MINUTES OF THE PERSONNEL COMMITTEE

TUESDAY, OCTOBER 24, 2023, 4:30 PM
In person at City Hall, Room 203 - Council Chambers.
Virtual attendance also available via Zoom.

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

Others Present: Ald. Mark Steuer, Ald. Melinda Eck, City Attorney Joanne Bungert, Public Works Director Steve Grenier, Park, Recreation and Forestry Director Dan Ditscheit, Finance Director Diana Ellenbecker, Chief of Operations Joseph Faulds, Police Operations Commander Kevin Warych, Human Resources Manager Melanie Falk and others.

C. APPROVAL OF THE AGENDA.

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

D. APPROVAL OF MINUTES.

1. Approval of the Minutes from the 10/10/23 Personnel Committee meeting.

Moved by Ald. Jim Hutchison, seconded by Ald. Brian Johnson to approve.
Motion Passed.

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

E. REGULAR BUSINESS.

1. For consideration with possible action on the request to fill the following replacement postions and all subsequent vacancies resulting from internal transfers.
a. Truck Driver

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

2. For consideration with possible action on the implementation of the updated City Pay Plan as recommended by the 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, Jesse Brunette, Bill Galvin, No- None, Abstain- None.

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

Moved by Ald. Jesse Brunette, seconded by Ald. Brian Johnson to refer to the Joint Finance/Personnel Committee without a recommendation.
Motion Passed.
Yes- Jim Hutchison, Brian Johnson, Jesse Brunette, Bill Galvin, No- None, Abstain- None.

3. 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. Jesse Brunette to enter closed session.
Motion Passed.
Yes- Jim Hutchison, Brian Johnson, Jesse Brunette, Bill Galvin, No- None, Abstain- None.

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

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

F. INFORMATIONAL.

1. Report of Routine Personnel Action Items

2. Next Meeting: November 28, 2023

G. ADJOURNMENT.

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

VERBATIM MINUTES

- This is the personnel committee meeting for the City of Green Bay on October 24th at 4:32 PM. We'll start with the roll call, Alder Johnson.

- Here.

- Alder Brunette.

- Here.

- Alder Hutchinson.

- Here.

- All right, everyone is here. I'll entertain a motion on the agenda.

- Is moved.

- Second.

- All those in favor say aye.

- Aye.

- Aye.

- And that passes unanimously. Entertain a motion on the minutes.

- Move to approve.

- Second.

- I have a motion to approve and a second. All those in favor say aye.

- Aye.

- Aye.

- And that passes unanimously. On to regular business.

- Item one, for consideration with possible action on the request to fill the following replacement positions and all subsequent vacancies resulting from internal transfers. Item A is a truck driver. Does anyone have any questions for staff?

- Motion to approve.

- Second.

- I have a motion to approve and a second. All those in favor say aye.

- Aye.

- That passes unanimously, for consideration with possible action on the implementation of the updated city plan as recommended by the Carlson Dettmann market analysis staff.

