

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE BROWN COUNTY
EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE**

Pursuant to Section 19.84 Wis. Stats., a regular meeting of the Brown County Executive Committee was held on Monday, January 7, 2019 in Room 200 of the Northern Building, 305 E. Walnut Street, Green Bay, Wisconsin.

Present: Chair Lund, Supervisor Moynihan, Supervisor Erickson, Supervisor VanDyck, Supervisor Sieber, Supervisor Hoyer, Supervisor Buckley
Also Present: Supervisor Dantine, Supervisor Deslauriers, Director of Administration Chad Weininger, Corporation Counsel Dave Hemery, Director of Port and Resource Recovery Dean Haen, Internal Auditor Dan Process, media, other interested parties,

I. Call meeting to order.

The meeting was called to order by Chair Tom Lund at 5:30 pm.

II. Approve/modify agenda.

Motion made by Supervisor Sieber, seconded by Supervisor Hoyer to approve. Vote taken. MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

III. Approve/modify Minutes of December 10, 2018.

Motion made by Supervisor Moynihan, seconded by Supervisor Sieber to approve. Vote taken. MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

Comments from the Public – None.

Amended Resolution

1. Amended Resolution to Create a Citizens Redistricting Advisory Sub-Committee to Report to the Brown County Executive Committee.

Supervisor Moynihan recalled this Resolution was amended at the last meeting to change language from *political science professor from either the University of WI – Green Bay and/or St. Norbert College to an active or retired academic educator*. The remainder of the document has not changed and this is before the Committee now for approval.

Motion made by Supervisor Moynihan, seconded by Supervisor Sieber to approve. Vote taken. MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

- a) Appoint members to the Redistricting AD Hoc Committee: Possible appointments of Tom Sieber, Patrick Moynihan, Jr., Aaron Linssen, Tom Lund, Ken Bukowski, Pam Parish, Renee Gasch, James Crawford, Dan Theno, Robyn Davis, Thomas Joynt, Cheryl McCutcheon, Anneliese Waggoner, Hector Rodriguez.**

Supervisor Erickson expressed concern in that the resolution contains language that people with paid party memberships shall not be on the committee, however, in the documents in the agenda packet he found several people that have paid party memberships.

Moynihan pointed out the resolution that was just approved provides that the Executive Committee chair shall appoint members of the committee and what is before us at this meeting is not that scenario and for that reason he suggested that this be held for a month.

Chair Lund said he will make the appointments and then this can go to the full Board in February. The process was discussed further before being referred to the February County Board.

Supervisor Sieber feels the process should move a little faster, but Chair Lund noted the census is not going to start until next year so there is plenty of time. He noted he has already talked to some of the people who are interested and will be talking with the rest before making the appointments. Sieber informed he has spoken with Anneliese Waggoner who indicated her name was included on the list in error and she does not want to be on the committee.

Motion made by Supervisor Sieber, seconded by Supervisor Moynihan to open the floor to allow interested parties to speak. Vote taken. MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

-Barbara Brown, 401 Arrowhead Drive, Green Bay, WI

Brown asked about the provision regarding membership of political parties. She feels it is a little nebulous and asked if what is meant is that people that work for a party and earn money by working for that party cannot be on the board or if what is meant is that any of the people who became a republican, democrat, socialist, etc. cannot be on the board. She also thanked the Committee for the work that has been done on this.

Supervisor Van Dyck said the resolution language is *any paid political memberships of the nominee*; not that they are paid by the party. It also says that that needs to be disclosed, but it does not say that that would preclude someone from membership on the committee.

Motion made by Supervisor Moynihan, seconded by Supervisor Sieber to return to regular order of business. Vote taken. MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

Motion made by Supervisor Moynihan, seconded by Supervisor Erickson to refer to February County Board. MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

2. Review Minutes of:
 - a) Benefits Advisory Committee (August 23, 2018).

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

Legal Bills

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

Motion made by Supervisor Moynihan, seconded by Supervisor Erickson to pay the legal bills. Vote taken. MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

