

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, January 11, 2016 in Room 200 of the Northern Building, 305 E. Walnut Street, Green Bay, Wisconsin.

Present: Chair Lund, Supervisors Patrick Moynihan, Bernie Erickson, Steven Fewell, John Van Dyck, Pat Evans, Pat Buckley

Also Present: Chad Weininger, Erik Pritzl, Tom Miller, Paul Zeller, Paula Burkhard, Jenny Hoffman, Maria Lasecki, Megan Reetz, Matt Kriese, Supervisor Robinson, Dave Ehlinger, other interested parties.

I. Call meeting to order.

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

II. Approve/modify agenda.

Motion made by Supervisor Erickson, seconded by Supervisor Evans to modify the agenda by moving Items 9, 10, 15, 16, 17, 18, 19 and 20 to follow comments from the public. Vote taken. MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

III. Approve/modify Minutes of December 7 and December 16, 2015.

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

Chair Lund noted the passing of Marvin Process, father of Internal Auditor Dan Process, with sadness. Marvin was 89 years old.

Comments from the Public. See comments from the public following Item 12.

Although shown in the proper format here, Items 9, 10, 15, 16, 17, 18, 19 and 20 were taken at this time.

Vacant Budgeted Positions (Request to Fill)

1. Child Support – Accounting Technician – Vacated 01/05/16.
2. Child Support – Child Support Clerk – Vacated 01/05/16.
3. Circuit Courts – Law Clerk – Vacated 01/08/16.
4. Human Services – Economic Support Specialist (x2) – Vacated 12/11/15 & 01/08/16.
5. Parks – Assistant Naturalist – Vacated 02/26/16.
6. Public Works (Facilities) – Housekeeper – Vacated 01/06/16.
7. Technology Services – Document Center Specialist – Vacated 12/11/15.

Motion made by Supervisor Moynihan, seconded by Supervisor Fewell to suspend the rules and take Items 1 – 7 together. Vote taken.

Ayes: Lund, Fewell, Evans, Moynihan, Van Dyck, Erickson

Nay: Buckley. **MOTION CARRIED 6 to 1**

Motion made by Supervisor Moynihan, seconded by Supervisor Fewell to approve Items 1 – 7. Vote taken.

Ayes: Lund, Fewell, Evans, Moynihan, Van Dyck, Erickson

Nay: Buckley. **MOTION CARRIED 6 to 1**

Legal Bills

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

Motion made by Supervisor Erickson, seconded by Supervisor Evans to pay. Vote taken. **MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY**

Treasurer

9. ACTION – Review, discussion, and setting of “Starting Bids” for tax deed properties for sale as follows:

<u>Parcel #</u>	<u>Municipality</u>	<u>Address</u>	<u>Min. Starting Bid</u>
21-1293-2	City of Green Bay	1739 Main Street	\$37,500
14-157	City of Green Bay	1274 Cherry Street	\$6,800
1-898	City of Green Bay	1322 S. Chestnut Avenue	\$5,700
2-661	City of Green Bay	519 Twelfth Avenue	\$6,300

Treasurer Paul Zeller indicated that these four parcels did not sell the first time they were up for sale and they are being brought back to attempt to sell again. He stated that the objective valuation opinions from the valuation company he uses are included in the agenda packet. Zeller said he can attempt to sell the parcels again at the minimum starting bids listed above, or a lower minimum price can be set or he can go back to past practice of putting the minimum starting bid at \$100.

Supervisor Erickson felt these parcels should be listed at the minimum bids shown above as he felt that this time of year may be better to sell real estate. If there are not successful sales at the minimum bids shown above, adjustments can be made to lower the minimum starting bid.

Motion made by Supervisor Van Dyck, seconded by Supervisor Fewell to list these parcels for sale at the suggested minimum bids. Vote taken. **MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY**

10. Discussion/Action re: Choosing a professional source to obtain “appraisal” of tax deed properties under Wis. Stat. 75.69.

Zeller stated that the provider of the evaluations he referenced earlier is no longer able to provide valuations at a fee to Brown County for insurance reasons. Zeller also referred to Wis. Stat. 75.69 which was included in the agenda packet, and stated that there is a direct statement in the Statutes which requires that every bid less than the appraised value of the property be rejected. He is proposing at this time to do a request for quotation to find someone to provide valuations. He would write the specifications for only Brown County appraisers to provide submittals. Zeller noted that Purchasing will write the documents based on what the Committee decides.

