions, etc. that get in the way of talking about this.

Robinson's suggestion would be that if they wanted things to move in a certain direction they increase the likelihood of going in a direction if they actually try and make it happen. The only alternative would be to not do this. So while he was not suggesting that they were wrong, if they were going to move in that direction they had to make some steps. As far as the budget process goes, by the time some of this work was done they would have gone fairly down the road with staff this year for the 2014 budget. So this planning process was put together in mind so that it could impact the 2015 budget process. If you look at planning processes of counties around the State, the things that they had done, they were rather extensive. There can be a lot of moving pieces, a lot of work, a lot of time and effort going into it. This one was pretty stripped down.

Motion made by Supervisor Moynihan, seconded by Supervisor Vander Leest to approve the proposed strategic planning process for Brown County. Vote taken. MOTION UNANIMOUSLY APPROVED.

2. **Communication from Supervisor Robinson re: Clarification of RFP process and the Board's participation including 1) A written policy of when the Board has final approval of agreements through RFP process and 2) a policy that a resolution for approval of an RFP by the Board clearly indicates whether the awarding of the agreement comes back to the full Board for approval. *Motion at January Executive: To have Corporation Counsel check with Purchasing for clarification and bring back to this committee next month.***

Robinson stated that he brought this forward because he felt there was a lack of consistency among the written policies in the county as far as purchasing goes and RFP. Secondly, the policy that was there was unclear to the County Board members. There may be some people that were crystal clear but he was not one of them. He brought this forward not necessarily with the goal of what the process should be but rather to bring consistency across the board. It should be clearly communicated and understood by the board. Administration Director Brent Miller referred to the documents and flow charts in the agenda packet and addressed the RFPs. The RFP portion laid out step by step what procedures they went through. He asked if there were specific questions, he could go through it all but the committee could also read each step. Miller informed that he and Robinson spoke with regard to an appeals process. There was an actual copy of what was included in an RFP when it went out for appeals and how it was set up. The appeals committee was made up of the Chairman of Executive Committee, the Chairman of Administration Committee and the Internal Auditor. When an appeal was requested the items to be looked at were very specific. The Appeals Committee would then make the decision and that would be the final.

Risk Manager Barb West stated that only RFBs are required to come back the committee, and RFBs were Public Works projects. RFPs are approved to go out but do not come back. Approval of the Standing Committee and County Board is required for any RFP \$10,000 or greater but the approval was to send out the RFP, it did not come back to committee.

Robinson stated that the A5 and A20 procurement policies were a little confusing, and it may be that he was reading it without a sufficient amount of information. For example on the A5 procurement, the Public Work purchases for projects \$25,000 or over, approval of the requesting departments standing committee and County Board was required after receive of bids and vendor selection. West informed that an RFB was for Public Works only and it was based on price only. Miller informed that an RFB was set up by State Statutes. Robinson reiterated that there was a lot of confusion out there so half of his communication was about clearly communicating and educating the board about how this worked. Miller informed that there was an ordinance coming forward to change and adjust some things in this process.

Vander Leest felt that if there were questions Supervisors should work directly with administrative staff. The Executive Committee had to deal with certain items. There was a process if there were suggestions to change an ordinance or something specific, bring it forward. He didn't feel there should be any action taken. Van Dyck stated he disagreed because there had been a lot of confusion at the last few board meetings where members who had been on the board for some time were under the presumption that once an RFP was approved it still came back to the board for re-approval. If that was not the case than why were they relooking at the bid at the airport for services? That should have never come back to the board and it did. Vander Leest responded that it came back because there was a motion for reconsideration. Vander Leest reiterated that there weren't any question with process for him.

Lund wouldn't disagree with Supervisors Van Dyck or Robinson, he felt it might be smart to clarify and have the policies right next to each other. It wouldn't hurt to go over the policies. They were supposed to go over them 8-10 years ago and change everything to make it clearer and they never did. If they had questions Lund felt it was appropriate to come forward to look at those things.

Miller informed that there were County Board Supervisors that were involved on some of the selection committees.

With regard to modifications to the processes, West clarified that the process itself hadn't changed, the documentation had.