- So we have in the packet a report on the Carlson Dettmann study. A couple weeks ago we went through pages one through three that talked about the recommendation, which was implement the 50th 75th percentile plan, a COLA on April 1st, 2024. And then employees get their annual step increase or performance range increase throughout the year. So we're, we came back here tonight to talk about like the employee feedback and some other options for personnel. So I'm gonna go to page four in the packet that talks about employee feedback. So for the most part, generally speaking, there's been positive feedback from employees regarding the pay plan, considering the increases employees will get January one, and then also be in place on lower step that will provide a higher earning potential for employees. And then employees being thankful that the city's taken a step to provide competitive wages. And then obviously there's been some concerns, as we heard a couple weeks ago. And from other concerns from employees, which center around retention concerns, employees in the performance range currently that are moving to the performance range of the new pay plan are not receiving an increase and they're not feeling valued for that. And then also employees that are not feeling valued if they receive a small increase moving onto a step, but it's a small increase during implementation, like a less than 1% increase. And then there's other employees that are concerned that they're moving down in steps and they're closer to new hires. And a question that keeps coming up is, why can't employees just stay in their current step in the new proposed pay plan? And I'll talk about that in a little bit. And then there's concerns about seniority and leapfrogging where the major one that comes up is employees that are hired within the past three years or so. They're moving to the minimum step or step one, and they're all going to the same step, but they have different seniority. So what happens if you keep the same performance evaluation date, if someone was hired, just for example, if someone was hired last year in January and then someone was hired three years ago in June, they'll go to the same step this January. But if you have the performance evaluation date consistent, the person hired in January last year will leapfrog the person with more seniority. So those issues are things we can address. And I do believe that the leapfrogging issue, I think would be better to address by department and by position within the budget next year. And not necessarily with the whole pay plan discussion, but we can talk more about that later. So when I say generally speaking, employees have been positive, I think for the most part they have been positive. It doesn't mean that every employee doesn't have some concern. I think they do, it's not a perfect plan, but for the most part, when someone expressed their concern and it was addressed, they said, I get that. I understand overall it's a positive plan. So that's when I say generally speaking, it's been positive, it has been. So then on page five I go through the Carlson Dettmann implementation options. So what we have outlined is four options that we reviewed and that were potential options for us to pursue. So the first option is called increase to the minimum. So what that means is we have about 158 employees that are lower than the minimum step on the new proposed pay structure. So 158 employees will be going to step one or the lowest step in each pay grade. If we did this option, those employees would move up. But then every other employee that's within a step or on that structure, they may be in between steps and they would stay in those in-between steps until their performance evaluation, then they would move up. So that's the least expensive option where only the people who are below the pay grade minimum only those individuals would get an increase January one and that'd be a cost of $590,000. We didn't think that was the best option. So we did not go with that because we wanted to make sure everyone received a increase on January one. So that was option number two, which is where each employee will be placed on a step of the appropriate pay grade. That provides at least an increase. That's where the employees in the step part of the pay plan. And then the employees that are higher than the control point and the performance range would not receive an increase. So that cost is about a 900,000 cost on January one. And that was what was proposed two weeks ago. So another option that we'll go through in more detail on the alternative proposals is that it's called a guaranteed above the base 1% increase, then increase to a step. So in this situation, you take everyone's base wage, which is in December 31st of the end of this year, you increase it 1% and then you place them on a step that provides an increase. So employees in the performance range that were not getting an increase under option two, they'd be getting at least a 1% increase in this option. And then the fourth one is the compression relief model, or guaranteed above the base 2%. This is where employees would be placed on the step based upon their longevity and use of service. And then employees in performance range would receive a 2% increase. So that would be, I think across the board it's about an 8% increase. But for most employees I think it'd be closer to 11%. And that implementation cost is about 2.4 million. So that would be adding about 1.5 million to what we're discussing today. So that's why that option wasn't chosen because of the cost of it. And tonight we're basically gonna be talking about options two and three with alternative proposals. So on the next page, page six, we have four proposals. The first one is where we take that 1% guaranteed increase to the employee's base wage. So like I said before, you take someone's wage on 1231, you add 1% to it and then you put them on a step. So that means employees in the performance range will be getting a 1% increase on January one. And then we still provide the 2% COLA on April 1st, 2024. We then would like to change the performance range increase from, gotta let someone in in Zoom, we would change the performance range increase from 1% to 2% and that'd be for all employees. So the additional cost for this is about $200,000 from what was proposed two weeks ago. What this does is it ensures, like I said, everyone in the performance range receives an increase and then it's also at least an increase of 1% for employees on the step portion of the new pay plan. And then going forward, those in performance range would be receiving a 2% increase, which is closer to a step increase in the pay plan. And the proposal two weeks ago had a minimum annual wage increase of 3%. This now would go to 5%. So the alternative proposal, 1A, I think Alder Johnson asked for what the cost would be if the COLA got moved up closer to January one. So you take everything I just went through. But you move the coal up to the second pay period in January or second pay period of the year, you'll get an additional cost about $335,000. So now alternative proposal number two, this is where we have the same implementation that we proposed two weeks ago, that everyone gets at least an increase on the pay plan and then those in the performance range would not receive an increase on January one. But we would in this proposal, have a 3% COLA in the second pay period of 2024. And then again with the performance range increase from 1% to 2%, that would be about a $590,000 increase. So this proposal, it provides a larger COLA for all employees throughout the year. And then it also brings the minimum annual wage increase from 3% to 5%. It just does not address the concern of having everyone get at least a 1% increase from January one. And then alternative proposal number three is essentially one and two combined where you give everyone at least a 1% increase January one, you have a 3% COLA that starts the second pay period of 2024. And then you have a performance range increase to 2%. And this additional cost is about $790,000. And then the rest of the packet has the distribution. So if you look at page seven with the guaranteed 1% increase for everyone, you can just see compared to just the increase to the step that about 96 employees are moving from less than 1% or no increase up to 1% or more increase. And then there's some other examples just how the implementation works and then some examples of the recruitment. So if there's any questions or anything that can help clarify, I'd be happy to do so.

