MINUTES OF THE PERSONNEL COMMITTEE

TUESDAY, OCTOBER 10, 2023, 4:30 PM
In person at City Hall, Room 207.
Virtual attendance also available via Zoom.
Immediately following Finance.

A. ZOOM MEETING INFORMATION.

1. Join Zoom Meeting Online:
https://us02web.zoom.us/j/86846491807?pwd=K3NJQ1NxdXU1cjB2RlR0TWVTUkJYdz09

Or call in by phone: +1 312 626 6799
Meeting ID: 868 4649 1807
Passcode: 298054

If you wish to speak at this public meeting or leave a comment, please fill out the online Comment Form prior to the meeting. More detailed Zoom Instructions can be found online.

B. ROLL CALL.

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

Others Present: Finance Director Diana Ellenbecker, Public Works Director Steve Grenier, Community Development Director Cheryl Renier-Wigg, City Attorney Joanne Bungert, Chief of Operations Joseph Faulds, Chief of Staff Amaad Rivera, Human Resources Manager Melanie Falk and others.

C. APPROVAL OF THE AGENDA.

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

D. APPROVAL OF MINUTES.

1. Approval of the Minutes from the September 12, 2023 Personnel Committee meeting.

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

E. REGULAR BUSINESS.

1.

For consideration with possible action on the request to fill the following positions and all subsequent vacancies resulting from internal transfers.

a. Financial Analyst
b. Operator II
c. Payroll Manager

Moved by Ald. Brian Johnson, seconded by Ald. Jim Hutchison to approve the request to fill the Financial Analyst position and all subsequent vacancies resulting from internal transfers.
Motion Passed.
Yes- Jim Hutchison, Brian Johnson, Bill Galvin, No- None, Abstain- None.

Moved by Ald. Brian Johnson, seconded by Ald. Jim Hutchison to approve the request to fill the DPW Operator II vacancy and all subsequent vacancies resulting from internal transfers.
Motion Passed.
Yes- Jim Hutchison, Brian Johnson, Bill Galvin, No- None, Abstain- None.

Moved by Ald. Brian Johnson, seconded by Ald. Jim Hutchison to approve the request to fill the Payroll Manager position and all subsequent vacancies resulting from internal transfers.
Motion Passed.
Yes- Jim Hutchison, Brian Johnson, Bill Galvin, No- None, Abstain- None.

2. For consideration with possible action on the addition of an Office of Violence Prevention Public Health Data Officer.

Moved by Ald. Brian Johnson, seconded by Ald. Jim Hutchison to approve as a Limited Term Employee (LTE) position and with the corrected job title of Office of Violence Prevention Operations Data Officer.
Motion Passed.
Yes- Jim Hutchison, Brian Johnson, Bill Galvin, No- None, Abstain- None.

3. For consideration with possible action on the implementation of the updated City Pay Plan as recommended by Carlson Dettmann market analysis.

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

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

Moved by Ald. Brian Johnson, seconded by Ald. Jim Hutchison to open the floor.
Motion Passed.

Yes- Jim Hutchison, Brian Johnson, Bill Galvin, No- None, Abstain- None.

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

Moved by Ald. Brian Johnson, seconded by Ald. Jim Hutchison to refer to staff to bring back alternate proposals for consideration.
Motion Passed.
Yes- Jim Hutchison, Brian Johnson, Bill Galvin, No- None, Abstain- None.

Comment Form: Received from Greg Koeppen, 1620 Windsor Drive, #4, Green Bay WI 54302

4. For consdideration with possible action on Health, Dental, Vision, Life, and Disability benefits starting January 1, 2024.

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

5. For consideration with possible action on the 2024 City of Green Bay and City of Green Bay Fire Fighters Local 141, International Associaiton of Fire Fighters AFL-CIO 158 labor agreement.

The Committee may convene in closed session pursuant to § 19.85(1)(e), Wis. Stats., for purposes of deliberating or negotiating public employee contracts for competitive or bargaining reasons. The Committee may thereafter reconvene in open session pursuant to § 19.85(2), Wis. Stats., to report the results of the closed session and consider the balance of the agenda.

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

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

Moved by Ald. Brian Johnson, seconded by Ald. Jim Hutchison to direct staff to proceed as discussed in closed session.
Motion Passed.
Yes- Jim Hutchison, Brian Johnson, Bill Galvin, No- None, Abstain- None.

F. INFORMATIONAL.

1. Report of Routine Personnel Action Items

2. Next Meeting: October 24, 2023

G. ADJOURNMENT.

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

VERBATIM MINUTES

- Alders Hutchison, Johnson, and Galvin are present. Alder Brunette has been excused. I'll entertain a motion on the agenda.

- So moved.

- Second.

- All those in favor, say aye.

- [Alders] Aye.

- And I'll entertain a motion on the minutes.

- Motion to approve.

- Second.

- All those in favor say aye.

- [Alders] Aye.

- All right, onto regular business. Item number one for consideration with possible action and request to fill the following positions and all subsequent vacancies resulting from internal transfers. A, a Financial Analyst.

- Motion to approve.

- Second.

- All those in favor, say aye.

- [Alders] Aye.

- And that passes unanimously. B, Operator two.

- Motion to approve.

- Second.

- All those in favor say aye.

- [Alders] Aye.

- And that passes unanimously. And C, Payroll Manager.

- Move to approve.

- Second.

- All those in favor, say aye.

- [Alders] Aye.

- And that passes unanimously. Item number two for consideration with possible action on the addition of an Office of Violence Prevention Public Health Data Officer, staff?

- So you have in the packet the job description. And just one thing to note too, is that we did change the title to Office of Violence Prevention. I have a data, I think operations and data officer. So if we make an amendment to that, that'd be helpful. So if we, the OVP has a director at this point, and what we're looking to do is to add a position to basically help bolster. The director's gonna be really focused on building relationships with the community and kind of set the strategy. This position's gonna be focusing on the data analysis and using that data to further the initiatives for the Office of Violence Prevention. So if you wanna talk to Director or Commander , they're here to speak more to it. Oh, and then the financial impact too, will be paid out of the grant fund. I think there's about a million dollars. So they'll be funded the position, they'll fund the position for 2024 and I believe 2025. And then if it continues, if the program's successful, then that would come back on for levy funds.

- So is it the point to set this as an LTE position right now? Is that noted? I didn't see-

- It can be noted. That was the intent, to have a LTE position through that's funded through the grant.

- Okay. So I'd make a motion to approve as an LTE position, noting the scrivener's error in the title.

- Second.

- Any comments? All those in favor say aye.

- [Alders] Aye.

- And that passes unanimously. Item number three, for consideration with possible action on the implementation of the updated city pay plan as recommended by Carlson Dettmann Market Analysis, staff?

