Pursuant to Section 19.84 Wis. Stats., a regular meeting of the Brown County Executive Committee was held on Wednesday, January 6, 2021 in the Auditorium of the Brown County Central Library, 515 Pine Street, Green Bay, Wisconsin.

Present: Chair Sieber, Supervisor Landwehr, Supervisor Borchardt (for Supervisor Brusky), Supervisor Schadewald, Supervisor Deneys, Supervisor Van Dyck, Supervisor Buckley

Excused: Supervisor Brusky

Also Present: Director of Administration Chad Weininger, Corporation Counsel Dave Hemery, Internal Auditor Dan Process, ADRC Director Devon Christenson, Supervisor Dorff, Supervisor Lund, Supervisor Lefebvre, Supervisor Coenen, Public Health Officer Anna Destree, Director of Health and Human Services Erik Pritzl, Museum Director Beth Lemke, Deputy Executive Jeff Flynt, other interested parties

I. Call meeting to order.

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

II. Approve/modify agenda.

Motion made by Supervisor Borchardt, seconded by Supervisor Landwehr to take Items 3 & 4 together and Items 5 & 6 together. Vote taken. MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY


Motion made by Supervisor Borchardt, seconded by Supervisor Schadewald to approve. Vote taken. MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

Comments from the Public. None.

1. Review Minutes of: None.

Communications

2. Communication from Supervisor Deneys: Amend Chapter 2 of the Brown County Ordinances to require that if a Chair of the County Board or Committee elects to have a meeting and allows for public comments via US postal service mail or email for said meeting, that said public comments received through these methods shall be read into the record by the Chair during the public comments section of the meeting. Action at October 2020 Executive Committee: To hold until subsequent Executive Committee meeting.

Motion made by Supervisor Deneys, seconded by Supervisor Schadewald to hold until subsequent Executive Committee meeting. Vote taken. MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

3. Communication from Supervisor Lefebvre: Please review and advise on the resolution from Health and Human Services Committee – “Racism as Health Issue”. Referred from December County Board.

Note: Items 3 & 4 were taken together and all discussion and action related to these Items is set forth at Item 4 below.

4. Communication from Supervisor Lefebvre re: I am asking the Human Service/County Board adopt the following NACO resolution the Executive Committee passed, urging the Federal Government to - Declare Racism a National Public Health Crisis -

1. Assert that racism is a public health crisis affecting our entire country.
2. Leverage a racial equity lens in evaluating federal policy.
3. Develop relevant policies aimed at improving health and economic opportunity in communities of color and;
4. Support local, state and federal initiatives that advance social justice.  

**Action at November Human Services:**

i. To approve the Resolution “Racism is a Public Health Crisis” provided by Supervisor Chu and forward to the County Board.  
No vote taken.

ii. To modify the resolution to strike current points 2 – 6 and add new point number 2.  
Create a subcommittee/work group, inclusive of community advocates, to identify ways Brown County government can address racism in its work.

iii. To approve as amended.

Supervisor Lefebvre informed she took the language in Item 4 from NACO and it came from their Executive Board meeting last fall. She would like to hear from Supervisor Chu who sent a resolution to the Committee, a copy of which is attached. Chu’s resolution asks for an ad hoc committee to be formed to look at this issue.

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

**Abby Ringle,** 2042 Memorial Drive, Green Bay, WI

Ringle spoke as follows:  
Today we sit on the precipice of history. We declare that all men are created equally and afforded life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness, but that simply is untrue for people who do not look like the majority of us in this room. Today we have seen white privilege unfold at our Capitol. White men and white women have stormed our very seed of democracy – the democracy that we promise to uphold. Yet every day our black, brown and indigenous brothers and sisters are killed for much less. This is the cleanest picture of white privilege I have ever seen, and yet I have heard individuals in this very room say that there is no such thing and that we do not have a racism problem in Brown County. I am here to tell you we have a racism problem in this country. Today is the day that we, the community of Brown County, declare publicly that racism is a real and dangerous health crisis. Today, we as a community need to start the hard work of dismantling the systems that deprive our black, brown and indigenous brothers and sisters of their inalienable rights. We demand as a community the immediate action in the formation of this committee to look into these issues. Today Brown County will stand on the right side of history and we will move forward with life, liberty and justice for all. We the people demand this.  Thank you.

**Kelly Delveaux,** 716 Chapel View Road, Green Bay, WI

Delveaux spoke as follows: I echo all of the sentiments that Ms. Ringle just spoke of. I was appalled to watch today as people breached the center of our democracy and yes, there was one woman who was shot but the majority of people with their acts of aggression were not met with tear gas, they were not met with rubber bullets, they were not met with giant sound blasting or military based vehicles. We have seen across this country black people, indigenous people, brown people trying to protest for their basic human civil rights. I watched live as they were kneeling in silence being shot with tear gas, shot with rubber bullets and they were not storming the Capitol. Brown County has been predominantly white until the last 20 years. I was a teacher in the Green Bay Public School District starting in 1995 and at that time we had in-services that our fastest rising minority population was Hispanic. At that time when I started teaching in our schools, approximately 7% percent of our students were minority. That has changed drastically in the last 30 years and we haven’t caught up with the times. I remember my grandfather who was born and raised in Brown County saying if you are black you are either a Packer player or passing through. That is not the case anymore, yet we still have some people in this community that still hold that mentality. This summer protesting, the amount of hate that I was met with as a white grandma peacefully protesting to have people come into my face, hit me with their vehicle, simply for saying “black lives matter” and “all lives cannot matter until black lives matter” was abhorrent. We have an issue in this community and it crosses every spectrum from education to healthcare to housing to economics and it has to stop, and it starts with you guys. It starts with our elected officials. I hope you received a letter earlier today from Women of Wisconsin Equity Coalition that runs through some of the statistics. We can deny it all we want, but until we form a committee and look at the actual numbers, we cannot say it does not exist. That is a pipedream. It does exist. As elected officials, you guys have a duty to your constituents and the people of this community to take a hard look at it because until we acknowledge there is an issue, nothing will change. Thank you.
Oscar spoke as follows: I am a founder and psychologist at We All Rise African American Resource Center, a nonprofit here in Green Bay. We were funded by the government starting at the end of 2019. I have been a community member for several years and I have also been a part of the dismantling racism team through the Fox Valley. I think you are all aware of the statistics in Wisconsin. We are the worst state in the country for the wellbeing and education and thriving of African Americans. We are also home to the most segregated city in the US. Brown County is no different; this is a fact and something we can argue. In my experience, the last year founding this organization and then building it, we started out with one grant and 4 ½ staff and we now have 11 staff. We have huge organizations like the Packers reaching out to us to try to be a part of what we are doing. We have volunteers and community members every day wanting to be a part of what we are doing. We have just blown up this year. That is clear evidence that this is an issue the people in Brown County are seeing and the people in Brown County think that we are needed, and these issues need to be taken seriously. It is right in front of our faces and I am asking that you all take a look at that.

