MINUTES OF THE PERSONNEL COMMITTEE

TUESDAY, OCTOBER 11, 2022, 4:30 PM
Virtual Meeting. Public may join via Zoom.

A. ZOOM MEETING INFORMATION.

1. This item contains Zoom information, instructions, and a link to the Virtual Comment Form.

B. ROLL CALL.

Present: Bill Galvin, Brian Johnson, Jim Hutchison
Excused: Jesse Brunette

Others Present: Ald. Melinda Eck, Ald. Steven Campbell, Ald. Jennifer Grant, Finance Director Diana Ellenbecker, Public Works Director Steve Grenier, Chief of Operations Joseph Faulds, Procurement Manager Thomas Walenski, Deputy City Attorney Lacey Cochart, Human Resources Manager Melanie Falk and others.

C. APPROVAL OF THE AGENDA.

Moved by Ald. Brian Johnson, seconded by Ald. Jim Hutchison to approve the agenda.
Motion Passed.
Yes- Bill Galvin, Brian Johnson, Jim Hutchison, No- None, Abstain- None.

D. APPROVAL OF MINUTES.

Moved by Ald. Brian Johnson, seconded by Ald. Jim Hutchison to approve.
Motion Passed.
Yes- Bill Galvin, Brian Johnson, Jim Hutchison, No- None, Abstain- None.

E. REGULAR BUSINESS.

1. Consideration with possible action on the request to fill the following replacement positions and all subsequent vacancies resulting from internal transfers.
a. Part Time Cleaner - Parks, Recreation, and Forestry
b. Document Center Operator - Administrative Services
c. Street Laborer - Public Works

Moved by Ald. Brian Johnson, seconded by Ald. Jim Hutchison to approve the requests to fill with the contingency that staff provides the fiscal impact of the part time Cleaner and the part time Document Center Operator as discussed.
Motion Passed.
Yes- Bill Galvin, Brian Johnson, Jim Hutchison, No- None, Abstain- None.

2. Request by Ald. Galvin for consideration with possible action to review and potentially increase the salary for the Mayor's position for the 2023-2027 term.

Moved by Ald. Brian Johnson, seconded by Ald. Jim Hutchison to approve a 3% increase per year to the Mayor's salary over 4 years.
Motion Passed.
Yes- Bill Galvin, Brian Johnson, Jim Hutchison, No- None, Abstain- None.

F. INFORMATIONAL.

1. Report of Routine Personnel Action Items

2. Next meetind date: October 25, 2022

G. ADJOURNMENT.

Moved by Ald. Brian Johnson, seconded by Ald. Jim Hutchison to adjourn.
Motion Passed.
Yes- Bill Galvin, Brian Johnson, Jim Hutchison, No- None, Abstain- None.

VERBATIM MINUTES

- Alright, this is the Personnel Committee Meeting on October 11th at 4:35 PM. In attendance, we have Alder Hutchison, Alder Johnson, and Alder Galvin. Alder Brunette said he may not be able to make it until five o'clock. Still in attendance from, the alder world is Alder Grant. I'll entertain a motion on the agenda.

- So moved.

- Second.

- All in favor say aye.

- Aye.

- Aye.

- Any opposed? I'll entertain a motion on the minutes.

- So moved.

- Second.

- All those in favor, say aye.

- Aye.

- Aye.

- That passes unanimously. On to regular business. Item E, number one, consideration with possible action on the request to fill the following replacement positions and all subsequent vacancies resulting from internal Number A is a part-time cleaner for parks and rec. B is a document center operator for administrative services, and C is a street laborer for public works. Does anyone have any questions for staff? Alder Johnson?

- Yes, just, just one related to, I mean we moved the document center from 19.7 to 20. Can you just talk about the why and if there's a sort of an impact, particularly as it relates to

- Alder Johnson, you kind of cut out at the end where you said, the impact that occurs to. And I missed that.

- If there's any impact to benefits. Right? A lot of, you know, some companies that at part-time classification. It just has a different impact. So I'm just trying to determine if there's anything with that.