- So what we have as the recommendation is the 50th or 75th percentile plan that's in the packet. And that was presented by Carlson Dettmann. They had two options, the 50th percentile or the blend of the 50th and 75th. They're also recommending a 2% COLA in April of next year. And then each employee would receive annual step increase or increase in the performance range next year. So a little bit of background, in 2017, there was a study that was done that focused really on the internal equity and the job duties of each position. The reason why they focus a lot internally was because the last study was done in the 1980s. So with that pay plan, they created this other plan to be at the 50th percentile of the market. It also had seven steps, which are called the hybrid plan. Step seven is a control point, which is a hundred percent of the market, which means that it's at a hundred percent of the 50th percentile. This also created some consistent guidelines for hiring and also how employees move through the plan. So if you fast forward to this year, we did another market assessment and the purpose was to create a pay structure that either maintains the 50th percentile or goes to the hybrid, or something above the 50th percentile. So what we did was, this assessment did not focus internally on the job responsibilities or job duties. It was mainly the market and external comparisons. There were some limited positions that were reviewed and those were attached in the packet as well. So with the Carlson Dettmann, when they presented last month, they stated that they use a variety of public sector accountables, and that's also in the presentation. And then also some survey data that included some private sector information, as well. So the findings that they came up with was they presented two options for us. One was the 50th percentile, or the meet the market plan. The other one was the blended 50th and 75th percentile plan, which would be more competitive than the 50th percentile. So if you look at the 50th and 75th blend market, I think we've been muted this whole time. So hopefully they can hear us, now. So if we look at the 50th and 75th market in employees right now, the top one third of our jobs are 11% behind that market. The lower two thirds are 6% behind that market. And then what this pay plan does, if you want to go to that pay plan, if you have it, if you look at pay grades between A and F, they have the minimum steps. They start at like step three or step two, they call that cleaving. So basically they cleave the first two positions or first two steps. So that's, so we start those positions and those pay grades at step three or step two, which is makes it more competitive to recruit for those positions. And then if you look at the control point for this pay plan that's in the packet, step seven or the control point was increased by about 11% compared to the current structure that we have. So the implementation of this, what's gonna happen is each employee will be placed on a step in the same pay grade that provides an increase. So, increase the employee's pay rate on December 31st, 2023. And then employees that are currently, or I should say on December 31st, 2023 and the performance range, if they land at the performance range in the the new pay plan, they will not be getting any type of increase. So I can give an example of that. So if you look at the pay plan that's in the packet, if someone was in pay grade E and on December 31st of this year, if they were making $25, that'd be in between step five and step six. So it'd be in between $24.64 and $25.29. That person would move up to step six and would go up to $25.29. If someone was in pay grade B and they were making $26 at the end of the year, they would be in the performance range, currently. And then the new plan, they'd be in the performance range. So in January one, since they're in the performance range, they would not be getting an increase. So that's a little bit of a difference with how people would get an increase and how people would not. So we would like to implement the plan January one. And then in April, of the pay period of April 1st we'd have a 2% COLA. And the total cost of the plan would be about $892,000. That's what Carlson Dettmann estimated for the annual cost. And then I had included in the packet was the distribution placement on the schedule. So if you look at about, and this is for the increase of wages starting January one, if you're placed on the pay scale, or the proposed pay scale. There's about 256 employees that will receive about a 2% or higher increase on January one. And then about 180 employees that will have less than 2% increase. And what I talked about before was this recommendation is looking at January one through December 31st, and we're looking at a total increase in wages, and that includes the implementation of the pay structure, the COLA, and that step increase for employees. So with that in mind, if you had from January one to December 31st, about 256 employees would have a 5% or higher increase in their wages throughout the year. And then about 180 employees, excuse me, you would have 143 employees that'd be having about a 4% to 4.5% increase. Then you have about 37 employees that are be closer to a 3% increase from January one to December 31st. So the minimum increase throughout the year will be about 3%. So this recommendation is included in the mayor's proposed budgets and I think Alder Johnson, you want us to bring back here to personnel to talk it through and have a discussion between to the budget discussion. We obviously have a lot of people here too, that have been waiting patiently. And so I'm not sure if you guys wanna talk about it first, ask some questions to clarify, or open up to the employees.

- What do you think would be good for us to talk first and then let, make comments, or let 'em make their comments first?

- Well, I think if you've got questions, maybe now that, that maybe ask the questions. We're gonna ask questions on both ends, but if you've got something directly relevant now, I would do that.

- I don't think we need to discuss yet, is my point.

- Okay, yeah, alright, then I would entertain a motion to open the floor.

- Yeah, I would make that motion.

- Second.

- All those in favor, say aye.

- [Alders] Aye.

- That passes unanimously. So, I mean usually at city council everyone throws their name in a sheet of paper and they read it off. But we'll just, however you guys want to do it, just take your time. Anyone that wants to get up and talk, make comments or questions, the floor's open.

- Alright.

- My name is Mark Berglund. I live at 806 North Broadway. I'm a mechanic for the Green Bay Park and Forestry department. We have a labor association. I'm also the president of that association. Periodically, our association has meetings with the human resources department and our director. Our recent meeting, we discussed the cost of living adjustment and the upcoming wage study. We have been told by multiple sources that human resources had budgeted 5% cost of living for April, 2024. Our concern was that the cost of living and the wage study would be played off of one another. We were assured that they were being treated as two separate issues. Also, the wage study was only looking at wages, not job descriptions or reclassifications. The wage study comes out and our budgeted 5% is now 2%. And there are job reclassifications and positions reviewed. Budgeting 5% was explained to us that the mayor or the city council could adjust that. In my understanding of budgeting, was that if 5% was budgeted, obviously the finance department must have reviewed that and said the available funds were there for that. So now that our cost of living went from the budgeted 5% to 2%, where did the rest of the money go? In 2017, we did a wage study. Six years later we're right back to where we were then. Too low a pay scale. So we have many job openings that can't be filled and employees leaving for higher paying jobs. If we kept up with the cost of living, we would probably never have to do a wage study again. The study says that everyone should see a 3% increase in 2024, but not the 5% that was budgeted. The study says that the lower two thirds of wages are down 6%, and you're going to combat that with a 2% cost of living. The control point states that every grade should see an increase of 11%. I believe that means over the course of seven years, which puts you where we are today and where we were six years ago. Do you see a pattern here? Last year, during this whole thing, last year, I did my own little cost of living survey. 2021 Green Bay gave out 1%. 22 was 2%. 2023 was 3%. Village of Ashwaubenon, 2023, 5%. Green Bay schools was 4.7% in 22, 5% in 23, they're getting 5% in 24. City of De Pere gave 2% in 22, 5% in 23. And they're giving 5% again for 24. Appleton, 5% in 23. Village of Little Chute, 5.5% in 23. Village of Suamico, 6% in 23. Village of Allouez, 5% in 23. The federal government cost of living went up 5% in 23. Social security went up 5.9% in 21 and 8.7% in 23. You know, social security's getting bigger raises than we are. Door County went up 5.5% in 23. Kewaunee County went up 7.5% in 2023. So, I propose that they bring back the 5% cost of living to get people up to where they should be sooner, and implement the wage study recommendations at the end of the year. I believe the whole idea of this wage study was to get people up to speed so that we're not losing people and we can get applicants. This wage study only, it's going in the wrong direction. You know, and the fact that I believe they had the money for the 5%. Why don't you just do that. If the money was there, you can implement the wage study at a later time. You know, it's, I just see a trend here where we just keep on doing wage studies every five or six years, because five or six years down the road we're in the same position again because we're just not keeping up. I think that you need to do something and make a big impact, you know, now, and start nipping it so that it's not going to, you know, roll out of control like it has been. The state of Wisconsin certifies our Park and Forestry Labor Association as a collective bargaining unit, yet there's never any bargaining. We are just supposed to accept what is doled out to us. Police, fire and transit are all unionized. They get to bargain for their wages. What did police and fire get last year, this year and next year? In closing, I may have said some things that are offensive to some, that's not my intention, but sometimes things have to be said, whether some people like it or agree or not. Thank you.