Christenson spoke from written notes, a copy of which are attached.

Gerlach spoke as follows: I am a member of the Green Bay Common Council representing District 3. I applaud you for taking this up and I definitely encourage you to support this resolution. I was a co-sponsor of a very similar resolution declaring racism a public health crisis in the City of Green Bay a few months ago and it was successful. This evening I would like to quickly share with you a few of the statistics I shared with the Common Council before we took our vote. In Brown County, a black woman is 21% less likely than a white woman to receive healthcare in the first trimester of her pregnancy. Black residents in Brown County are twice as likely to suffer a premature death than our white residents. In Brown County, white citizens live on average 16 years longer than black citizens and 18 years longer than Hispanic citizens. An African American baby born in Wisconsin is less likely to be born at a healthy weight and less likely to live to age one than an African American baby born in any other state in the union. I cannot believe that as a Wisconsin native. According to 2018 data, although 11% of white citizens here in Brown County live in poverty, 72% of Pacific Islanders in Green Bay live in poverty, 46% of Green Bay’s Black population lives in poverty, 33% of our Native population lives in poverty and 23% of our Hispanic neighbors live in poverty. Although Black citizens make up only 2.5% of our population, they represent 27% of our homeless population. A black citizen in Brown County is 10 times more likely to be incarcerated than a white citizen and a Native American is more than five times more likely to be incarcerated than a white citizen. I tell you these things because when I left Green Bay I worked in community health and I learned about social determinants of health. Until the social determinants of health are addressed, we do not have a healthy community and that is why we need to face the fact that racism is a public health crisis.

Motion made by Supervisor Landwehr, seconded by Supervisor Borchardt to close the floor and return to regular order of business. Vote taken. MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

Supervisor Chu informed she did not have a lot to add other than what has been discussed at previous meetings and what is in her proposed resolution. She advised the resolution is a place to start and a working draft and added that people are doing all kinds of work on this subject in the community and it has been compelling.

Supervisor Schadewald also provided a draft resolution, a copy of which is attached. It is very similar to Chu’s draft, but suggests the title of the resolution be changed to “achieving health equity in Brown County”. Schadewald’s concern is that if people want to say racism is a public health crisis, they want the Public Health Department to fix racism. The Health Department has their hands full right now with COVID. Schadewald also deleted the ninth whereas in Chu’s resolution which states, “Public Health’s responsibilities to address racism including reshaping our discourse and agenda so that we all actively engage in racial justice work”. Schadewald does not want to confuse Public Health with working on racism because people will gain the idea that this is just a public health issue, but it is also a social and economic issue. This has to do with poverty, availability of health insurance, access and education – all things that he believes in. Schadewald continued that it is not the role of the Board to fix state or federal issues; our role is to look at what we can do in our county and the formation of an ad hoc committee sounds like a great step. He left in all of Chu’s other
language, but the title “Racism is a Public Health Crisis” is not something he can adhere to. Schadewald feels “achieving health equity” is a better title for the resolution. He does not want to say racism is a public health crisis because he feels it limits the scope of what we are really trying to achieve. He would prefer laser minded focus and looking at Brown County and what is done here and having a committee look at our systems here. Schadewald supports the goals, objectives and committee and achieving health equity in Brown County and focusing on racism as an issue we have to deal with, instead of calling it a health crisis.

Chu does not have an objection to Schadewald’s proposed title and the striking of whereas 9 and whereas 10. She is also okay with striking the third therefore be it further resolved and added that she also wants to be laser focused and wants the people at the table to start tackling these issues. She has heard people acknowledge the complexity of this and she knows there is not one single solution and we have to find out what is meaningful and doable. Chu recommends that the first therefore be it resolved remain in the document. She does not feel this would complicate the role of the Public Health Department because she feels we have cleared that up in discussions that this is beyond what the Health Department does and Schadewald’s proposed title makes it less confusing.

Supervisor Dorff thanked those who spoke on this topic and indicated she appreciates the statistics that were shared and listening to the speakers’ points of view on how racism is affecting the health of those in Brown County. The statistics are there and there is no question that racism is having these effects on people. As representatives, Dorff feels the very least we can do is acknowledge that this is the reality many of our constituents are facing and we owe it to them to acknowledge that. She agrees that some type of committee to dig further into this would be really helpful, especially because there is such a lack of diversity on the Board so it is important to make opportunities to lift up more voices from people who are underrepresented on the Board so they can have a goal to see how we can do better. Dorff urged the Committee to pass this resolution.

Supervisor Van Dyck is looking at this from a different position. He feels it is unfair to have things dropped on our desk on the night of a meeting and then be expected to vote on it. There is a process that is supposed to be followed and in this case, it was not followed. He understands this was discussed at Human Services Committee but in looking at the agenda packet for the November Human Services Committee meeting, this item is on the agenda, but there is nothing in the packet on this resolution. The minutes from that meeting do not include any resolution either. The minutes talk about some changes made to a resolution, but there is no resolution included. There was not anything to read to prepare for tonight’s meeting and there was nothing in the agenda for tonight’s Executive Committee meeting to read to prepare for this either. Van Dyck would like to see this held until next month and added that he is not trying to delay anything, but he thinks it is unfair that stuff gets dropped on our desk and then we are expected to vote on it. He feels this information should have been included in the agenda packet. He has been very consistent in the past that if something is dropped on his desk the night of the meeting, he is not going to vote on it and if this comes to a vote tonight, he will abstain. Van Dyck continued that there was not a resolution available at the December Board meeting either. The usual process for resolutions is that it is passed at the committee level, is referred to Corporation Counsel to be put in the proper format and then comes back to the committee for review and then the committee either passes it or not. He does not have a problem discussing this tonight, but he will not vote on it.

Motion made by Supervisor Buckley, seconded by Supervisor Landwehr to send back to Human Services Committee. Motion withdrawn; no vote taken.

Supervisor Buckley feels this discussion needs to come out of Human Service Committee, not Executive Committee and he does not know how it ended up here. He does not feel Human Services Committee followed through on this as the resolution did not go to County Board. The discussion really needs to take place at Human Services and it needs to be vetted there and then referred to Corporation Counsel to be put in the proper format if that is the direction we go.

Supervisor Erickson feels the fact that the Board Chair does not know why this got referred to this Committee shows room for improvement, especially for citizens who came here to speak. She would like to know how this item was sent to Executive Committee. Sieber explained that as this item was discussed at Human Services Committee, it became a much bigger topic than just for Human Services. It was sent to the
Executive Committee because the resolution will affect the entire county. Sieber feels Executive Committee is the proper place for this to be taken up. If the Committee wants to refer this, he feels the appropriate motion would be to refer it to next month’s Executive Committee meeting.

From a procedural standpoint, Corporation Counsel Dave Hemery explained that when a communication is brought forward at the County Board, it is referred to one of the six standing committees. When the standing committee receives the communication, they discuss it and if they are going to act on it by voting on a resolution or have the ordinances amended, the standing committee determines what language they would like in the resolution or ordinance change and then they refer it to Corporation Counsel to be put in the proper format and get a fiscal statement from Administration and then Corporation Counsel brings the document back to the committee so they have a document that is actionable in front of them and they know what they are voting on and what the fiscal impact to the county will be. The document is then voted on and then it moves forward to County Board for full Board approval.

