



MINUTES OF THE PERSONNEL COMMITTEE

**TUESDAY, OCTOBER 8, 2019, 4:30 PM
CITY HALL, ROOM 207**

A. ROLL CALL.

I. Members: Ald. Bill Galvin, Chair, Ald. Kathy Lefebvre, Vice Chair, Ald. Barbara Dorff, Ald. Veronica Corpus-Dax

Present: Bill Galvin, Barbara Dorff, Veronica Corpus-Dax

Others present: HR Director Joseph Faulds, Chief of Staff Celestine Jeffreys, City Attorney Vanessa Chavez, Assistant City Attorney Lindsay Mather, Police Chief Andrew Smith, Police Commander Kevin Warych, Parks, Recreation & Forestry Director Dan Ditscheit, Assistant Finance Director Pam Manley, HR Generalist Adam Reidinger and others

B. APPROVAL OF THE AGENDA.

Moved by Ald. Barbara Dorff, seconded by Ald. Veronica Corpus-Dax to approve. Motion carried.
Yes- Barbara Dorff, Bill Galvin, Veronica Corpus-Dax, No- None, Abstain- None

C. APPROVAL OF MINUTES.

I. Approval of the minutes from September 24, 2019.

Moved by Ald. Barbara Dorff, seconded by Ald. Veronica Corpus-Dax to approve. Motion carried.
Yes- Barbara Dorff, Bill Galvin, Veronica Corpus-Dax, No- None, Abstain- None

D. REGULAR BUSINESS.

1. Consideration with possible action on request to fill the following replacement position and all subsequent vacancies resulting from internal transfers.

a. Park Maintenance Worker - Parks, Recreation and Forestry

Moved by Ald. Veronica Corpus-Dax, seconded by Ald. Barbara Dorff to approve. Motion carried.

Yes- Barbara Dorff, Bill Galvin, Veronica Corpus-Dax, No- None, Abstain- None

2. Consideration with possible action to increase dental insurance premiums 3%.

Moved by Ald. Barbara Dorff, seconded by Ald. Bill Galvin to approve. Motion carried.

Yes- Barbara Dorff, Bill Galvin, Veronica Corpus-Dax, No- None, Abstain- None

3. Consideration with possible action on request by Ald. Wery to discuss customer service standards and work expectations of inspectors. Investigate the addition of evening and/or weekend inspection hours.

Moved by Veronica Corpus-Dax, seconded by Barbara Dorff to hold until the next Personnel Committee meeting. Motion carried.

Yes- Barbara Dorff, Bill Galvin, Veronica Corpus-Dax, No- None, Abstain- None

4. Consideration with possible action to create City of Green Bay Policy Chapter 32 Employee Resource Groups.

Moved by Ald. Barbara Dorff, seconded by Ald. Veronica Corpus-Dax to approve. Motion carried.

Yes- Barbara Dorff, Bill Galvin, Veronica Corpus-Dax, No- None, Abstain- None

5. Consideration with possible action on the Grievance filed by Officer Matthew Lynch regarding the attendance of K9 training issued July 19, 2019.

The Committee may convene in closed session pursuant to § 19.85(1)(a), Wis. Stats., for the purpose of deliberating concerning a case which was the subject of any judicial or quasi-judicial trial or hearing before that governmental body. The Committee may, thereafter, reconvene in open session pursuant to § 19.85(2), Wis. Stats. to report any actions taken during closed session and to consider all other matters on the agenda.

Moved by Ald. Veronica Corpus-Dax, seconded by Ald. Barbara Dorff to go into closed session. Motion carried.

Yes- None, No- None, Abstain- None

Moved by Ald. Veronica Corpus-Dax, seconded by Ald. Barbara Dorff to return to open session.

Motion carried.

Yes- None, No- None, Abstain- None

Moved by Ald. Barbara Dorff, seconded by Ald. Veronica Corpus-Dax to take under advisement until the next Personnel Committee meeting. Motion carried.

Yes- None, No- None, Abstain- None

F. PUBLIC HEARINGS.

E. INFORMATIONAL.

1. Report of routine personnel actions for regular employees.

2. Next meeting date: October 29, 2019.

G. ADJOURNMENT.

Moved by Ald. Barbara Dorff, seconded by Ald. Veronica Corpus-Dax to adjourn. Motion carried.

Yes- Barbara Dorff, Bill Galvin, Veronica Corpus-Dax, No- None, Abstain- None

VERBATIM MINUTES

- All right, we're on, we're live?

- Yep.

- All right, this is the start of the Personnel Committee. It's October 8th, 2019. We'll start out with the roll call.

- Alder Dorff here.

- Alder Corpus-Dax present.

- Alder Galvin is here, and Alder Lefebvre is not here. I haven't heard anything about if she's coming or not, but we do have a quorum, and so we'll proceed. I'll look for a motion on the approval of the agenda.

- Move to approve the agenda.

- Second.

- All in favor?

- [All] Aye.

- Those opposed? That passes.

- Move to approve the minutes, or aren't you ready yet?

- I'm just waiting to see that he's done.

- Yep.

- Good, okay. Motion to--

- Move to approve the minutes by Alder Dorff.

- Second.

- Okay, all those in favor?

- [All] Aye.

- Any opposed? That passes unanimously. Onto Regular Business, D, sub one. Consideration with possible action on a request to fill the following replacement position and all subsequent vacancies resulting from internal transfers at the Park Maintenance Worker position. Staff?

- So you do have the position fill request in your packet. If you have any questions we can answer that.

- Anyone have any questions?

- I didn't have any questions.

- I'll entertain a motion.

- Motion to approve.