- Do you have any- specific questions? I mean, you, you had some, it's all my questions there. Like where did-

- Well, you know, I mean, if, you know, when we were told that they were budgeted for 5%, I just cannot imagine that, you know, somebody threw out a 5% number without checking with finance and saying, Hey, can we afford 5%? You know, and really, by Wisconsin State law, we, as a collective bargaining unit, we are supposed to be able to negotiate our wages up to the CPI index, which I think is 8% right now. So, you know, I don't think we're gonna try to get greedy and say, well the CPI is 8%, we want 8%. But the fact that apparently finance signed off on 5%, why can't we do that? So.

- Yeah, and I we're gonna get to that point.

- Sure, I understand.

- When we have an opportunity to talk with staff a little bit more. So just hold that thought for a minute. But I also just wanna say like, I don't think anything you said was offensive. And, so, but, I think obviously you have a lot of colleagues here in the room and I just want to commend you, because you come prepared to every council meeting and you speak on issues that are important to the people that you represent, and you're doing so tonight. And I want to thank you for that, because you always come prepared, and you come with facts and you come with thoughtful suggestions. Not just gimme, gimme, gimme, but how can we solve this problem? And you're doing the same thing tonight. So, thank you Mark.

- Okay, I appreciate that. Thank you.

- Is there anyone else that would like to address the committee? Yes sir.

- My name's Mike Herlache, I live at 926 Phasianus Street, Green Bay, Wisconsin. I reviewed some of the information you guys sent out and the way I see it is, an entry-level position coming into the city is gonna get about a $2 lift. So, being here 38 years, I'm gonna get an 11 cent lift. Is there anything that we can do to get positions reclassified to absorb some of this cost, or not cost, but to spread the wealth? 'Cause those people are gonna get 8 or 9% and I'm gonna get a quarter of a percent.

- Does he fall in, Joe, with some of those that we saw in the-

- Well, I guess one thing, I just want the committee to know is we really shouldn't talk about any specific employees. I think we have to go in closed session to do that. So I'm trying to talk in the aggregate about everything. So, I mean, even at perhaps even common council, I could share even specific data with that. But right now it's gonna aggregate 'cause we don't have it in closed session.

- Right, and I have no problem with it, 'cause there's other positions, from what I'm seeing, that are gonna be affected like this. Not just with, you know, park and rec and forestry. Any of the non-unionized or non-represented positions are the ones that are gonna be taking the hit on this, and some of 'em are gonna be taking the hit on this. Is that correct?

- Well, how I'd describe it is, so first of all, Carlson Dettmann had two plans that they proposed, and we are recommending one plan. So their study isn't necessarily what the increase is for employees, it's what is the pay plan to be competitive. That's what they recommended. So we're taking the pay plan, the 50th and 75th percentile and recommending we start January 1st. So if someone is in the performance range right now, and will be in the performance range in their plan, that means that they are above the 50/75th blend market. That's what that means. And that's why Carlson Dettmann, when they recommend how to implement it, they're stating they should not get an increase, 'cause they're already above the market. The control point. That is the rationale behind it. And whether we do that or not, that's just what was recommended we do at this point. So that's why someone who is a new hire or maybe someone's who less experienced, they might get a higher increase because they're farther away from the control point. They're 11% behind. Whereas some employees are already above the control point. That's why there's a difference in the increase.

- Thank you.

- Any other comments? Anyone else? Yes sir.

- Good evening. , Streets department, address is N 3592 Luxemburg, Wisconsin. To Mike's point, when we talked this afternoon, Julio had asked and I said without understanding the specifics of how the new salaries were generated, you know, I wasn't able to comment on your question regarding what we thought about it. I ran a couple numbers and as you can see, word spread quickly and it did not go over favorably. We're devaluing some of our most important employees, those who have been here for the longest period of time. One of the quirks in the system that I came across is an employee who is hired in 2021, let's say in July, will be put at the same step as an employee who was just recently hired in 2023. They both get moved down to step two. But if the employee who was hired in 2023 has an earlier anniversary date, they would move up a step sooner than the employee who was hired in 2021. They're in fact getting higher pay for a period of time, even with two years less of service. So there's some issues with the plan and we, we discussed that. But I think that's something that needs to be resolved. I think the two primary issues are, as Mike stated, the lower senior employees getting significantly more. I have no problem with that. We need to do something. We can't find people, okay? And we need to take care of the people who have been here, you know, through the thick and thin, the hard times. Ultimately, what this comes down to, Alders, we're tired of being taken advantage of because we can. Okay, we see what police and fire get, and I'm, we're tired of it. Okay, it's been too long, too, too much. And you're seeing the effects of it now. Thank you.

- Alright, thank you.

- Anyone else? Questions? Comments? Yes sir.

- Josh Brassfield 2058 Meadow Heights Trail, Green Bay. So my title here is the street superintendent. And I guess my question is, maybe it's more for staff too, is what, you know, how do you see this plan impacting employee retention and recruitment? So, I see it every day, as these guys do. I work hand in hand with them and I see, you know, trying to recruit people to come in. You know, we're hiring people right now off of the street and having to train them to get a CDL, where when I started 11 years ago, it was a requirement that you had a CDL coming in. So, what is it going to do to, you know, that 22 year old guy comes in, he works here for seven years and then he's up here speaking like Mike is, after 38, that now he's hit his control point and where do we go from here? So, I don't necessarily know what the answer is. Maybe there's another wage study that's done in that next seven years. But, it's a concern of mine because we're trying to keep these services rolling with less and less people than a variety of other things.

- Anyone else? Going once? Going twice. All right.

- Motion to close the floor.

- Right?

- Did you-

- No, no.

- Okay, sorry. I saw your hand up. Motion to close the floor.

- Second.

- All those in favor say aye?

- [Alders] Aye.

- And that floor is closed. I agree with a lot of what I'm hearing today. It has been a concern of my concern, almost since I got elected just about eight years ago. And I know I've heard other Alders voice concern that we were seeing employees leave, going to other municipalities to make more money, in some cases, doing less work. And, it's been a burr in my side for a long time and I've made comments at budget where we delegate the non-union people to 1-2%, while the unions are able to bargain for more. And we're doing it because that's the way it works out. You know, Act 10 didn't do anybody any favors, in that regard. And you heard earlier in the finance, when they changed the way they distribute the money in the state, how it's affected what this city can do. And how well it can do it. So, I mean, this is something we've been pushing for a long time, to try and get some changes. I'm interested to hear what you've had to say and I think Director Faulds has been, or Chief Faulds has been taking some notes on some of your concerns. So I hope that I, I don't think this is done here tonight. I think this is, my opinion is I think it should go back for some more consideration. Alder Johnson?