- Does anyone on the committee have any questions for chief Hall? I have a question, you mentioned the step and then there's the COLA. What's the main difference, I guess, is there advantages of the step versus the COLA?

- Yeah, so I think what you're asking, is there an advantage to moving someone January one to a different step as compared to having the same step that was proposed two weeks ago and having a higher COLA?

- Yes.

- So I think what the advantage would be is when you have a higher COLA, it will impact all the employees and it also will increase our pay structure by 1%, which makes it more competitive. So when you look at our step plan of seven steps and then the performance range, if an employee's in step two and they get a 3% COLA, they obviously see a 3% increase to their step two. But steps three and above also go up 3%. So that's the advantage to doing a COLA, higher COLA as compared to moving someone in a step along the way.

- So if someone gets moved in a step that's forever, I mean that's a step up for a long time. A COLA is a one-time deal, right?

- Yeah, a COLA will be a one-time deal, but it's also increasing every step of your pay plan for this. So that's why it's helpful, yeah.

- [Speaker] Okay, Alder Brunette.

- Chief Faulds, the mayor's proposed budget is now publicly available. There's a open house a couple days from now. The budget presented to us includes the plan that is being recommended by the mayor and staff, is that correct?

- The budget includes what was proposed two weeks ago.

- [Speaker] Okay.

- It doesn't include any of these alternative options. So the costing for these options is you take the mayor's proposed budget and you add that approximate cost to it.

- Of about $900,000 to implement, okay.

- Yeah, so maybe I can clarify that. So what was proposed two weeks ago was the option two on, let's see here, it was on page five, number two. So that was, like I said, the implementation cost is about $900,000. That's already included in the mayor's proposed budget, to be clear on that.

- All right, thank you.

- Joe. And this actually, we might jump one committee early here. I got a question for director Ellenbecker, the mayor's proposed budget, I haven't had a chance to review it entirely relative to the preliminary meeting that we had. But when we evaluate levee limits, where is his proposal relative to where the levee cap is?

- Microphone.

- Maybe turn this on.

- As you know, this will take us up about a million and a half dollars over a previous levy. However, we will not hit our capacity on the levee limits because of the debt debt adjustment. That still leaves us to another about three million adjustment that we can take on that adjustment.

- [Speaker] Because of the shared revenue.

- Nope.

- [Speaker] What's the three million?

- What happens is you have your debt levy, I mean I'm sorry, you have your levy and then you are allowed to take adjustments for the amount of your debt that's included in your budget. And so every year we've been taking a portion of that adjustment. So as our debt is around $10 million, we're up to about $6 million of that adjustment we're taking. So it gives us more capacity to go over what's allowed for the calculation for the levy increase.

- Okay.

- So we still have capacity and so yeah, we are not using up the whole capacity.

- Okay, so unlike last year where we were kind of pushing up against that capacity.

- Right, originally, I mean, this gives us wiggle room to even have this discussion.

- Yes.

- [Speaker] Right, yeah. Okay, thank you.

- [Galvin] Alder Brunette.

- Thank you, Chair Galvin. This is either for Chief Faulds or Director Grenier. You know, all city positions are important, keeps the city functioning. But over the past few years there are a couple positions that really caught my eye and that perhaps they were either too low paying or that we were not competitive in other ways. One would be a lot of the engineering positions in your department director Grenier and then the other for some of the drivers, plow driver, sanitation. When I think of those positions, would this plan, in your opinion, address some of the concerns that we have had as a city government in finding and retaining those harder to fill positions?