Motion made by Supervisor Fewell, seconded by Supervisor Erickson to proceed with a request for quotations. Vote taken. **MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY**

Resolutions, Ordinances

11. Resolution re: Adjustments to the 2015 Classification and Compensation Plan.
a) Objections by Department Heads.

Motion at November 9, 2015 special meeting: To show the employees current salary along with the low, the mid, and the high ranges; then include their requested classification, also showing the low, mid, and high rates as well as the fiscal impact. Appeals deadline to be one week on November 16, 2015, Class and Comp discussion to be brought before the January 11, 2016 Executive Committee meeting. Vote taken. Abstain: Evans. MOTION CARRIED 5 to 1.

Airport Director Tom Miller addressed the Committee. He indicated he is requesting reconsideration of the placement of the airport financial analyst and the airport administrative manager in the new classification and compensation plan.

With regard to the financial analyst, Miller directed the Committee's attention to the previous approval of the treasurer's office in the original packet received by the Committee in October or November. The financial analyst was moved to an administrative assistant II position and the reason given by the treasurer's office was that when the treasurer hired a chief deputy, many of the duties of the financial analyst were taken away from the position, thus changing the pay range. Miller then directed the Committee's attention to Item 15 in the current handout provided in the agenda packet, where the comments state that the position compares to the duties of the treasurer's financial specialist. However, the job comparison that was made by the airport staff was completed before the job duties were reassigned in the treasurer's office.

With regard to the airport administrative manager position, Miller directed the Committee's attention to the large packet received several months ago which contained the justification form developed to appeal the initial placement in the proposed plan. Under the approvals of the HR packet received in the agenda packet, Item 21, it shows HR had recommended this position be placed in pay range 11, and Miller also noted that HR had indicated that they would need to create a class specification specific to the airport administrative manager position as there was no comparable position in the County.

Miller stated he continues to support the placement of the administrative manager in pay range 8 as originally appealed because of the duties and responsibilities associated with the position including direct supervision of the airport financial analyst which he is recommending for pay range 10.

Supervisor Buckley asked Miller if he had taken his concerns back to HR. Miller responded that he did and after discussing it with HR, HR indicated that they put the positions where they felt they should be. Buckley asked if there was anyone from HR available to discuss this at this meeting. Director of Administration Chad Weininger indicated that the HR analyst was not able to attend the meeting due to a family matter and that is why he had asked earlier that this matter be postponed.

Weininger continued that with regard to Item 14, the main issue was the level of education required for the position. With regard to Item 15, Weininger stated that his understanding from HR is that that position is comparable to the financial specialist position in the treasurer's office. Miller responded that there are no accounting duties or responsibilities included in the position as there is in the financial analyst position. The financial analyst is responsible for the airport's accounting. Miller added that if you use the class specs that were created by Wipfli as well as the job description for the airport financial analyst, all of the duties performed by the financial analyst are included in the class spec created by Wipfli. Lund noted that the Committee does not have the full job description and Buckley stated that without all of the information it is going to be hard to make decisions on these matters. Miller noted that he had provided the job description in September in the PD & T meeting and that was distributed to the Committee at that time.

Motion made by Supervisor Erickson, seconded by Supervisor Evans to approve Items 14 and 15 of the Class & Comp Reconsideration Requests. *Motion withdrawn; no vote taken.*

Supervisor Buckley stated that he will have a hard time voting on anything tonight without seeing the HR end of this. He is not saying that the information is incorrect, but there are reasons for the denials and he wants to hear the reasons. Weininger noted that he had made it clear that the reason he wanted this matter postponed was because the senior analyst who worked on this under former HR Director Warren Kraft was not able to attend this meeting. Weininger stated he does not have exact detailed reasons for the denials other than what is specified in the documents he provided in the agenda packet. He noted that there are 90 class specs in front of the Committee encompassing 445 employees. He does not have details on all of those positions and that is why he asked that this item be postponed.

Erickson said he made his motion because he is familiar with the people in these positions and he knows what they do and he is very pleased with what they do. That knowledge makes him comfortable with regard to these two positions, but he does not have the same knowledge on most of the other positions. Erickson felt he was speaking for the Committee when he said that he is not comfortable with the Committee juggling the futures of the people in the room as well as those who were unable to attend. He does not want to make the wrong decisions and he does not want to jump in and make a blanket decision either. Supervisor Moynihan echoed what Erickson and Buckley said.