- Yeah, I mean this, this, this is definitely not gonna get done tonight. This is really part of the budget process, right? So this is, it's great to see all of you here. Share that feedback. This is to me more of a, almost an initial kick at the can. Well, probably our second kick. The first kick was when you presented it, we asked you to come back with a recommendation. This is the recommendation, but ultimately the recommendation gets adopted through the budget. So that's November. But now's the time for us to be doing our homework to really address some of the concerns that were brought up. And I do have a couple of questions for staff. Mr. Bergland talked about the 5% budgeted COLA. Can you address that please?

- Yeah, I think it is poorly, not by Mark, but I think when we say it's a 5% COLA, it's budgeted. We have to put some type of number to budget and try and prepare for the 2024 budget. So, to phrase it as like we were planning for a COLA and then trying to, you know, go from there. I think we just started somewhere, and we just kind of looked at where the salary study came in and it came in around that number. So, to address it a little bit too, the 5% would be a COLA, that'd be across the board for everyone. The salary study, it kind of shows that it would distribute it differently. Some people would be around 10% or higher. Some people would be above 5% or higher, some would be lower. But if you do 5% across the board, it's gonna be the same for everyone. But the pay plan that the Carlson Dettmann organization put together, that would be, essentially, you take every step and you add 11%. The COLA would be adding 5% to every step. So that's kind of trade off, of a short term, Rhonda, I think, it would be happier 'cause it's 5% for everyone in the performance range. But then again, your pay plan now is losing that 6% for every step. So the budget, the question is, it wasn't really budgeted 5%. It was a placeholder to help us prepare for the budget process.

- So we could, in theory, still put in minimums, maximums, floors and ceilings, to maybe help address some of those concerns.

- Yeah, and I thought a good concern that was brought up was about the experience with someone who's been here like three years versus someone who's been here for like one year. They will probably go to step one, because you're going up 11%. So, some people are going up like a dollar, but then some people might go up two, get to that step one. And you'll see that with pay grades with between A through G, which we have a lot of employees in those pay grades here, especially in pay grade E, with some of those employees where the minimum step is step three, you'll have quite a few people at like $22, $20, they're going right to 23.35. So it's not the same increase, but they're starting at the same spot. So there's pros and cons to that.

- Okay, so I think, I mean to me the likely outcome here would be that we would kick this back to staff for a little bit more fine tuning. I mean, obviously the final result would be adopted during budget. But you know, I think the hard part is, you know, this goes back a little bit to the finance committee, right? When we talked about levy limits, and how we, the state imposes a cap on us in terms of how much we can raise taxes, right? And so, we'd love to give bigger raises, but then in order for us to do that, we'd have to tax the max and probably cut somewhere, in order to do that. And the, obviously the biggest source to cut is staff. That doesn't feel, like nobody wants to do that. It doesn't feel great, right? So, but we have a unique opportunity this year, and I think this is why several of us have strongly advocated for this survey, and that's shared revenue. And the state adjusted its formula. And while I don't think they did enough, the city will be getting 3 million-ish more this year. And we have that opportunity, as was talked about, there's that freeze on expenditure restraint for a year. And I feel like we have one opportunity right now to get this right. To recognize, I think long-term employees that have given to the residents of this city for a long time. But also put us in a good position to attract talent in a really tight labor market. And that's really, I mean, why we requested this, is because we did want to right-size things. We want to take care of our staff, and that's really what ultimately led to this. The issue in the past has been like, we could order up this study and it could come back and say, here's the recommendations, you need to do X, Y, Z. But the state law said, nope, you can't raise taxes to make that correction. And that's the predicament we've always been in in the past. We have the opportunity to fix that now. And that's why, and this happened before I was elected, but the timing of the raise used to be January 1st and then it got bumped to September or October, right? And then last year we modified that, we bumped it back up to April. We were able to do that because of ARPA. One thing Joe and I brought this up during the ARPA discussion is that I wanted to see that date come back to January one. And that's not in this proposal and I know that's gonna cost money, but that is at least one recommendation that when we, assuming we kick this back to staff, that I would like to at least see a proposal that shifts that date back to January one. And so really, when we're taking a look at this distribution of increases for placement schedule, this is very helpful, but it's missing a really important piece, which is the fiscal impact of each of these areas. And I think if we can get that calculation, I think that would be really helpful in terms of determining maybe ceilings and floors, timing of when a raise could be implemented. I would love to see January 1st. I can't sit here and promise that we'll be able to deliver that. We'll obviously have to see the numbers, because that three million's gonna go pretty quickly once we start implementing really, cost of inflation, less than cost of inflation raises, which is the real sad reality. But we have to do something that I think gets us a little bit closer. The topic was brought up about reclassifying positions. Has staff talked about that?

- So, I think there's, the bulk of the positions that were looked at were police captains, police commanders, and then assistant fire chiefs and the battalion chiefs. And that's because, I think some people alluded to it, with police and fire unions with their COLA increases or wage increases over the years, they've really built in a compression with those supervisors, and it's gotten to a point where we had to do something about it. So that's really why those positions were focused on. There were some other positions that were focused on because they were in the queue to be re-classed last year or maybe two years ago. So then we re-classed 'em with this study. So that's really the bulk of the positions and there are a few new ones.

- Yeah, and the reason of course I bring up, 'cause we were having a few come to us with re-classes, and we talked that this study would hopefully help us get us into a position where we're avoiding that. Because I don't want that to turn into a mechanism, you know, where we're trying to get people raises by reclassifying them. I don't think that's a fair and equitable approach to how we, you know, really assign salary to skills and responsibility. So I mean any, I hope that some additional analysis is given to that to really make sure that we've set the table level. Okay. Okay. Yeah, and I think the other thing, the other questions I've written down were addressed. That's what I have for now. But again, just wanting to emphasize that this isn't gonna be settled tonight. So, I hope that this, I hope you stay engaged to this process and I'm sure your reps will keep you apprised of that. Council will maybe take this up, maybe not, but really it's that budget season when this really becomes a timely and pertinent discussion, so.

- Alder Hutchison?

- Yeah, the fact that these people are here is kind of confusing to me in the sense that we wanted to do something that was not this. I don't think it's good that these people are here from the sense. If we would've done this assessment, they should be in agreement with it, not coming in. And these are all older faces. I don't wanna see older faces looking at our report and going, well what the hell? You know what I'm saying? It kind of, it's counter to what we wanted to do. So, I guess, it may be good to look at the program that was used. They always use a straight line for it, because you can get a slope and get an R value, and all that stuff on graphs. But I wonder why couldn't you take this graph? I mean, this must be, this must come up all the time, you know what I'm saying? And what I'm gonna recommend is gonna cost the city money potentially, but you take the line and you kink it. After so many years you kink it so it's a little steeper slope. Okay, now that's just a way to address the fact that if you've been here so many years, all of a sudden your pay is above the 62%, whatever we're using for the straight line. And it should be maybe, greater than 62% of what everyone else around Wisconsin is making. And we should address that by maybe looking at this, how we present the salaries and how it's portrayed. You know what I'm saying? Now, the people who did this should be able to do that, I would think, right?