Fewell stated that the problem was, when you are asking a corporation or a businesses in good faith to make proposals to the county to do work, the county approved an RFP and sent it out, qualified responses come back but then the board wants the approval to be able to not accept the proposals and/or request to reopen the process to take in other people. They second guess the selection team on which RFP to accept. The county sends out an RFP to get a cost to do what they had already agreed on but then the County Board wants to be the selection committee. The problem is there already was a selection committee and a selection process. The RFP had been approved, if the board had agreed to that to begin with, then they agreed to the process as well as the selection committee selecting the vendor to do the work. Fewell didn't want to see RFPs coming back. He felt that it needed to be spelt out that when the board approved an RFP to be sent out, that they have agreed to the selection process as it was stated in the RFP which was stated to every vendor in good faith.

Motion made by Supervisor Vander Leest, seconded by Supervisor Erickson to receive and place on file. Vote taken. MOTION UNANIMOUSLY APPROVED.

3. Communication from Supervisor Steffen re: Term-limits for Brown County Supervisors. *Motion at July, 2012 Executive: Refer to Corporation Counsel for disposition of communication.*

Motion made by Supervisor Vander Leest, seconded by Supervisor Erickson to receive and place on file.

Supervisor Steffen informed that Corporation Counsel had provided a draft resolution (attached). He stated that he believed democracy required participation for it to remain healthy. This was a part of that initiative. It benefits the county as well as the public in general to have great participation by its members. He could understand where people may differ on that but reality long term entrenched incumbency affects the ability for greater participation in this government. As stated in the resolution, this would not affect any current member until 2026. Steffen stated that there seemed to be a quick move to get rid of this communication and he found that interesting considering the majority of people of this county and this state support term limits. As a delegate of a district, he was surprised so little effort had been put into the thoughts and wishes of the people they represent. He would be interested in any comments as to why it was being quickly moved and shuffled to the side. He felt it was a relevant, important, timely issue.

Vander Leest stated that taxpayers benefit from experience and knowledge of County Board members. He was involved in some of the first leases with PMI, some of the changes that were worked on and some of his firsthand knowledge helped get a better deal for the county from a standpoint of remembering some of the negotiations and discussions on the previous lease with PMI. If there were term limits you wouldn't be a part of those discussions. He felt there was a process that if you had some board members that had additional experience, had additional knowledge and had a memory of how things worked out, they could use that for future discussions and negotiations and the ability to give first-hand knowledge. He believed there were countless examples like his. The voters decide if supervisors were doing a quality job or not and if they don't they vote you out of office. He believed he got better every term with experience and be able to rely on things that they had done. He felt very strong about it, he understood why he wanted to do it but he didn't agree with it. It was arbitrary.

Fewell stated anyone could die on the way home, negotiations and good deals for the taxpayers will be negotiated long after every one of them are out of office or when they die. He didn't think anyone had an exclusive market to good negotiating. He wasn't saying he overly supported this idea, if it were a referendum he would personally vote against it. He was not sure, as an elective official, if he should be determining whether or not there were term limits on his term. He was not going to support receive and place on file because he really felt that if the voters in Brown County felt there should be term limits then it should go to referendum and let them vote on it.

Erickson informed that he had seconded Vander Leest's motion due to the fact that they were an arm of the State and they followed directions from the State and right now the State had not indicate that they wanted term limits for anyone at the state level or at the county level. One of the only offices in the entire nation that had term limits was the President of the United States. He didn't know if they were quite on that same level. Anyone could experience a term limit quickly just by running for reelection and it happened a lot.

Evans stated it was an interesting communication, people stated they like term limits but then they elect the same people. When he heard term limits he believed there were term limits, he had a term of two years. He had to get signatures next December. Why should they punish the populous, constituents might really like their elected officials. Steffen responded that supervisors had mentioned that every election was an opportunity to have a term limit. That discounted the advantage that incumbency provided to each one of those. He believed that everyone had a greater advantage going up to that starting line by being an incumbent. For example last elections District

