

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE BROWN COUNTY**  
**EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE**

Pursuant to Section 19.84 Wis. Stats., a regular meeting of the **Brown County Executive Committee** was held on Monday, September 11, 2017 in Room 200 of the Northern Building, 305 E. Walnut Street, Green Bay, Wisconsin.

---

**Present:** Chair Lund, Supervisor Schadewald, Supervisor Van Dyck, Supervisor Erickson, Supervisor Buckley, Supervisor Hoyer

**Excused:** Supervisor Moynihan

**Also Present:** Director of Administration Chad Weininger, Human Resources Director Kathryn Roellich, Internal Auditor Dan Process, Supervisor Joan Brusky, Corporation Counsel Dave Hemery, Museum Director Beth Lemke, Planning Director Chuck Lamine, other interested parties

---

**I. Call meeting to order.**

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

*At this time a moment of silence was observed in remembrance of the victims and events of September 11, 2001.*

**II. Approve/modify agenda.**

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

**III. Approve/modify Minutes of August 7, 2017.**

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

**Comments from the Public.** None.

**1. Review Minutes of:**

**a) Benefits Advisory Committee (August 16, 2017).**

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

**Legal Bills**

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

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

**Communications**

**3. Communication from Supervisor Brusky re: I am requesting an adjustment in hourly wages for the Brown County employees who, because they were initially hired at a lower starting pay, now make less than employees with less experience who were hired after them. I am particularly referring to those hired in 2013 – or other pertinent years. *July Motion: Refer to staff to come back to the Executive Committee in 60 days with a list of employees who are in the same predicament and whether they are budgeted for a higher amount than they are being paid. CARRIED 5 to 1.***

Supervisor Brusky informed she did not have anything new to report on this and recalled that at the last meeting this was discussed under “such other matters” because it was not listed as an agenda item. This was placed on the agenda for this meeting so if any new information becomes available it will be easier to follow through on this.

Supervisor Erickson said it is his understanding that Human Resources is currently addressing this issue, but there have been some conflicts and complications they are trying to resolve. He would suggest this be received and placed on file until a report is received from Human Resources.

**Motion made by Supervisor Erickson, seconded by Supervisor Schadewald to receive and place on file. No vote taken.**

Supervisor Van Dyck asked if this is something that should be referred to staff for incorporation in the budget, especially if any adjustments would not be put into effect until next year. Supervisor Buckley wants to be sure this does not get lost in the shuffle and would like to see this come back to this Committee in Resolution form when something is determined. Chair Lund agreed that a referral to staff for a Resolution would be important.

**Motion made by Supervisor Erickson, seconded by Supervisor Schadewald to refer to staff. Vote taken. MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY**

4. **Communication from Supervisor Moynihan re: For your consideration, I hereby request striking some of the language of Brown County Code of Ordinances 2.13(4)(h). I find it unnecessary to place closed session language on the county board's agenda, if we as a board, as deemed by the Chair, will not be convening into closed session due to lack of committee action/motion. I believe it provides a false pretense to the public and media. Referred from August County Board.**

Lund indicated he discussed this with Supervisor Moynihan and if the Committee is willing, they can move forward with striking closed session language on future County Board agendas if the Board will not be meeting in closed session due to lack of committee action or motion.

**Motion made by Supervisor Buckley, seconded by Supervisor Erickson to approve striking closed session language on future County Board agendas if the Board will not be meeting in closed session due to lack of committee action or motion. Vote taken. MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY**

#### Resolutions, Ordinances

5. **Resolution Adopting Brown County's 2018 Six-Year Capital Improvement Plan.**

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

6. **Resolution Authorizing First Amendment to \$1,540,108 Brown County, Wisconsin, Industrial Development Revenue Bonds (WESCO Project) Series 2010 Bonds.**

Corporation Counsel Dave Hemery informed that this relates to industrial revenue bonds which are a unique type of bond in that the County has zero liability with them. The County uses payments that come in each month from the company to make payments on the bonds, but even if the payments fail to come in, the County still does not have any liability.

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

7. **Initial Resolution Authorizing the Issuance of Approximately \$20,815,000 General Obligation Refunding Bonds of Brown County, Wisconsin.**

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

8. **Resolution Providing One-Time Supplemental Compensation to: 1) Employees in the IBEW Local 158 Bargaining Unit; and 2) Employees in the Brown County Human Services Professional Employees Association.**

Erickson understands what this is doing, but recalled it was discussed at earlier meetings that these groups of employees do have their bargaining. There have been years where none of the employees got raises and insurance went up and he asked if that would reflect back to these units as well. Lund said these groups are authorized up to CPI.

