

## 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, March 11, 2013 in Room 200 of the Northern Building – 305 East Walnut Street, Green Bay, Wisconsin

---

---

**Present:** Chair Tom Lund, Supervisors Patrick Moynihan, Jr., Bernie Erickson, John Vander Leest, Steve Fewell, Dan Robinson  
**Excused:** Patrick Evans  
**Also Present:** Supervisors Williams, Van Dyck, Nicholson; Executive Streckenbach, Brent Miller, Dan Process, Brian Shoup, Lynn Vanden Langenberg, David Hjalmsquist, Sandy Juno, other interested parties

---

---

I. **Call Meeting to Order:**

The meeting was called to order by Chairman Tom Lund at 5:30 p.m.

II. **Approve/Modify Agenda:**

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

III. **Approve/modify minutes of February 11, 2013.**

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

### Communications

1. Review Minutes of:

- a) Brown County LEAN Steering Committee (January 3, 2013).

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

### Comments from the Public

#### Vacant Budgeted Positions (Request to Fill)

2. Human Resources – HR Analyst - Vacated on 2/20/13.
3. Human Services/CTC – Clerk II - Vacated on 2/13/13.
4. Human Services/CTC – Hospital & Nursing Home Administrator – Vacated on 4/30/13.
5. Human Services/CTC – Behavioral Health Supervisor - Two Positions, Vacated on 2/22/13 & 4/3/13
6. Human Services/CTP – CTP Worker - Vacated on 3/1/13.
7. Human Services/Economic Support – Economic Support Specialist I - Vacated on 2/22/13.
8. Human Services – Social Worker/Case Manager (Child Protection Intake/Ongoing) - Vacated on 3/4/13.
9. NEW Zoo – Guest Services Coordinator - Vacated on 12/31/12.

**Motion made by Supervisor Moynihan, seconded by Supervisor Erickson to suspend the rules to take Items 2-9. Vote taken. MOTION UNANIMOUSLY APPROVED.**

**Motion made by Supervisor Erickson, seconded by Supervisor Robinson to approve Items 2-9.  
Vote taken. MOTION UNANIMOUSLY APPROVED.**

*Supervisor Fewell arrived at 5:32pm*

**Communications**

- 10. Communication from Supervisor Buckley re: Review what is the work week for the 24/7 Employees. *February Motion: Hold for one month and ask Human Resources to bring back an update with regard to the work formulas, etc. for the 24/7.***

Supervisor Buckley informed that he had spoken with Interim Director Cullen Peltier, Peltier informed that they were working on the shifts and forwarded info to Buckley via email. Once they hire the full-time Director, hopefully that person would have some input as well.

Erickson stated that there were several different options as far as the way the work schedule could work. There were two options that fell within the current workweek of the rest of the county employees. Erickson wanted it noted for the record that he would be in favor one of the two and will vote for it once it came time.

**Motion made by Supervisor Fewell, seconded by Supervisor Buckley to hold for two months. Vote taken. MOTION UNANIMOUSLY APPROVED.**

- 11. Communication from Supervisors Van Dyck & Lund re: Request that the task force that was formed by the Board Chair last year to examine the future of BC Library system be disbanded and that the mission for which it was formed be undertaken by the Education and Recreation Committee. *Referred from February County Board.***

Supervisor Van Dyck informed that it was his understanding that the County Executive was in the process of developing a new committee to replace the one that was formed previously and asked the committee to hold for another 30 days.

**Motion made by Supervisor Fewell, seconded by Supervisor Buckley to hold for 30 days. Vote taken. MOTION UNANIMOUSLY APPROVED.**

- 12. Communication from Supervisor Van Dyck re: Request that jurisdiction over the Central Library repair projects be reassigned from the Planning, Development & Transportation Committee to the Education & Recreation Committee. *Referred from February County Board.***

Supervisor Van Dyck asked that this communication be received and placed on file as Public Works Engineer Doug Marsh will be providing updates at the Ed and Rec Committee meeting. Erickson informed that Marsh had been bringing forward updates to the Library Board meetings. He suggested sending memos to one or the other committee rather than having March attend both.