- Second.

- All in favor?

- [All] Aye.

- And that passes unanimously. Number two, consideration with possible action to increase the dental insurance premium, staff.

- So I just handed out the dental insurance plan, so you'll see in the first column on the left that they were asking for a 9% increase, but we made some changes, and you'll see them in red on the bottom. And all those changes are standard, too, there's nothing above and beyond what other dental contracts have. So we're just asking for a 3% increase because what those changes involve.

- So just fluoride once a year?

- For dependent children up to age 17, yep, and they said that's standard.

- Oh, it is, but for older people it's twice a year. I don't know if that's changed or not, I'll have to get back to you on that.

- Okay.

- All right.

- When you think prevention, I mean, that's prevention, so you'd think that would make sense because that keeps your rates lower, usually.

- I think it was for younger--

- It says for dependent children up to age 17, so that--

- I think that's why, but I'll double check on that.

- Maybe that just means, okay.

- Okay, so does anyone have any question on any of this?

- I think this is good.

- And to add, too, we will be providing three cleanings per year now. That is now standard for individuals.

- Really?

- Yeah, I didn't know that either.

- I didn't know that either.

- I'll have to tell my wife about that, she might want to.

- I'm not going three times.

- If you want to.

- Okay, all right. Move to approve.

- Second?

- Are you, oh you're still reading.

- No, I'm fine.

- All right.
- Did you second?
- Oh, you seconded?
- Oh, I seconded, yeah, . All those in favor?
- [All] Aye.
- That passes unanimously. Alder Wery is not here, I'm willing to hold this until we get to the end in case he shows up.
- I move that we amend the agenda and hold it to the end of--
- For number three?
- For number three, or is he not coming?
- He won't be here tonight. So I did reach out to Alder Wery, and he's talked to Community and Economic Development about having 30 days to get information to them, so this will be, so I'd ask that you hold it for him until the November meeting. So we have time to get the information for him.
- So I move to hold until the November?
- Which meeting in November?
- The first one, I think the 12th.
- November 12th.
- Okay.
- I think.
- Okay.
- All right.
- Motion?
- Oh yes, second.
- All in favor?
- [All] Aye.
- That passes unanimously, to hold that until November, the first meeting in November.
- Yeah, and we'll get the correct date of that.
- Okay, consideration with possible action to create a City of Green Bay Policy Chapter 32 Employee Resource Groups. Staff.

- So there's a lot of information here. So I'll just go through our memo and then the policy, and if you have any questions you can ask us about them. So the City wants to leverage our diversity and foster inclusion to provide the best service for the public, and the goals we also have is to create a culture that would value the contributions from all of our employees and provide equal opportunity for professional development and career advancement. So that's why we're bringing forth the Employee Resource Group. So what is an Employee Resource Group? It's an employee group that's been formally recognized by the City and is comprised of employee members who share a common background, focused area of interest, and/or goals. So we're hoping that the Employee Resource Groups will create this type of culture for the City. So that's kind of the why behind it. So if you look at 32.2, and now I'm looking at the policy that we have. So in 32.2, what we're hoping that our Employee Resource Groups will achieve, and you see the letters here, would help the City strengthen the City's ability to recruit a diverse workforce, provide safe and supportive employee networks, organized around shared characteristics or interests which help improve working relationships and create a more inclusive and attractive working environment, create an open forum for the exchange of ideas on how to better engage all City residents and provide exceptional services for the public, help foster opportunities for personal and professional development for City employees, empowering employees and develop leaders, and then help identify gaps and opportunities in the City's Talent Acquisition and Employee Development process. So, how would an employee set up an ERG? So I do have in here the application form and the charter template as well. So what an employee would do is they would apply to the HR Department. The HR Department would look over the application and then we'd approve it, and then from there we would help the employee set up the charter for the group. And then HR would then work with the ERG to make sure they're following all their guidelines and following their policies. So who is eligible for an ERG? All employees would be eligible for an ERG. And then we'd just have to make sure the ERG activities don't conflict with our Personnel policies, and any state and federal laws and ordinances as well. And the ERGs are not just for, it's not a hobby, it's not just a social group. It has to be to further the City's mission and purpose and help further diversity and inclusion in the City. And then when an employee is at an ERG sponsored activity during the work hours, that will be covered as pay, but when it's outside of the work hours, it's on the employee's own time. So then, like I said, the responsibility of the HR Department, let me back up. I guess in order for an employee to go to an ERG activity, they have to have supervisory approval to do that.

- Can you give me an example of an ERG activity?

- Sure, so what we put in here for activities?

- Mm hm.

- Well, yeah. Like what would someone do during work hours?

- So I think what they'd do is a certain group of shared characteristics would meet, and they would talk about any concerns or issues they have in the work environment, any ideas they have to improve services, any thoughts they have on different training they could provide to employees. It's an opportunity for employees to get together informally and talk about the work environment and what the City can do to help improve the services or training or just the work environment for the employees.

- Okay, and you were going to answer, what kind of group, give me an example.

- So the group that we had in the charter was women in STEM, so that's science, technology, engineering, and math. So that would be a discerned group, where you have women in STEM throughout all the departments, so they would meet, and I think what it helps is you have women in STEM in more than one department, so that kind of breaks down those silos and has employees meeting together and talking about what they do at the city, not just within their department, but within, or I guess with all departments.

- Okay, it says in the paperwork that an ERG helps to promote diversity.

- Mm hm.

- How does a group of specific people, women in STEM, so it can't be men in STEM, I mean, how does this promote diversity?