Regarding the provision in the proposed resolution about forming an ad hoc committee, Hemery advised the Code sets forth the procedure for standing committees to form sub or ad hoc committees. The Chair of the standing committee nominates the members and then the members are confirmed. The standing committee that created the sub or ad hoc committee that reports to the standing committee, that standing committee votes on the members. A resolution is then drawn up and voted on. Hemery said he would be happy to meet with members after tonight’s meeting as long as there is not a quorum to explain this further or answer any questions.

Lefebvre informed she is not opposed to having this held until the next Executive Committee meeting. She added that this has been being worked on for quite a while and she would like to move it along.

Chu clarified that the resolution she presented is just a working draft; a place to start. It is for informational purposes and a beginning point to start a structured discussion.

Schadewald feels Executive Committee is the correct place for this discussion because of the all-encompassing matters that will be discussed. He does not recommend this be sent back to Human Services. It does not make sense to him to have Human Services Committee have a subcommittee that will be looking at all departments. Executive Committee forming a subcommittee that goes across all departments with all the Chairs of all committees looking at this wide range of issues makes more sense. Schadewald is opposed to sending this back to Human Services Committee but would support a motion to hold until the next Executive Committee meeting. We can then come up with a resolution, send it to Corporation Counsel to be put in the proper format and attach a fiscal impact and then vote on it. Sometimes moving slow but sure gets you what you want. This is a pretty significant matter and in order to do it right we need time to look at it and come up with ideas.

Erickson agrees that Executive Committee is the appropriate place for this, but she is concerned about Schadewald’s proposed title. Schadewald responded that achieving health equity is part of all our jobs. Health is something that is looked at in many areas throughout the county. For example, health is a big issue under the Administration Committee because they want HR to do things right and have the proper training and education. Public Safety Committee looks at the health of the law enforcement officers as well as the citizens and mental health issues.

Van Dyck emphasized his opinion has nothing to do with the topic; it is the process that he has a problem with. He does not like dragging stuff out, but we need to follow the procedures we put in place. The County Board did refer this to Executive Committee. His preference would be to hold this until the next Executive Committee meeting and he respectfully asked Buckley to amend his motion to hold this for a month for the Executive Committee to look at again.

Supervisor Borchardt agreed that this should come back to Executive Committee as it is more encompassing than what Health and Human Services does. She attended Public Safety Committee last night and said that the Sheriff talked about some situations his officers were recently in and she is concerned about the mental health of the law enforcement officers and ongoing PTSD issues going forward. This is all-encompassing
when we are talking about both resolutions that were brought forward tonight and reiterated she agrees this should come back to Executive Committee.

Buckley does not have a problem referring this to the next Executive Committee meeting, but he questioned if a subcommittee would be to help the community or to oversee the county, because overseeing the county is the job of the County Board. He has some concerns with this. Buckley feels we need to better define what the purpose of the subcommittee is and he would like to have some clear direction as to where this is heading.

**Motion made by Supervisor Buckley, seconded by Supervisor Landwehr to hold until subsequent Executive Committee meeting. Vote taken. MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY**

Regarding Buckley’s question as to the purpose of the subcommittee, Chu read from her proposed resolution that the purpose of the ad hoc committee is to *co-create an action plan to address health inequities and disparities in Brown County informed by research, best practices, and the lived experience of those most impacted by systemic racism*. This is open enough that the members of the ad hoc committee sign on to bring recommendations to the organizations and entities they are a part of to do internal organization work. Or it could be for some specific research or programming that community stakeholders around this issue could begin to address. It is not intended that the ad hoc committee would come in and weigh in on how we do business within the county. It is to have multiple perspectives and more lenses for us to think about the way we do our work. Like Supervisor Dorff said, we do not have representation on the Board of those impacted the most by racism. We have other perspectives here that inform other great decision making. Chu feels it would be hard to come to real informed decisions without a group like this. The ad hoc committee can serve us in that way, and we can continue to do good service at the committee level through the recommendations that would come out of the ad hoc committee.

Supervisor Deneys informed he is in favor of holding this for a month and bringing it back to the Executive Committee.

Health and Human Services Director Erik Pritzl said when talking about the activities of the Public Health Division and the work they are doing, it is only one set of activities that they highlight. There is also the community work which the Public Health Division sometimes leads and sometimes is part of other community organizations that take the lead. There are a lot of different ways that we are all trying to work on what is influencing the health of our community and those social determinants of health that have been referenced. Pritzl’s department can only influence so much. They deliver mental health services and public health services, they have economic support services but, for example they do not control housing. They also do not control things like the workforce, recruitment and retention and the education of the county’s workforce. Pritzl feels this issue does need to remain with Executive Committee because the issues being discussed are bigger than just Health and Human Services. The issues are very important and very real, and we need to have the community involved and Pritzl feels the ad hoc committee may be a good way to do that.

At this time a vote on the motion was taken.

5. **Communication from Supervisor Lefebvre: Request that during the continued time of the COVID-19 pandemic that all future county board and committee meetings be virtual until advised by the Brown County Health Officer along with local health experts that in-person meetings can safely resume. Referred from December County Board.**

Note: Items 5 & 6 were taken together and all discussion and action related to these Items is set forth at Item 6 below.

6. **Communication from Supervisor Lefebvre: Request for those who cannot attend in-person meetings because of the COVID-19 pandemic be allowed to legally and binding, vote by phone. Referred from December County Board.**
Lefebvre informed she brought this forward two different ways because they are kind of different. One is to go back to virtual meetings. She likes the accommodations for tonight’s meeting. There are people who cannot attend in-person meetings and they are missing out on a lot of things. When Lefebvre was in a box at the Resch Center, she felt more like a spectator than a participant at the meeting and she was criticized for interrupting. She could hear what was going on for the most part, but could not really hear people who did not speak directory into their microphones. Lefebvre did not attend the December meeting, but she called in and then found out that they could talk, but their vote did not count because it was not in the Code. Lefebvre continued that she would like to discuss a way to come up with something that will work for everyone and have everyone’s vote count.

Borchardt brought forward information that had been prepared by Human Services Committee Chair Joan Brusky. She informed that 61 of Wisconsin’s 72 counties are allowing virtual attendance and voting by Supervisors at Board meetings. Sometimes it is as few as one Supervisor appearing virtually and in other instances the entire Board meeting is held virtually. Currently Winnebago County is meeting virtually, and it is working fine and Borchardt is aware of several other counties that are still meeting virtually.

Director of Administration Chad Weininger informed he had been asked by Brusky to provide financial information for holding virtual meetings. The County has incurred expenses of approximately $19,140 to date for holding meetings at the Resch Center. The January meeting which will be held at the new Expo Center is expected to cost approximately $1,500 for set up. All of these expenses will be reimbursed by the CARES Act.