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

- 13. Communication from Supervisor Steffen re: A Budget Development Policy. *January Motion: to forward to Administration for their review and then have Administration work with a couple supervisors to bring back something more in line with what Brown County could use; Referred back from February County Board.***

Erickson stated that they had some very reliable straight-forward budgets the last number of years delivered in a prompt time. Anyone that wanted input had it. The County had been delivering these

budgets for over 150 years and things were working fine.

Robinson said if they were going to make major decisions to the budget at the last minute. His understanding was that this was a policy and didn't legally tie hands and felt if they put this forth as a guideline in terms of how we do our budgeting, if we can minimize large swings at the last second where the public doesn't have opportunity to comment, then it was a good thing.

**Motion made by Supervisor Erickson, seconded by Supervisor Robinson to hold for one month. Vote taken. MOTION UNANIMOUSLY APPROVED.**

14. **Communication from Supervisor Nicholson re: Review the ordinance/policy/county code that prohibits county employees to do lobbying own interest on county time. *Referred from February County Board.***

**Motion made by Supervisor Moynihan to hold for one month. No second.**

**Motion made by Supervisor Fewell, seconded by Supervisor Erickson to receive and place on file. Vote taken. Nays: Moynihan, Buckley. MOTION APPROVED 3 to 2.**

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

Nicholson stated he wanted to know if there was anything on the books that prohibited or addressed county employees lobbying some type of support outside county politics. Moynihan believed there was something in the ordinance. Lund stated there was something for political but what about self-interest? Lobbying for their own jobs on company time.

Supervisor Robinson referred to Chapter 4.103 Political Activity: Political activity on the part of local government employees are codified at the Hatch Act at 5 U.S.C. SS 1501-1508. County employees shall abide by the provisions of the Hatch Act in regard to their political activities which are summarized as follows:

Covered Employees. The Hatch Act restricts political activity of individuals principally employed by local governments, including the County, who work in connection with programs financed in whole or part by federal loans or grants. The Hatch Act does not apply to employees who exercise no functions in connection with federally financed activities.

Prohibited Activities. The following activities shall be prohibited for employees who are "covered" by the Act:

- (1) Using an employee's official authority or influence for the purpose of interfering with or affecting the result of an election or a nomination for office;
- (2) Directly or indirectly coercing, attempting to coerce, commanding or advising a state or local officer or employee to pay, lend, or contribute anything of value to a party, committee, organization, agency or person for political purposes; or
- (3) Be a candidate for public office in a partisan election.

Fewell referred to Chapter 1.11 Code of Ethics – (5) Conflict of Interest. (a) Financial and Personal Interest Prohibited. No official or employee, whether paid or unpaid, shall engage in any business or transaction or shall act in regard to any direct financial interest which is incompatible with the proper discharge of his or her official duties in the public interest contrary to the provisions of this section or which tends to impair his or her independence of judgment or action in the performance of his or her official duties. (b) Definitions. 1. Financial Interest. Any interest which yields directly a monetary or other material benefit to the officer or employee or to any person employing or retaining the services of the officer or employee. 2. Persons. Any person, corporation, partnership or

joint venture. 3. Official duty or act. One done by an officer in his or her official capacity under color and by virtue of his or her office. An authorized act. 4. Violation. Violation includes any unlawful behavior by a public officer or employee in relation to the duties of his or her office or employment, willful in its character, including any willful or corrupt failure, refusal, or neglect of an officer or employee to perform any duty enjoined by law on him or her.

Lund felt it was convoluted because he felt they were talking about people that were actually sending out emails and calling people while working to keep their jobs or get different hours.

Erickson questioned if there was a specific area that they should direct this to? Nicholson responded that it was a county employee or under the umbrella of the county with the state and they were working in county government, was it proper, was there a code, part of the ethics of the county code or ordinance to have that employee lobby for votes on county time. Lund stated that when talking about an election lobbying for votes was strictly prohibited. Nicholson questioned, what about appointments.