21 had zero opponents run against him but there were seven people that applied for his position when it vacated. District 18 ran unopposed last election and he had nine people apply for his position when it vacated. Evans appreciated his comments however he believed those positions opened. There were some supervisors, alderman's, trustees that no one knew and they were incumbents, so just being an incumbent, he didn't believe it, there were people who were incumbents where the races were completely open because the incumbent didn't do anything. Steffen responded that the difference between a campaign and a legislature were completely different things. You can be a fantastic campaigner and a horrible legislature and vice versa. While they were related the correlation was quite slight. Evans stated that he looked at his abilities from when he came on the County Board to where they were now with understanding and knowledge in the Human Services area. There were some pretty entangled items. All he saw was if they had a continual changeover of supervisors, what they had done was completely empowered administration. They were the checks and balances. The fact was that they had to start getting supervisors that need the challenge and had a good understanding of a lot of things. He believed they wouldn't have a new Community Treatment Center without that. He was afforded to be reelected and he worked very hard on it, but he would have been done. He gave another example with regard to an issue he had been working on for the 10 years he had been an elective official. Sanimax in his opinion was a perfect organization that understood on how to continuously drag things out, grind things up, maybe they would get a new supervisor/County Board and maybe things will work well, maybe they won't. The fact of the matter was that they had a term limit which was every two years. He supported the incumbents because he appreciated the work people do.

Moynihan was not going to agree with the motion, not that he concurred with the term limits scenario but he didn't want to see a supervisor's idea squashed. He suggested bringing the resolution back next month with the communication and then they could take up the resolution at this committee as well at the County Board. Steffen would appreciate the courtesy.

Van Dyck stated that while he would agree with Steffen, where he felt the election process and federal and possibly the state level was broken and term limits may be in order, at least with the county board and most local elections he believed it still worked because you can still get to your constituency and become personable. In this case he would disagree with term limits. Every two years the general public had an easy way of voting people off that didn't exist at the federal level and maybe the state level. He wouldn't personally like to see this go to referendum because it was too easy for the general public to automatically say they wanted term limits. He didn't feel it should be on this level, maybe on the federal level.

Lund stated that these local elections don't have a lot of money involved. Lund stated he had lost and won local elections and had been in many elections. Sometimes you win, sometimes you lose. It was up to the voters to decide. How the resolution was written, in 12 years, in his case, he could go 24 years. New supervisors would only get 12 years. He would be very arbitrary in saying that he needed to be on 24 years, the electors are going to continue to vote him in for the next six terms. It seemed to him that as a veteran this was great for him but it would be limiting any newcomer to six terms. He would be very hypocritical in supporting on how this was written.

Motion made by Supervisor Evans, seconded by Supervisor Moynihan to make a motion by substitution to put the resolution on next month's agenda. Vote taken. MOTION UNANIMOUSLY APPROVED.

4. Communication from Supervisor Buckley re: Review what is the work week for the 24/7 Employees. Held from December meeting. Held for one month.

Erickson informed that at the last Public Safety meeting there were at least four examples for scheduling for 24/7's. Out of the four there were two that fit the county's prescribed work week

which was Sunday through Saturday. He questioned that if they hold this would it impede the progress of the scheduling. Moynihan stated that they were just holding it by virtue of consideration for Supervisor Buckley's absences. Lund wouldn't mind holding for one month but regardless he would like to get started on this next month. He believed it was unfair to the workers in the 24/7. Lund wanted to get some recommendations.

Motion made by Supervisor Moynihan, seconded by Supervisor Evans to hold for one month and ask Human Resources to bring back an update with regard to the work formulas, etc. for the 24/7. Vote taken. MOTION UNANIMOUSLY APPROVED.

Legal Bills

5. Review and Possible Action on Legal Bills to be paid.

Motion made by Supervisor Erickson, seconded by Supervisor Vander Leest to approve the legal bills. Vote taken. MOTION UNANIMOUSLY APPROVED.

Reports

6. County Executive Report.

Streckenbach welcomed Vander Leest to the Executive Committee. He looked forward to working with him and the newly elected Education and Recreation Vice-Chair Van Dyck in the future.

Streckenbach informed that they were in the process of putting together a debt plan to address how to deal with structured debt for the next 20 years, more importantly how to manage the debt levy versus the amount that they actually had to pay until 2020. The amount that they owed versus how much they had in debt levy was a \$1.5M difference. He was hoping to bring a debt plan to the committee that would hopefully mitigate that cost in the future.