A question was asked by Buckley as to how much the county paid to hold meetings at City Hall. Weininger responded the county pays roughly $6,300 on an average year to use the facility plus $4,500 for sharing hardware and roughly $1,800 for sharing software.

The January County Board meeting will be held on the main floor of the new Expo Center which is much larger than the Resch Center and social distancing will be no problem. The estimate to have an in-person/virtual meeting at the Expo Center would be $6,000.

Lefebvre does not feel there is any reason for the County Board to meet in person as the number of COVID cases are going up and the number of deaths is also going up. She feels we need to go back to Web Ex meetings which had no cost to the county. There are people at the County Board meetings who do not wear masks and this is against the the state law. Lefebvre is asking the Committee to take into account the issues that several Supervisors have and to make accommodations for them. She feels there are no appropriate accommodations that can be made for her to appear in person at the new Expo Center. She does not feel it is okay for Supervisors to not be able to attend meetings when they can be held by Web Ex as they have been in the past.

Supervisor Lund does not have an objection to allowing Supervisors who do not attend the meeting in person to vote. He feels it is up to the Board to decide whether they want to meet virtually or in a combination virtual and in-person meeting. Lund does not want to see meetings held virtually way into the future and feels there needs to be a cut off as to how long to allow virtual attendance. He feels it is only fair to constituents to allow Supervisors to vote and have their vote count when they are unable to come to the meeting in person due to the pandemic.

Chu informed she shares the same sentiments as Lund and feels it is reasonable and important to come up with a way to allow Supervisors who cannot attend meetings due to the pandemic to be have a legally binding vote. She noted that the schools have come up with some gating criteria as to whether classes are held virtually, in-person or a combination of the two and she offered that as a possible option. She would have opted to attend tonight’s meeting virtually, but because of the weightiness of the items she wished to speak to and because she is new on the Board, she felt it was important and more impactful to come in person. Chu feels it is important to find a way to allow Supervisors to have a virtual option for attendance and have their votes count when they are unable to come to the meeting in person due to the pandemic.

Landwehr appreciates Chu’s comment about coming in person as he feels that it will help her to get to know the other Supervisors and for the other Supervisors to get to know her. He referenced the Web Ex meetings
that were held in the past and felt they were very lacking in that it was hard to have meaningful discussion like they normally have at in-person meetings. He also feels the Wen Ex meetings hinder the public from being able to adequately contribute and see what is going on. Landwehr continued that the hybrid budget meeting really bothered him because everyone could hear over the microphone one of the Supervisors who was attending virtually asking “are they doing anything yet” which seemed to indicate perhaps a Supervisor was not present during the discussion that was going on. Then when it comes time to vote, it isn’t clear if the person doing the electronic voting was actually listening to the discussion or, for that matter, who is actually doing the voting. Landwehr feels the Board Chair has gone to great lengths to accommodate people and the size of the floor at the Resch Center allows for more than adequate social distancing. The Expo Center is dramatically larger than the Resch Center and the social distancing can be greatly expanded there. He does not know what else can be done to make the meetings any safer.

Van Dyck questioned if the system we are using tonight could be incorporated into the full Board meetings versus the large production that was done for the budget meeting. Weininger responded that he recently had a meeting with Chair Buckley, Technology Services Director August Neverman, Camera Corner and PMI staff regarding options at the Expo Center. In that meeting it was indicated that because the Expo Center is such a large venue, there would be too much echo to do something like is being done tonight so a meeting similar to tonight would not work well.

Van Dyck continued that he does not have a problem with joint virtual and in-person meetings, but he is not in favor of going back to full virtual meetings. He feels it is a personal choice to decide whether to come to a meeting in person or not. He agrees that there needs to be a cut off as to how long to do the joint meetings. The communication mentions the Brown County Health Officer can determine when in-person meetings can safety resume, but Van Dyck noted the Health Officer and others from Health and Human Services attend the Board meetings and they obviously must feel the meetings are being conducted in a safe manner so he does not feel that is a good guide. If a change is made, Van Dyck feels it is up to the Board to determine how long that change will last. He continued that if a change is made, it is a matter of saying Supervisors have the choice of attending in person or virtually and that is the way it is going to be for a specified period of time regardless of the reason why a Supervisor is choosing to come or not come. He is not in favor of someone having to say they have health issues or whatever because that puts the Chairman of the Board back in the situation of having to decide what is a reasonable excuse and what is not. He would support some sort of a mixed model. Van Dyck feels the in-person and virtual model for tonight’s meeting is working well and suggested we try it at the next Board meeting. We shouldn’t not try it because we don’t think it will work; he feels we should at least try it.

Lefebvre informed her communication referenced the Public Health Officer along with local health experts who know what is going on with the pandemic. She would like to be involved in meetings because they are important, and she wants to be there for her community. She agrees with Van Dyck in that we should try a system similar to what is being used tonight because it is working well. She reiterated she would like to see something where Supervisors who do not attend in person can still participate and make legal votes. Lefebvre also referenced earlier comments that it could be unclear who was voting, and she assured that it was her that was in the meeting and voting.

Schadewald feels the idea of being able to connect through Web Ex is something that needs to be explored and noted the hybrid model being used tonight will also be used tomorrow night for the Administration Committee meeting. He said that even if someone cannot hear everything, Committee Chairs typically repeat the motions before a vote is taken. He feels Web Ex could be used for those Supervisors who for whatever reason during this pandemic prefer not to attend meetings in person. If there is internet available at the Expo Center, Schadewald feels there should be a way to connect to a Web Ex, even though it may not be perfect, but those attending virtually could hear the motions and vote. Hemery said that each Committee Chair has the ability to determine if virtual votes count in their meetings. Schadewald feels it is important for government to be fair and transparent and to have the wishes of all Supervisors considered. He is not in favor of spending $6,000 like we did for the budget meeting.

Buckley pointed out that Board meetings have been held at the Resch Center for the last few months and there is plenty of room for social distancing and there are walkthroughs before each meeting with various people to be sure they are providing the safest environment possible. Buckley is not aware of any issues in
any of the meetings. He continued that Corporation Counsel, Administration and the Health Department all came together and did a wonderful job walking through the set up and providing answers and solutions to any situations that came up. They worked very hard before every meeting to address any concerns. The Expo Hall where the January meeting will be held is huge and it is disappointing to Buckley to hear people poo poo the set up before even seeing it. There have been walkthroughs of the facility and staff has done a great job of laying it out and setting it up. Buckley does not see any concerns from a COVID standpoint with the new facility. Being almost a year into the pandemic, we have had to learn how to work within the pandemic. The county has done a great job working with the Board and the Committees and it seems like the meeting formats are changing almost months. Buckley said we have all had to adapt to this and he finds it frustrating that we do have some people that are very unprofessional about how they approach this topic. He has been yelled at about how meetings are being conducted, even when there is more than adequate social distancing, yet these people are going out other places. The county has tried to accommodate to the best of their ability and have tried to make this work, but there is not the ability to officially record votes. Buckley said we are now trying to figure out yet another accommodation, but we have not even exhausted the current accommodations for the January 20 Board meeting. There will only hopefully be a few more months of meetings before people are vaccinated. Buckley has always tried to follow the will of the Board and will continue to do so but reiterated that current accommodations have not even been tried yet, but we are still thinking of more accommodations. He wants people to be able to attend in person and he wants to accommodate them as best he can. He commended county staff for everything they have done during the pandemic and he does not feel anyone should be treated unprofessionally.