Communications

4. Communication from Supervisor Deslauriers re: In order to prevent future Landfill Siting Agreement violations by Brown County, that Port and Resource Recovery Director Dean Haen work with Corporation Counsel to review past violations and create a written policy governing any "correspondence, reports and data relating to the Landfill filed with [or received from] the Wisconsin DNR and other governmental agencies by the County and its retained environmental consultants". This policy will ensure all of these communications are shared with the Town of Holland Local Monitoring Committee "at the same time such documents are filed" or "within 10 days of receipt" in accordance with the contract between Brown County and the Town of Holland (quoted text taken directly from the Landfill Siting Agreement of 1998). *Referred from December County Board.*

Supervisor Deslauriers said what he is looking for is an agreement as to what communication is required by Brown County with the Town of Holland. With the well contamination issue, Corporation Counsel has made this direction to Port and Resource Recovery and Deslauriers' goal with this is to have simple acknowledgement of that communication and guidance so we do not run into the same problems moving forward.

Corporation Counsel David Hemery noted he and Deslauriers had a little miscommunication with regard to these communications as to what Committee these should go before and the correct policy would actually be for these to go to Planning, Development and Transportation Committee before coming to Executive Committee.

Hemery continued that he does like the idea of the communication and he is in favor of policies, but what is being asked for here is more of an administrative function than a County Board function as it is an internal department policy. Hemery also spoke with Port and Resource Recovery Director Dean Haen who advised him that he is already working on a policy that includes the language from the Landfill Siting Agreement regarding communications and that they shall also be sent to the LMC within 10 days and the policy also made clear that the Director is the person responsible for seeing that that is carried out. The policy also details other things such as how large documents will be sent. Hemery will continue to work with Haen on this policy and feels at this time this could be referred to PD & T or be received and placed on file if the Committee feels it is being appropriately addressed.

Deslauriers informed the core of this communication is that there has been fundamental disagreement on what constitutes a timing violation. He is thankful that there is a policy being worked on for this, although he does not understand why it took so long, but he is hopeful the policy addresses these fundamental, easy to identify and easy to fix issues.

Hemery pointed out that on the list of timing violations included in Deslauriers' communication, the last 5 items came about after the requirements of the 1998 Landfill Siting Agreement were brought to the forefront. Even though the last 5 are listed as violations, Hemery questioned if they really are. Deslauriers responded that a primary reason he took this job was because of Haen's actions or inactions as it pertains to the contract and this has been going on for at least a year and a half. These things have been talked about at PD & T a number of times. He feels the contract is extremely clear that these are to be shared at the time of submission, not a day or two later and he feels that is not difficult to accomplish. The slippery slope is what concerns him. If we say a day, 2 days or a week, and most of these are well beyond that, is not a good basis of any policy that will be brought forward.

Deslauriers indicated he is agreeable to having this referred to PD & T, but he brought it here so a different set of ears could hear this as one of the issues has been ongoing since April and the other since July at PD & T although now he understand that procedurally this may not have been correct. Fundamentally he wants this addressed so it can be put to rest so we do not need to keep wasting resources and time dealing with it.

Lund agreed that there should be a policy that clearly states the amount of time between receipt and when notification has to be given, but it sounds like this is being worked on at this time. Supervisor Buckley asked what the Town of Holland does when they receive the information. Deslauriers used the Brown County Artificial Wetland Exemption Submittal as an example and said that item was to exempt the County from protecting the wetlands at that site that were artificially created. By not sharing that document until the DNR accepted it and concurred with it, the possibility of the Town of Holland to participate in the process and object if necessary was eliminated. The Town was waiting for that submittal to become part of the process for exemptions. By the County only sharing that submission after concurrence and approval of the DNR, the Town was systematically eliminated from that discussion. The whole point of the contract is to avoid these types of situations.

Van Dyck feels this should be fairly cut and dried and whatever the requirements of the agreement are should be followed and what the Town of Holland does with the information is irrelevant. Hemery said a lot of it is really not cut and dried though because there are issues on both sides of the agreement. For example the agreement says that anything Brown County files with the DNR has to be provided to the LMC but it does not specify if things like e-mails are considered documents, and there are legal opinions on both sides of that. The agreement also requires the Town to establish the LMC within 60 days of signing by ordinance, however, as of today, there is no evidence of an ordinance in this regard, but he has been told that such an ordinance establishing the LMC will be brought forward at this month's Town Board meeting. Hemery feels it make sense for the standing Committee that is already familiar with some of these issues to look at this.