Motion made by Supervisor Moynihan, seconded by Supervisor Buckley to approve HR recommendations effective January 31, 2016, further, direct HR and the new HR Director to review those requests which were denied or modified and thoroughly review and return final recommendations to the Executive Committee at the first opportunity. Vote taken.

Ayes: Erickson, Lund, Moynihan, Van Dyck, Fewell, Buckley

Nay: Evans MOTION CARRIED 6 TO 1

Moynihan realizes that this sounds like passing the buck, but felt that it would allow the due diligence to be done on the requests and he felt that it was the fair thing to do for the employees. He noted that the Board could have rubber stamped the denials, but they did not feel that was appropriate. Moynihan continued that not all supervisors have familiarity with all of the positions and he does not see this process working right now as had been hoped.

Supervisor Fewell thanked Miller for appearing at the meeting to speak on behalf of his employees. He would like to see department heads come before the Committee because if the department heads are in support of changes and will fight for that, he wants to hear it. Fewell will also listen to what HR has to say, but he does want to hear from the department heads. He felt that employees are being put in a bad place by having to come to all of these meetings and then being put off.

Supervisor Van Dyck felt that there was a well-intentioned attempt to create an avenue of appeal for what was anticipated to be a few exceptions. Unfortunately it has exploded to something that is truly not manageable at this level in this format. He noted that there are 90 denials that need to be considered. His point is that this subject matter needs to be dealt with by the administration, HR and the department heads at budget time and not in isolation by the Executive Committee in January. Van Dyck continued that this may not be the perfect plan and needs to be tweaked. The alternative is to throw the plan away and go back to the old process of reclassification; however, that will not benefit anyone in the crowd. He continued that there has at least been an attempt to have some kind of internal equity among positions. He felt that solving some problems creates other problems and he does not know where this will end. Van Dyck does not think we can look at all of these positions in isolation and felt there has to be an overall full plan that is improved. He realizes that an overall plan would not be perfect and would need tweaks as time goes on, but in his opinion trying to do these one by one is going to create a bigger mess than we already have and for those reasons he will support Moynihan's motion.

Supervisor Evans stated he understands the motion and can live with most of it. He stated that he has met with Human Services and some employees and this reminds him how people got excited about Act 10 because there was going to be a way of holding down costs in government, but we found out that that did not work. He indicated that people on other County Boards are going through the same thing in other counties. This shows how ill-equipped our management was or is in handling a large organization, versus taking it out of how a union environment was to bring it into a non-union environment. Evans continued that people are struggling with this and there are different comparables as well as a different person doing the analysis and it is very messed up. He can see how the employees are frustrated and can understand it. Evans feels that not all employees that are requesting to get a pay raise deserve it, but the process that has come to this point has been detrimental to the employees. He continued that the number one goal of business is to ensure happy and productive employees. If employees are happy, then the clients will be happy and well served. Evans does not see that this plan is really working for the employees. It seems to him that over the past few years the only way the County is able to

manage the budget is by taking things away from employees and he does not like doing this as it is not fair for an employee that comes to work and then is derogated. Evans continued that it is akin to supporting a pay raise for the County Board because he values what they do. Evans said that if there is a group of people who do not value what the County Board does, it will fall on the employees and he finds this sad and upsetting. He will not support the motion at this time. Evans continued that he does not have a lot of faith in the HR department and referenced the lack of continuity as a factor. He cannot support this at this time and indicated that he feels bad for the employees as he feels they are being taken advantage of. He said there were some employees that probably should be denied, but also felt that there are more employees that because of improper management are being taken advantage of and he does not like that.

Buckley stated there are a number of employees in the room and he struggles when the Committee is put in a position to negotiate directly with the employees. He felt that department heads should be fully capable of doing this and he thanked Miller for coming forward to fight for his employees. Buckley continued that there is a process during the budget process where this could be done. Additionally, he felt that instability in the HR department is a factor in this and he felt long-term leadership is needed in the HR Department to provide direction. For the Committee to go through every one of these denials and make decisions, it is circumventing the entire process so the process might as well be wiped out. Buckley does have faith in the department heads and feels that they are the ones that should be here fighting for their employees. He feels that this is a process, although it may not be a perfect process, but based on what he has seen, the process needs to be improved. He does not want to throw out the whole process, but he wants to see the process refined. The process is better than what we had, but there is room for improvement. Until Buckley has further information, he would like to see the ones approved as stated in Moynihan's motion and then continue to work on the others.