- Yeah, yeah, so I can address that. On page nine, it kind of gives a pretty good overview. It has some recruitment examples, it has a current open position. I know this isn't a truck driver, but the same, I guess principle kind of goes with it. Our current open position, we have ADPW labor right now laborer right now. And our current posting starts at $21.60, under the new pay plan, I believe that would go up to 24. Lemme make sure I have that, I might add a typo there. Yeah, under the new pay plan, we'd be going from 21.60 currently to 24.68. So it's a $3 increase that we'd be posting. So I mean it's not a silver bullet, but I do believe that's puts us in a much better position. And we did do a market assessment for engineers this past year that gave them a bump. And generally speaking, most employees that would have received a reclass in the past like two, three years are seeing a smaller increase with the new pay plan. 'cause they're probably closer to the new target market that we have, the 50th percentile. But I think engineers are probably seeing another increase in this one 'cause what we've talked about the pay has been low at that. So I think it's addressing both those positions. So I think it's a step in the right direction.

- Director Grenier, where are you at with staffing levels for some of those positions where a month away from snowfall, I mean, even with the increased rate, are you going to have trouble or issues recruiting enough workers to fill these positions?

- Well we've got some deficiencies in operations at the truck driver position and or labor position. In a market like we have right now, those historically have been challenging to keep filled. The truck driver position in and of itself has been probably one of the ones that has changed the most in my tenure as director. That was a very highly sought position at one time because the primary job function that separates the 23 laborers from the 16 truck drivers is those 16 are the first ones called out on spreading and plowing operations. Just the dynamic of the workforce. We're seeing folks who don't necessarily, and we're not unique in this, speaking with my counterparts at police and fire, we're seeing similar phenomenons in the workforce where the work-life balance has changed and you can throw all the overtime in the world you want at somebody at some point they get burned out and they wanna spend time at home with their families as opposed to making overtime. And I think that's what we're seeing here. That's one of the challenges we're facing there. So again, as operations manager Faulds has indicated, I think this is a step in the right direction. I don't know that that's going to be the be all end all cure, from a staff engineer perspective, we're sitting okay right now. The bigger problem I actually have is in mid-management. I have an assistant city engineer position that has been open since June and I have a traffic engineer that's been open for two months.

- [Speaker 2] Right.

- And we're just not getting candidates.

- Thank you for that. Director Grenier or Chief Faulds, this is more of a philosophical, overall the way I see this is that as I stated, all the city positions are important, right? There are some positions that are harder to fill that are very critical to operating our city. That would be plow drivers people, first people that gave the call. And when you see some of these as director Grenier said, this work life balance, at a wage that they're currently at, for them to, chances are if they have a spouse or partner that also has employment, it puts a lot of stress and a lot of demands on those folks who wake up in the middle of the night and respond to a first snowfall or ice or whatever it is. And when I say that all city positions are important, there are some positions in our city that have very little turnover. Meaning that there are a lot of people in those positions that like higher pay grade, not public works, but say professional positions, say city clerk, you know, a lot of the professional staff level positions in offices. All very important still. But will we be better off again, knowing that the wage study is a proposal from the professionals allocating more money to some of the critically needed positions that we're having a hard time recruiting and keeping people in versus some of the professional positions where we have less turnover. Still important, but I wanna make sure that they're the professionals or the consultants that we're not overly rigid in how we're applying it. That we should put some of the money towards the critically important positions with the life work balance. 'cause if a spouse or partner also has a job and the employee has to wake up in the middle of the night and just drop everything to respond, sure they sign up for that. That's the job, but also we have to be mindful of the demands that places on the family. 'cause we've done that in other positions like firefighters for example. That's a lot, could you just kind of respond, like what are your thoughts on that?

- Yeah, and I guess the first thing I would say is, I can do a little bit more digging, but I guess I won't be as quick to say that we haven't had turnover in the higher level positions. I mean we just recruited three director positions in the past year and a half. Steve was talking about he has a upper level mid-management position. He is looking to recruit. We had a deputy finance director. So I mean, there's turnover I think across the board. But I think what you're talking about and proposing, for me, I think the most important thing is to implement the pay plan that's proposed. And I think if you want to address some of those positions that are more difficult to recruit and maybe some of those positions for example snowplowing or snow plan operations, I think there's ways within this proposed pay plan to do so. So I think that to me is probably the most important is I think getting this proposed pay pay plan in place. 'Cause it's 11% increase every step across the board. And then addressing some of those more difficult positions to recruit.