Motion made by Supervisor Moynihan, seconded by Supervisor Buckley to refer to Planning, Development & Transportation Committee and Port and Resource Recovery Director Dean Haen. Vote taken. MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

5. **Communication from Supervisor Deslauriers re: That the Brown County Board request that Port and Resource Recovery Director Dean Haen follow the recommended communication guidelines specified by Brown County Corporation Counsel (in his November 27, 2018 email to Supervisors Schadewald and Deslauriers) "to notify the WI**

DNR within 60 days whenever we have a sample that attains or exceeds a groundwater standard, and especially to follow any and all WI DNR recommendations re this issue". This to best protect the health of Brown County families. Director Haen's stated communication plan for future well contamination events (at 3 separate PD&T meetings) will not follow this Corporation Counsel guidance. *Referred from December County Board.*

Deslauriers is agreeable to having this referred to PD & T and said his goal is to have the County Board ask Haen to comply with the recommended communication guidelines specified by Corporation Counsel. He has a commitment to the County and has tried to give the County every opportunity to correct this issue quietly without too much hassle, but we keep coming back to something wildly outside the guides of Corporation Counsel.

Hemery said the timing of these things will be part of the policy he spoke of earlier. The statutes and state codes that regulate when landfill incidents need to be reported to the DNR apply to owners and operators of landfills but at this time there is no owner or operator of the landfill so the 60 day requirements to report to the DNR are not statutory. However, his advice is that if there are signs of contamination that the procedure be followed as if this was an active landfill and Haen was fine with that. Deslauriers responded that that contradicts what was said at meetings and that is why he brought this here.

Deslauriers referenced the Significant Event Claim Notification signed by County Executive Streckenbach after the last Board meeting and asked if that will be part of the policy. Hemery responded that that is a policy that will have to be followed and that is one of the ways administration was addressing Deslauriers' concerns.

Motion made by Supervisor Buckley, seconded by Supervisor Sieber to refer to Planning, Development and Transportation Committee. Vote taken. MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

Motion made by Supervisor Sieber, seconded by Supervisor Moynihan to suspend the rules to take Item 7 at this time. Vote taken. MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

Although shown in the proper format here, Item 7 was taken at this time.

6. Communication from Supervisor Sieber re: Discussion by Corporation Counsel of Closed Session Procedure and Violations.

Hemery provided handout, a copy of which is attached, and indicated there are two things that apply to closed sessions – the Wisconsin Open Meetings Law and the local rules established in our County Code. Violations would be prosecuted by the District Attorney or sometimes the Attorney General. Penalties for violation range between \$25 - \$300 per violation and these penalties are not reimbursable by the County. He outlined the remaining information contained in the handout.

A lengthy discussion followed Hemery's remarks regarding closed sessions and violations thereof, with an emphasis on penalties for violating closed sessions rules. Also discussed were procedures for minutes of closed sessions, actions taken in closed sessions and how closed session language is determined to be included on agendas. Open meeting laws were also discussed. Hemery will look further at the items discussed and bring some proposal back to the Committee.

Motion made by Supervisor Moynihan, seconded by Supervisor Sieber to suspend the rules to allow interested parties to speak. Vote taken. MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

-Doug Schneider, 435 E. Walnut Street, Green Bay, WI

Schneider noted the Committee is basically talking about creating policy regarding violations of a policy that does not exist and asked what they are doing about penalties for those who violate open meetings laws. He also questioned why the Committee feels a need for financial penalties for those who speak of the contents of closed session when there are not financial penalties for Supervisors who violate open meetings laws.

Hemery spoke to this as did Lund, Buckley, and Van Dyck.

Motion made by Supervisor Moynihan, seconded by Supervisor Erickson to return to regular order of business. Vote taken. MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

Sieber asked several questions of Hemery regarding procedures of closed session, all of which were addressed.

Motion made by Supervisor Van Dyck, seconded by Supervisor Erickson to refer to Corporation Counsel for further investigation. Vote taken. MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

Resolutions, Ordinances

7. Resolution Authorizing \$500,000 Loan to Greater Green Bay Convention & Visitors Bureau, Inc.

Erickson recalled at the last meeting it was indicated the County would lose approximately \$15,000 per year in interest if this loan is made. It was indicated that was on the high end and Director of Administration Chad Weininger responded as soon as there are payments, that will be factored in. Erickson has done some research on current rates with some banks and found the current best rate that would likely be given to any business is 6%. The proposal for this loan to CVB is for \$500,000 with no payments for the first 5 years. He recalled the County Board said they would not balloon any payments and this would be going against our own policies and giving money out to a private firm. He is in favor of the loan, but would like to see payments started on the first year and that interest of 2% be charged to help offset some of the County's loss.