Supervisor Schadewald explained that since Act 10, bargaining is hypothetical. The law states the bargaining union can submit a proposal and the management can submit a proposal. If they do not agree, it goes to mediation. If they do not agree at mediation, the management can do whatever they want. The County Board has set a historical pattern of giving these bargaining units the same raise as everyone else until it became a situation where hypothetically the bargaining units could bargain for the CPI which could be more than what was given to the rest of the employees. If we are going to treat these bargaining units the same next year, Schadewald feels maybe they should be treated the same this year and that is why he supports this Resolution saying they ended up with the CPI that was less than everyone else got. We have been treating everyone the same for years and we should treat everyone the same this year as well. Schadewald continued that when the bargaining unit could have got 1.18%, the County gave them 1% like everyone else. Last year was a bit unusual in that the County gave a higher raise than the CPI and he feels these bargaining units should be compensated the same and that is the rationale for his support of this.

Hemery said this Resolution is to give the bargaining units a one-time payment of the \$400 the other employees got plus the difference of the .67% and the 1% that the others got. That being said, because the general employees got more this year and the unions would be paid more, the counter argument would be when general employees get less or no raise, the unions could still bargain up to the CPI. Schadewald noted that when the unions could get more of a raise, they still did not.

Director of Administration Chad Weininger recalled that during the 2017 budget meeting he advised the Board that they were deviating and treating union employees differently than the other employees and the Board made a conscious decision to do so. There were two units that did not recertify after that so they could get the higher wage rate. Lund noted there needs to be justification of the wages to make sure that they are in line with other similar units around the state. Weininger noted since he has been here they have been trying to treat everyone equal. The position we are in now is that we gave the other employees a COLA, but the unions did not really qualify for that so now the Board is looking at a one-time fix for this year and he noted that this is not something that is built into their wages. Lund reiterated a wage adjustment has to be justified by something other than fairness to all employees; it has to be justified by how much people in that union would make around the state.

Weininger said there are two options: approving this Resolution to fix this for this year or trying to come up with a way to justify a wage adjustment for these two specific groups. Hemery said the thing to keep in mind is that this does not touch base wages; it is like a bonus to equalize employees, but next year their bases wages will remain the same as this year.

Van Dyck recalled a year when we froze wages and employees did not get anything and asked what the unions got that year. Weininger responded that the unions most likely did not get a raise either in that instance but he will double check with Human Resources on this. Van Dyck would like to know since Act 10 has been in place, if when other employees did not receive any increase, if the unions also did not receive any increase.

Weininger informed if the union employees do get a lump sum, it will be taxed at 25%. He also noted that they did budget this because they assume that most of the unions will decertify for the year and then recertify the following year.

**Motion made by Supervisor Schadewald, seconded by Supervisor Erickson to approve. Vote taken. Ayes: Schadewald, Erickson, Lund, Hoyer Nays: Buckley, Van Dyck MOTION CARRIED 4 to 2**

**Standing Item**

9. **Discussion of 2.12 of the County Code of Ordinances: The duties and responsibilities of the EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE.**

**Motion made by Supervisor Schadewald, seconded by Supervisor Buckley to hold for one month. Vote taken.  
MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY**

**Reports**

**10. Internal Auditor Report**

**a. Board of Supervisors Budget Status Financial Report – July 2017 (Unaudited).**

Internal Auditor Dan Process noted the financial report includes a comment regarding postage and noted the Board Office continues to see an increase in the postage costs. One of the initiatives with the tablets was to reduce postage and printing costs, but that is not happening. Lund said there will not be a decrease in expenses until all 26 Supervisors use the tablets. Process said another reason for the increase in postage is that the office is no longer using the County's mail service provider due to the length of time it was taking Supervisors to get their weekly packets.

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

**b. Status Update: August 1 – August 31, 2017.**

Process referenced Attachment A in his report and said each year he does an analysis for each department that illustrates significant changes. He noted there had been some changes to the budget book where some of the changes are being included in the budget book and he wants to be sure that there is value to sending that information on to the Supervisors. He said there is prior year history on the report that is not included in the budget book. Lund and Van Dyck both indicated they see value in this as the budget book only contains information on one prior year and they like to be able to see trends over several years instead of just one year. Based on this, Process indicated he will continue to provide the information.