Weininger noted that he would have a resolution drafted reflecting Moynihan's motion for the January County Board meeting. Fewell asked for clarification on the approval of some of the positions. Weininger responded that HR recommended some approvals. He noted that part of the problem is that the burden of the proof is on the individual employees and he felt that was one of the flaws of the process in that decisions were made on information provided by the employees. The motion that Moynihan made will now allow HR to look at each of the denials in greater detail. Moynihan clarified that his motion relates to all approvals since the initial approvals in October, 2015.

Buckley questions if because of the changeover in the HR department, it would behoove the County to bring someone in with an HR background to assist in reviewing these and help expedite the process. Weininger responded he felt the current staff has done their job after researching specific job descriptions and he would not suggest going back over them.

Van Dyck concurred with Buckley and going back to what Evans said, he agrees that one of the issues that we have is the fact that the guidance that was provided by the union contracts was eliminated with Act 10 and there was nothing put in place to take the place of that. This is no fault to the department heads and they are being thrown into an area they have never had to deal with before and they have not had a lot of help in figuring this out. He would agree that going back to Wipfli is not the best answer, but he sees benefits in reaching out to the community and looking for someone with a business perspective from a larger corporation that could come in and administer in an advisory capacity to try to help get this thing structured not only for the few jobs being talked about but for the whole thing in general so we could get some confidence that it has been put together in a proper format. Van Dyck thinks we should admit that it is broken, and that we don't have all of the answers and then spend some money and reach out to get someone to help us get this in place instead of plodding along for another six months.

Weininger stated that the new HR Director will start on February 8, but in the meantime, he could reach out to a few firms that do this to see if they are willing to come in and look at the denials and research them and make some recommendations.

Erickson commented that there has been good discussion on this issue and apologized to those in attendance. He noted that the Committee is not intentionally trying to put this off. He stated that the agenda packet the Committee receives has very little information on which to base decisions regarding the employees' futures and he does not feel this is fair to the employees. To base decisions on the little information the Committee gets makes no sense to him.

A question was raised as to if approvals would be retroactive back to the first of the year since this matter has been going on for so long. Weinger responded that that would be up to the Board. Weinger said that if the Board were to approve all of the requests, the cost would be roughly \$400,000. Moving everyone up one grade would be roughly \$700,000. Weinger continued that if the Board is looking at this for the 2017 budget, they would like to have HR or an independent local group look at the positions, do the research and make recommendations to be included in the 2017 budget. Erickson felt that the direction we should be going is with someone who has a little more knowledge and then deal with the department heads. If necessary, as a last resort the Committee could deal with the employees. Erickson would like to see the new HR manager put this as a top priority on her list and he feels the sooner this is implemented the better. He also indicated he would stick around after the meeting to talk to any employees who desired to do so.

Robinson stated that there are some positions that are partially approved, but partially denied and he would like to see those positions that are not fully approved be reviewed.

Reports

12. County Executive Report.

a) Budget Status Financial Report for November, 2015.

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

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

-Mike Buhr, 5992 Langes Corners Road, Denmark, Wisconsin

Buhr stated that he is the fleet superintendent in the Highway Department and he is here to speak on behalf of the mechanics who received a 1% raise instead of a 2% raise due to the way the raises were computed. Buhr provided the Committee with a handout, a copy of which is attached. He directed the Committee's attention to the highlighted portion on Page 3. The part that Buhr wishes to point out is that the HR memo specifies 2015, but HR used 2016 to determine wages. Buhr also referred the Committee's attention to the highlighted section of Page 4 of the handout. The final page of the handout shows where the mechanics are. If the 2015 pay is divided by market, it comes to 102.69%. If the 2016 pay is divided by the market, it comes to 104.74% which was rounded up to 105%.

Buhr continued that the November 10 memo stated that the 2015 pay would be used. If the 2016 pay was going to be used, Buhr felt the market value should also go up a certain amount for inflation. He does not think it is right to use the 2015 data for the market and then the 2016 data to determine wages. Additionally, Buhr said that the December memo states at least 105% but 104.74% is not 105%. The way they got a 1% raise instead of the 2% raise was to use the 2016 data and round up. It seemed to Buhr that HR worked very hard to lower the pay increase by 1%. He concluded that the mechanics respectfully request the Board change the way wage increases are computed by using 2015 numbers and making sure that the wages do not lower to 1% until at least 105% like stated in the December memo.