Moynihan sees the CVB as an arm of Brown County in that they promote the County and do a lot of good work in the community. The reason no payments for the first 5 years is being proposed is because the CVB is in the middle of a campaign to garner \$6.5 - \$7 million dollars. As of this time there they are at about \$3.5 million dollars and this loan from the County is seed money to help them achieve a threshold so they can proceed with the project. Moynihan feels this is the proper way to go about this because in the first 5 years in the facility, they can get their bearings and let the dust settle. Loan payments will come from advertising and/or fundraising, which they are currently doing. He feels the resolution is appropriate and urged the Committee to support it.

Van Dyck asked for more information on the timing of the funds. Weininger informed one of the things that would have to be done is to enter into a contract with the CVB and one of the pieces of that would be that the County dollars be last in. The County would not release money until it is shown that all permits have been secured and the necessary funds have been raised or committed to start the construction. The CVB would have to use their other funding before the County would give them the money so we can keep the funds in the general fund as long as possible. Van Dyck asked if there was any risk of shortfall after the County provides the money as far as proceeds to finish the construction. Weininger said the contract would include language that guarantees the level of commitment and would also include provision for the County to have some interest in the property if something happened, however, it was noted that the CVB does not own the land.

CVB President Brad Toll said the land is being leased from the Packers, but they are paying well below what would normally be charged because of the in-kind nature of the project. Toll indicated that the primary lender on the project will be Nicolet Bank. With regard to the interest suggested by Erickson, Toll noted that although they could pay that, he feels that money would be better spent on things like sales trips to promote the area. The CVB will be the building owner over the course of 30 years and then it will go to the landowner and the CVB will lease from them. Toll noted they have received a lot of support from throughout the community from a lot of major corporations as well as individuals and families.

Supervisor Buckley mentioned the expo hall that is going to be built and noted part of what the CVB does is help put people in our hotel rooms which results in room tax revenue which helps pay for some of the larger projects in the County, but they also get people at our gas stations and in our restaurants and stores which brings revenue into the community. Given what the County is putting into the expo hall, Buckley feels this loan is a very small percentage of advertising that will help bring things into the expo hall which will bring money back into the community. He feels in the long run, the County will realize much more benefits than what will be lost in interest over the course of the loan. The County needs to bolster the CVB to be able to do their job better and he feels this is a small price to pay for the benefit the County will receive.

Toll informed that typically a CVB receives about 50% of what a community collects in room tax and shared some history on how it came to be that the CVB here gets considerably less than that. He noted that Door County is building a new visitor center, but they do not need help with it because they receive about 70% of the room tax and Eau Claire is in the same position. The CVB has five people in the sales and services department and competes with Madison who has 15 in their sales and service department. This is why the CVB needs help. By not having a visitor center where we can encourage people to spend more time in the community or come back with friends later, the community would be missing out. The CVB is not asking the County to build the facility or maintain it, they are only asking for some help in getting it done.

Moynihan reminded this is a loan, not a handout and referenced several other communities where the CVBs get tax dollars to fund operations and again urged the Committee to vote in favor of this resolution.

Van Dyck asked if the CVB needs the loan in order to get the loan from Nicolet Bank. Toll said they do not absolutely need the County's loan to get the loan from Nicolet Bank, but having the County's money would mean they would need less from Nicolet. The ramification of not getting the loan from the County would be greater costs to the CVB and getting the deal done. The CVB is still fundraising and they are about \$900,000 from where they need to be and this loan from the County would reduce that to \$400,000. They are trying to break ground in April and this loan from the County would help ensure that that happens. The CVB intends to raise all the money they can and does not intend to stop fundraising when they get to the \$900,000. Van Dyck asked if in the event the fundraising efforts exceed the \$900,000, if the excess could be used to pay the loan back sooner. Toll said they could do that and would be happy to pay the loan back as quickly as possible which would result in more funds being available for marketing.