- I think so. I think, yeah, I can do that.

- Okay, and I'm only saying that because you can kind of hold the entry level at a certain position and then treat the those who have been here longer differently, okay? And I think, maybe that's what's required. You don't have to take the whole line and move it up. You kink it, I mean, to make sense, I don't like to see these people here. You know what I'm saying? These are the people that run the city. I don't wanna see 'em here. I wanna see 'em at home going, yeah, that's right. So, I guess my question, I guess my comment to the staff is, can we look at this with the intent of making our workforce more in agreement to the evaluation that we ran here? Because it doesn't make sense if we're ticking off our older workforce people by trying to make it right. It doesn't make sense to me that, so again, it's gonna cost the city money, but I think maybe it should. To me, it should. If I see this, I mean people who are sat here and said nothing says something by sitting here. You know what I'm saying? People are articulate who came up, but the fact they're all here is important, I think. So we have to recognize that and move forward with that. I wish I could take a camera and bring it to common council, you know, say when we were talking about this during the budget, 'cause Alder Johnson is correct, this is budget, this is a budget thing. But I think of all things we pay for, this is what we pay for. We want these people to work for us, not go somewhere else. So that's my point.

- I guess Joe, I would like to add in that we're still seeing people leaving. And granted, you haven't implemented anything yet. But social media, you see the complaints, people complaining about the lack of service from the city. And when I call DPW I'm being told it's because we can't hire 'em, or we hire 'em and they quit. So we don't have anyone to do the work. So, stuff is not getting done. We had the same problem at Bay Beach. Again, that's seasonal help, but the parks were suffering again this year. Parks and forestry is suffering. And when I have someone stand up that says they've been here for 38 years and he's gonna get less than a percent raise, and the COLA is only 2%, you know, that's just, the way I'm looking at it, he's losing money. And you know, like Brian said, we need to look at this again, but I'm just wondering, you know, we looked at the 50 to 75 percentile. Is there a way of looking at some different options. You know, either with what Alder Hutchison is talking about, you know, change the rate a little bit, or you know, can we look at it like a 60-65% up to 80-85%? 'Cause again, if we're only in the 50 percentile, that means there's other places that are still offering more money and benefits than we are. And I mean, Green Bay is a great city. I mean, I loved working here when I was here. But the thing is, if someone next door is offering you a better deal, why wouldn't you leave and go take it? 'Cause you gotta think about your family, your future, your retirement. All this rolls into that. I mean, we've seen police supervisors leave, now. I don't know about fire department, but we've seen other vested employees from the other departments leave. And even the ones with bargaining power, more power than Parks and Forestry have leaving to go to other municipalities because they're getting paid more. And so I think if we wanna stop what's been happening for the last several years here, maybe we gotta look at something a little bit better than the 50 percentile. And you know, I mean, granted, yeah folks, budget time comes, the state says this is all you got, this is all the room you have. You can't go over that. I mean, I remember once, the police department, they were given a choice, you guys want some of these new positions or do you want a raise? My guys were like, the hell with the positions, I'll take the raise. So I get that. And so I just, I, you know, strong recommendation that, you know, maybe, and I know it's gonna be tight for the budget time in November, but we've gotta put the work into it and we've gotta see what we can do.

- Joe, the fiscal impact of this proposed plan. I thought I saw that somewhere, roughly 900,000, is that right?

- Yeah, so what essentially what you'd do is, like, the example I used before, like, if someone was at $25 in grade E, and they're going up to $25.29, you take 29 cents, you times it by 2080, you get a number. You do that for every single person. That's where you get the 892.

- Okay, so it's 892.

- Yep.

- And that doesn't include the COLA or the-

- Yep, and that's what it's getting at. So, the COLA would come separately. And right now, the, you know, the budget in its draft format. I mean your, this is the plan that you've held right now?

- I think this will be included in it, but I think we knew this conversation would shift, or was gonna happen as the placeholder that we have this time.

- Yeah, and I would presume that budget's probably shifting every day, but okay. And, it just, again, it helps you understand, right? Recognizing that as we kind of go through this budget process and we start hitting that ceiling again, the state imposed ceiling, you know, we're gonna be restricted a little bit on what we can do, or if we make certain decisions, we'll be forced to make other decisions, right? And so we just, we gotta be able to be prepared, I think, to have the information to have those. But I've said this every year at this table: The most valuable asset that the city of Green Bay has are the men and women who do the work on behalf of its residents. And we need, if we have discontent within our workforce, and based on the numbers that Mark shared with us, I can see why. And, to Alder Hutchison's point, the purpose of this study was to have the opposite of this. And so we gotta figure out how to get ourselves into a better place where everybody can feel like they got a win out of this.

- I'll just say a couple things in the sense of, I think Carlson Dettmann, what they did was, I think they did what they sought to do in the sense that they created a plan that was competitive in the 50th and 75th percentile. And I think someone asked, might have been Josh, like, what will this do for recruitment and retention? I think if you look at recruitment and you look at where we would start recruiting with the proposed pay plan, I think it would greatly help. The weak point is with people in the performance range and thinking about those long term employees. So that's what we have to kind of piece together.

- Yeah, and you can't take those separately, right. You can't have a conversation about recruitment if you're not willing to have a conversation about retention.

- Is this 900,000, this doesn't include the raises, hose raises for Police and fire, does it?

- No, just people on the city pay plan.

- Okay.

- And I do wanna make a comment about that. And I just want to be very careful, and I appreciate the comment, right, about police and fire have seen different wage increases. I just wanna make sure that the city employees, we're not pitting ourselves against each other. I think that's really, really important. We need all of you. And I think we just need to make sure that we're giving you an honorable deal, that recognizes everybody's efforts to the city. So, I just, I kind of want to at least make that comment, and make sure that as we refer this back to staff, that our pencils get a little bit sharper, to really come up with a plan that everybody can say, Hey, you know, what city workers are united to do, you know, the job that the residents demand. And, it's because we all agree that we're being compensated fairly for what we bring.

- All right.

- All right, so I mean, really I think this can just, Joe, you got all this, you captured all this feedback, we can just kind of refer this back to staff and leave it at that.

- Yes.

- Okay.

- Alright.

- Motion?

- If you don't mind, I just want to ask the question, because obviously we had discussion here. I mean, if anybody else still wants to make a comment or ask a question, I at least want to give you that opportunity before we close this topic. If anybody wants to say something, just raise your hand. I'll gladly open the floor. I make a motion to open the floor again.

- Second.

- My name's Tom-

- No, no, hang on, hang on. We just got a procedural thing.

- All those in favor?

- [Alders] Aye.

- The floor is open. Yes sir?

- My name's Tom-

- We need you to come up to the podium, I'm sorry.

- My name's Tom , I live at 1806, sorry, I live on Christian Street. I've been with the city for eight years. I've seen seven of our mechanics leave. We ain't keeping them. You know, few of 'em retired. But a lot of 'em went to different places, and that we can't have. We can't keep them trucks up. A lot of our trucks are older than me. Well, not really, but, . But you know, we need to keep the older people. I mean, I'm one of them, you know, and you start pushing us out the door, it's not a good thing. I left a place to come here, and I was there for 25 years to make myself better. So I'm trying to stay, you know, I wanna stay here. This, I love, this city is my town. And to stay here and to enjoy my work habits and doing what I do now, you know, we need to talk about the pay raises better, you know. Some of us, yeah, we're doing all right, but it doesn't keep up with the cost of living. And we need to, you know, we all need to.