Lund thanked Buhr for his comments but indicated that the Committee cannot take any action on this as it was not on the agenda. Lund stated that he will include this matter on next month's agenda for the Executive Committee.

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

13. Internal Auditor Report.

- a) Board of Supervisors Budget Status Financial Report for November, 2015.
- b) Monthly Status Update: December 1 – December 31, 2015.

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

14. Human Resources Report.

Interim HR Director Chad Weinger indicated that the new HR Director will be starting on February 8. Additionally, the Wellness Committee has been meeting and doing some good work.

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

Other

15. Open Session: Discussion and possible action regarding the contract negotiations for the 2016 PEA Labor Agreement.

16. Closed Session: Discussion and possible action regarding the contract negotiations for the 2016 PEA Labor Agreement. Notice is hereby given that the governmental body will adjourn into a closed session during the meeting on the above date, as authorized pursuant to section 19.85(1)(e) of the Wisconsin Statutes, for the purpose of deliberating or negotiating the purchase of public properties, the investing of public funds or conducting other specified public business, whenever competitive or bargaining reasons require a closed session, which bargaining is pursuant to Wis. Stat. §111.70 for purposes of negotiating and collective bargaining said agreement.

**Motion made by Supervisor Erickson, seconded by Supervisor Evans to move into closed session on Items 16 & 19. Roll Call Vote Taken:
Ayes: Evans, Erickson, Lund, Moynihan, Buckley, Fewell
Nay: Van Dyck. MOTION CARRIED 6 to 1**

Motion made by Supervisor Erickson, seconded by Supervisor Evans to return to regular order of business. Roll Call Vote Taken: Ayes: Evans, Erickson, Lund, Moynihan, Buckley, Fewell, Van Dyck. MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

17. Reconvene in Open Session: Discussion and possible action regarding the contract negotiations for the PEA Labor Agreement.

Motion made by Supervisor Moynihan, seconded by Supervisor Erickson to approve the recommendation as presented by administration. Vote taken. MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

18. Open Session: Discussion and possible action regarding the contract negotiations for the Non-Supervisory Deputy Sheriff's Labor Agreement.

19. Closed Session: Discussion and possible action regarding the contract negotiations for the Non-Supervisory Deputy Sheriff's Labor Agreement. Notice is hereby given that the governmental body will adjourn into a closed session during the meeting on the above date, as authorized pursuant to

Section 19.85 (1)(e) of the Wisconsin Statutes, for the purpose of deliberating or negotiating the purchase of public properties, the investing of public funds or conducting other specified public business, whenever competitive or bargaining reasons require a closed session, which bargaining is pursuant to Wis. Stat. §111.70 for purposes of negotiating and collective bargaining said agreement. See action at Item 16 above.

- 20. Reconvene in Open Session: Discussion and possible action regarding the contract negotiations for the Non-Supervisory Deputy Sheriff's Labor Agreement.**

Motion made by Supervisor Moynihan, seconded by Supervisor Erickson to approve the recommendation as presented by administration. Vote taken. MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

- 21. Such other matters as authorized by law.**

Supervisor Moynihan stated that one of the speakers at the November Executive Committee meeting, Dick Powers, wished it noted that the minutes say he *had* been an employee at the Airport, but he remains at the Airport therefore currently *is* an employee.

- 22. Adjourn.**

Motion made by Supervisor Moynihan, seconded by Supervisor Buckley to adjourn at 6:47 pm. Vote taken. MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

Respectfully submitted,

Therese Giannunzio
Recording Secretary

HUMAN RESOURCES DEPARTMENT

Brown County

305 E. WALNUT STREET
P.O. BOX 23600
GREEN BAY, WI 54305-3600



WARREN P. KRAFT

PHONE (920) 448-4071 FAX (920) 448-6277 WEB: www.co.brown.wi.us

DIRECTOR

DATE: 10 November 2015

SUBJECT: County Board Approved Health Insurance and Wages for 2016

On Wednesday, November 04, the County Board approved two actions that impact County employees. The supervisors formally adopted the 2016 Health Insurance plan as recommended by the Executive Committee. They also approved a wage increase for all general employees, not covered by labor agreements, and suspended for next year the pay-for-performance module of the Classification and Compensation Plan. (Note that this action does NOT affect the current evaluation process and pay-for-performance bonus for this year.)