- Yeah, so how it works is the group would be women in STEM, it would be helping to further the goals in helping women in STEM talk to each other. But it's open to every single employee in the City to be in that group. And you need the buy-in from leadership and employees to be in that group, because if you're not listening to what women in STEM are suggesting, then it's really going to go nowhere. So that's how it fosters diversity, is it gives people of a shared goal or characteristic to meet, and gives them a forum to talk about it. But then it allows the leadership to buy in and listen to their suggestions, because right now we don't really have a women in STEM group to meet and talk, why, because they do it on their own time, they could, but this kind of formalizes a system where people of a certain characteristic or idea can meet in groups, talk about their suggestions, and then leadership can listen and give them feedback on it.

- But this is, is this a real group that really wants to have a charter?

- I don't know.

- Or is this just a sample?

- Example?

- It's a sample, yeah.

- And it's not going interfere with bargaining units, or I mean, if they have ideas, anything like that, they have to either, A, go to the bargaining unit, or if they don't fall within a bargaining unit, then they could go to management with their ideas?

- So the way that I've looked at this now is I think that police and fire and transit, would be open to have an Employee Resource Group. Whether that need to be bargained or not, I think it's just good to have Employee Resource Groups throughout all of our departments. So how does it increase diversity? I think for candidates as well, diverse candidates, it's good for them to know we might have an Employee Resources Group that they can join to provide resources for them when they get work in the city.

- So this is kind of a thing? I've never heard of it. And I've been out of education now for four years. So this is a thing that--

- Yeah, a lot of private organizations have ERGs, it's very prominent in the private sector. And then Milwaukee also has Employee Resource Groups as well, many of them. And we've talked to them about their policies, and I've worked off their policies in putting this together.

- Is it attractive to Millennials, is that a specific group that might, or not so much, it doesn't really have to do with age ranges, it's more of culture?

- Yeah, I think it's more about culture.

- Or education, like STEM, or, Celestine,

- You can jump in.

- [Celestine] Thank you, Celestine Jeffreys, Chief of Staff.

- And Celestine, do you want to come up, so we get you--

- On the camera.

- [Celestine] So it is open to employees who want to form a group, and it is very much, it isn't the staff, the senior staff telling employees what group they should form, but rather what groups employees feel call to form. And we talk about diversity, we talk about it very broadly. And so that includes many, many different kinds of categories by which someone would identify. Or, someone in a life circumstance. So I can give you another Employee Resource Group potential. Once again, we don't know if people are interested in doing that here in the City, but caregivers, right? So some people in the middle of their lives find themselves being caregivers for their parents. And that could be an Employee Resource Group, middle-aged caregivers of aging parents.

- Maybe a Veterans group.

- [Celestine] Could be a Veterans group, exactly, right. And it's open to everyone. I think the key thing that Director Faulds had said is that it's open to everyone.

- Well, what do we do with the employee that joins 10 ERGs?

- Yep, that's a great question. So I think what we need to do as the supervisors and senior staff is make sure that, I think someone could join 10, I don't know if we're ever going to get to 10, but then it cannot conflict with your work responsibilities, so let's just say you joined two or three or something like that. We would think that the meetings would be probably be once a month, so if you're in three groups, maybe you don't go to three every single month, and maybe you rotate and its quarterly or something like that. So that's how we would handle that, we would just make sure it doesn't conflict with work responsibilities.

- Right.

- And I think we will encourage them to have meetings during their break times or around the lunch or something like that, because we want the dialogue to be with the supervisor and the employees, what can we do to make sure it's not conflicting with work responsibilities, or just minimizing how much it's affecting. And we do also have like our benefits committee, we have safety committees, we do have a lot of committees that we do meet during work hours, and I think this would be part of those.

- Okay.

- So I think what we were hoping for was that we would have this starting January 1st, and that would give us time to educate our employees, and educate supervisors on how to work with ERGs. And then also to let you know is that Human Resources, for the budget, we will be reclassing one of our positions. We have two HR Assistant positions. We just filled one. The second HR Assistant position we'll reclass to a Diversity and Inclusion Coordinator. That person would oversee ERGs, it wouldn't be all they do, they'd also do other strategies to improve diversity and inclusion, and then we would also be asking for about some seed money for the ERGs at the budget time for you guys to look at as well, which would be about 1,500.

- Motion?

- I'll move to approve.

- I'll second.

- All in favor?

- [All] Aye.

- Opposed? Passes unanimously. Now we're onto item five. We're here for consideration with possible action on the Officer Matthew Lynch regarding the attendance of K9 training issued July 19th, 2019. This Grievance is before the Personnel Committee meeting at this time upon the mutual agreement of the parties for extensions of time, rather than at the meeting that was first available after filing. This is a quasi-judicial matter. It is the goal of the Personnel Committee to provide and conduct the hearing that is both fair in form, appearance, and substance. To ensure that this hearing satisfies these goals, each member of the Personnel Committee please confirm the following by stating, I confirm. I do not have an interest or conflict of interest in this matter.

- I confirm.

- I confirm.

- I confirm. I have not received any communication from any person or party about this matter.

- I did not.

- I did not.

- The decision will be made based upon a Labor Agreement between the City of Green Bay and the Green Bay Professional Police Association in effect as of the date of the event complained thereof. The Personnel Committee will either announce its decision tonight or take the matter under advisement and have a decision at the next committee meeting. The Personnel Committee will make findings of fact and conclusions of law based upon the record before it. At this time, the following materials have been submitted into the record. Number one is letter from the GBPPA dated August 7th, 2019. Two, the original Grievance number 2019-003, identified as Green Bay Professional Police Association Contract Violation Information Form, dated August 7th, 2019, and attached documentation. Number three is a Grievance Response, number 2019-003, from Chief Andrew Smith, dated May 30th, 2019. Number four is a letter from HR Director, Joseph Faulds, to Officer Matthew Lynch, dated July 19th, 2019. And lastly, a letter from Attorney Jon Cermele?