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

**11. Human Resources Report**

**a. Review of Chapter 4 revisions. Referred to HR to bring back next month with proposed changes after meeting with department heads.**

Human Resources Director Kathryn Roellich addressed Committee. There are three sections of Chapter 4 that are the subject of this Item: Vacation; Corrective Action and Discipline and Employment Selection Process.

With regard to Section 4.66, Vacation, Roellich noted they have had exempt (salaried) positions offered to people who are coming from previous jobs where they have had some longevity and then only getting a week or two of vacation to start here which is not a real motivator. Having the ability to offer more vacation based on an applicant's experience and education is helpful. Lund noted these situations used to come to the County Board for approval, but he is not opposed to offering more vacation to a qualified applicant. Buckley's concern is that someone could then come in and start with more vacation time than someone who has been employed at the County for 10 years. He feels there has to be some sort of oversight on how extra vacation is determined so it does not turn into the "me too" situation we are currently looking at with regard to wages. Roellich responded that approval of Human Resources and the County Executive would be necessary when making determinations of additional vacation and questions like how it compares to others in exempt positions within the department are taken into consideration. Lund noted the majority of exempt positions are department heads and deputies.

Schadewald said recruiting for jobs today is different than it was before Act 10. It is now a free agency situation and people move around in the workforce more than they used to. Employers have to compete for the best employees and things like vacation, insurance and wages are all factored into the package. If Brown County wants to get the best employees, this is realistic. When it comes to Buckley's argument about having the "me too" situation, Schadewald noted that most of the positions this would apply to are singular positions. He does not have any problem offering more vacation to someone who has good experience and education and can come in and do good

things. He does not want to tie the hands of the people doing the hiring by limiting their ability to have some flexibility on vacation.

Van Dyck asked Buckley about his concern and Buckley explained that if a supervisor has been employed for five years and gets two weeks of vacation and then a new supervisor is hired at the same level and given three weeks of vacation, the first supervisor with two weeks of vacation is going to come and say they want the same amount of vacation because the newly hired supervisor is doing the same work but getting three weeks of vacation and half the Board will agree. He feels there needs to be some sort of procedure in place instead of just leaving it up to the department heads, because the department heads and HR is who got us into the mess with the similar situation regarding wages. Van Dyck agreed with Buckley's concern, but also understands the intent of this revision and agrees with it although he cautioned about making a firm commitment in the policies because it may not always be necessary to offer the full amount authorized to get the person.

Schadewald said the free agency creates inconsistencies, but it is the real new normal. He acknowledged that there could be problems but said we do not want to get into a position where we are being turned down by good employees because we are not going to give them vacation similar to what they had at a former job. There are a number of factors that have to be looked at including years of service and supply and demand. He does not want the consistency to be wrecking the employment and recruitment process.

Buckley said the difference in the governmental situation, particularly in Brown County, is that there are 26 union reps fighting on the employees' behalf, while in the private sector they can just say no. We typically have a Board that is not going to say no and he bases this on past practice of what the Board has done.

Van Dyck agreed with Schadewald in that the market is different than it used to be and that we should not be tying the hands of the County, but he also agrees with Buckley that this is something that will come back just like the other situations that have come up regarding wages. He feels perhaps there could be language added that none of the changes are to be applied retroactively in any manner but noted that the Board could change that, but at least there would be language out there that this is not construed to be retroactive. Lund agreed that limiting language would be a good idea.

Schadewald said there are not 26 union reps, there are 26 management reps because Act 10 has created free agencies, where the unions used to have contracts that managed 90% of the employees, but now every day the Board is managing 95% of the employees. The Board is going to have to come to some collective decisions on this and Schadewald noted that the Board is now part of the discussion on these issues as labor management officials.

Buckley did not disagree with the concept for department heads, but feels it will get sticky with other exempt employees. He feels we need to be cautious of what the County Board's role is in the hiring process because we have an executive floor that should be handling these things under the direction of the Board and he said if the Board is taking this all on maybe we do not need the whole sixth floor.