Insurance Matters

Please note that **Open Enrollment** begins **this week** with the first two employee meetings, this Friday, November 13, at 10AM and 1PM at the Neville Public Museum, 210 Museum Place. There will be another presentation for all employees next Monday, November 16 at 3:15 PM at the Syble Hopp School, 755 Scheuring Rd., De Pere. *Please check with your supervisor to see if you can attend one of these presentations.*

If you are unable to attend one of the presentations listed above, it will be recorded and posted on the Intranet for employees to view at their convenience. An email will be sent to notify employees once the presentation is available on the Intranet.

Look for the informational packet in your mail, sent next week to all benefit-eligible employees' homes. It will contain important information related to 2016 benefit plans, as well as instructions on how to enroll online, and enrollment forms for those benefits that cannot be enrolled in online.

Summary of the Approved Insurance Plan

- *The 2016 overall premium remains unchanged from this year.* The employee premium will remain at a 12% contribution rate, as it is currently, for employees who participate in the Personal Health Assessments (PHA). Employees who choose not to participate in a PHA will have a premium payment at 17%.
- HRA (Health Reimbursement Account) amounts will be tiered based on an employee's PHA score.
 - Employees ranked in the **Gold** tier will receive the full amount of HRA dollars provided (\$1050 for single, \$2100 family).
 - Employees ranked in the **Silver** tier will receive 80% of HRA dollars provided (\$840 for single, \$1680 family).
 - Employees ranked in the **Bronze** tier will receive 60% of HRA dollars provided (\$630 for single, \$1260 family).

*Comments from
the Public*

- Employees ranked in the **Standard Participant** tier will receive 40% of HRA dollars provided (\$420 for single, \$840 family).
 - Employees ranked in the **Tobacco** tier will receive 20% of HRA dollars provided (\$210 for single, \$420 family).
 - Employees who choose not to participate in the PHA will have a premium contribution of 17% and will have an HRA amount of \$630 for single and \$1260 for family.
- *Additionally, there is no change to the HRA dollars.* Employees will continue to have the opportunity to earn HRA dollars, up to the full amount at the Gold tier (\$1050 for single, \$2100 for family), by participating in the Reasonable Alternative Standards (RAS). RAS goals will be established by working with a Health Coach to create specific health goals. Reasonable Alternative Standards will be participation-based, meaning that employees who elect to pursue these goals will have to engage and participate in the goals established. They will be expected to participate in the activities established with the Health Coach. Once participation is completed, employees will receive points for achieving those specific goals. *Employees may begin working on their RAS after January 2, 2016.*
 - Please note that **FastCare** remains in place for 2016 and is free to all benefit eligible employees, and to all employees who take the County's health insurance, plus their spouse and dependents. These facilities are located inside ShopKo stores throughout the Green Bay area. Otherwise, the Board approved an increase to \$15 copay if an employee, spouse or dependent uses another medical provider's urgent care facility.
 - The Board approved a change to **Short Term Disability**. The plan will pay 50% of wages beginning January 01, 2016.
 - New for 2016: HRA dollars will accumulate beyond the deductible and will not be capped for 2016. Those dollars, which will not rollover into VEBA accounts, can be used for deductible and copays. Those employees who have VEBA accounts will keep their accounts and become responsible for the administrative fees associated with their personal accounts. The County will maintain the HRA dollars on the employees' behalf.
 - New for 2016: Wellness dollars accumulated in the year earned qualify for Section 213(d) expenses, similar to money that the employee sets aside in a Medical Flexible Spending Account (FSA). Unused Wellness Dollars will roll over to the HRA and can be used for deductible and copays once in the employee's HRA account. There is no change for the Flexible Spending Account, in that employees use this set-aside money for claims arising in the year of savings, provided that claims are submitted to EBC on or before March 31 of the succeeding year. (For example, claims for 2016 flexible spending dollars must be filed by March 31, 2017, to qualify for reimbursement.) There is still a \$500 carryover of unused FSA dollars into the subsequent year.
 - Though it does not immediately affect current employees, the Board also approved an annual incremental premium increase of 8.7% for retirees on the County's health plan for each of the next five years, over and above any general yearly premium increase to the plan.