- Finance Director Ellenbecker, do you wanna jump in on this?

- Yes. We actually originally was gonna post it at 19 hours. That's roughly what was, historically had been budgeted, but we made, we had some other changes but in the process, working with HR, found out 19 hour employee gets zero benefits. They do not even get prorated leave time, they don't get any benefits at 19 hours. At 20 hours they start getting prorated sick vacation, leave time, and then prorated part-time health benefits. The cost is still higher for the employee on health benefits than for a part-time employee than the active employee. But at 20 hours they can start getting those benefits. The reason why we didn't know that before is because in the past we had Cheryl, she was one employee. When she worked for the city and she was working about 37, 38 hours. So she was considered a full-time employee. We believe that for recruitment, that there was a decision to try to separate two different kind of skill sets at really, and we actually did take that one from a 19 hour up to a 20 hour working with HR, believing that recruitment would be better if we were able to recruit with part-time benefits, versus 19 hours and no benefits at all. So that is why we recruited at, we're trying to recruit at 20.

- So does that, and I apologize, I'm trying to get into Civic Clerk, and it's not letting me, I don't know if anybody else is having that problem, but.

- Yeah, Brian, Yes. From what I understand, Mike about a half an hour ago, half an hour ago, said that board view is not working. So at any point, if we need to, we can show the, we can show the packet online if that's what you need 'cause, or you can go into the city website and access it that way. Board View is down and there is a ticket into Civic Clerk.

- Yeah, and I, I I did pull up the packet. So I'm just, so when I'm looking at this, right, there's the, the fiscal impact that's showing actually a savings of roughly $75. But if I'm looking at this, that does not take into account the additional benefits. Is that correct?

- I'd have to look at the packet. From what I understand though, a full-time employee, what did the, with Cheryl was, she was getting full, full benefits at, at a full-time employee. She was getting full family plan, getting full benefits, two single plans with prorated benefits at a, at a single plan for part-time employee actually isn't as expensive as a one full-time, part-time. I mean full-time employee. I believe, I would have to pull the packet up.

- Okay. I, yeah. And I just wanna make sure that we're all understanding and on the same page with what the real fiscal impact is, and if that minus 75 is accurate, great. But if there is more to it, I just wanna make sure that everybody understands that.

- Any other questions or comments?

- Yeah, I mean, Melanie, I saw you kind of shaking your head yes.

- Yes. Cheryl was receiving full-time benefits. She was working very close to 40 hours a week.

- Okay. So when we fill these two positions, then are we, are are we, you're, you're, what what I'm hearing, and correct me if I'm wrong, is that the benefits paid to two part-time positions is less than what you would pay to one full-time position?

- I'm looking for the packet.

- I dunno how, I think the, the amount of, I guess, premium that the employee pays when they're part-time employee, and then the employer portion of it. My assumption is that if we have two employees that are part-time and they both decide to take family benefits, that's kind of tough because it's a, it's a big premium payment for the part-time employee. But if they both took family, I'm assuming it would be an increased cost to the city. That's my guess.

- Which isn't really documented here, and really isn't being communicated in this. And this is why I wanna make sure from a committee perspective, if we bump this up to 20, that that, that there's more of a fiscal impact than what's being documented here. Right?

- Yeah. So I, if we want to, what we can do for common councils, we can make sure we have that information for you. I don't know how much of an increase it would be, but that's something I'll have to talk it over with, I guess Director Ellenbecker and HR Manager Falk.

- Yeah.

- Okay. And we've not really made an attempt at this point to recruit or fill that role, right?

- Oh no, we have not.

- I mean, I guess I would appreciate it for the full council packet if we could see what, what that, you know, and, and I bring this up and we've had this conversation here before at personnel, where we've, we've upgraded a lot of positions, right? And we, and, and of course that, that when you're always upgrading positions, and you're never downgrading positions, you're always adding positions, you never remove positions, that, that starts to grow the payroll. And, you know, it's, it's one thing if we're all okay with that, it's another thing to just really have a transparent discussion around what the fiscal impact of that is, you know, as we're heading into budget season.