Van Dyck is in support of the loan and resolution, but feels a lot of the details discussed tonight are not included in the resolution and he would like to have the opportunity to see them in an agreement that comes back to this Committee for approval.

Hemery would like to know the terms and conditions that the Admin Committee and this Committee would like included in the agreement so the agreement can be drafted and included in the County Board packet for the January meeting. Items he intends to include in the agreement are that the CVB would have to obtain all permits, that the Brown County cash would be last in and that the parties would not ask for forgiveness of the loan. The Board of course will make the final decisions on this.

Lund is not against the resolution, but he also would like to see a contract that sets forth the details regarding things like the timing of payments and the mechanisms for payments, etc.

Erickson said he will also support the resolution but questioned if the \$500,000 is needed by CVB to hit the 80% necessary to start the project. Toll informed the agreement with Miron is to have 80% and the loan from the County is needed to get to the 80%. They do not need the 80% to get the loan from Nicolet, but they do need it to get the project started. Erickson feels it would be easier for the CVB to pay \$50,000 per year starting in year 1 instead of \$100,000 a year starting after 5 years. If the CVB is going to continue to fundraise as Toll said, Erickson feels they could start making payments right away.

Buckley suggested a clause in the agreement that if the CVB would end up raising more than their goal, a percentage of that be used to start paying off the County loan early. Toll said having some relief at the beginning would be helpful to allow them to get the electronics up and everything else that comes up. They want the building to blow the socks off of people who walk in when it is done and not take a number of years to complete. Moynihan pointed out the CVB could continue fundraising even after they are in the building. Lund said the more the CVB can promote the community the better. Promoting things like the airport and expo hall and business in the community is going to put the County far better off in the future than we are now. Lund does not mind language about prepayment, but he is not in favor of having specific numbers tied to it to allow the CVB some flexibility in promoting the County.

Van Dyck agreed with Buckley in that there should be something in the agreement that if the fundraising goal is exceeded, that the funds are shared with the County to go towards the loan. He does not want to see the CVB stop fundraising efforts when they reach their goal so he would propose some sort of split and consideration for early pay

back. Lund would also support this, but he does not want to see the provisions be punitive and cause the CVB to stop their fundraising efforts.

Sieber noted the CVB is a non-profit entity whose job is to promote the community. This loan would be an investment in the community and its economy. Sieber would like Corporation Counsel to research whether the County is allowed to make money in the form of charging interest on a loan. Hemery said governments are allowed to break even, so if there is a loss on the County's side for giving the loan, they are able to charge interest to break even. Sieber noted how much the CVB does for the community and, in particular, the work they did on behalf of the Treasurer's office for the Wisconsin Treasurer's Association convention which was hosted by Brown County, all at no cost to the County. Sieber also noted that CVB staff has done work to try to bring more flights into Austin Straubel. They provide a number of other services to the County and Sieber said Green Bay is likely the only NFL city without a visitor center. He noted that the economic benefit of visitors to the community is large and getting them in a visitor center to show what the community has to offer and get them to come back and spend more money is very important because .5% of everything that is spent here goes right back to the County.

Motion made by Supervisor Moynihan, seconded by Supervisor Hoyer to approve. Vote taken. MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

8. **Resolution to Notify State Officials of Results of Referenda Questions Regarding Dark Stores and Medical Marijuana.**

Motion made by Supervisor Moynihan, seconded by Supervisor Sieber to approve. Vote taken. MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

9. **Resolution Re: Authority to Execute a 2019 Labor Agreement with the Brown County Electricians Bargaining Unit.**

Motion made by Supervisor Erickson, seconded by Supervisor Moynihan to approve. Vote taken. 4 Ayes, 1 Abstention (Sieber). MOTION CARRIED

10. **Ordinance to Amend Brown County Code Section 2.05 regarding Creating Sub or Ad Hoc Committees.**

Hemery informed that only the ordinance needs to be acted on. The resolution that is attached is a proposed resolution that would be used in the future in the event this ordinance is passed. The ordinance requires that if a standing committee wishes to create a sub or ad hoc committee, it would have to be done by resolution approved by Corporation Counsel. The resolution is a fill-in-the-blank type document that sets forth the name of the sub or ad hoc committee, membership, etc.