Dorff said she appreciates the lengths Buckley has gone through regarding social distancing accommodations. Regardless of any accommodations made at the meeting site, there are still people who are not comfortable. Sometimes people still need to quarantine. She does not want anyone to feel like they cannot follow through and do their job because of having to quarantine or feel unsafe. She feels it is important to offer an option for Supervisors to vote virtually so all constituents are represented.

Lund agreed with Dorff that quarantine could happen to anyone on the Board at any time and Supervisors would not be able to come to the meeting no matter how good the social distancing is. Supervisors would likely still want to attend the meeting because it is their duty and he feels we should change the procedure a little bit during the pandemic to try to offer those who do not attend in person to be able to virtually attend and have their vote counted.

Erickson echoed the sentiments and Dorff and Lund regarding quarantine and noted that she was in a quarantine situation at the time of the budget meeting. She was advised by county administration and the Health Department to not personally attend the meeting. She asked if in-person accommodations were availed for the budget meeting and she attended virtually. She would have been devastated to not be able to vote at the budget meeting, especially since it is her first year and the budget meeting is the most important meeting of the year. The people with the power did everything they could to make sure she could participate and complete the democratic process in its entirety. Erickson does not feel right denying any other Supervisor similar accommodations. She would like to know that whatever accommodations can be made are made so that no district in Brown County goes underrepresented because their Supervisor cannot have their vote counted. She feels that if a Supervisor is able to attend a meeting virtually and be mentally present for all of the discussion and have enough ability and power to vote out loud and the vote is documented, they should be able to do so.

Regarding accommodations, Hemery said that legally if someone needs an accommodation, they should let staff know so they can start the dialogue and see if reasonable accommodations can be made. He did not hear of anyone contacting his office or Human Resources saying they had COVID or were quarantined or isolated by a doctor’s order or Health Department order and could not attend. This is certainly something that would be addressed and absolutely every request for an accommodation goes through the process of having a dialogue and then review of what options can be offered. There is a distinction in someone saying they have a condition that does not allow them to participate versus someone saying they prefer not to participate. There is a difference legally in how accommodations are provided. He wants it noted on the record tonight that if a Supervisor was quarantined or isolated because of COVID and was not allowed to attend, that is news to him and would not be proper action on the county’s part unless there was no reasonable accommodation available, but that would not be known until the dialogue was started.
Hemery continued that the Code requires a Supervisor to be present to have their vote count. The County Board held a vote that said all members must appear in person and therefore if a Supervisor is not in person, they are not present, and their vote would not count. It is no different than a member stepping out of the room and not being present at the time of a vote. This Board took a vote saying that meetings will be in person and to be considered present at an in-person meeting you have to be there in person. If the vote was you could appear virtually, or in person or by phone, a vote would count. The Code allows the Chair to mark someone absent or excused when they are not present. Past practice is that members have not been allowed to vote by phone. Hemery continued that a Chair of a committee controls a committee and would be able to make the decision to allow virtual appearances and virtual votes or phone votes. Hemery said it is much easier to get technology to work for a committee meeting than it is for a full Board meeting. Combination virtual and in-person Board meetings will not work without spending a significant amount of money.

Deneys said it seems to come down to how a meeting is posted; whether it is in-person, virtual or whatever decision the Chair makes. Hemery said that is correct and as long as members have the understanding they can go in person and participate fully by being part of the discussion, seeing documents, and vote but instead they choose to use the virtual option where they understand they may not be able to hear and would not be able to be part of the discussion, that would be legal, but that would all have to be laid out on the agenda so members know what they are getting into if they choose to go virtual because it sounds like when Supervisors choose to go virtual, they are losing things that members who are there personally have. Hemery would want some sort of disclaimer by those who choose to go virtually saying they understand that if the connection is lost, the meeting will continue and they would not be able to vote, etc. The ground rules would need to be laid out so everyone knows what they are getting into. Deneys responded that it sounds like appearing virtually may be losing some of their capabilities and asked if that technically would then fall under an accommodation.

Hemery responded that people can agree to accommodations that give them less than they would otherwise have, but they would have to agree. The legal accommodation is only triggered when there is a medical condition that requires an accommodation. A medical condition that requires an accommodation is different than a preference not to attend a meeting.

With regard to the vote taken earlier by the County Board to hold County Board meetings in person, Sieber asked if that binds Chair Buckley to make people attend in person in order to vote or does he still have discretion over that vote? Hemery responded that he would have to see the exact language on that vote before he can give an opinion. Sieber said it sounds like the majority of the Committee wants to allow Supervisors to vote whether in person or attending virtually and asked Hemery if he would recommend that this Committee forward something to the next Board meeting or wait until the next Executive Committee meeting. Hemery said there are different ways to do this, including changing the ordinance. He would need to know exactly what the Board wants to do and then he can let the Board know how to go about doing it.

In talking about accommodations and reasonable accommodations, Buckley said there has been some concern in the past as to verifying a reasonable accommodation. There are Supervisors who have missed meetings because they are on vacation and he questioned if what we do for one we would have to do for all. Hemery responded that if we make an accommodation of preference for one individual, the same accommodation of preference should be offered to the reset. The required legal accommodation depends specifically on the person’s disability or medical condition. Further, accommodations are often different based on what the medical condition or disability is.

At this time Buckley added that he would like to commend Internal Auditor Dan Process for the work he has done in helping to set up safe Board meetings.

Van Dyck said we can sit here all night and debate reasonable accommodations. No one should be critical of the Board Chair or anyone in the county that reasonable accommodations have not been tried and made. Some people’s definition of reasonable accommodation is going to include not coming to a meeting. Van Dyck does not feel we are going to solve anything for the January Board meeting and feels it is important to move forward with the meeting at the Expo to show support for a facility that the county and its citizens just spent millions of dollars on. The Expo does not have the technology in place to hold virtual Board meetings.
there which we did not anticipate needing. Using the Expo is creating unforeseen challenges that are not easily solvable without spending a lot of money. Van Dyck suggested we have the January meeting as planned at the Expo and then consider holding subsequent meetings, beginning with the February meeting, in the Library Auditorium which will hold 29 people and has the ability to have a joint virtual and in-person meeting as demonstrated tonight. There is space for the public to sit outside the room and the meeting could be streamed on a monitor.