- Yeah, I agree. And I, and I think it's, I said when we look at the impact between, I think the, the benefits, these small and the grand scheme of things, and I think the focus was on these are two separate positions and we wanna be able to recruit someone, for different skill sets for each of them. And then I think it's, y'all know this is the common council, I mean, our services aren't really decreasing either, so I think that kind of goes hand in hand with us adding positions as well. But that's a bigger discussion for us to have at the budget time.

- That's the only question I had, Bill.

- Okay, does anyone else have any other questions or comments, concerns? Otherwise I'll entertain a motion.

- Motion to approve with the contingency that it be reported out in the council packet, the additional fiscal impact for those benefits as we discussed.

- Yeah. Good.

- All those in favor, say aye.

- Aye.

- Aye. That passes unanimously. On item two, consideration with possible action to review and potentially increase the salary for the mayor in 2023. My concern, the reason I'm bringing this forward that the last mayor went quite a while without any kind of raise. I think that was due to some animus between members of council and the mayor at that time. After that, when he had said he wasn't going to be the mayor anymore, the council discussed and implemented a, a raise for that position spread out over four years. To try and somewhat tamp it down, the effect it would have on our budget.

- It, Bill, am I the only one having a hard time hearing him?

- No, I, it's hard to hear him.

- Okay, I'm trying and get closer. Is this better? Oh, can you hear me better now?

- Yeah.

- Okay. So anyway, I felt that, you know, you hear a lot of complaints about professional politicians and that kind of stuff and, and you hear about people talking about running for office, but that it is very time consuming. It can be very expensive depending upon the position you're running for. And I have looked at what the mayor does in the last six years and there's a considerable amount of commitment to that position, a considerable amount of time. And you have an individual that's basically responsible for how the city runs with oversight by the council. He has a lot of people that, administrators that are all making more money than he is. And it's not all about the money, but if we're looking to have quality people running for office, whether they be current politicians or people in the private sector, but especially for the private sector, for people to give up jobs and that kind of stuff to try and, and lead the city, I, I think there needs to be a decent amount of compensation to attract them. And so we have an election coming out of committed to running so far. There may be more in the wings, who knows? But I think that this, it's at this time we can't do it again for another four years. I think we should look at increasing the compensation.

- Yeah. Look, you know, we, for those who might be a little newer to Council, if you're not overly familiar, this is the only time that we can take this item up. So once this individual, whether it's city council or municipal judge or the mayor, which obviously the positions for which we have oversight, elected positions, you have to make that decision prior to the election, once the election occurs, that, that salary is frozen at that level until the next election. And, and if, you know, this body were to take action again. So when you think about inflation, that happens every single year. So, so I think at a minimum you have to account for that. This position was frozen for a very long time. And, and I think that's unfortunate because it's, it, when you look at the city budget, if I'm not mistaken, maybe Director Faulds could even verify or, or corroborate this, but I think every, and I think most assistant directors are actually at a higher salary level and, and not that the mayor spot has to be the highest, but even when you look at, I looked at a compensation report and this was a couple years ago, the average chief administrative officer in the state of Wisconsin is 155,000. So if you look at every single village administrator around us, substantially, they're paid substantially more. And yet we are the flagship community of the region. And so, so I do definitely support. Do I think it needs to get up to 155? No, I think that's too much of a, of a shock to the system in, in one election cycle. And really it doesn't give you the benefit which you're looking for, a runway for an appropriate compensation attract the right candidates. But I, but I certainly think at a minimum you have to address inflationary increases. Council just did that for ourselves during the last budget cycle. So I think at a minimum you have to account for that. And the best case scenario, I think we have to, how you move that needle to an appropriate level for the skillset that is required to do this position successfully.