Fewell stated it was a hard thing because Department Heads allowed employees to use computer time on their breaks and they could go on Facebook or send emails to supervisors. They were not prohibiting that. Then they would have to ask what the policy was of using a smartphones at work because you can send emails from smartphones while on break, were they at work or on break? Were they going to tell employees that you can't communicate during your scheduled work hours including breaks and lunch? When he saw an email regarding county issues coming from a county email address he started having issues with that. If it was an issue that they were concerned about, they should not be using county equipment to get that to him. He was not sure they should be using county equipment to do anything but county business but that was another policy. Nicholson responded that this was another example that he would agree with. Maybe this committee could look into it and be a part of his communication also.

Nicholson wanted to know if there was anything on the books, if there isn't than it was obsolete. The issue would be a county employee or someone employed by the state, calling up other political figures for lobbying for votes on appointments or even elections. Was it self-interest or political?

The committee further discussed examples and suggested moving this item to next month with the option of a closed session. Streckenbach stated that he would make sure to have staff prepared to answer these types of questions. Robinson suggested, when having staff look into this, a crucial question would be to define what self-interest was. When listening to Chapter 1, self-interest was defined as financial which would be different than some of the examples that were given with regard to appointments to a board, etc. Van Dyck stated to him Chapter 1 talked about outside conflicts of interest in other words to enter into a contract that somehow it would benefit a person. He didn't know if it was necessarily clear.

**Motion made by Supervisor Fewell, seconded by Supervisor Erickson to refer to Human Resources for clarification and bring back in one month with the option for closed session. Vote taken.**

**MOTION UNANIMOUSLY APPROVED.**

15. **Communication from Supervisor Williams re: request to change the starting time of the Wednesday County Board meeting from the current 7 p.m. to 6:30 p.m. hereafter. Referred from February County Board.**

Supervisor Williams informed that he brought a communication forward previously but with the suggestion of a 6pm start time. One thing that was brought up the last time was the fact that there could be an emergency or special meetings called right before County Board. He looked back at last year and it only happened twice. He believed the first meeting was a leftover from the previous

board and the second was for bonding. Williams stated that the concern was that if the County Board meeting started at 6pm, special meetings would start at 5-5:30pm. That may pose an issue for some supervisors who may not be able to get there on time. He felt the County Board was in a better position as to getting things done more expeditiously. In making this change, Williams was considering the people in attendance such as county employees and people who wanted to speak under "comments from the public".

Supervisor Erickson stated he wouldn't have a problem with 6:30pm but the only comment that he had heard was with the rural population. They questioned why meetings were scheduled so early, once they got into sprint, summer or fall they would have to come off the fields to get to the meetings.

Robinson stated that he wasn't opposed to the time change but his biggest thing was what's the best time in terms of the public coming? He didn't know if moving from 7 p.m. to 6:30 p.m. was an improvement.

**Motion made by Supervisor Moynihan, seconded by Supervisor Buckley to change the County Board start time from 7:00 p.m. to 6:30 p.m. and to adjust the ordinance accordingly. Vote taken. Nay: Erickson. MOTION APPROVED 5 to 1.**

**16. Communication from Supervisor Moynihan re: Request approval of amending Brown County Code of Ordinances 2.13(5)(f) to delete "and discussion pertinent to the subject matter." *Held until March.***

Moynihan stated that next week as a County Board they could voice an opinion one way or another to a three prong approach, removing the verbiage, thus acknowledging the audio visual streamlining scenario. It made no sense to have staff attend a meeting, tape it, go back to the office and listen to the same meeting and type every word out. You will have the ability to click on the agenda item and watch the agenda item or the entire committee meeting once Room 200 was wired up.

Fewell stated that by supporting this it would bring the Board to the appropriate century.

Lund felt that all of the committees would need to meet in Room 200 or else they would not have the verbiage. Moynihan stated that just as the County Clerk's office had done for years, the City of Green Bay, City of De Pere, and the Village of Ashwaubenon you would have the motions and the actions. In addition, the audio would still be posted online whether held in Room 200 or off-site.