**Motion made by Supervisor Van Dyck, seconded by Supervisor Schadewald to request that staff and County Board Chair work together to potentially hold joint meetings in the Library starting with the February County Board meeting and allowing for folks with COVID-related medical conditions that preclude them from attending in person to attend virtually. Motion amended; see below. No vote taken.**

Lefebvre thanked administration for the accommodations they tried to make for her at the Resch Center. Her doctor stated she could attend a socially distanced meeting if everyone was wearing a mask, but some Board members did not wear a mask and that is when she was moved to the box. She reiterated that tonight’s Web Ex was very good in that she could comment and could also see and hear everyone in the meeting. She does not want the county to have to spend money on her account. She feels Van Dyck’s idea is a good one and she would support it. Lefebvre also feels virtual attendance should be used only by those with medical issues who are not able to attend meetings in person, not just for people who are on vacation.

Deneys indicated he was in agreement with the spirit of Van Dyck’s motion and he agreed with what Lefebvre said. He feels the virtual attendance should be for people who need medical accommodations, not for just anyone who does not wish to drive in for a meeting. He feels this should be worked through the Chair so it is set up as an accommodation and the Web Ex does not even appear in the public posting of the agenda so the Chair knows who will be attending virtually.

Deneys asked if Van Dyck would be open to a friendly amendment to make the motion a little simpler to allow the County Board Chair to allow virtual attendance as an accommodation. This would open it up to allow the Chair to decide where to hold meetings based on the technology that is available.

As a point of order, Landwehr asked Corporation Counsel if we always have the requirement scenario of the friendly amendment. Hemery responded that if there is an accommodation needed because of a disability or medical condition as those are defined legally, the county has a requirement to engage in a dialogue with the individual and to see if we can reasonably accommodate the condition. He noted that in some cases, there is no reasonable accommodation. The law only requires reasonable accommodations be made for a disability or a medical or psychological condition that prohibits you from engaging in the activity. Hemery guaranteed that if someone has a medical condition or distality and requests to be accommodated, it is absolutely addressed according to the law and they look for some type of accommodation.

Van Dyck understands where Deneys is coming from and informed he worded his motion the way he did because based on information that we were provided with earlier, technology does not exist at the Expo Center for what we are looking for so he specified the Library because we know the technology is available here. He is not opposed to a better option if there is one. The question really is whether we want to have a virtual option for people to attend.

Buckley reiterated that staff has worked very hard to make accommodations for everyone. He feels we are getting very formal on how to get this done. We are having the next meeting at a brand-new facility and there are ample, reasonable accommodations. He trusts that staff will do whatever they can to figure this out. If we are going to tie us to the Library, after watching people and how they interact at the Resch Center, he does not feel comfortable here. A lot of Supervisors do take their masks off and there would be a lot of people in the auditorium of the Library. The Expo Center is much larger and Buckley wants the ability to see what the capabilities are at the Expo. It seems the more accommodations we try, the more we want to continue on the path, and he feels this is getting too formal. Buckley feels there will be people who will not feel comfortable coming to the Library because it is a much smaller space than the Expo. Staff knows what the Committee wants, and he wants to give staff the chance to figure it out. They are committed to that and have been doing that all along.
Motion made by Supervisor Van Dyck, seconded by Supervisor Schadewald to request that staff and Board Chair work together to potentially hold meetings allowing for folks with COVID-related medical conditions to attend virtually.  Motion withdrawn; no vote taken.

Borchardt informed she is in support of the motion and feels reasonable accommodations need to be made for those who need them. She wants to be sure that there are no legal ramifications for not making accommodations. Hemery responded that by federal law the county is required to make reasonable accommodations so regardless of what is done here, the county still must make reasonable accommodations. Borchardt asked if Supervisors are not able vote virtually, if individuals would be able to sue the county because they do not feel represented because their Supervisor cannot vote. This is something that has been brought up to her by members of the community who do not feel represented. Hemery responded that first there would need to be a right to vote by telephone in order to be sued and his opinion is currently there is not a right to vote by telephone based on the County Code, past practice and based on the Chair being in charge of his meeting.  Hemery does not believe a suit for something Borchardt mentioned would have merit.  Borchardt responded that making sure everyone in the community is represented and having their voice heard by their representative is something that is important to a lot of community members.

Supervisor Coenen asked Lefebvre what was missing in the accommodations that were made for her that she would need to have happen per federal law. She is confused as to why we are having this discussion if this is something we already have to do legally. Lefebvre responded that she made a request through her doctor that she could not attend meetings if they were not socially distanced or people were not wearing masks. Some Supervisors took off their masks so Weininger and Hemery worked with her and put her in a box at the Resch Center. The first meeting she was criticized for interrupting to speak. Further, not all Board members spoke into the microphone and therefore she could not hear what they were saying. Lefebvre questions if that was really a good accommodation because she felt like a spectator at the meeting and not a participant. This is why she is asking for these accommodations tonight.

Coenen said her interpretation of what is being asked for is more than just accommodations, it is for voting too. She said her personal choice is not to ask for accommodations, but she thinks of the big picture as well as at a committee level too. She is curious as to how this would affect more than just the full Board meeting. Sieber responded that each Committee Chair will still be able to choose how they hold their meetings, whether they are all in person, all virtual or a combination. Tonight’s meeting is the first one that has been held both in-person and virtual that has worked well.

Lefebvre questioned if there is any place at the Expo that can accommodate her. There are no boxes or other area that she can be in and still participate, talk and vote. It is a huge room and if she sits way in the back, she will not be able to see anyone or hear anyone if they do not talk directly into the mike. Something has to be done so that everyone can do their duty for which they are elected and have their votes count to represent their constituents. That is what she and Joan Brusky are asking for.

Schadewald said the motion would give the County Board Chair the flexibility to do the accommodations. He supports all the things that have been done, but he also encourages us to keep trying to do things better. It is not easy, but Schadewald feels the reason the motion makes sense is it has staff and the County Board Chair looking at more options to accommodate during the pandemic and that is why he supports this.

Buckley informed he will likely abstain from voting on the motion. Just so everyone is clear though, the Board is dictating how he operates the meetings. He is told every month what he is doing to some people, but it is the Board and now we are looking to add another step as to how to run the meetings so the Board is really dictating how the meetings are run, not the Chair.

Sieber commended Buckley for his leadership throughout the pandemic and added that it has been difficult, and it is a difficult position to be in because he cannot make everyone happy at the same time.

At this time, Van Dyck withdrew his earlier motions. He said he will be making a new motion because this is the same conversation that we had in October. We are getting hung up on reasonable accommodations and
the legal definition of that. The fact remains that up to this particular point in time, reasonable accommodations have been made; there or no additional reasonable accommodations to be made. Some Supervisors may disagree with this, but we have met the test. They would like to have a virtual option and the earlier motion does not guarantee a virtual option because we will be right back where we were before which is we are already making reasonable accommodations.