- And I, I concur. And if you look at the, the attached sheet of information on salaries compared to other municipalities, Green Bay's number five. But when you look at how much some of the ones just below Green Bay are making, and then you look at the size of the population that they're dealing with, again, there is a disparity there. And you know, I, I, I don't make this request looking at who the current mayor is or potentially could be. I am thinking towards the future as we try to attract good quality candidates to run for this office. And I, I think a lot of people are probably sitting there thinking maybe I could, maybe I should. But when they start looking at what they'd be giving up by running for office, even if they got it, I, I'm not sure if the juice is worth a squeeze there for 'em. And you know, some people may, you know, they should do this out of their commitment to the community. But I think if you look at the amount of time the mayor spends doing this job, and I'm looking at two mayors now that I've, that I've been working with, they do considerably more than I think people realize. I mean, it's not just an eight hour a day job, it's much, much more than that. And so I think if we wanna keep moving this community forward and drawing or attracting good candidates to run for office, we have to be those compensation packages.

- Yeah. And I think. Go ahead, Brian.

- Well now I was just gonna say, and I think we have to dispense of this notion that this is a, a position of community service. This is a professional position managing a professional staff of almost a thousand employees who has to have extensive knowledge about public administration. The, the, the superintendent. You know, that story just came out, right? I mean, what, what our the, the sort of the, the lack of, of temper intended pool, and you're really talking about someone equivalent to a school district except you're running a city, and the compensation schedules are substantially different than what you're seeing in these levels. And in, and of course when you look at the, the charts as you alluded to, Alder Galvin, that are in the packet, this is, I, I presume referring exclusively elected mayors and, and does not take into account what administrators earn. But we have to remember we are a strong mayor system. That means our mayor is the administrator, is the elected CEO of our city. And so unless we move into a direction of hiring an administrator, which for a city this size will cost us probably over $200,000. Right? If I mean it's, unless we, we migrate away from that and go to a weak mayor system, this position, we, we have to understand the scope of responsibility for, for which exists under this position.

- Yes. Alder Grant.

- I apologize, it was a little hard to hear Alder Galvin, What, when was the last raise? What was the year of the last raise?

- It would've been four years ago. That was the last raise, and the last raise before then was back in the, I believe the nineties.

- Okay. Oh, go ahead. Sorry, Chief Faulds.

- Yeah. So Alder Galvin and Grant. So last term was when we did an increase for every year. So the, the last raise was this April.

- Right? We, we spread it out over four years because we didn't wanna, we, you know, we wanted to make it look like we weren't trying to just dump a big load of money on the mayor's position.

- Okay. I guess. Just my opinion, I 100% understand what you guys are saying. A couple things though that I want people to keep in mind is yes, I understand there's inflation every year, Alder Johnson, but at the rate that we're seeing this year is not normal. We just did a reassessment to our entire community and that is gonna affect.

- Ope, we lost her.

- She's gone. Does anyone have her number or something? They can contact her and let her know she's not on the air anymore. We'll give it just a couple minutes, see if she realizes it and logs back in.

- Yeah. While she's logging in, Alder Galvin, you know, another, oh, there she is. Oh wait.

- I'm sorry. My city. Sorry. So, but yeah, I understand house values went up, but what everybody also has to keep in mind, like I spoke to Chief Faulds today, my district, I have to represent my district. My district got hit very hard with this reassessment. A lot of people are over a 33% increase. Mine personally are almost, so even if we dropped the mill rate by 25%, neighbors in my area are going to pay more in taxes. We also have a school referendum coming to the ballot in November. I, these asks, something has to give. So where is this money gonna come from? Is it gonna come from salary? things that we have to keep in mind. We can't keep asking for more. The schools need more. You know, I'm just saying, something, I'm worried about the timing and since there was a raise four years ago, I don't think this is the appropriate time. And I, but again, I do, you guys bring up a lot of good points. I do understand that we need good talent, but at the end of the day, how much can our community afford to give?

- Could our community afford, if it was $3,000 a year, it'd be 12 community afford that for that one position?