The next section that was discussed was with regard to vacation carryover and Roellich said the modifications are to articulate what has been done in an informal way historically because of extenuating circumstances. The modification clarifies and gives a consistent process as to how carryover vacation will be handled. The policy is that an employee can carry over 10 days of vacation at the end of the calendar year, and can keep on carrying over 10 days, but it cannot add up. Roellich continued that sometimes there are circumstances where there are staff shortages so employees cannot take all of their vacation or there may be an extra-large project that prevents employees from taking all their vacation and this would allow the department head to submit a request to HR to allow the employee to carry over more than the 10 days but they would have to use it by June 30 of the following year otherwise it is lost. Lund asked why we would not just pay someone out for their unused vacation if there were circumstances that they were unable to take it because they were needed at work so we do not get in a situation where someone ends up with six weeks to use the following year which is a lot of time to be out, especially if there are large projects going on where we need the people at work. Supervisor Hoyer pointed out that this is not doing anything to change the number of days of vacation someone receives. Roellich added that these situations do not arise every year and if the County said that employees would be paid out for unused vacation if it cannot be carried over, there will be employees who take advantage of that which will create budget

issues. The proposed modification is saying that the employee will not lose the unused vacation at the end of the year because of certain circumstances and they will have the first six months of the following year to use the vacation but if they do not use it by then, it will be lost. This is to account for some of the anomalies that occur.

The next portion of the discussion was an explanation of changes to the corrective actions, discipline and termination section. A section was added to define the terms of the ordinance. Roellich said the definitions are helpful so everyone is using the same language. A lot of the language is to clarify and provide a solid foundation and understanding of what we are doing. The section contains language regarding types of corrective action and discipline and an understanding of where employees fall and whether or not something is grievable. The grounds for corrective action and work rules were very minimal and did not even include insubordination. Roellich noted that the proposed language is not deemed to be all inclusive, but it gives a better idea to the employees of the expectations the County has of them from the onset. Hemery has reviewed all of this and said Roellich did a good job in including the most common offenses.

Van Dyck asked Roellich and Hemery about Supervisor Evans communication to insert progressive discipline into the policy and asked if this comes anywhere close to meeting what Evans wanted. Hemery responded that the County is an at will employer but it is also important to be fair and in typical situations discipline will go through the progression of oral, written, suspension and termination. It is also emphasizes that these are at will employees and that any significant offense in and of itself may be enough to jump right to suspension or termination. This is not a system that says this is progressive discipline that must be followed; it recognizes that there could be serious situations that could result in termination. Van Dyck asked if the revision includes language that would lead to a more progressive discipline procedure than what was in place before. Roellich responded that she delineated in the definitions the types of corrective action or types of discipline and that they become more egregious in the different levels. The proposed language states, "The County reserves the right to impose corrective or disciplinary action as may be appropriate in particular circumstances. As such, discipline taken should be at the appropriate level to correct the identified behaviors." This means when looking at an issue with an employee, for example attendance, we would not go all the way to suspension. Any action taken is meant to be corrective, not punitive and therefore they will look at the infraction or infringement and what should be done as a result. HR tracks historical data regarding discipline and they are reviewing that in moving forward. It is not specifically spelled out because they do not want to include a just cause standard because then their hands become tied when there are serious infractions, such as a nurse slapping a resident at the mental health center, where stronger action than a written reprimand is necessary and appropriate. Hemery added that this comes real close to progressive without crossing the line while still making it clear that we are at will and can use any type of discipline, but, in general, should use progressive.

Schadewald said he is comfortable with the proposed revisions. He said just cause puts this in a whole new arena and what is being proposed is progressive while still giving the County the at will abilities that we should have.

The next section discussed was the employee selection process. Roellich said there are a number of changes being proposed to clarify compliance with employment laws and also to clarify the process of who has authority to hire for certain positions and what process needs to be followed for recruitment and filling the positions and also to be sure we are consistent on how positions and announcements are posted. She made mention of the recent discussions regarding whether or not it is appropriate for applications to ask whether the applicant has been convicted of a felony. Proposed language in Section 4.21 would be, "In recognition of the County's efforts to provide all citizens with an opportunity to succeed, it is the policy of Brown County that applicants will not be required to disclose arrest/criminal record history when completing the County's online employment application, unless required by state and/or federal law ..." Roellich continued that in Section 4.34 (Background Verification), there is specific language regarding caregivers or anyone working with a vulnerable population that outlines the requirements. There is also language about completing criminal background checks which happens on all candidates who are selected for an offer of employment.

Lund said there is a big difference if someone committed a felony 15 years ago and spent a few years in jail and then has had a good record after that as opposed to someone who just got out jail a few months ago. Erickson asked for clarification of what positions in the County someone with a felony would not be considered for. Roellich said that caregivers and law enforcement fall under that category. In Wisconsin, to use arrest and conviction

history in relation to an employment decision, there has to be a nexus of what the applicant was convicted of and the employment they are seeking. For example, someone who was convicted of embezzling will never be hired in finance and someone who was convicted as a sex offender would not be hired as a teacher. However, someone who was convicted of embezzlement could later be hired as a zoo educator because they would not have access to money. Erickson asked about a prior drug offense and Roellich said there are many circumstances that come into play such as how long ago the conviction was and what was involved. She also noted that people could also be convicted of misdemeanors that would prohibit them from employment as well. Felonies are not the only thing considered when making hiring decisions; all arrest and conviction history is taken into consideration.