- So let's just say the budget includes $900,000 increase, right? That's what's included in the budget. If that's what the appetite is, let's just say from the mayor and the council, within that $900,000, is there some flexibility to take from one pot of higher wage workers and put towards some of the lower wage workers that are very important to the operation of the city?

- Yeah, so I won't say it's hard to explain, but the implementation for each position on January one with what's proposed right now, there is not a real rhyme or reason who gets a bigger increase when it's implemented versus who doesn't. There's positions that are in lower pay grades that might see a 8% increase January one, there's positions on the higher pay grades that might see a one to 2% increase. So it's not necessarily, you just take, it's not like there's higher paid positions getting more money January one or getting more money during the implementation, 'cause that just isn't true. It's based upon where you're at in comparison to the pay plan and where you're at in comparison to the new pay plan that's being proposed. So it's not as simple as saying, we can take less money from higher paying jobs and just shift it down because there's lower paying jobs that are getting higher increases than higher paying jobs. So I think like I said before, the better way to address it would be to try and find additional funds to address those issues. Because, and maybe I can just answer this too. I think what was budgeted as a placeholder for new positions, and I think it's in the budget book, was about $1.5 million. So that's what's within what's proposed. So the $900,000 is an estimate of the implementation on January one, but it's not a 2024 cost of the plan, if that makes sense.

- Okay thank you Chair.

- Alder Johnson.

- Yeah, thank you Chair, Joe, how much did we pay for this study?

- I think it was about between 30 and 35,000 and there's still some additional costs that will come in, but I don't believe it will exceed 40,000 and we put aside 50,000 to pay for the study.

- Okay, and I want us to recall why we asked for this and several of us had been asking for this for many years. I think I have a stronger appreciation now of why we were unable really to do it in the past. And I mean, but at the end of the day it was about getting us to that 50th percentile. We could sense that some positions weren't there anymore. And that's been the policy in the past. I don't mean to suggest that that's gotta be our policy in the future. And of course, you've got a 50 75 proposal in here. But the attempt was to equalize all positions, right? And so I just have a strong hesitancy to deploy a rob Peter to pay Paul scenario because I don't think that that leverages why we paid to get the study in the first place. But I also do believe that we have a very unique opportunity in front of us with shared revenue with kind of what Diana shared with us, which is this opportunity to make a really positive stride forward to correct some of the imbalances that do perhaps exist right now with some of our positions. And I appreciate you pulling together those numbers on adjusting maybe the timing of one raises occur. I think that gives us a really important point to con contemplate in last year's budget cycle. We did move the timing of that up. Council members may remember that, we filled that with ARPA, but of course it creates a structural gap that we then have to fill moving forward. And I'm glad we did that and I'm comfortable that we did that. Moving that up though, it just requires that level of contemplation, of course, that it's not just impacting first quarter 2024, it's impacting first quarter of 25, 26, 27, and on and on. So we just have to be willing to accept that and I'm willing to entertain that. But I think from a timing perspective, and I'm trying to get at the heart of, we had a really good discussion around this last time, we asked you to come back with some new numbers and you've done that. What is your expectation of this today? Are you expecting personnel committee to say adopt plan X, Y, Z? Or are you anticipating that the budget's already been proposed? That's the proposal on the table. It's really up to the budget process to alter it if we want it altered, right? Like which, which path are we going here?

- I think it's up to the committee. And I think you could do either one, right? I mean, I think the committee could pick a proposal right now, you don't have the full budget in front of you, so that might be more difficult to do. The committee could talk about maybe proposals they feel more comfortable with or they could just refer probably to the budget, the joint personnel finance committee and talk about it more. So I think those are all on the table.

- Yeah, and that's my point, right? So from a procedural perspective, right, we can make all the motions we want on this today, but the budget proposal book is out so we can't change it. And of course we have a lot of individuals here and I think we're gonna get to the point where we open the floor and have that opportunity to listen folks, that will help inform and guide our decision making up here, which is really important. But I also wanna maybe kind of set the table with appropriate expectations that there's probably little that we're gonna decide on tonight. It'll still come at a future meeting, but this is a really important step obviously to get the information we need to, to kind of make the right decisions. Would that be a fair assessment?