- I don't know Alder Galvin, can they afford it with a referendum and their tax assessments going up as well? It's not just a little, I mean if you're talking about $2,000 make or break on top of everything else, on top of gas, groceries, everything has gone up. Not everyone is getting these raises at their own personal jobs.

- We're not talking about 12,000 or 2,000 per person. We're talking about a $12,000 increase to our budget for the mayor.

- I understand, but I think-

- And you also understand, you also understand that the assessments, and I don't know if you've been looking at social media, but there's some people in surrounding communities who's had, have had assessments before us. Their value went up, and in some cases their taxes went, goes up. Doesn't mean your taxes go up. The last time in 2004, my assessment went way up, and my taxes did not go up.

- Okay? But if your assessment goes up by 45% and the mill rate only drops by 25%, it will go up. So.

- So if, if, if the mill rate doesn't, if the mill rate goes down accordingly, and everyone's taxes stay the same, would you be in favor of this?

- I just, I want people to understand what the community understands. When they go to vote in, in November for the school referendum. Do you think this might be in the back of their head, on top of everything else?

- Well, I, I, you know, I'd be, I'd be shocked if someone thought a $12,000 increase to the city's budget for the mayor's office would be the make or break point, whether they vote for a school referendum or not.

- But when it comes to our budget, what if we ask for pay increases for all of our staff? We other things we're asking, for the council just committed to the fire department, a new building that we might bond. I'm just saying at the end of day, asking for more and more. It's not just this.

- And, and, and I think the fact that we a ask for more and more is an indication that we need more and more. I, I have had a real rough time trying to understand how everybody can spend more money on gasoline, cell phones, internet, all those things out there, HBO, I mean, you name it, trips here and there. And when it comes to paying for something that they need, city services, they want us to make cuts and cuts and cuts, to the point where if you look at, if you've been looking at what's happening here in personnel, how many people have left the city because they're going elsewhere to get better paying jobs?

- Right, which is why I-

- Okay, so, so that bleeds into it. And here's, here's a mayor's position. We're trying to get good quality candidates for mayor. We're trying to boost the salary a little bit to get it up there where it's more competitive and more attractive. And if not now, and I've asked this like Alder Wery, 18 years, he said, this isn't the year for raises for anybody, or to raise taxes. Well, when is it going to be? I mean, what, what has to fall in place? The school referendum has nothing to do with the city of Green Bay budget. And what happens if the state raises taxes? Or the federal government? Does that mean we have to lower our taxes? Or lay people off? So that other residents feel better about it? We have to be concerned about our house. We have to take care of our house. And, and to me, if, if we're not going to take care of our house, and let's just throw in the towel and just, you know, let things go, let's not give anybody a raise and see what happens. And that's the same thing here. We're trying to get good candidates. I mean, all you see on social media is complaints about politicians and how do you get good politicians? You have to compensate 'em. And that, that's, I guess that's just my concern. If someone had a good reason not to do it other than inflation, every year we have inflation, every year taxes. But the assessment, we, we don't know if this assessment's gonna raise taxes yet or not. I mean, there's a concern, but there's state laws in place that prevent us from doing that, past a certain percentage point. So I'm, I'm, you know, I just like you to have an open mind to what's going on here and, and maybe give it a little more weight until budget time than make up your mind on this.

- Til', til' budget time because like I said, you're right, we are losing staff. I would rather that money go to pay increases to retain them. I just, I brought this all up as something to consider, and I understand we aren't to the school district, but to assume that people won't think of that when it comes time to vote is out of touch. And I'm sorry, but not everybody is, has HBO and I mean, to think that everybody's living outside of their means. I'm very aware of people who have cut back on things and who are struggling to get by right now with everything going on. And I'm just trying to be fiscally responsible with our resident's money. And I just think that, if we had a raise in the last four years, why do we have to do it again now?