Buckley asked why we would wait until we get down to the last few applicants to find out if they are felons. Roellich explained that they do not do reference checks either until they narrow the selection down. She said that at the point of application, if a box is checked that the person has been convicted of a felony, HR does not know what the felony is. The arrest and conviction history is confidential and HR does not even look at it until the person is being considered for the position. Further, even if the box is checked, the person may still be eligible for employment depending on what the felony conviction is and how long ago it occurred. Buckley does not have a problem with people who have been convicted of a crime being given the opportunity to explain themselves, but part of committing a crime is paying for the crime and part of that is being labeled a felon. His perspective comes from being in law enforcement and also from being a victim of crime and he feels that people need to be held accountable for their crimes and nowadays people are not always held accountable.

Van Dyck asked Roellich if she felt more language should be included in this section that explains to people when their criminal history comes into play in hiring decisions. Roellich said that the Statutes are referenced and that is where those things are spelled out. Lund added that people who are felons probably understand what jobs they would be eligible for and not eligible for. Buckley responded that a lot of these people are felons because they did not make the right decisions to begin with and will not know what jobs they can and cannot apply for and he questions who the appropriate gatekeeper should be to decide whether someone is hireable or not based on their past criminal activity. Roellich said sometimes the background check only lists the type of crime, so they do further research and do some case history to obtain further documentation. Then they may contact with the candidate to hear their explanation before a determination is made.

Buckley said this is pretty subjective to whoever is making the decision and feels there should be a clear standard. If the County is going to employ felons, he feels there needs to be specific information as to what kinds of felons we will employ and what departments and positions they can work in. Hemery said there is case law that says the felony has to be substantially related to the position. Case law continues to develop as different situations come up and the County needs to continue to review the cases. Roellich noted that sometimes standards can result in trouble because what the County may feel is reasonable standards could result in someone filing a discrimination case and then we become one of those cases that other employers reference. Hemery said the County saying they will not hire felons would be discriminatory and this is an area where we have to be careful.

Schadewald added that people without criminal convictions can be hired and then they can have criminal convictions while they are employed. He said what is being proposed is a policy that is a lot more detailed than it was in the past and there are policies that let us do background checks that are non-discriminatory and he feels HR will do their best job on this.

Lund referenced Section 4.32 regarding nepotism, and noted that it appears that now brothers or sisters can be hired into the same department as a sibling if they have the qualifications. Roellich responded that she included this because some departments are very large and have more than one location. For example, Health and Human Services covers a large variety of departments. If someone is working at the CTC and a sibling is hired to work in Sophie Beaumont, the likelihood of some of the issues that typically occur that constitute nepotism are unlikely to occur and the County should not limit themselves to hiring another quality employee at a different unit. If they would be working in the same work unit under the same department, that would be different because there are a lot of things that can happen. The revisions were made to give some flexibility on this.

Lund does not mind if two people from a family are in the same department, but he does not feel a family member should be supervising another family member. If both employees are on the same level, he feels the County should

not limit the ability to take the good employee. He does feel that County Supervisors should not have children working for the County because the Board is in direct supervision over wages and benefits for the County. Buckley agrees that a family member should not be directly supervising an immediate member of the same family. Roellich said when talking about family members working in the same department, maybe they start out at the same level with equal footing but then one wants to promote to a more supervisory position and they are not able to. She also noted that family members get into disputes often and they cannot always control where and when they address the disputes and if they are in the same work unit this can become a distraction in the workplace. There is also the scenario where one family member may be doing wrong, and the other family member helps cover it up.