Comments from
The Public

Summary of 2016 Wage Increases

For next year only according to its motion, the Board suspended the pay-for-performance module in the 2015 Classification and Compensation Plan. It created a sliding wage increase scale of 3%-2%-1%-.05%, depending on where the employee's rate of pay currently falls within the salary range established for that employee's position. *(Please note that this impacts only general employees who are not represented by a union. Those unions will collectively bargain their own wage adjustments.)* The intent is to bring employee compensation as close to market as possible. The wage adjustment will be implemented with the first paycheck in February 2016, retroactive to 01-01-2016. Because these adjustments are unique to each employee, Payroll is working closely with Finance to apply the Board's parameters. It is too early to advise each employee what her/his specific 2016 wage will be.

These are the criteria which the Board adopted:

1. Firstly, if an employee's current pay is below the minimum established for that position, dollars are to be applied to bring that compensation to minimum rate of pay.
2. All employees will receive a minimum 1% increase unless the pay is above market as established by the 2015 Classification and Compensation Plan.
3. The Implementation Plan, approved last month, used a grid that placed an employee's current pay within the pay range, called a quintile. The Board directed that the percentage of pay increase be based within which quintile the employee's 2015 pay lies.
 - a. Employees whose pay is between 80% and 96% of the market rate established for the position shall receive a 3% increase.
 - b. Generally, employees who pay is between 97% and 104% will receive a 2% increase.
 - c. Employees who pay is between 105-120% will receive a 1% increase.
 - d. Employees above the maximum rate of pay established for the job classification will receive 0.5% increase

Thank you for taking the time to stay informed by reading this letter. If you have any questions about health insurance please ask them during the open enrollment meetings or by calling the benefit provider directly using the numbers listed in your enrollment booklet. If you have any questions about 2016 wage increases, please hold those questions until Human Resources and Finance can calculate the impact on each employee.

cc: Brown County Executive
Brown County Board of Supervisors

Comments from
the Public.

From: BC_Human_Resources
Sent: Friday, December 11, 2015 2:45 PM
Subject: 2016 Wage Adjustment Information

By the end of December, all non-represented employees should be notified of their adjusted rate of pay for 2016 as a result of the wage adjustment adopted by the County Board at the November meeting. The wage adjustments will be effective as of 1/1/16.

The goal of the wage adjustment was to assign a salary percentage increase to move employees closer to their market wage.

Because whole numbers were used, any calculation that did not result in a whole number had to be rounded to the nearest whole number. For example, numbers that fall between percentile 96% and 97% were rounded to the nearest whole percent, so 96.3% was rounded to 96%, and 96.6% was rounded to 97%.

Below is a summary of the calculation methodology.

Step One – If the employee was below the minimum pay value for their current position grade, they were increased to the minimum pay value for that grade (i.e. 80% of market)

Step Two – The employee's current rate of pay was calculated as a percentage of the market rate for their pay grade .

- If the percentage was 80% - 96%, the employee received a 3% increase.
- If the percentage was 97% - 104%, the employee received a 2% increase
- If the percentage was 105% - 120%, the employee received a 1% increase.
- If the percentage was over 120%, the employee received a 0.5% increase.

Step Three – The employee's new rate of pay was calculated as a percentage of the market for their paygrade. If the employee was now above market (i.e. at least 105%), the wage increase percentage previously applied was lowered by 1%. Again, the goal of the wage adjustment was to get employees' salaries to market.

Thank you for taking the time to review this communication.

Brown County Human Resources

PLEASE POST THIS INFORMATION FOR EMPLOYEES WITHOUT COMPUTER ACCESS.

2015 Mechanic Pay = \$23.28

Pay Grade 13:

<u>Min.</u>	<u>Market</u>	<u>Max</u>
\$18.14	\$22.67	\$27.21

$$\$23.28/\$22.67 = \boxed{102.69\%}$$

80% - 96% = 3% increase

$\boxed{97\% - 104\%} = \underline{2\% \text{ increase}}$ ←

105% - 120% = 1% increase

Over 120% = 0.5% increase

If you use a 2016 pay rate: $\$23.28 \times 1.02 = \23.7456

$\$23.7456/\$22.67 = 104.74\%$ (This number was then rounded up to 105%).

Our 2% pay increase was lowered to 1%.

We respectfully request the Board change the way downtown computed the wage increases to use 2015 wages like the November memo stated and make sure that wages won't be lowered to 1% until at least 105%, like the December memo stated.

*Comments from
the Public*