The ordinance language was discussed and Van Dyck feels if we are trying to formalize the process, the language which states *appointments to subcommittees and the selection of nonsupervisory advisors shall be at the discretion of the committee chair* which was struck should actually be included in the ordinance to keep everything uniform. He feels deleting this language could cause more issues down the road.

Sieber said the concern of some members of the Administration Committee was making sure the process was formalized and the Committee chairs cannot just come up with subcommittees that are not officially recognized by the full Board. He does not object to language regarding the Committee Chair having the authority to appoint the members of sub or ad hoc committees.

Motion made by Supervisor Van Dyck, seconded by Supervisor Hoyer to amend the ordinance as presented to leave in *Appointment to subcommittees and the selection of non-supervisory advisors shall be at the discretion of the committee chair* and add *and confirmed by majority vote of the standing committee*. Vote taken. MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

Motion made by Supervisor Moynihan, seconded by Supervisor Van Dyck to approve as amended. Vote taken. MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

- a. **Resolution Authorizing Standing Committee to Create Sub or Ad Hoc Committee.**

No action taken.

11. **Ordinance to Amend Brown County Code Section 2.14 Regarding Parliamentary Procedure – Only Allow One Motion Amendment to be Considered at a Time.**

Motion made by Supervisor Moynihan, seconded by Supervisor Sieber to amend ordinance as presented by changing *Section 2.05(8)* to *Section 2.14(10)* in Section 1. Vote taken. **MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY**

Motion made by Supervisor Moynihan, seconded by Supervisor Sieber to approve as amended. Vote taken. **MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY**

Supervisor Buckley was dismissed at 7:56 pm.

Internal Auditor

12. **Board of Supervisors Budget Status Financial Report (Unaudited) & Veterans Recognition Subcommittee Budget Status Financial Report (Unaudited) – November 2018.**

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

13. **Status Update: December 1 – December 31, 2018.**

Internal Auditor Dan Process noted there are dollars remaining in the County Board budget for tablets that will be carried forward and there is also a carryover in the Veterans' Recognition Subcommittee budget related to a donation.

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

Corporation Counsel

14. **Corporation Counsel Oral Report.**

No action taken.

Department of Administration & Human Resources

15. **Director of Administration Report.**

Weinger invited the Committee to the cost allocation plan which deals with the process of chargebacks. If more than three Supervisors wish to attend, he will do the appropriate documentation for an open meeting.

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

16. **Budget Status Over/Under Report as of November 2018.**

Weinger informed this is trending well, although final figures from Health and Human Services have not been received yet.

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

17. Human Resources Report.

Weininger said he is working with HR staff on an employee policy manual and this is going efficiently. From a staffing level, the HR department is fully staffed with generalists but is looking for an assistant generalist which is more of a clerical position. They have brought in some people who have good experience that are currently learning the system and doing well. There is no interim HR Director at this time and Weininger said departments are supposed to work with the generalists and then if there are issues they can go to the senior generalist and from there to an HR manager. The goal is to have the assistants and generalists be able to talk about benefits so they can cover all HR issues with employees which should provide better quality of services. They are also doing mandatory monthly training on a number of topics.

With regard to the class and comp, Weininger is looking for some feedback and thoughts from the Committee. This information was also presented at Administration Committee. With regard to the class piece, the department heads are in the process of signing off after double checking the information regarding job descriptions and wage range.

The comp piece is more complex. Weininger recalled that there is \$800,000 set aside for this. The first thing he would like to do is set aside \$300,000 to move everyone that is below min up to min. The end goal is to keep everyone in market which would be somewhere between min and max.

Next Weininger would like to put \$100,000 in an account for market place adjustments. This would be used to adjust starting salaries when necessary to recruit for positions when the existing salary is not bringing in good applicants. In addition, this could be used to adjust salaries do reduce disparity in certain situations. This fund would also be used for flexibility in compression issues. The County has been very static in being flexible to meet the labor issues of the last several years and this fund would provide flexibility of that scenario as well.

One of the proposals for the remaining \$400,000 would be to use it to bring everyone who is at minimum up to a percentage of roughly 14 – 16%.

Moving forward, the plan would be to budget \$60,000 - \$100,000 for market based wage adjustments. The goal is to keep everyone in the market and there is a question as to what to do with everyone who is above max. The proposal would be to redline those positions but they would still get the COLA but it would be more like a bonus so it is not included in their base.