Lund felt it should be left up to the department head to be sure that everything is noted before a hiring decision is made. Buckley said he does not have a problem with this as long as family members are not in direct supervision of other family members. Lund said he is glad there are exceptions included in the policy so the County can focus on hiring the best people for the job without having to limit themselves. Van Dyck said it sounds like what we are talking about is basically going back to the rule that was in place previously. Roellich said this is really just a clarification of the current policy which defines who is an immediate family member and what can and cannot happen with regard to direct supervision and then allowing for exceptions to be made by HR. Lund said it is important to allow for the exceptions. Van Dyck said if supervision is the only concern that this body has an issue with, then we should focus on supervision and it appears that the old policy seems to be that there could be multiple people from the same family working in the same department as long as none of them are directly supervising any of them but it seems that the new language is almost asking for full discretion by HR to make decisions regarding whether or not family members are employed in a certain department if there is already a family member employed in that department. Van Dyck respects the fact that there is ability for HR to make the decision, but if there is turnover in HR Directors, the policy could become very inconsistent based on the HR Director's discretion. Roellich said the previous language includes both direct supervision and family members just being in the same department. What is now in the language does not alter what was previously there. Hemery suggested this be sent back to HR and Corporation Counsel with direction to focus more on direct supervision situations.

Weininger said this was on the agenda tonight for discussion purposes. After this goes through the Administration Committee, staff will go back and make final revisions. Buckley's biggest concern for any of the changes is that HR seems to have a lot of discretion, but the instability in the past in the HR Department seems to have led to a lot of the issues that we are dealing with right now. His comments are because he wants to see less discretion and more definitive ways so we do not get in similar situations in the future. Roellich understood that and said she is also working on operational procedures so things are done on a consistent basis moving forward and noted that she intends to stay at Brown County until she retires.

**Motion made by Supervisor Schadewald, seconded by Supervisor Erickson to refer Item 11a to Administration Committee. Vote taken. MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY**

Roellich continued with the Director's Report and said that there was a lengthy conversation at the last PD & T meeting about how holiday and vacation time impacted overtime and what the historic impact was. Roellich said when this change was made in November, 2016 the projected fiscal impact was \$277,000. When the cost for what has been identified as overtime and what is projected for the remainder of this year was calculated, it was over \$327,000. The discussion at PD&T resulted in that Committee referring this back to the Executive Committee. Roellich has drafted preliminary language regarding this for future discussion.

Van Dyck asked when the revisions to Chapter 4 will be reduced to a Resolution for voting. Weininger indicated it should be coming back to the Committee next month.

**Motion made by Supervisor Erickson, seconded by Supervisor Buckley to receive and place on file the Director's Report. Vote taken. MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY**



**12. Department of Administration Report**

Weininger informed that the bond refunding should free up about \$300,000 of levy. It was initially anticipated applying an additional \$459,000 in levy, but that will not be necessary due to the bond savings which will help the budget significantly in 2018.

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

**13. County Executive Report**

*No report. No action taken.*

**Closed Session:**

- 14. Open Session: Motion and Recorded Vote pursuant to Wis. Stats. Sec. 19.85(1), regarding going into closed session pursuant to Wis. Stats. Sec. 19.85(1)(e), i.e. deliberating or negotiating the purchasing of public properties, the investing of public funds, or conducting other specified public business, whenever competitive or bargaining reasons require a closed session, in particular, deliberating and negotiating strategy and options regarding obtaining property for employee parking downtown.**

**Motion made by Supervisor Van Dyck, seconded by Supervisor Hoyer to enter into closed session. Roll call vote taken: Ayes: Van Dyck, Erickson, Lund, Schadewald, Hoyer, Buckley. MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY**

- 15. Convene into Closed Session: Pursuant to Wis. Stats. Sec. 19.85(1)(g), the Brown County Board of Supervisors shall convene into closed session for purposes of deliberating or negotiating the purchasing of public properties, the investing of public funds, or conducting other specified public business, as competitive or bargaining reasons require a closed session here for deliberating and negotiating strategy and options regarding obtaining property for employee parking downtown.**

**Motion made by Supervisor Van Dyck, seconded by Supervisor Hoyer to return to regular order of business. Roll call vote taken: Ayes: Van Dyck, Erickson, Lund, Schadewald, Hoyer, Buckley. MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY**

- 16. Reconvene into Open Session: The Brown County Board of Supervisors shall reconvene into open session for possible voting and/or other action regarding obtaining property for employee parking downtown.**

**Motion made by Supervisor Schadewald, seconded by Supervisor Hoyer authorizing Corporation Counsel the authority to draft a Resolution to go to Administration Committee and County Board to contract with Associated Bank to purchase parking lot for nominal amount as discussed in closed session. Vote taken. MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY**

**Other**

- 17. Such other matters as authorized by law. None.**

**18. Adjourn.**

**Motion made by Supervisor Buckley, seconded by Supervisor Schadewald to adjourn at 7:20 pm. Vote taken. MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY**

Respectfully submitted,

Therese Giannunzio  
Recording Secretary