**Motion made by Supervisor Moynihan, seconded by Supervisor Buckley to approve. Vote taken. Nay: Erickson, Lund. MOTION APPROVED 4 to 2.**

**17. Communication from Supervisor Moynihan re: Considering a request to move the County Board office to Room 102, and have the Parks Department move to the County Board Office. *Referred from February County Board.***

Moynihan informed that this would be the third prong of what he was trying to accomplish. As supervisors they always tell Administration that they had to do more with less. This was an opportunity to move staff and work in conjunction with the County Clerk's office. If the Board approved the audio/video next week, it would open up more staff time, there would still be a division between the Board office and the Clerk's office, but gave the opportunity to cross train back and forth staffs just by virtue of covering for vacations, illness, disability, things of that nature. It would eliminate redundancies and save on potential overtime scenarios. The County Clerk was in favor as well as County Board staff, hopefully the Board would as well.

Erickson would like to know the monetary or fiscal impact of the move would be. Moynihan responded that he had discussions with Public Works Director Van Noie and IS Director Hjalmsquist and it was nominal at best. It was no different than moving someone from one desk to another.

Buckley believed they would end up saving money if they were cross-training employees.

County Clerk Sandy Juno stated that in looking at Moynihan's proposal, she felt it would make a lot of sense for the offices to be working together and was in support of this. Because of the small staff in the Board office, there were times when they need additional coverage. With her staff they had really heavy peak time in the afternoons where they could use extra assistance. There were possibilities to do cross-training to cover each other's areas. She would like to be able to give the County Board Secretaries the ability to flex their hours around meeting times, etc. Just different ways of using the staff to get the best efficiencies out of both departments. One person in her office that had absolute outstanding history of Brown County is able retire in a few years if she wanted and it was extremely important that they worked with the County Board and their staff to pass on what information she had with regard to resolutions, ordinances, how things were indexed. The Clerk's office would be like to be able to assist with agendas such as the County Board agendas, etc. She would like the ability to have the physical closeness rather than by phone or email. Having the physical closeness would encourage having more contact and it would be easier to pass info to each other. This would get rid of a lot of redundant filing especially when neither department knows what each other had. This would be a lean way of cleaning up records and indexing. Juno informed that this year in their budget they had a half-time position left in the Table of Organization but it was not funded, that was with the thought that they would only have two elections this year. However, next year when they are in a four-election cycle there was no way that they would be able to operate without that extra help. Her thoughts would be to share a position with the County Board office. It would reduce hours in the County Board office and fulfill the need they had.

Buckley commended the departments for working together. He felt the move made sense.

Robinson felt it was a great idea. He questioned the implications to the Park's Department. Juno responded that if the Park's Department moved to another location in the building, the Clerk's department sold a lot of their boat launch and trail passes.

County Executive Streckenbach stated that the Park's Department liked the exposure on the first floor verse when they were in the Sophie Beaumont. However, he felt it was really great to see the County Clerk work with the County Board. If they extended the conversation with the Treasurer, Streckenbach felt they could address this issue long term in allowing that service to be available on the first floor. There were discussions with regard to moving the Medical Examiner in the current County Board office location but as the Register of Deeds slowly consolidates and shrinks their size, there was plenty of room potentially to outfit down the road. Temporarily he felt the solution would be to locate the Parks to the current board office until they found a lasting location that would be suitable for the Park's Department.

**Motion made by Supervisor Moynihan, seconded by Supervisor Buckley to approve the relocation. Vote taken. MOTION UNANIMOUSLY APPROVED.**

*Supervisor Nicholson arrived, Fewell asked to reconsider the motion for Item #14. Item 14 was taken at this time.*

#### **Legal Bills**

#### **18. Review and Possible Action on Legal Bills to be paid.**

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

**Reports**

**19. County Executive Report.**

Executive Streckenbach stated that this had been an ongoing discussion item amongst the County Board about ongoing compensation and moving forward with a long term strategy of how they were going to appropriately provide to employees of Brown County. With that being said, they just recently entered into an agreement with Wipfli to handle the class and compensation process. Streckenbach informed that he will be asking Board Chairman Moynihan to select three individuals from the board to oversee the process, bring up issues, help navigate and hammer out issues before it was brought forward. The result of the study won't be available until December. The step increases for Administrative staff, at least 200 employees, had been frozen since 2002. He believed this was long overdue and that they address this.