- Cermele.

- Cermele, I'm sorry, to the Personnel Committee, dated October 3rd, 2019. Pursuant to Section 3.8.3 of the Labor Agreement, the Committee may decide whether to hold a fact finding hearing. As neither party has requested a fact finding hearing, the Committee will consider as evidence only the materials which have been submitted into the record. No testimony or further evidence will be considered, but both parties will be permitted to make arguments to support their written submissions. Does either party wish to make arguments to support their written submissions?

- Not at this time?

- City?

- We don't either. And I just want to clarify, I think there was, was there also a letter from the City from myself on October 4th? It's in the packet.

- [Vanessa] If it's in the packet, we can add it onto there. When I was going through there I didn't see it.

- Yeah, it's in the packet that you do have.

- All right, I'm going to make an amendment to the statement, then, number six, there's a letter dated--

- October 4th.
- October 4th, from whom to whom?
- From HR Director Joe Faulds to the Personnel Committee.
- Okay.
- [Vanessa] Just one correction, it looks like it's actually dated October 1st.
- Then there's--
- There's an October 1st one.
- There's a 1st and the 4th.
- There's two on the 4th.
- [Vanessa] I'm just double checking something here.
- I found it, October 4th is the very last one.
- Last, mm hm.
- Yep, it's in there.
- I'm going to ask the, are there any, do you guys have any concerns or questions about these two other letters that are being added?
- [Phil] I was aware that there was an additional letter from Director Faulds that was added in response to Attorney Cermele's email. I was not aware that there was two, and I guess I'm--
- So I did send an email to Phil, and Attorney Cermele, and Chief Smith, that it was in response to Attorney Cermele's letter.
- [Phil] So there's one response, correct?
- One response, that's it, yep.
- Okay, all right. So, neither party wants to make any arguments in support of their written submissions. Does any member of the Personnel Committee have any questions for either party? If you do, go ahead.
- Okay, so this was really difficult, first of all, because, I mean, I have a lot of questions, I guess, but I tried to frame this up so that I wasn't looking at it like a K9 unit, okay, I was thinking, first I thought, well, okay, if there was one less--
- Do we need to go into closed session?
- No.
- No?

- This is open session, that's fine.

- If there was one, say there was one less quadrant in Green Bay, say all of a sudden the high school, middle school, the elementary schools all combined, they were all shut down and we had 10 SROs, and then we didn't need SROs anymore in that quadrant. But then I thought that was a bad one, because we need SROs everywhere, so I just decided not to use that. So then I thought, okay, I'm not being facetious here, but hear me out. We no longer have horses. But might someday get some more horses. We have an equestrian unit right now, right? We do have an equestrian unit. Would they still train, and these are maybe hypothetical, not that you have to answer them, but I was trying to kind of like, would they still train if we didn't have horses, would they drive the vehicle and horse trailer to the training, I was kind of extrapolating that, why would you drive the car, the K9 car to the training, because you maybe, or if we know we had a boat, or access to a boat, would the dive team drive the boat and trailer, no boat on the trailer to train. That part was kind of easier from me to think, why would you take the car if you didn't have a dog in it? So, are they allowed to answer questions, or am I just?

- Do you want to clarify, are you asking for the vehicle to stay with the officer?

- [Jon] I struck that from--

- Oh, that's gone now?

- I did respond to that, but that's no longer an issue. The issue now is simply on attending training.

- Okay, that makes sense. Okay, in that case, handlers have expensive training, because I've looked at the training a little bit, not around the K9s and support dogs, and so it's expensive training, it's probably good training. So it makes sense that they train monthly to keep their skills up. A lot's been invested in the officer's training. If this officer gets a dog again, will he lose his skills? Is it less costly to keep him trained than to start over with training, or would he have to start over with training because it's new K9? Who wants to answer that question? That group of questions, I can say them again.

- [Phil] Should we just, should we address that?

- [Matthew] Do we go up, or no?

- [Phil] All right, so, Phil Scanlan for the Police Association of Green Bay, and Officer Lynch here.

- And Phil, sorry, do you want come up to this, so we can catch you on camera. Thank you for doing that.

- All right, that was kind of, it was a long way to get to that question. So I'll answer it the best I can. We recognize in the Association that Officer Lynch has been a K9 handler for nine years. So the City's invested a lot of money in his training over the course of that time. He's handled two dogs. The second dog he handled, prior to that dog's passing, prior to the dog retiring, had three other handlers, is that correct?

- Correct.

- [Phil] Had three other handlers. So he's the fourth handler to handle that dog. So not only has he had all that prerequisite training, but he's also been trained in handling dogs that previously belonged to other handlers. And that's part of the Association's point, is that the Department and the City's invested this money in his training. We all know that police work is a dangerous job. We know that tomorrow, any one of our department's six previous K9 handlers could fall ill, could have a car accident, could be assaulted or injured on duty, could just decide to say my family circumstance has changed, I no longer want to be a K9 handler. And now we'll have a dog that the City's invested a lot of money in. And we'll have a handler that has not been allowed to train. And the concern is why not? The Association's position is actually that the department is a

little bit remiss to not let him train. They've invested a lot of money in that training. And we have all seen lately, in the past six months, the value of our police dogs. Our police dogs save citizens' lives, they've saved our officers' lives, and I understand that the department has the obligation to be frugal, I understand that. I understand that budgets are tough. But it's the Association's position that this is a very, this is a very important unit within our department for our rank and file, and for the citizens that we serve. We also recognize that the department has invested a lot of money in continuing this training, and to put it on hold, assuming that nothing will happen to the current handlers or the current dogs in the meantime, I think, is a risk that the Association doesn't agree with. And I also think the language is clear in the Grievance, that it says that these K9 units shall train as a unit. There's no exception in the contract for whether or not the handler has a dog or not at that time. So I don't know if that specifically answered your question. Officer Lynch can probably, or any of these other K9 handlers that are present might be able to address some of the diminished skill sets that they might incur if they no longer trained for a one month, three month, five month, six months, I'm not a K9 handler, I can't speak to that.