Motion made by Supervisor Van Dyck, seconded by Supervisor Schadewald to request that staff and the County Board Chair work to select a venue and the necessary technology to accommodate a combination in-person and virtual meeting through the June 2021 County Board meeting. Vote taken: Ayes: Van Dyck, Schadewald, Landwehr, Sieber, Borchardt Nay: Denyes Abstain: Buckley MOTION CARRIED

Internal Auditor


With regard to the Board of Supervisors budget status financial report, Internal Auditor Dan Process informed a correcting entry will be made to reclassify a COVID-related expense. Regarding the Veterans Recognition Subcommittee budget status financial report, a carryover request has been put in to carry over $1,300 of donations that were not used in 2020.

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

8. 2020 Audit and Work Plan (Status Updated: December 31, 2020).

Process informed a number of items on the work plan have been carried over from 2020. This is because he has been working with external auditors for the last few months in the Technology Services area. Depending on the report from the external auditors, there may be some recommendations that will impact 2021. When the report is done, it will likely go to a closed session of the Administration Committee.

Van Dyck asked about a 2021 work plan. Process responded that the 2021 plan had been included on a prior agenda and reiterated that a number of items on the 2020 plan have been carried over to the 2021 plan. Process will forward a copy of the 2021 plan to Van Dyck.

In light of what occurred in TS, and some of the major ramifications of that, Van Dyck feels that the priorities of what Process is going to do in the upcoming year may need to change, especially if there are other departments where we are similarly at risk. He questioned if attention should be focused more thoroughly in a smaller number of areas rather than the broadness we have had in the past. He suggested that an item be placed on the next Executive Committee agenda to revisit the previously approved audit plan which was prior to the situation that occurred in TS to determine if there are better places for our Auditor to be spending his time.

Weininger informed it is already known that there will be some standardization recommendations which will help throughout the entire organization and the work plan will definitely need to be adjusted. Buckley suggested a joint meeting with the Administration Committee and Executive Committee be held when the report is done regarding TS. Weininger said there are really two pieces to this. Process is working with external auditors on one component of this and the other component is the fraud investigation piece and that is the forensic audit. The two audits will be laid out together and then a determination will be made as to what steps need to be taken and what controls and policies need to be put in place throughout the organization so this does not happen again.

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

Other

9. Discussion and possible action on changes to Chapter 2 of the Brown County Code of Ordinances.
Weininger provided a handout, a copy of which is attached. He has been reviewing Chapter 2 and noted there are a few areas where Van Dyck wants to streamline things. One of the things that needs to be streamlined is the TO change process and there are several other areas that he will be looking at as well. Weininger talked briefly about the chart he distributed and said he wants a person to be able to read it and know what a committee does, what the oversight is and what the approval process is.

Motion made by Supervisor Van Dyck second by Supervisor Schadewald to hold until next Executive Committee meeting. Vote taken. **MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY**

10. Audit of the bills.

Motion made by Supervisor Borchardt, seconded by Supervisor Landwehr to acknowledge receipt of the bills. Vote taken. **MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY**

11. Such other matters as authorized by law.

Sieber thanked Curt Beyler from the Library and County Clerk staff for their work in getting this meeting set up.

12. Adjourn.

Motion made by Supervisor Landwehr, seconded by Supervisor Borchardt to adjourn at 8:58 pm. Vote taken. **MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY**

Respectfully submitted,

Therese Giannunzio
Administrative Specialist
Brown County Executive Meeting 1.6.2021

- The ADRC is just starting our journey—we must walk humbly and seek to listen and understand. I can’t speak with expertise or provide the path forward.
- We do know we are involved, are part of the solution and a partner in this—we are not looking for Brown County to shoulder the whole burden or provide all the solution-
- It is an important overarching statement—it is direction to all of the departments so they know it’s not only safe to participate but encouraged
- This is also a message to our community about who we want to be in the world as a county—how health equity is an important issue, that we not only want to make a difference but can make a difference
- The ADRC’s across the state were moved organizationally into the Public Health Division at the state level for a reason—our job is to prevent and delay chronic conditions and expensive long term care—what we do is engage people in the community and work toward wellness—we also relocate people from hospitals and nursing homes to their homes—where they want to be and quite honestly, save the government money. It was clear early on—that people of color have significant health disparities that challenge the success of this work—we have to impact health as we partner with the public health departments and collective impact wellness organizations like Wello to offer evidenced based programs on diabetes, chronic conditions, incontinence, isolation and loneliness and more—we have worked diligently to create a Spanish health navigator program with Casa Alba under and community foundation grant and hope for funding in the spring—this is our work—where health impacts are greatest. Only 20% of health impact occurs in a medical environment—we need to work where the impact is great—at home.
- We have started learning sessions and discussion groups with our staff and board—we anticipate creating an action plan in the spring that will guide us as an agency—I anticipate actions such as internal policy and practice review, board recruitment strategies, intentional service delivery in communities of
color, focus groups with our customers of color to learn and build programs that are meaningful, seeking partnerships with other non-profits and resource center for racially diverse populations to reach community underrepresented in our service-and much more.

- Thank you for taking this discussion seriously-for considering all the options and engaging in a dialog-there will not be one simple solution-getting people to the table and starting a dialog needs to start and it starts with each of us-this statement of Racism as a Public Health Crisis and a task force that starts our conversation is a great step forward.

From: Devon Christenson
RESOLUTION: Racism is a Public Health Crisis

[Submitted 1/6/2021 for consideration of Brown County Executive Committee by Sup. Chu]

WHEREAS, race is a social construction with no biologic basis (1); and

WHEREAS, racism is a social system with multiple dimensions: individual racism is internalized or interpersonal; and systemic racism is institutional or structural, and is a system of structuring opportunity and assigning value based on the social interpretation of how one looks, that unfairly disadvantages some individuals and communities, unfairly advantages other individuals and communities, and saps the strength of the whole society through the waste of human resources (2,3); and

WHEREAS, racism causes persistent racial discrimination in housing, education, employment and criminal justice; and an emerging body of research demonstrates that racism is a social determinant of health (1,4); and

WHEREAS, more than 100 studies have linked racism to worse health outcomes (5); and

WHEREAS, in Wisconsin, the highest excess death rates exist for African American and Native Americans, at every stage in the life course (6,7), and our infant mortality rate for infants of non-Hispanic black women is the highest in the nation (8); and

WHEREAS, the American Public Health Association (APHA) launched a National Campaign Against Racism (3); and

WHEREAS, Healthiest Wisconsin 2020 states that, “Wisconsin must address persistent disparities in health outcomes, and the social, economic, educational and environmental inequities that contribute to them” (9); and

WHEREAS, the Wisconsin Public Health Association has adopted in 2010 the resolution “Achieving Health Equity” and in 2014 the resolution “Promoting a Health in all Policies (HIAP) Framework to Guide Policymaking” and in 2017 convened a Racial Equity Workgroup; and

WHEREAS, public health’s responsibilities to address racism include reshaping our discourse and agenda so that we all actively engage in racial justice work; and