In the next couple of days Streckenbach will announce the task force to address the co-locating of the museum and library together. Ironically he received people interested in looking at it. The biggest issue that they were faced with right now at this point in time potentially was parking. Outside of that he believed people were willing to discuss the issue and see the pros and cons. He felt they had a great opportunity to explore, to see what they could potentially do to increase the visibility and awareness of the museum and position it for the future but also take a look at the programming needs and services that the library was providing. Right now the goal was to look at co-locating the library with the museum. He felt it had the best opportunity for the redevelopment which was taking place within the City of Green Bay particularly in the downtown area. He felt it had great synergies with the efforts of On Broadway along with the Washington street developments. Other ideas had been brought up by the Museum Director of going after the USS Green Bay and potentially creating a maritime museum in conjunction with the overall picture of how they were going to reinvent the museum of the future. There had been nothing but positive comments regarding that effort. Streckenbach was reaching out to Chairman Moynihan and Supervisor Erickson would have any interest in working with the task force on that would eventually be created to work on bringing in the USS Green Bay or something similar. He felt with their service to the country it would be fitting, it was definitely a veterans issue, trying to educate not only the adults but with children on what it meant to be in the service. He felt this would be a great asset. The county had been founded by the port. The port had started this initiative back in the early 90s to bring back the USS Green Bay, ironically there wasn't a lot of support or interest by the museum at that time. With the background of the director of museum Rolf Johnson, he had a lot of experience in Maritime Museums. He felt they were in a good position. Moynihan and Erickson stated that they were happy to help in any way.

Erickson stated that he had been speaking with Reid Ribble about getting a small airplane for the museum. Streckenbach felt this would be a perfect opportunity to explore that at the same time. They will need the support of the congressional delegation, Senator Baldwin, Senator Johnson, and Congressman Ribble. He felt it was a great opportunity to enhance what this county was founded on.

Streckenbach informed that they were at a point where they had some candidates for a Public Safety Committee Director. He will be asking Public Safety Committee Chairman Buckley and County Board Chairman Moynihan to sit on the selection committee.

April is National County Month for Recognition. He was aware that the county doesn't always do a good at telling the citizens of Brown County of all the good things that they do. He will be working with staff to come up with ways to make the public aware of all of the things the county does.

Moynihan interjected that once they had something compiled perhaps they could put it in resolution form and act upon it at the next Executive Committee meeting. Streckenbach felt that was extremely appropriate and will work on it. Robinson felt it would be nice to come up with some items for the county in terms of the folks that live in Green Bay and De Pere because he felt the county services in those communities weren't readily apparent to them.

Referring to the previous discussion regarding Ordinances 2.13(5)(f), Streckenbach felt that in the past minutes weren't always accurate of what the intent was of the communications. He asked that if in the event that the board decided not to move forward with Moynihan's communication, that the committees look at the accuracy of the committee minutes that they were approving. 10-years from now people will go to that record. He informed that he as well as Administration uses the historical information to help guide in trying to understand what the intent of the board was.

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

**20. Internal Auditor Report.**

Internal Auditor Dan Process stated to piggyback off of the Communication from Supervisor Moynihan, as far as the movement of the County Board office, there was a LEAN Event scheduled for next Monday and Tuesday and the County Clerk's office was going to be involved. The County Board office did see a need for their involvement in that.

Looking at the fiscal year 2012, preliminary budget numbers, although the GLS hadn't been closed yet, as far as the County Board, they were looking pretty good.

Audit Plan Update - Process continued to make progress on the audit plan specifically the bank reconciliation review. He's been meeting with the various department heads and staff members to get an understanding of internal controls. He's had follow up meetings to discuss the findings and recommendations and was in the process of drafting a report for that as well.

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

**Resolutions, Ordinances**

**21. Resolution re: Change in Table of Organization Public Safety Communications Assistant Director of Public Safety Communications.**

Buckley informed that at the Public Safety meeting they chose to send the resolution back. They felt that the job description that was brought forward wasn't any different than the one before. The second reason was that the County Executive stated that in a short time the new Director would be in place and they felt that that person should be a part of it all.