- The reason was because he went the, that position went so long without a raise. And when we finally decided to give them a raise, we, we were also concerned about the public, the taxpayers. And so instead of boosting it up to where we thought it should have been, we only did a partial boost of, of getting it at least within the ballpark. And that's, and that quite frankly, that that was the thought process behind And that's why I thought, if we boosted up a little bit more this time, then we're good for the next four years. I mean, like Alder Johnson said, if this doesn't go now, it sits locked in for four years and at what, you know, what's it gonna be like in four more years? And will it be the right time in four more years? No, and four more years, we're still gonna have inflation, we're still gonna have referendums, we're still gonna have school taxes, Brown County taxes, you know, state taxes. I mean, none of that's going away. And you know, who knows where gas or, or the cost of living is gonna be that goes up every year. So I mean.

- Yeah, and I think it's, you know, we have to remember too, I mean our staff gets a raise just about every year. I think we're right around 2% now. Is that, is that right? Chief Faulds? You know, so, so this notion, you know, and remember this position was held for a long time, so it didn't, it never kept pace with inflation. And so when the council last time made the decision to do what we did, it was to try to get it to be a little better than inflation. It was still, and, and so it's still kind of flat. So if we, if we say right now we're not gonna do a raise, that's it for four, four topic for another four years. We can't go two years and then say, oh, okay, we'll, we'll try to do something. You know, so, so I think minimally we have to have that conversation inflationary increase look like, so that this position is treated fairly just like every other position. Talk about, Alder Gavin. I don't think that I personally, I just don't think that I would support like a huge lump sum. And for, if we do something, I'd rather see it a step increase, just like we do with any other position in our organization. So, you know, X amount first year, X amount the second year, so on so forth. But I do think we, we, we have to keep, not only do we have to minimally keep pace to get this position to where it ought to be. What's the cost to the city of Green Bay when the leader of your organization makes a bad decision? It's a heck of a lot more than what we're talking about right now. Let's say we even say it's 5,000 a year, just to arbitrarily pick a number. Let's say we're gonna say 5,000 a year. I've seen, I've seen RFPs go through our committees that are a hundred grand or more apart and we don't even talk about it. We don't even bat an eye, right? But we, but, but when we talk about a $3,000 raise, it's, it's a crisis. I just, I I I don't know that it is, I think it's a crisis when you have a bad person and couldn't attract good candidates that make bad decisions that cost the city of Green Bay way more money than, than than what we're talking about here. I I don't think we're talking about Milwaukee or Madison type salary ranges, at least I'm not talking about that. But I think a prudent, inappropriate given the of the decision making that goes on at this level.

- Right? And I didn't think numbers were thrown out yet, which is why I think waiting till budget would be important to see what we can give. I didn't think that much for even being discussed. I wasn't trying to make a big deal over $3,000.

- Oh no, no. And I didn't mean to suggest anything you said Alder Grant, I apologize it was that way, but, but just maybe a little bit of clarity on that too. I think the purpose of taking this up now is because whatever decision this body would ultimately make gets incorporated into the budget. And you and I would look to stand that. But I, but it was always my presumption when we've taken these issues up in the past, at least with the mayor's salary we took, I know with the council last time we took it up during the budget process. But staff, if you could maybe provide clarity on that?

- Yeah, Alder Johnson, it was pretty similar process to this. I think we had one or two meetings to talk about the salary and then I kind, I think we did end up making a decision at the budget meeting. So just to be clear on the timeline, the salary for the term has to be set before, I think the first day that you can pull nomination papers, which is December one, if I understand correctly. So we do have time the next month, and it can do this throughout the budget, which it's usually a, think it's either a resolution that's approved or it's a like miscellaneous ordinance that's approved. And so everyone's aware before they can pull a thing to add as well. Like the, like the request is, is coming from Alder, you know, Galvin and this is a discussion for the common council, staff is not making recommendation on what the increase should be or if there should be one. And also Mayor Genrich is not in support of increase in the salary for the mayor's position.

- Yeah, that, I had a meeting with the mayor on this and he said he, he, he doesn't support it at all.

- Well, it's political optics for him. I'm thinking about the next term, the next candidate.