- And that was kind of a follow up as you spoke, I wondered how quickly does one lose their skills, and then what dog would he train with, what K9?

- [Phil] I can tell you this, that having worked with K9 handlers, and having worked with Officer Lynch on the SWAT team, who had K9 on the SWAT team, we understand that these canines are pack creatures. We understand that the more that we train with them as a SWAT team, and we understand, they can testify as well, that the more these handlers train with these dogs as a unit in whole, these dogs become familiar with their handlers, they become familiar with other law enforcement officers and partners in their pack, and increase their effectiveness, and it decreases their potential of biting them, or their ability to work with them. Officer Lynch, if I can answer for Officer Lynch, or he can come up and tell you that, in the event of an emergency, and an officer lost, was unable to perform his dog, Officer Lynch would be able to work with that dog based on his training and experience.

- Has it ever happened? Has there ever been a time, when a sub-handler was needed? Like in the past two years, five years, ever?

- [Matthew] Yes, Officer Salzmann was injured for some time, and he was not working his dog at that time.

- So who took his dog?

- [Matthew] Nobody did.

- So you didn't have a sub-handler?

- [Matthew] Not at that time.

- Because you all had your own dogs.

- [Matthew] Yeah, everybody else had a dog, as did myself.

- I'll come back up if needed.

- Okay. Did you guys want to respond to that?

- [Andrew] Mm hm.

- Yeah, if you want to.

- [Andrew] Andrew Smith, Chief of Police. A couple of points. If we eliminated our horses, we certainly will not continue to train as a horse unit. We could have the unit suspend their operations, but they certainly wouldn't go to the arena, they certainly wouldn't train, to answer your first question.

- Okay.

- [Andrew] Second of all, dogs are, and I completely agree, a tremendous asset for our city, love having dogs, love K9s, love K9 handlers. I think they do a great job while they're out there. I wish we could have more dogs out there, but our budgets just won't allow it. We just don't have the room to have seven K9s right now. Down the road if we do, we'd certainly like to increase the number of K9s. But it doesn't make sense to me, and I don't think it makes sense to the taxpayers, to have somebody down there, watching other guys with their dogs, train other guys' dogs. If we decide to get another K9, and that goes to Officer Lynch, and he will certainly be afforded all the training he needs to get caught up in any training that has elapsed, or any training that he doesn't feel comfortable with, leading up to him getting that dog and being certified in the field. And we do that for everybody whenever they get a new dog, they spend many weeks training with that dog offsite, and then more training back onsite before they are comfortable and they are certified to go out and work with that dog.

- So the fiscal portion of it was 17 hours a month of training, is that what I read, 17 hours a month?

- [Andrew] 17 hours a month, yeah, they train monthly.

- So, and that could be overtime pay, too, right? Or do they just, they're not working whatever other job they'd be doing?

- [Andrew] Right, my understanding is that time they are working doing their training, not on overtime but just a regular duty day, and they would otherwise be out in the field working. So he will spend 17 hours a month at the training facility with the other officers that are training their dogs instead of being out on patrol in the field where I would prefer him to be.

- And would he be working with a dog, though, would they share their dogs with him?

- [Andrew] Well each dog has its own handler. There may be times when he could substitute. We do have a program that allows people to become a K9 decoy, it's part of the new part of the contract. Should he desire to, he could apply to become a K9 decoy, and then as needed, he would go and work with the dogs being the decoy for the dogs that are there in their training. It's something we worked out in the last contract agreement. Right now we don't have any K9 decoys. I don't know if he's got an interest in doing that, but that's certainly something that's available to him, or anyone else that wants to become a K9 decoy.

- So it comes down to the fiscal responsibility, the argument being, right, or is there more to it? That it's costing us 17 hours of not having a police officer working at whatever else they might be doing, rather than, and then they'd be with the dogs instead.

- [Andrew] Correct.

- Where they really wouldn't be doing, they don't have their own dog?

- [Andrew] They don't have a dog, so they don't have a dog to be training with. If they would substitute for someone else's dog, that's certainly not something that we do, but to me, it doesn't make sense to tell the taxpayers I got a guy watching other guys train 17 hours a week, when I would prefer him, and I think every taxpayer here, would prefer him to be in the field working, handling radio calls, especially when we're down 17 officers as we are in the city right now, 17 police officers' positions are vacant today in Green Bay. And I just can't afford to send someone to training to watch other guys train.

- And I just, just to add too, to that, I think that's a big portion of it, but there's nothing in the contract that talks about what happens when a K9 is retired. And I believe the union has not disputed that we have the right to determine to add or not add a dog. And we've decided that we're not going to going forward, so it's our management right that we don't believe that someone should be training without a K9.

- And in the past--

- That's something--

- [Andrew] Go ahead.

- That's a question I want to follow up on later on.

- [Andrew] In the past we've had several officers, who, as K9s have died or their K9s were not continuing the program, they did not continue to go to training, they went and went back to the field and did patrol duties.