Streckenbach stated that his concern was that the Communications Manager position was ending March 31st. They had thought that the county would come back with a new job description to be filled. Then they could have a new person in place to help with the transition and with the interoperability that was being rolled out. He was wondering if it was appropriate to bring on temporary support staff until the vacant position was finalized. He informed that during the budget process the County Board eliminated the Communications Manager Position from the Table of Organization, but the money be held in the budget to give the Director, Public Safety Committee, Human Resources Department and Stakeholders Group time to create a new position that will meet the Communications Center's needs (\$84,130). And further to allow the Director to use the

necessary funds during this transition not to exceed April 1, 2013.

Lund felt that they were allowing for temporary help until the job was filled. Streckenbach informed that there was a person in that current position. Fewell questioned what was in the best interest of the county. Streckenbach stated the best interest of the county right now was to make sure that the rollout for the interoperability goes as smooth as possible because multiple agencies such as law enforcement that relied on the county. He was just looking for clarification on how to manage this moving forward. Buckley questioned if he had a hire date in mind for the Director of Public Safety? Streckenbach stated assuming that a number of applications were not from the area, two months. Lund stated that he would maintain the status quo until they got a new person so that they could have their input on the position. Streckenbach agreed with the direction of the Public Safety Committee to hold the position until there was a new director.

A discussion ensued with regard to the decision made regarding the Communications Manager position and the funding at budget time and how to handle this moving forward. The funding was there but there was no position.

Buckley and Moynihan felt that they needed to have a Special Public Safety and Special Executive Committee meeting before the County Board to address the money to carry over. Director of Administration Brent Miller informed that the position ended on March 31, 2013, the money was in the budget and it would be a change in Table of Organization. Lund stated that they would have to change the position in the Table of Organization until the end of May. Streckenbach informed that he would schedule a meeting immediately tomorrow to figure out what their options were and will give Lund and Buckley a call with the info.

**Motion made by Supervisor Buckley, seconded by Supervisor Moynihan to hold for two months. Vote taken. MOTION UNANIMOUSLY APPROVED.**

**22. Resolution re: Reclassification of Position Utility Worker Airport.**

**Motion made by Supervisor Erickson, seconded by Supervisor Moynihan to suspend the rules to take 22 & 23 together. Vote taken. MOTION UNANIMOUSLY APPROVED.**

**23. Resolution re: Reclassification of Position Housekeeper I Public Works.**

Erickson informed that he had taken the items together because if you look at the fiscal impact, there was a difference but that they were the same grade and same step, one position just had more hours.

Robinson stated when looking at the fair market value there were three-hourly compensations listed and questioned if they were comparable positions. Was it the policy to begin at the bottom of the pay rate and at best get to the middle or even less than the middle of the prevailing wages for similar positions? He felt they created a range and the bottom of the range was less than anything listed and the top of the range was maybe in the middle. It didn't seem like a living wage for a full-time job, he wasn't suggesting that they pay \$30/hour but it seemed odd to have the range so low compared to other jobs. Lund's feeling was if the wage was too low and can't hire anyone, then they won't be able to hire them at \$11.37, there was a wage range there but you get into compression areas if you were going to hire people that do maintenance in buildings at the same rate as you hire some that had professional qualifications. Robinson didn't believe there was a compression issue because they were chopping the wages for the new hires compared to the present ones considerably. He wasn't suggesting bumping them beyond the range; it was more of a policy question. He felt they had defaulted into a very low range in the comparable.

Vanden Langenberg informed that they look at two things. If it was a position that was hard to fill and they received only a few applications then they might move across the range more. They look at the compression and if it would upset the county wage scale. With the current wage scale, sometimes they can get someone at Step 1 but other times they had to move across the scale a little bit. And that was why they had that range. If a person brought a lot of experience in the same type of work that they were looking for then they might be across the range further than someone else. Was there a policy, it was on a case by case basis.

Robinson responded that it was not that they had a range, he understood the range and he understood how they placed people. The range that they were suggesting was so much lower than the comparables in the market and he believed that this was a policy question. He felt they were trying to get by with as little as possible. He understood the rationale behind it but at the same time it was not a living range for a full-time job. He questioned if they were going to try to lowball.