- And that's exactly what I'm thinking about. I I, I guess, you know, we, we have three positions we're filling here. We've been in conversation about union contracts that are being discussed right now.

And all of those discussions, we're talking about potential raises and increase in benefits for employees. This, this person is an employee. We shouldn't be looking at it as to who the person is. And we had set up for after the next election to take place. It should be about the position, about the position, not about the person. And, and that's, I'm, I think sometimes especially you see on social media, people get all wrapped up about the person and it can't be about that. You have to be thinking about the future. And that's what I think we have, that's why I think we have to address this before December. Now if that means we wait to see how much money is in the budget or how the budget looks fine, but every year, again, I mean, you know, and I understand what you're saying. You, you represent your citizens. Not all the citizens are doing well. I mean, part of the reason why we got the, because I had people calling me up who said they couldn't afford the assessment that the city was putting on 'em for the roads. But you see what's happened because we've had Alders in the past that stopped roads for, and now we're in the hole on our, on our roads. So if, if we do this with the mayor's position, like Alder Johnson said, we end up with a position that's woefully underfunded and you're not attracting quality candidates to run for that office.

- I think it puts us in a tough spot in the future too. Like we were the last discussion, which is trying to gain ground, right? Because, because it was frozen for so long, and then all of a sudden you're like, we gotta gain this ground because the salary was frozen for 12 years, or whatever that timeframe was. And that that, that actually I think puts us in a more difficult bind. But you have a proposal in mind.

- I was thinking actually $3,000 a year.

- Look that, that, that would be to say 3%, right? And if you think about where inflation's at, Alder Grant's right, right now it's high right now, it's not always there, but I think generally you look at your CPI index, you're, you're right around 2% roughly, give or take. So if you did 3000 again, 3%, whatever you wanna take, that, that, that's less than what we're seeing in inflation right now. But probably more than what you might see on the back 3% is like a status quo proposal.

- And that's why I was also recommending it be per year instead of all at once the first. So it would be like we did this last time, it's you're spreading it out over, over four years. So at the end of four years it would be a 12,000 overall salary increase.

- Rather than doing a flat amount. Would you be open to doing it as a percentage?

- Sure. Although my bat math gets a little wishy wash at that point, but. Sure.

- And I don't think we have to get drilled down to the exact, but I'm saying even 3%. Again, it's certainly far less than what you're seeing with inflation increases, especially in the private sector. You know, I, it just, so my point is I don't think you have to take 3000 and reverse engineer what that percentage would be. It's, it's pretty darn close.

- I'm okay with 3%.

- And, and of course this, to Alder Grant's question and point. We can make a recommendation. We could wait, you know, either way it's gonna be taken up during the budget discussion.

- I'd prefer a recommendation at least we can discuss it at, at the council. Unless you wanna hold it till, you know, we start the budget discussion. But either way, like you said, I think it needs to be discussed.

- Yeah. Cause they, you know, and I I don't wanna see, you know, tax increases anymore than the next person. But I also recognize that I don't think 3000 is what's going to, is what's going to drive a tax increase.

- True.

- And I think the sooner we start the discussion, the better. Otherwise it may get lost in the dust. It is a time to be fiscally responsible for all of us, but that also means to make smart choices and to pay more where it'll be the biggest bang. And I can't think of a position that has a bigger bang than this one. So I'm kind of lined up with this, this notion, because spending more here will ultimately, potentially be spending less in the long run that would ultimately affect the actual tax rate. So I'm definitely in favor of starting this discussion sooner than later. And hopefully it follows

- All right, well, unless anyone else has any other comments or questions or concerns, I'll

- I'll make a motion to do 3% per year for the next four years.

- I'll second.

- All those in favors say aye.

- Aye.

- That passes unanimously. Onto item F, informational. Does anyone have any questions about the reported routine personal act items? If not, our next meeting is October 25th. I'll entertain a motion for adjourn.

- Move to adjourn.

- Second.

- All those are favors say aye.

- Aye

- Aye

- Aye.

- All right. Five minutes. We'll be back for finance.