At this time these are just thoughts. Weininger met with department heads to talk through some of these scenarios and he feels what he just outlined allows for flexibility we have not had in the past and will fix a lot of the problems. Another idea is to do a legacy step system which allows for progression but would not cost anything additional to the County. This is something they will look at more for the 2020 budget.

The Committee was happy that there was a plan in place that the employees will be happy with. Weininger said when looking at the class they looked at the geographical region and found that no every county has similar positions. Sometimes they had to reach out to counties further away to find similar positions.

Van Dyck feels what is being proposed is good but he said there needs to be enough in the \$100,000 to make all the necessary adjustments and he is not sure \$100,000 is enough so there should be enough in the \$300,000 pot to supplement that. He does not necessarily like the legacy step program; he would rather see the steps based more on performance. Lund said it is not always the cost of bringing someone in; it is also about retention and keeping the good employees here.

Weininger will be working on finishing up the comp policies and then will send this all out to the department heads and then move it forward to the Administration Committee for review. He is also working on ideas of how to roll this all out to employees.

**Motion made by Supervisor Moynihan, seconded by Supervisor Van Dyck to receive and place on file. Vote taken.
MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY**

County Executive

18. County Executive's Report.

No report; no action taken.

Other

19. Such other matters as authorized by law.

Moynihan announced that Alicia and her husband Bob welcomed a baby girl into their family. Evie Patricia was born on January 4 and both she and Alicia are doing well.

Moynihan also advised that the Board Office has filled the part-time position and he would like to introduce the new employee at the next County Board meeting.

Sieber recalled he had mentioned that he would like to move oversight of the Brown County Housing Authority from Administrator Committee to PD& T and asked if that can be included in next month's agenda. Lund was agreeable to that. Sieber also feels this Committee should have a discussion as to what the appropriate committee is for Administration and HR to report to to alleviate the need for Weininger to attend two meetings. Lund noted that can also be included on the next agenda.

20. Adjourn.

Motion made by Supervisor Moynihan, seconded by Supervisor Erickson to adjourn at 8:26 pm. Vote taken.

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

Respectfully submitted,

Therese Giannunzio
Administrative Specialist

Brown County Code 2.13(5):

(a) Minutes of each meeting of the County Board and meetings of all County committees, commissions, boards, etc., whether in regular session, special session or closed session, shall be taken, transcribed in writing and filed with the County Board staff by the secretary of the committee, commission or board or other person so designated within 3 working days of the meeting. Closed session minutes should be limited to motions made and votes, if any taken, in closed session.

(b) Minutes of any closed session shall not be made available to the public until the reason for calling the closed session no longer exists as determined by the Chair of that closed session upon the advice of Corporation Counsel.

19.85 Exemptions. (1) Any meeting of a governmental body, upon motion duly made and carried, may be convened in closed session under one or more of the exemptions provided in this section. The motion shall be carried by a majority vote in such manner that the vote of each member is ascertained and recorded in the minutes. No motion to convene in closed session may be adopted unless the chief presiding officer announces to those present at the meeting at which such motion is made, the nature of the business to be considered at such closed session, and the specific exemption or exemptions under this subsection by which such closed session is claimed to be authorized. Such announcement shall become part of the record of the meeting. No business may be taken up at any closed session except that which relates to matters contained in the chief presiding officer's announcement of the closed session. A closed session may be held for any of the following purposes:

19.96 Penalty. Any member of a governmental body who knowingly attends a meeting of such body held in violation of this subchapter, or who, in his or her official capacity, otherwise violates this subchapter by some act or omission shall forfeit without reimbursement not less than \$25 nor more than \$300 for each such violation. No member of a governmental body is liable under this subchapter on account of his or her attendance at a meeting held in violation of this subchapter if he or she makes or votes in favor of a motion to prevent the violation from occurring, or if, before the violation occurs, his or her votes on all relevant motions were inconsistent with all those circumstances which cause the violation.

19.97 Enforcement. (1) This subchapter shall be enforced in the name and on behalf of the state by the attorney general or, upon the verified complaint of any person, by the district attorney of any county wherein a violation may occur. In actions brought by the attorney general, the court shall award any forfeiture recovered together with reasonable costs to the state; and in actions brought by the district attorney, the court shall award any forfeiture recovered together with reasonable costs to the county.

(6)