Vanden Landenberg stated that they didn't just pick a grade, there were 12 factors that they got points for and it ended up falling into a grade based on those factors, such as experience required, education, etc. That's how they got to the grade. Then they do an interim comparability and then they go to the market to see how their grade compared to the market. If they fall within that grade to the whole range, that's where they keep it. Otherwise they go back and see where they may have gone wrong in rating it. It was not an intentional lowball of a position. It was based on the rating criteria that they were using right now, which can be improved, and that was why they were doing the wage comparability study to get it more contemporary. With some of the lower positions, candidates know the rate of pay. The benefits were a lot better than Seek or a housekeeper at a private company. Robinson felt it may be more work than it was worth but it would be interesting to bring in the whole question of benefits. He was going to presume that the Wipfli study was going to address whether or not the pay grades were in line with the market value.

Buckley stated that if they were freezing pay steps and there was a range of 7-different pay steps, wouldn't that imply to someone coming on that there would be room for their wages to go up. He didn't understand why they were putting such a wide range in there. Vanden Langenberg informed that the current Class and Comp had 7-steps and that was where they got the range from. When they point factored the position it fell to Grade 3 and that was the range that they had with their current wage system. When they get their new system established with Wipfli they will be re-grading all of these positions. When a job is offered they let the candidate know what the rate of pay was and if there will be an increase or not after the probation period. The county used NEOGOV.com to post positions and all of the wages and benefits were listed. She informed that they received at least 100 applicants for these positions. Lund stated he wasn't buying that people don't want these jobs.

Fewell stated when looking in the budget book it listed up to \$16/hour for a Housekeeper I and the top step was \$13.26. If you budgeted \$16.19/hour for 9.5 employees they were paying a lot of Housekeeper I's a lot more than \$13 an hour. When doing the math they ended up with \$60,000 that was budgeted above what they said they were paying. Lund stated you had to question how long they were with the county and they were union workers and on union benefits.

A brief discussion ensued with regard to contracting out housekeeper positions at the Airport once there was an open position or a retirement. Buckley stated the board vowed to the pressure of the employees and thus they had county employees back at the Airport. The question was, if it was a good idea to do this, why don't they have a position open in that particular classification, were they not contracted to that position or looking to go there. Vanden Langenberg stated that when it was presented to the board, the board turned it down and wanted to maintain the positions in the budget. Lund responded that they did, the board would have to change it to contract, and you can't go out unilaterally and contract for that position. The board had the authority of the Table of

Organization and the board said Table of Organization was county employees until they change it.

Buckley didn't understand why it couldn't come to the board now and state that there was a position open and they didn't want to replace it but that they wanted to contract it out. Lund stated that the Department Head did not ask for a contracted position, he asked to have a position that was within the table, remain status quo. They would have to ask Airport Director Tom Miller why he didn't want to have a contracted employee.

Erickson added that it was budgeted for a county employee. He believed that they had a contracted person or two until they filled the full-time position for now. If he was not mistaken, if they went back approximately 12 years, they eliminated housekeepers/maintenance as county employees except at the Airport. So they were contracting in county buildings and the Airport had their own union contract that was going up and the maintenance people that they had contracted with for the rest of the buildings didn't work out so they dissolved those contracts and went back to county employees. But now those jobs were reclassified and they were all hired in at a lower rate of what they had felt the job should be. As they grew, the Airport grew higher, and now they were bringing those jobs back in at where they felt they should be.

Robinson stated his point wasn't if they could get people for this rate, he didn't doubt in this economy that they couldn't get 100 applicants at this rate. His question was more to what should they be doing, he didn't know if it was the county's best interest or the community's best interest to question what little they could get by on in terms of what they were paying people. He reiterated that the benefits may be good so that's why it was an incomplete picture. The question when doing the Wipfli study should include what was the living wage because he felt that served the community the best.