- This has happened before?

- [Andrew] Correct, several times.

- Have those officers ever then gotten a K9 later on?

- [Andrew] No, they've retired. Several of them retired, and one of them has got a detective position.

- How come you don't just eliminate the position then?

- Yeah?

- [Andrew] Well, it's a specialty unit assignment, and we cannot remove, by the contract, we cannot remove anybody from a specialty unit assignment without cause, and losing your K9, or having your K9 die, and not being able to replace that K9, is not cause to remove them from a specialty unit assignment.

- [Bill] So if the City decided due to fiscal, or whatever reason, to reduce the K9 unit to one K9, we could potentially have six officers attending training with no dogs?

- [Andrew] Correct.

- Could I, okay, I'd like, can I speak to Officer Lynch?

- Yeah, I think he'd be happy to come up.

- So, Officer Lynch?

- Yes.

- Why do you want to do this?

- [Matthew] This is entire, this is what my whole career kind of came to, this is what I always wanted to be was a K9 handler. So I've been there 25 years now. And this is one of the more important things that, to me, I'd like to end my career as being a K9 handler, and I think it's a very important part of the department, and I have more experience than anybody else does in the department, as far as handling K9s.

- But you don't have one right now, so why do you want to do this, why do you want to go to these trainings?

- [Matthew] I can help the other K9 handlers with their dogs, I won't be there watching. I'll be there helping to train, with all my experience from the past. Problems will occur with these dogs, and since I have the most experience, I can help work through these problems.

- So if they reduced the K9 unit by one more, should we tell that officer that he can then attend training too, and give his experience? Or would we have to make a decision? I mean, I just, I understand you've got a lot of experience. I understand that this is how you want to end your career, but I guess the question I would also ask out here, is what if one of the K9 dogs dies tomorrow? If we were to replace it, who gets the replacement dog? Officer Lynch, or the officer who--

- [Andrew] It makes sense it would go to the senior person, and so that would Officer Lynch, the senior person that's still a part of the unit, and that would be Officer Lynch.

- All right, and how much training did you have to go through, Matt, when you got your dog the first time?

- [Matthew] The first dog I had, I had six weeks of training.

- And what do they do now for training for a new officer getting a dog?

- [Matthew] You'd have to talk to one of the new officers. They went to a different vendor right now. I didn't go through that vendor.

- But you had four dogs?

- [Matthew] No, I had two dogs.

- So how much training did you go through?

- [Matthew] My last dog had four handlers.

- Okay, so how much training did you go through for the second dog, did you go through six weeks again?

- [Matthew] No, I did not, because--

- Because why?

- [Matthew] Because I'd got another dog, and I'm an experienced handler that they said you did not have to go to school. You already have been through that.

- So you still would have a lot of skills.

- [Matthew] Yes.

- So, the purpose of going to the training is for you to get training, not necessarily to be helping other handlers, because that's not the purpose of the training. The purpose is for you to do training. So, what, I don't know, what will you be getting out of this training? You really have a lot of experience.

- [Matthew] Yes I do, I can help the other handlers if problems arise.

- I get it, but that's not the, that's not the purpose for you being in, I mean, for me that doesn't fit into, what, I'm thinking, oh, I don't want you to lose your skills, or we've invested a lot in this guy, I don't want him to lose

his skills, he should keep these skills, but it seems like you have the skills, and that you don't really need the additional training. You're not even going to be, you're going to be helping, not really getting training.

- [Matthew] With anything else, if you don't continue your skills, I think you lose them, it's possible, they're perishable.

- Well, you're right, you're right.

- [Matthew] So I think that would be an important factor too.

- Any other questions for Officer Lynch? All right, thanks, Matt.

- [Matthew] Thank you.

- Thank you.

- Any other questions?

- That was these for now.

- Okay, so if I understand correctly, contract says they can't be removed unless for cause. Not having a dog is not cause. If another dog dies tomorrow, Matt would be able to bid for it by seniority, or he would get it by seniority.

- [Andrew] He would get it, it's my understanding is he would--

- So if he doesn't train for a year, and another dog dies, okay, and say if the City prevails, he doesn't train for a year, and another dog dies.

- Or retires.

- Or retires.

- You don't have to die.

- Who would then get the dog? Would you post it, or would he have automatic bid on it.

- [Andrew] He would have the first option to get that dog. We would purchase a dog or make arrangements to purchase a dog. He would then begin training with the K9 unit until his dog is ready to be picked up. He would go to the vendor. He would receive training onsite from the vendor. Then he would come back here. We'd make sure that everything was squared away, and he was comfortable, and that he was certified, and then we would put him out in the field to work.

- And then that other officer whose dog was retired would have to wait in the wings until another dog left?

- [Andrew] Correct.

- Or we added to the corps?

- Correct

- Or unless we set a precedent, he could go to training?

- Right, well, I'm just saying, if the City prevailed.

- Right.

- Okay. So then my question for the City is, what do you cite that you believe gives you cause to say we don't have to follow the contract in this case?

- So I think when they say it in there that it's unambiguous, the language, I know they stated they kind of, I know there was some past practice arguments made before, but they say that when it's unambiguous language you can't look at past practice, which I've made that argument to the Committee a few years ago, and I agree with that. But I think when you look at the language, where it says, "a K9 officer shall be responsible for 17 hours of maintenance training per month", I think when we look at a K9 officer, I think you assume a K9 officer has a canine, when you think of that. And then also, the language does not talk about what happens when a K9 retires. So I think because it doesn't talk about what happens when a K9 retires, the City can determine whether or not to fill that K9. We've decided not to. And in the past, when we haven't filled a K9, that officer was not able to go to training. So it's our management right to say when someone doesn't have a K9, they are not going to continue their training. But once we get a K9, that person's up next.