- Sure.

- Thanks.

- Thank you. Yes sir?

- My name is Alexander. You guys talk about, specifically, allocating the financing for wages. But, you guys are, a lot of people exclaiming that you guys are having a hard time hiring a newer workforce. Is there any financial implications involved trying to involve a newer generation of people that can work for the city?

- Not really. I mean, it's a levy limit supported. So when we talk about levy, that's property taxes. So, sorry, sometimes we get so hung up in the lingo we use that, and I don't want to pretend you don't know, but I don't wanna pretend you do. And, so, the state restricts how much we can raise property taxes every year. And, so when, of course we have personnel that comes from property taxes. Some of it is funded through fees and grants, but that's not really, that doesn't have an impact as much on the overall discussion. It's the property tax supported positions. And whether you're young or old, I mean that doesn't matter.

- Isn't levy also involved for like educational purposes? Like for like public funding for schooling, for example, like that?

- Yes, except that comes through a different taxing jurisdiction, that'll come through the school board.

- That's the only thing I can think of that would help with trying to hire new workforces, trying to create a final job allocation. Trying to circulate like more people that are coming in because like the previous man said, there's more people leaving out, so.

- Yeah, for sure.

- That's my only question slash statement.

- Yeah, and I appreciate that, and it's, yeah, for our purposes it doesn't, the difference, I guess, between the types of employees doesn't really matter. It just, it takes your salaries in aggregate and that's how we address it.

- Alright.

- Thank you.

- Thank you.

- Sure.

- I'm Barbara Dorff, 3375 Pebble Beach Court, Green Bay. And I know I must speak to the chair. My words are for the group behind me. I was on finance, I was the chair of finance for four years, on city council for six years. And what I wanna say is, November 2nd is joint personal and finance, is that not right? I believe.

- I'm looking at staff.

- Yes. Yes it is. That is the day that we need people to come. One of the days, another day is November 7th and November 9th. Those are two other days where there are council meetings. When I sat on city council and voted for budgets, so many times there were Alders in the room that did vote no, and didn't really understand that what they were doing was hurting our city because by voting no, you're voting to defund the police and the fire and DPW when you vote no on a budget. But partly it was maybe because they didn't understand. You guys have a deep understanding of what goes into making a budget and what goes into personnel. And it's nice, I love that the people are here, because it gives us an opportunity to say, go to the council meeting where you need to convince the people that might be voting "No". That's very important. So thank you, Chair for listening to me.

- You're welcome.

- Yes sir?

- He looked hesitant to call on you, Barb.

- In regards to what you had said about we're all on the same team, working together, essentially, is unfortunately with the Act 10 and the processes that have taken place, there has been some animosity created. I shouldn't say there has been, there is absolutely animosity created, to no fault of DPW employees, police and fire. But it exists, okay? And we've been taken advantage of, because we could be. Okay, whether right or wrong, previous administrations did not do what they should have done. And you're now starting to see all of the, you know, fallout of that, and it's going to be severe. Okay, if something isn't done quickly. So, while I commend everything you guys have done, and I appreciate your comments, it's fantastic. We got 40, you know, plus people here tonight, but you get what you pay for, okay. And you're starting to see that right now. And we're gonna have bigger issues than just personnel if we don't take a serious look at what's going on. Okay, thanks.

- I think there were a couple others that had their hands up before. Yes, sir.

- I'd just like to make one last comment. Mark Bergland, 806 North Broadway. I just want to say thank you to the committee for allowing us all to come in and speak our mind and listening to what we have to say and taking and doing whatever you can with that. So many times we go to people and they say, yeah, yeah, yeah, yeah. And it goes over their head. I just wanna say, I appreciate all of you letting us coming here, speaking our mind, and actively listening to us and see if we can come to a solution. So, I thank you all.

- Thank you.

- Thank you.

- Anyone else?

- Yeah.

- Yes sir, one more.

- To speak to Paul's point, you know, from a management, middle management standpoint, you know, you said, Alder Johnson, that this is the best resources, all these people that work here. And you're gonna have to make tough decisions. But I guess keep that in mind that you know, that tough decision about the next plow truck, the next ambulance, the next whatever. You're not gonna have to make the, it won't be as tough if you don't have these people, right? So if they're all gone it'll be an easy decision because you won't have anybody to run it anyway, so.

- All right, yes sir.

- Ryan Lewis, 1607 Kalahari Drive. I've been with the city for 23 years. I've started in Park department now with DPW, here. And I've seen a lot, when I first started, it was very few people that left, and you were here for the duration of your time. Now, people are coming in only here one or two years and they're leaving and going to other communities that he gave the numbers of Ashwaubenon and Howard, wherever. And they're going, they get a little experience and they leave. So we're not keeping anyone, and we're spending more time training people. And people can be taught. But that's a lot of man hours. Continually training people, training people. And then when it comes to the season of plowing, which is so important to the city, we don't have the people experienced to do the plowing. And you're gonna see that more and more because people don't have the experience coming in. But people can be taught. But it again takes time and it's, you're seeing more and more of that, and what everyone is saying around here, is you're gonna do something about it. But I've been here for 23 years and I've heard it, I've seen it, and I predicted that it was gonna be a 3%. I mean overall for the, for us, I mean, yes some newer employees are getting the bump up, but when you're starting out at a lower wage, when they did the years study seven years ago, I knew it was gonna be a problem because you lowered people coming in and they're not at a competitive wage. Now, you're having this problem and people are leaving. You can't get anyone to come. And we're not, we're first talking about it right now, but if we don't do something soon, like Paul said, people are gonna be leaving in mass numbers, and people are gonna be retiring and we're gonna have no one that has experience to even replace them, because no one seems to want to do our jobs. And why are they gonna come and work 16 hour days plowing, and then turn around and come back in after four hours and do it all again, and you're not getting no paid, and you can go do something else and maybe not be as stressed or what have you, under those circumstances. So, I think the council and you guys really have to look hard at what can we do. We need to increase the wage coming in for employees, but also look at what we talked about as the long term effect for people that have been here 23 years and plus. Because if you figure out I'm only gonna get 7 cents, I mean that's really not an encouragement to stick around or like thank you for 23 years at 7 cents. So, I think we really have to do some thinking on this. And like you said, Chair Johnson, this is the time.

- Sorry, Galvin's the chair of this one.

- Okay, Bill. That this is the opportunity, I think we really have to take it and and do something because if we don't, I think it's gonna be some really hard times with the city because there's so many people that are close to retirement and if we don't do something with this, and they're talking about the implementing other things of leave time and stuff. And if people are not getting a wage and you're gonna have this other stuff, people can leave in mass numbers, then you're gonna have more problems, so. Thank you.

- Thanks. All right, motion to close the floor. Oh wait, we have another one .