The communication that was brought forward by Supervisor Robinson really played into what the last two years had been and will be in this next year for his administration. Last year they had the county initiatives, performance evaluations, LEAN events, succession planning and efficiency reports. Hopefully by the end of February every employee will have received an evaluated by leadership, which had not been conducted in the past. Last year they were able to do 21 LEAN events along with a number of success events and they felt it was a positive move direction for the county in addressing cultural changes and looking at processes and improvements. This was one of the areas that they would be able to address continuous ways for the county to continue to deliver services with new challenges they were facing with the financial aspect of things.

Succession planning: as they know on average in the next 20 years two million people will retire nationwide. They want to make sure that the county was in a position to manage that transition both in a table of organization but also in documentation of procedures and operations. They were working with departments to identify those things. That kind of led them into 2013 plans and initiatives which he felt was very important that the departments bring to the board strategies. Not only on what they were able to accomplish the year before but what they were working on in the upcoming year, but also then to report that in their Annual Review. This was something that they were going to ask and require from the departments for the next upcoming year. There were a lot of departments that do not have five year strategic plans or do annual reviews. He felt this was an important way to communicate with the Board of Supervisors so that they had a snapshot of where they were at and where they were heading. The board could give feedback as to what the priorities are of the County Board of Supervisors. They were trying to create a vision which was a living document that would change each year. The ultimate goal would be that each department will then eventually turn in to the Board of Supervisors after they had a review five year strategic plan. They realized that that changes with the different board changes along with the County Executive. At the

end of the day if they weren't going to be able to be reactive, it would be important for them to be proactive. One of the areas they could help in that would be bringing forth plans. The ultimate goal would be to build trust and build transparency.

For clarification, outside of Public Works bids, RFP are ultimately approved through the budget process. And when they decide that an RFP was the best route for a decision on a project, the board ultimately reviewed the RFP proposal, gave the o.k. to go forward with that process and then the county administered the budgeted items that the board approved and the projects that were approved and now it was just a matter of a process.

Vander Leest questioned if there would be annual reviews for all county employees. Streckenbach noted that this was new for a lot of employees. Ultimately it was building moral, giving employees an opportunity to speak with management about the good things they were doing and be recognized. It's also an opportunity for the county to work with staff to find ways they can be more beneficial. One of the things he was asking departments to do was build metrics and measurements. Vander Leest suggested creating an opportunity for employees to give feedback on things that may not make sense, or a perceived improvement that's needed or waste.

Motion made by Supervisor Fewell, seconded by Supervisor Erickson to receive and place on file. Vote taken. MOTION UNANIMOUSLY APPROVED.

7. Internal Auditor Report.

Internal Auditor Dan Process stated he continued to make progress on the Audit Plan. As he was meeting with various department heads and individuals he was looking for efficiencies, etc.

The County Board office will be participating in a LEAN event in the next few months. There may be a request for a supervisor or two to step in and participate as well.

Motion made by Supervisor Moynihan, seconded by Supervisor Vander Leest to receive and place on file. Vote taken. MOTION UNANIMOUSLY APPROVED.

Vacant Budgeted Positions (Request to Fill)

8. Child Support – Clerk/Typist I - Vacated on 12/10/12.
9. Human Resources – HR Analyst - Vacated on 1/21/13.
10. Human Services-CTC – Account Clerk I - Vacated on 1/04/13.
11. Human Services-CTC – Nurse Educator (.5 FTE) - Vacated on 2/13/13.
12. Human Services-CTP – Staff RN (.5 FTE) - Vacated on 1/10/13.
13. Human Services-Economic Support – Clerk II - Vacated on 1/01/13.
14. Human Services-Economic Support – Receptionist - Vacated on 2/18/13.
15. Human Services – Social Worker/Case Manager (Child Protection Intake/Ongoing) - Vacated on 3/18/13.
16. Human Services – Social Worker/Case Manager (Long Term Care) - Vacated on 4/04/13.
17. Public Works-Facility Management – Facility Mechanic - Vacated on 1/23/13.
18. Public Works-Facility Management – Facility Worker - Vacated on 12/11/12.
19. Public Works-Facility Management – Housekeeper I - Vacated on 12/10/12.
20. Register in Probate – Deputy Register in Probate - Vacated on 1/07/13.