- So this actually has happened before and no one objected?

- So what's happened, and the Union can correct me if I'm wrong here, when we are replacing, so let's say a K9 retires.

- Okay.

- We then say we're going to replace that K9. We allow the person to go because we knew the K9 was going to be replaced. But when we knew we were not going to replace a K9, we did not allow the person to go to training.

- So that's actually happened before?

- Yes.

- But why wasn't there any objection before?

- I think it's because the person did not want to continue to go to training. The person may not want to be a part of the K9 unit, or a K9 officer any more, that's my guess.

- Okay.

- Because I think Officer Lynch wants to continue to be a K9 officer. And we've said, he is part of the K9 unit. He could be a K9 decoy, that's, and he's up next, if a K9 is purchased. That's why he still part of the unit. We just don't think that the contract enforces us to make the person go, or to allow the person to go to training, and we think that we have the right to determine to replace the dog or not.

- And what are the parameters for a decoy? Do they attend the 17 hours of training a month?

- I guess I would have to ask the Chief.

- [Andrew] I'd have to jump in on here, that was something that we worked out the last contract, and it's a position that they would apply for, and then we'd use them as they're needed, they wouldn't be there for every part of the training--

- Do you mind coming up to the podium, please.

- Yeah.

- Sorry. It's for the camera.

- Sure.

- Thank you.

- [Andrew] So, in the last contract we worked out, because there may be times when they need a K9 decoy, someone to go and hide and let the K9 find this particular person, we thought that it would be best if that person had a certain amount of training before they became a K9 decoy so that it's not just a random officer out there. We got something in the contract last time around that would allow us to advertise for and people put in to become a K9 decoy, and then as they are needed they would be able to go out and act as a decoy for the K9 unit that's out there. That's a position that is still open. No one has come forward that wanted to be a part of it.

- No one wants it?

- Correct.

- [Man] We haven't posted it yet.

- [Andrew] It hasn't been posted, there's never been--

- I was going to say, I can understand not wanting to get bit, but--

- How much does an officer get per hour, like on average? I mean, how much money are we talking about here? 17 hours a month times?

- \$35.00 an hour would be a ballpark?

- Yeah, that's--

- [Phil] That depends on their wage.

- Right, but let's just give me a number. I'll take one from you, give me a number.

- [Phil] I imagine that Officer Lynch would expect to, is probably right around, with shift differential, \$39, \$40 an hour.

- Okay, I'll put 40, times 20 months. Some of which would be on-duty time and already be part of the salary.

- But it's still-

- But it wouldn't be--

- It's still a cost.

- [Phil] Can I come up?

- Sure, come on up.

- Yes, come on up. \$8,160.00, so we're talking about that. That just, I mean, that gives me a little parameter there.

- [Phil] If I could make just a couple of comments. And I'll keep it brief. I understand we're giving, kind of making, we're kind of getting a wide scope here on, I think, a relatively narrow topic. For starters, there's been some discussion on whether the dogs' handlers who had other dogs die or retire and stop training. To their knowledge, that's not happened. They're all allowed to continue training when their dogs were down. I understand the difference here that there is no one, there is no dog that it's happened. I understand that there is a little bit of apples and oranges to that. But I will say this, in regards to management's rights, the contract for the Green Bay Police Association is very broad, but does specifically address that all maintenance training is handled by the K9 unit. It specifically addresses that. The City never bargained any exception to this. The City never, we recently addressed the K9's contract in the last contract, there was no bargaining exception for that made if a dog goes down, you don't attend training, the City saves the money, that exception was never made. And because that provision is broad, but specifically addresses that all members of the K9 unit train together when feasible, we would opine that he's still a member of the K9, in good standing, he's a member of the K9 unit, he should attend training. I get that the Association and Management will disagree sometimes, oftentimes when it comes to money, we understand that, but the language on this, we would like to go back to the language. Commander Warych, himself in an email, Matt Lynch, and the Chief testified, Matt Lynch is a member of the K9 unit in good training. The language says that all members of the K9 unit train together. It is not specifically itemized that when a dog is not there, he's not available, he doesn't attend. That happens on any given day, dogs get hurt, dogs get sick. We don't not let the officer attend training at that time because a dog's not available at that time. There is no specific limitation to that. So, and although we've brought it out to a lot of arguments, I would really respectfully ask that you address the language itself. We understand that the City wants to save money. We understand the Personnel Committee might have questions about our wages and our hours and how much money that saves directly, but this is addressed in our contract, and it does say specifically that all K9 handlers will train together as a unit. Matt Lynch is a K9 handler. His dog is down, his dog was retired by the City. He is still a K9 handler with the City in good standing. So, thank you.

- Phil, I, just a question.

- [Phil] Sorry.

- So what do we, who represent the taxpayers, who don't necessarily care about a contract, what do we tell them about that cost, that there's not an officer on the road working traffic, handling calls for service, that potentially is working overtime because not all the training is on their workday, is it?

- [Phil] Okay, two points. One, it's not overtime. The officers on our K9 unit are on a 5-3 work schedule. So as the calendar year rolls on, some of their training is on their work time, and they are pulled from the shift when feasible. So the department, I would imagine, could make an argument, if there is safety staffing issues, they could make an argument that that may be feasible that they still stay on the road, right, but some of that training falls on their days off which does not affect the staffing of the road, does not affect any more officers on the road, and the compensation is straight time pay, it's not overtime.

- [Bill] Okay.