- Eric Peters, 2980 Vince Lane, Green Bay. So as to Paul, the retention part, I'm kind of a prime example of that. I left a family business of 20 years to come here. When I was hired, I did have a CDL. I came in as the number 15 truck driver for plow and snow out of 16, had been here not quite three years, say two years, eight months-ish. I'm already up to number seven. By the end of the year I could possibly be number five. Talking to people that have been here a lot longer than me. I know someone that's been here since 1989 and talking with him, he was telling me that in years passed if you weren't here 20, 25 years, there was no way you were getting a truck driver position. And I mean, now we're hiring guys that had desk jobs with no CDLs come in and learn to truck drive. Never sat in a truck in their life. So I mean that's, I mean that's a prime example right there of what we're going through. I understand that you guys have your process that has to be done, but I mean, as you can see, the amount of people that are here, it means something to us. So we're just, we're just trying to make it right. Thank you.

- Sure, one more time?

- So what is, like, you mentioned levies is one of the things that's involved with helping with the wages for people working for the city, right? Is there any more kind of taxes besides that?

- Not that really cover salaries.

- Okay.

- Yeah.

- Yeah, so.

- Yeah, everything else that would be grant funded or fee based are usually kind of specialty services.

- Okay, so where do you like know where, like for example, these kinds of grants are coming from?

- So there really aren't grants that would be available for the types of positions we're discussing right now. That's usually the city's, you know, normal operating, I mean that's, that's-

- No, I'm just asking like is it like from like a third party entity or like-

- Where the grants come from?

- Yeah.

- Yeah, usually it could be federal government, can be state government, can come from a lot of different sources.

- Okay. Yeah, like one of the things that would probably, like one of the things that drives like, like today's age and economy and how capitalism works is not like the allocation of wealth too, but it's also the circulation of money that is going through the economy. So, like the thing is, is like I noticed that people are complaining how they need to have more money specifically allocated, but it's only coming from the levy. And I'm not saying to just tax people outright, or just raise taxes on the land, but we have a lot of very austerious land areas allocated for the mainly private businesses that have been here for sustained for decades, if not essentially. So, maybe the idea of trying to come up with these things is probably having like a certain percentage of the top businesses that are obviously doing well enough to circulate the money out of our local city slash state. Like for example, franchisees, which drives the money out of circulation for a local economy, right?

- Yeah, I mean that's gonna be more of a federal government decision.

- Hmm, okay. Yeah, I don't know the implications, which is why I'm asking you.

- Yeah, yeah.

- Specifically.

- Yeah, we wouldn't be able to kind of isolate out specific businesses or even specific changes.

- No, I'm not saying specific businesses, which I am, I kind of technically am, but like the thing is, it's like you're just literally trying to get, paying the people from the value of the land. So it's like, and land is not any, not a cheap thing to come by. So it's just, I'm just trying to like spit ball here just out loud, which.

- Yeah, and it's, I think at the local level you find we have a lot of restrictions from the state and federal government in terms of what we can and can't do. And property taxes is really like the only, I mean, that and fees are the only two ways that they allow us to generate revenue.

- Okay, yeah. I'm not saying to just start having a slippery slope fallacy slash bias, but it's just, it feels like you're just literally trying to take, like you're just basically beating a dead horse at this point with specifically trying to take from taxes from the land. And just trying to implicate that. Anything, probably just tax the wealthiest businesses that are locally around here, which I, that's something that I would like to see implemented, just to see how it goes. But just only for like a temporary, like a small short period.

- Yeah, we just, unfortunately, we wouldn't have the ability to do that. We can only tax the value of the property, and that's literally where our jurisdiction ends. But I appreciate the sentiment behind trying to come up with some solutions.

- I'm just spitballing here, 'cause it just seems like you're, everything's going to a circular argument with everyone in this meeting. So I that I don't, it's just an idea that I don't know too much about the current standards of how you allocate wages to people and try to keep that value for the wages and money.

- Yeah. Appreciate your interest though, in asking the questions.

- Thank you.

- Yes, sir?

- Brendan Wallful, E309 Luxemburg. This is more of I guess a proposal for the study. If you guys have looked at more of the private sector compared to just municipalities, you know, around the surrounding area. Even you know, municipalities that are comparable in size of Green Bay, Milwaukee in that way. I'll say as a mechanic, a mechanic at West Side Shop, but we're expected to do the work of the dealership. You know, when something breaks down and now this equipment doesn't get any less sophisticated, the newer it gets, it comes to us, now we're expected to diagnose and fix and repair it at the dealership level. Well, if you compare wages from the private sector to where we're at, that's not even close. So, I guess it's more of a proposal, maybe, to look in that direction, and you can even go as far as, you know, if you were to hire someone to plow the city, you know, hiring that out or garbage, any of that, compared to what it's costing and you know, what we're getting paid to be that level, I guess, is what I wanted to bring to the table. Just, you know, for you to look at. So, you know, as far as setting up spreaders and looking at street sweepers and all this, you know, there's dealerships and now it's, I mean it's even getting hard for the dealership to come look at it. So it's really relying on us at, you know, to keep that running. So, that's all I wanted to say about that.

- Thank you. Anyone else? All right, I'll entertain a motion to close the floor.

- Motion to close the floor?

- Second.

- All those in favor say aye.

- [Alders] Aye.

- I'll make a motion to refer this to staff and have them research and come back with information, and maybe suggest some alternative proposals, just per all of the things that we discussed today.

- Second.

- Quick question. When you get that information, are you gonna present it all here or are you gonna give it to the units here so that they can take a look at it prior to the meeting?

- I think we'll try to meet with some of the representatives before. We'll try to do that, and then I think, we'll try to have this in two weeks for personnel to have a discussion there so we don't have to have another one at the budget second time around.

- Sure, I appreciate that. You got a lot of work ahead of you, then.

- I appreciate that you think this won't be talked about again.

- Well I know it will. Get it whittled down a little bit.

- Okay, good. 'Cause I'd like to have them as well informed as possible when we have that next meeting. So if they want to come and make more comments or suggestions, we can certainly get that aired. All right, thank you. All right, on to-

- Have we got a vote yet?

- Oh yeah, okay. All those in favor say aye.

- [Alders] Aye.

- Aye, and that passes unanimously.

- Thank you everyone.

- Appreciate your input.

- Thank you.

- All right, for consideration with possible action on health, dental, vision, life, and disciplinary benefits starting January 1, 2024.