Motion made by Supervisor Moynihan, seconded by Supervisor Erickson to suspend the rules to take items 8-20 together. Vote taken. MOTION UNANIMOUSLY APPROVED.

Motion made by Supervisor Moynihan, seconded by Supervisor Fewell to approve items 8-20. Vote taken. MOTION UNANIMOUSLY APPROVED.

Resolutions, Ordinances

21. Resolution re: Change in Table of Organization Public Works Department Clerk/Typist II.

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

22. Resolution re: Change in Table of Organization Aging and Disability Resource Center Outreach & Benefit Program Specialist.

Motion made by Supervisor Erickson, seconded by Supervisor Evans to approve. Vote taken. **MOTION UNANIMOUSLY APPROVED.**

Closed Session

23. Closed Session Pursuant to Wis. Stats. § 19.85(1)(c) to consider employment, promotion, compensation or performance evaluation data of any public employee over which the governmental body has jurisdiction or exercises responsibility. (Labor negotiations).

Motion made by Supervisor, seconded by Supervisor to enter into closed session @ 7:12 pm. Vote taken. **MOTION UNANIMOUSLY APPROVED.**

Roll Call: Fewell, Vander Leest, Moynihan, Lund, Erickson, Evans.

Motion made by Supervisor, seconded by Supervisor to return to regular order of business at p.m. Vote taken. **MOTION UNANIMOUSLY APPROVED.**

Roll Call: Fewell, Vander Leest, Moynihan, Lund, Erickson, Evans.

Motion made by Supervisor Evans, seconded by Supervisor Moynihan to accept Human Resources recommendation as it pertained to 2012 new hired employee's compensation. Vote taken.

MOTION UNANIMOUSLY APPROVED.

Other

24. Such other matters as authorized by law.

Lund requested that Vacant Budgeted Positions be switched on the agenda to be moved before Communications.

Moynihan informed the committee of the postal service changes, they will be stopping Saturday delivery in August. Committee Chairs need to have buttoned up agendas or think of another date to host their meetings. Erickson suggested checking with committee member to find out when they received their packet.

Lund welcomed Vander Leest to the committee and noticed the supervisors who came and stayed for the entire meeting. He appreciated their attendance and participation.

Motion made by Supervisor Vander Leest, seconded by Supervisor Evans to adjourn at 7:38 p.m. Vote taken. **MOTION UNANIMOUSLY APPROVED.**

Respectfully submitted,

Alicia A. Loehlein
Recording Secretary

Proposed Strategic Planning Process for Brown County

February 2013

Goal: To articulate a shared vision for Brown County government through a five-year, rolling strategic plan that:

1. Includes budget and non-budgetary items;
2. Incorporates state and federal mandates;
3. Involves stakeholders throughout the community, giving them opportunity for input, but also includes existing information, such as the 2011 Life Study, other existing community surveys, and information put together by County staff;
4. Provides goals by which to assess the progress on the plan;
5. Is a shared process by the County Executive and County Board, but ultimately results in a strategic plan brought forth by the County Executive;
6. Addresses the County's need for a fresh look at marketing and branding; and
7. Utilizes a communication strategy to share plan with the public.

Timeline:

January – May, 2013

- Staff provides input on 2012 accomplishments and 2013 goals to County board and committees.

June 2013

- County Board holds a session during which Supervisors can share their ideas for a County government mission statement, a five-year vision, and goals.

September 2013

- Conduct public listening sessions throughout Brown County co-sponsored by the County Executive and County Board. Utilize listening sessions as an opportunity to:
 - Provide education about Brown County government and what it does;
 - Share information on vision, mission and goals that came from the June 2013 session; and
 - Hear public input.

February 2014

- County Executive articulates a County mission, vision, and five-year strategic plan with goals to be shared during the annual State of the County address.

2014-2016 County Board

- County Board reacts to document prepared by County Executive with opportunity for further input, instituting annual rollover process of the five-year plan.