Van Dyck informed that there were other numbers underneath that they were ignoring which were the private numbers which were all at least a \$1.50/hour less. While he could appreciate the comparables, two of the comparables were government numbers. In his opinion it was like being overweight and comparing yourself to even more overweight people and then saying that you were not overweight. He would rather look more at the private sector to see what they were making because certainly everyone in that list that fell in the \$9.80/hour were not receiving the same benefits that county employees received. With regard to Buckley's comment on outsourcing, what was the wage for the position being replaced today. Vanden Langenberg responded \$19.14. They had one vacancy and another person left during the budget so they had two vacancies right now. Van Dyck stated that with the adjustments that were being made, it likely eliminated the benefit that was available to outsource because they were taking the wages down to where they should be. He didn't know if there was a benefit to outsourcing if the wages were in fact adjusted and most of the people now were going to be at a lower wage. Buckley stated that as long as they didn't come back in a few years asking for a reclassified because others were making much more. Lund stated the bottom line was that you can't get rid of compression issues if you didn't take advantage of market wages or people that were starting in jobs such as this. They will have a lot of people that will apply for these jobs because they were good jobs.

Streckenbach stated that one of the reasons they would like to have the county involved in this process as far as oversight, they know that two things were going to come from this report. One that they had a lot of employees who were technically higher than what the market should bare and then they had a number of people that were in another area that were way below the market which put the county in an interesting predicament as far as hiring the talent that would help them find ways from going from good to great. Looking at outputs verse inputs. Essentially making sure that the county was providing great services and thinking outside that box. The thing that he learned in the history of the county was that whenever wage and compensation came forward that people got unelected because of it or the sticker shock around it was so high that people weren't prepared to

accept it. That is why they think that when they do eventually roll this out that it would have to be over a phased plan. And more importantly they really needed the board to be involved in this, in the end there was a long history here that hadn't necessarily been addressed. Right now in Human Services they were looking at areas where supervisors and managers were \$19,000 below what other counties were paying in those positions. They were very fortunate to have people that were willing to work for the county for the wages that were being offered at all levels. Fewell questioned how they would phase in a \$19,000 discrepancy by the time they retire. Streckenbach stated that that's why he was asking for County Board participation because at the end of the day they were going to be surprised to see what the results were.

Ironically Streckenbach found out today, Public Safety Committee had a debate on the attorney for the District Attorney's office, and that position was at \$49,000, conversely at \$19.00/hour that was almost \$40,000. They had to figure some of the things out and he felt that this wage study was going to help really hone this in. They really need to figure out how to move the county forward. They were going to require individuals to be willing to look outside that box and come up with strategies that allowed them to have a wage compensation that was fair, that allowed them to attract individuals who want to come to a great community but also understand that in the current structure what they had to offer. The point that he wanted to make as far as the current wage that they were suggesting, last week he had overheard an employee that was excited that a new opportunity had opened up within other county operations. Once in the system, they were finding new avenues to move around, which he felt was great.

They wanted to see succession planning. They wanted to see them have an opportunity to grow. There were other individuals that were looking for income outside of home and wanted the benefits and weren't as concerned with the paychecks as much as with the benefits. Then there was everyone in between there. He felt as they move forward this was what Administration came forward with as far as recommendation. Streckenbach felt this would be a long debate as to how they will eventually address the issues because the county had a lot of work to do.

**Motion made by Supervisor Moynihan, seconded by Supervisor Erickson to approve 22 & 23. Vote taken. Nay: Buckley. MOTION APPROVED 5 to 1.**

24. **Initial Resolution Authorizing the Issuance of Not to Exceed \$6,630,000 General Obligation Bonds of Brown County, Wisconsin in One or More Series at One or More Times.**

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

25. **Resolution No.: 122-2012-13 from Outagamie Board of Supervisors.**

**Motion made by Supervisor Robinson, seconded by Supervisor Buckley to approve. Vote taken. MOTION UNANIMOUSLY APPROVED.**

**Other**

26. **Such other matters as authorized by law. None.**

**Motion made by Supervisor Fewell, seconded by Supervisor Buckley to adjourn at 7:18 p.m. Vote taken. MOTION UNANIMOUSLY APPROVED.**

Respectfully submitted,

Alicia A. Loehlein  
Recording Secretary