- So what we have in the report or the packet is a recommendation for health insurance premiums to increase by 3%. And then I handed out this packet that I include for the common council, that goes through the fixed costs and the projection that our broker is recommending for 6.12%, but we're asking for a 3%. Part of it is because we do believe that our reserve fund could cover the rest of it. We think it's in a good spot to do that. And I think every once in a while it's okay to dip into that, and it's a little, probably risky doing that, but as you can imagine, listening to a lot of people here, concerned about the cost of living going up, trying to keep the health insurance premiums down as much as we can, we thought that was good to offset it. And then with the spousal surcharge, I think it, I might have put it a little bit inaccurately in here. So we have the family savings plan for employees where if you have a spouse, the spouse and your family is able to go on this plan where if you go to coverage or health insurance coverage, that's the providers that are in network for network health, and in network for their own employer insurance. You can get up to a hundred percent reimbursed, for your medical expenses. Sometimes it's, there's no money out of pocket. Sometimes you have to actually get reimbursed. So since we implemented that plan, we would like to allow people who, prior to 2021, if you were not on the city health insurance plan, you were not eligible for that family savings plan option. We'd like to open it up to those employees. So that's one thing we'd like to do. But in doing that, if someone has a spouse and they're eligible for the family savings plan but they turn it down and would like to go on the city health insurance plan, that's when we would like to include the $400 surcharge per month. 'Cause we're offering this plan that's a hundred percent reimbursable for your medical expenses. We think it's a really good option for them. So to come on our plan, we think you should be able to pay them for the risk that you'd be taking on. So, if we didn't have a family savings plan, we wouldn't be recommending a surcharge. There's no way we'd do that without this option. So that's what is in here and we're not, there's other employees in situations where this might have misread in the memo in the sense of some employees have the city health insurance and their spouse is on the family savings plan. And that situation, the employee isn't paying a surcharge because they have different health insurance option. It's only if your spouse comes on the city health insurance. I'm sure that was clear as mud.

- It, well it makes sense to me, but question for you: They're recommending a 6% increase, you're saying 3%. What's the difference?

- 3%.

- No, I mean,

- And you're on the finance committee!

- It's, aw man.

- You rat!

- I think it's, I could run some numbers real quick. I think it would, oops.

- Could be 300,000, I think.

- Yeah, so I think it's a half of that, right? So it's about 150,000?

- No, you're right. Yep, 300,000. So we're $600,000 short, and it's about $300,000. And what we have in here is, it may not be necessary based on our claims next year, like if our claims continue to, you know, go up, then it's gonna be higher than 300,000. If it's a better year, it'll be less, so.

- I guess I'm always worried about unfunded. And then how do you make it up the next year? You know, because, and I've done that a couple times, I've regretted it, one of my biggest regrets was taking that surplus tax money from the stadium and using it to offset the budget by a million dollars one year and then 800,000 from our savings account. And, that's just, to me that's not smart. Granted, this is not a huge amount of money. It's not like that. But you know, I mean, do you think budget-wise we can pick it up then, the next year if need be?

- Yeah, that's the part of the reason why we're recommending it. And also at the fixed cost, I think we were conservative with some of our savings, especially from the Family Savings plan and from another program called Can Rx with where you can get mail prescription from Canada. There's gonna be some savings with that. So, I think we are conservative with our fixed costs and the savings, but I mean, it still is a little bit risky doing this. But I think it's a good option considering cost of living increases and trying to keep that premium down as slow as we can.

- Okay.

- So, you know, I seem to recall the last couple of budget seasons, that we were saying that Reserve was not where it needed to be, and so we were actually allocating more funding to go into that reserve. And what I'm hearing you say is that we have more than we need in that reserve. So which is it?

- So I think about four or five years ago, and maybe director Ellenbecker, can help me, I think four or five years ago, we were in a tough spot with it. I think over the years we've improved, and I think the family savings plan the past couple years has helped us grow the reserve fund. And then we've had a tough year this year with our cost of claims. So we don't know maybe for sure where we're gonna end this year, but I do think that we're in a good spot that we're above the internal policy of having two months of paid claims in our health reserve fund right now.

- Yeah, and I think where I would feel a little bit more comfortable, to Alder Galvin's point, my fear is, right, you do this and then you create a structural deficit so that next year you gotta make this up, and whatever increase you have next year. And so, you know, what's going through my mind, and I applaud, you know, the, you know, the intent behind it. I just wanna make sure that that's the best option, right? And just figuring out how we fund that. So when we go into budget season, you know, do you, I mean I, you know, if we're gonna do that, you know, do we still have to see a direct allocation into the reserve fund like we've done the last couple of years, right? Because I don't wanna leave that reserve fund in shaky position like it was five years ago, right? So, so I just wanna make sure that if we proceed with that, that the budget's accounting for that 3%. I mean, what kind of a dollar figure are we talking, do you know?

- So I think the, are you talking about-

- Was that the 300,000?

- Yeah, the 300,000 is what we're talking about.

- Right, yeah.

- So I mean, what is the balance of the reserve fund right now? Because we've been putting, I'm trying to think, 50,000, 100,000 a year in there?

- This is the health fund. So, that one we don't actually budget for. You're not gonna see that as a separate budget item.

- Which fund have we been putting that money into?

- Probably 702, which is your worker's comp, or 703, which is your general liability. In both cases they were negative for different reasons. But yes, we had been adding additional dollars to them to get them to be positive. Again, remember when they're positive, it also is, it's taking every claim that we know of and every claim that is incurred but not recorded, and we booked that up at the end of the year, and then we decide whether or not we have enough funds to cover that or not. So, in this case, the fund balance, as of 12/31 2022, we're at about $2.8 million. Based on an average of two months claims it was a little above $900,000 over the two month claim, two months on average. Part of it is because 2022 had a lower claims, you take two months of a lower number, you're now, you have a higher percentage of coverage. But, so we take all claims plus what we know about and haven't paid, we add that up, and then we still have a fund balance of about $2.8 million at the end of 2022.

- Yeah, I must be thinking of a different fund, then. I'm confusing the two. Have to look back at my notes.

- Yeah, the only way this is funded, I'm sorry, you know, again, the shortfall that we talked about, of course, 85% of it'll be covered by the city and then the employees will pick up the 15%. So, if we were to increase it higher than 3%, the employees, of course, continue to pick up 15% of that difference. So, we're over the 2% internal policy.

- Okay, good. Okay, thanks for that clarity. So, do you need a motion tonight? Is that what you're looking for? Or is this information?

- I mean, usually we take a motion prior to the budget and that's kind of locked in for the budget.

- Understood. I'll make a motion to approve.

- I'll second it.

- All those in favor, say aye.

- [Alders] Aye.

- Aye, that passes unanimously. On item number five, for consideration with possible action on the 2024 City of Green Bay and City of Green Bay firefighters local 141, International Association of Firefighters, AFL CIO, 158 Labor Agreement.

- I think we can go into closed session on this, just give you guys an update on where we're at.

- Motion to go into closed session.

- Second.

- Want to read the language?

- The committee may convene in closed session pursuant to section 19.85, subsection one, subsection E, Wisconsin statute for purposes of deliberating or negotiating public employee contracts for competitive or bargaining reasons, the committee may thereafter reconvene in open session pursuant to 19.85, subsection two, Wisconsin statutes to report the results of the closed session and consider the balance of the agenda.

- All those in favor?

- [Alders] Aye.

- We are in closed session.

- Motion to return to regular business.

- Second.

- All those in favor?

- [Alders] Aye.

- Okay. And do I have a motion?

- Motion to direct staff to proceed as discussed in a closed session.

- Second.

- All those in favor say aye.

- [Alders] Aye.

- Aye, and that passes unanimously. Informational. We have a report of routine personal action items. Does anyone have any questions for staff?

- Negative.

- All right, and our next meeting is October 24th, 2023.

- Move to adjourn.

- Second.

- All those in favor, say aye.

- [Alders] Aye.

- And that passes unanimously. All right, folks.