WHEREAS, while there is no epidemiologic definition of “crisis”, the health impact of racism clearly rises to the definition proposed by Galea: “The problem must affect large numbers of people, it must threaten health over the long-term, and it must require the adoption of large scale solutions.”(10)
THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED that the Brown County Board of Supervisors asserts that racism is a public health crisis affecting our entire society.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the Brown County Board of Supervisors advocates for policies that improve health in our communities of color, eliminate health and opportunity gaps along racial lines, and increase the success of all groups by distributing resources justly across all communities.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the Brown County Board of Supervisors will support local, state, and federal initiatives that advance social justice.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the Brown County Board of Supervisors encourages individual advocacy to dismantle systemic racism and recognizes that every Brown County employee is responsible for creating and maintaining a culture in which employees respect the diverse values, beliefs, and behaviors in the workplace and the community that they serve.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the Brown County Board of Supervisors works to build alliances and partnerships with other organizations that are confronting racism, commits to engaging municipalities and institutions with the county to prioritize racial equity to address structural racism producing disparate population health outcomes, and encourages other local, state and national entities to recognize racism as a public health crisis.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the Brown County Board of Supervisors forms an Ad Hoc Committee to continue to build alliances and partnerships to confront systemic racism:

Name and Type of Ad Hoc Committee: Health Equity and Justice Ad Hoc Committee, Racial Equity and Justice Ad Hoc Committee

Purpose of Committee: The purpose of the committee is to co-create an action plan to address health inequities and disparities in Brown County informed by research, best practices, and the lived experience of those most impacted by systemic racism.

Number of Members: Nine (3 supervisors, City of Green Bay rep, 5 community members)

Selection of Members: (who appoints the members and what body confirms the appointment) Members will be selected by the County Executive and confirmed by the County Board

Special Member Criteria: (member make up) Required members include: Three (3) Brown County Supervisors; Five (5) community members (formal or informal leader) representing our largest sub-populations (per US Census): Hispanic/Latinx, Native American, Asian and Black; One (1) Brown County community member with either: lived experience, personal or professional interest, and/or health equity expertise

Term of Members: Two years, staggered terms
Selection of Officers: A Chair/Facilitator to set the agenda; a Secretary to prepare the Agenda at the direction of Chair/Facilitator and to take Minutes, and to forward both to the County Clerk's Office, shall be nominated and selected by majority vote of the Ad Hoc Committee at the start of February 2021

Adapted from the WI Public Health Association Resolution, 2018 and Rock County WI Resolution passed June 25th, 2020

References:

RESOLUTION: Achieving Health Equity for all Brown County citizens

[Submitted 1/6/2021 for consideration of Brown County Executive Committee by Sup. Schadewald]

WHEREAS, race is a social construction with no biologic basis (1); and

WHEREAS, racism is a social system with multiple dimensions: individual racism is internalized or interpersonal; and systemic racism is institutional or structural, and is a system of structuring opportunity and assigning value based on the social interpretation of how one looks, that unfairly disadvantages some individuals and communities, unfairly advantages other individuals and communities, and saps the strength of the whole society through the waste of human resources (2,3); and

WHEREAS, racism causes persistent racial discrimination in housing, education, employment and criminal justice; and an emerging body of research demonstrates that racism is a social determinant of health (1,4); and

WHEREAS, more than 100 studies have linked racism to worse health outcomes (5); and

WHEREAS, in Wisconsin, the highest excess death rates exist for African American and Native Americans, at every stage in the life course (6,7), and our infant mortality rate for infants of non-Hispanic black women is the highest in the nation (8); and

WHEREAS, the American Public Health Association (APHA) launched a National Campaign Against Racism (3); and

WHEREAS, Healthiest Wisconsin 2020 states that, “Wisconsin must address persistent disparities in health outcomes, and the social, economic, educational and environmental inequities that contribute to them” (9); and

WHEREAS, the Wisconsin Public Health Association has adopted in 2010 the resolution “Achieving Health Equity” and in 2014 the resolution “Promoting a Health in all Policies (HIAP) Framework to Guide Policymaking” and in 2017 convened a Racial Equity Workgroup;

THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED that the Brown County Board of Supervisors advocates for policies that improve health of all citizens of Brown County, eliminate health and opportunity gaps along racial lines, and increase the success of all groups by distributing resources justly across all communities.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the Brown County Board of Supervisors encourages individual advocacy to dismantle systemic racism and recognizes that every Brown County employee is responsible for creating and maintaining a culture in which employees respect the diverse values, beliefs, and behaviors in the workplace and the community that they serve.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the Brown County Board of Supervisors works to build alliances and partnerships with other organizations that are confronting racism, commits to engaging municipalities and institutions with the county to prioritize racial equity to address structural racism.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the Brown County Board of Supervisors forms an Ad Hoc Committee to continue to build alliances and partnerships to confront systemic racism:
**Name and Type of Ad Hoc Committee:** Health Equity and Justice Ad Hoc Committee, Racial Equity and Justice Ad Hoc Committee

**Purpose of Committee:** The purpose of the committee is to co-create an action plan to address health inequities and disparities in Brown County informed by research, best practices, and the lived experience of those most impacted by systemic racism.

**Number of Members:** Nine (3 supervisors, City of Green Bay rep, 5 community members)

**Selection of Members:** (who appoints the members and what body confirms the appointment) Members will be selected by the County Executive and confirmed by the County Board

**Special Member Criteria:** (member make up) Required members include: Three (3) Brown County Supervisors; Five (5) community members (formal or informal leader) representing our largest sub-populations (per US Census): Hispanic/Latino, Native American, Asian and Black; One (1) Brown County community member with either: lived experience, personal or professional interest, and/or health equity expertise

**Term of Members:** Two years, staggered terms

**Selection of Officers:** A Chair/Facilitator to set the agenda; a Secretary to prepare the Agenda at the direction of Chair/Facilitator and to take Minutes, and to forward both to the County Clerk’s Office, shall be nominated and selected by majority vote of the Ad Hoc Committee at the start of February 2021

Adapted from the WI Public Health Association Resolution, 2018 and Rock County WI Resolution passed June 25th, 2020

**References:**
RESOLUTION & ORDINANCE SUBMISSION

Summarizes which committees are required to approve specific resolutions/ordinances as outlined in the County Code of Ordinances, Chapter 2: County Board of Supervisors.

(NOTE: the below assumes the resolution/ordinance has already been drafted, reviewed and approved per Administrative Policy A-13: Resolution/Ordinance Creation and Submission)

Subject Matter or Purpose of Resolution/Ordinance

- **Bonding**
  - Oversight Committee
  - Administration Committee
  - Executive Committee

- **Banking, Finances, Insurance, Taxes, Licenses or Claims**
  - Oversight Committee
  - Administration Committee

- **Transfer from General Fund**
  - Oversight Committee
  - Administration Committee

- **Capital Projects**
  - Oversight Committee
  - Executive Committee

- **Personnel**
  - Oversight Committee
  - Executive Committee

- **Legislation or Administrative Rules**
  - Oversight Committee
  - Executive Committee

- **Other**
  - Oversight Committee

County Board