- [Phil] Which is agreed to by the City, and I would hope that although taxpayers might not be happy that we have a contract with the City, I think the City agreed in good faith with our Association on this contract, in negotiations, and we'd ask that they recognize our contract.

- [Bill] And the management rights?

- [Phil] The management rights, our opinion on that, in regards to that is that there is specifically an article regarding K9s, and although it's broad, it's addressed. So I think we would opine that management rights does not pertain to this because it says in the article that all K9 handlers will train together as a unit when feasible.
- Okay. All right, thanks. Are there any other questions for either party?
- Does anyone else want to say anything?
- Okay, all right, I will now entertain a motion to go into closed session so we can deliberate.
- Motion to go into closed session.
- Second.
- All in favor?
- [All] Aye.
- All right, we need to read the--
- The closed session language.
- Yeah. Okay, consideration with possible action on the Grievance filed by Officer Matt Lynch regarding the attendance of K9 training issued July 19, oh wait, yeah--
- I got it.
- Yeah, go ahead.
- The Committee may convene in closed session pursuant to 19.85 sub , Wisconsin Statutes, for the purpose of deliberating concerning a case which was the subject of any judicial or quasi-judicial trial or hearing before that governmental body. The Committee may, thereafter, reconvene in open session pursuant to 19.85 sub , Wisconsin Statutes to report any actions taken during closed session and to consider all other matters on the agenda.
- That's it.
- That's it.
- Do you guys take a vote on that, or?
- I thought we did.
- But, don't we have--
- We did, we did.
- All right, so, we're gonna have to ask everyone to leave while we go--
- Whoa, power down completely.
- Okay, I'll entertain a motion to go back in session.

- Hold on, hold on.
- Hang on, stand by. Did it freeze?
- I'm so glad I didn't touch it.
- It's okay if it doesn't work, we'll--
- No, it's fine, we were off so long that it just powered down. Okay, we're good.
- I move that we go back into regular order.
- Second.
- All in favor?
- [All] Aye.
- All right, that passes unanimously. All right, what we're doing is we're taking this under advisement.
- I can make that motion.
- Do we?
- Yep.
- Okay, go ahead.
- That would be the proper procedure.
- I'm sorry.
- I'd like to move that we take this under advisement.
- I will second that.
- All right, all in favor?
- [All] Aye.
- Okay, I'm sorry to put this off, guys, but this is going to be put off until the next meeting on November 12th. There's some stuff that we're going to have staff look up for us to advise us on, because it's, it's just one of those things. So it's not easy to come up with a decision on this one, so that's what we're going to do, all right? All right, thank you very much. All right, public hearing, nothing. Informational.
- [Phil] Thank you.
- Thank you.
- Take care.
- Yes, we do have the report for Personnel Actions in there, and then also the next meeting's on the 29th for the Joint Finance Personnel meeting.

- Any questions?
- This is, did you state that we were taking that up under, on the November 12th meeting?
- Yep, he said November 12th.
- Okay.
- Yep, mm hm.
- He did.
- Should I move to adjourn?
- Yes.
- Okay, move to adjourn.
- Second.
- All in favor?
- [All] Aye.
- All right, let's go outside and warm up.
- Oh my God, it's so cold.
- I want to stay here longer.
- [Woman] My water literally is freezing.

Dental Carrier:		Humana		Humana
		Current		Alternate
Deductible				
	Single	\$50		\$50
	Family	\$150		\$150
Annual Maximum				
		\$2,500		\$2,500
Preventive Services				
	Oral Exams	100%		100%
	Bite Wing X-Rays	100%		100%
	Cleanings	100%		100%
	Topical Fluoride	100%		100%
	Sealants	80%		80%
	Space Maintainers	80%		80%
Basic/Major Services				
	Amalgam/Composite Fillings	80%		80%
	All other X-Rays	80%		80%
	Simple Extractions	80%		80%
	Oral Surgery	80%		80%
	Endodontics	50%		50%
	Periodontics	80%		80%
	Stainless Steel Crowns	80%		80%
	Porcelain Crowns	50%		50%
	Inlays/Onlays	80%		80%
	Implants	50%		50%
	Removable or Fixed Bridgework	50%		50%
	Partial or Complete Dentures	50%		50%
	Full & Partial Denture Repair	50%		50%
Orthodontics				
		50% to \$2,000		50% to \$2,000
Rates		Current		Forecast
Employee	196	\$42.65	\$46.49	\$43.93
Family	461	\$129.62	\$141.29	\$133.51
		9.00%		3.00%
Monthly Totals		\$68,114.22	\$74,246.73	\$70,157.65
Annual Totals		\$817,370.64	\$890,960.76	\$841,891.76
		\$73,590.12		\$24,521.12

Alternate Includes:

1. Limit Fluoride to 1 per year for only for dependent children up to age 17 (2.25%)
2. Move full-mouth and panoramic x-rays limit to 1 per 5 years - remains covered under Basic (2%)
3. Move local anesthetics/study models to integral services (.5%)
4. Remove coverage for restorations/appliances due to increasing vertical dimension, restoring occlusion, replaing tooth structure lost by attrition, abfraction, abrasion and erosion and splinting (.5%)
5. Apply missing tooth clause (removes existing coverage of congenitally missing teeth) (.75%)

While every effort is made to illustrate the carriers' various benefits, discrepancies or errors are possible. In the event of an error, the actual product brochure furnished by the insurance carrier and approved by the Commissioner of Insurance will prevail. The master contract and policyholder certificates are more detailed and should be used for the determination of benefits. All plans will comply with state and/or federal requirements with regard to nervous and mental benefits.