- Yeah, absolutely, and one thing I was gonna touch on, you talked about the two options that Carlson Dettmann proposed and they did propose a 50th percentile, which the city has went to in 2017 and then we've been trying to get there or maybe go higher. So we recommended the 50th and 75th percentile to try and get ahead of the 50th percentile market a little bit. When you look at the implementation for either plan, I mean it's pretty close to the same numbers, it's just people on the higher plan will go lower in steps. So I think this plan that we're recommending has more earning potential down the road. So that's part of the reason why. So if someone's kind of like, well we could implement the 50th percentile and save more funds, it's not gonna work that way. It's gonna be about the same cost either way.

- [Speaker] Should we you open the floor?

- Sure.

- Entertain motion to open the floor to hear from interested parties. Need a second?

- Second.

- All right, all those in favor say aye.

- Aye.

- Aye.

- That passes unanimously. We'll need you to come up one at a time to the podium over here. We'll need your name and your address and then your comments. Usually we say between three and five minutes. So try and keep it in there. So everyone here who wants to speak cab speak, do we have anyone on Zoom that's asking to speak at this time? No, all right, so whoever wants to go up first. Anybody, come on, you're up, Mark.

- Mark Bergland, 806 North Broadway, being the lead off guy again, someday I'd like to be the closer. So anyway, we know we're behind on wages. You know, while the surrounding municipalities we're giving 5% or more COLA we were doing one, two, and 3% for the last few years. Hence the market assessment. COLA in my opinion's, the big equalizer, you keep up with COLA, we don't have this problem. Six years ago we had a wage study, six years later we're in the same spot. The wage plan ensures, this proposed wage plan ensures that five to six years from now, we'll be doing the same thing again. And the last meeting that we had last Thursday tells us so. We were told every five to seven years we should be doing a wage study. And what that does, and case in point, we implemented a seven year wage study five years ago. We're right back there again, a while ago we were told they were budgeting for the 5% cost of living. My thought at the time was great. The city's finally doing something big and bold to handle this situation, all good. Then we're told it's 2%. Then I was told that the 5% was never a consideration, never discussed, wouldn't work a bad idea and shortsighted is what I was told. So I'll drop the 5% right now. There's some good things in this plan like increasing the starting wage, that I think is great. I think that'll do a lot for getting new people in. But now we have three or four alternative proposals to add to that. So obviously there was some flaws in addition to the good, otherwise you wouldn't have to have three or four revisions. So here we are again, other municipalities are giving 5% COLA again. Is gonna do 5%, schools, I think they budgeted for 8%, but they're gonna do 5%. So you know, when we do the one, two, and 3% and everybody else is doing 5%, we're never gonna catch up. And having these seven year plans just ensures that we'll never catch up at some point in time you've just got to catch up and maintain. So last night I had a discussion with the facility supervisor from Door County. Door County just did a Carlson Dettmann study. Their adjustments for next year are stewarding out at 4% and going up to 12%, all happening this year. Door County is going to hire in the 87th percentile. And these were all the recommendations from

Carlson Dettmann and they're doing exactly what they had recommended. Obviously door county's got a deep well of money, which we don't. But that being said, one of the other points here is I had heard that all jobs in the city are important, are they equally important? I'm not too sure, but things like specifically and they're important. But Green Bay City police and fire, what have they gotten for increases in the last three years? The unions no doubt have gotten a better deal for them than the rest of the city employees. Why are we treated differently? In 2021 we got a 1% cost of living. Do you think police and fire got that? I don't know, can anybody tell me what they have been getting for raises? Obviously us people here, we're not arresting criminals, we're not saving your house from fire. But I think at some point in time we're just as important. Start looking at things like close the park department. What happens? What happens to the quality of life in Green Bay? No Bay Beach, no pools. No parks, no public restrooms. Like I say, we're not arresting criminals. We're not keeping your house from fire. But I think we're important, what if the Department of Public Works didn't plow snow, didn't pick up your garbage? Where are we gonna be then? Why are we be treating differently than the union entities? And I think that's maybe because you can, the unions, they dictate what they do. You bargain with them, they get what they ask for or close to and we try to ask for something and we don't get nearly what we ask for, some other things like in the proposal, some things that are stated but aren't exactly quite clear. Now, I'm off notes here, so bear with me. Proposal three says a 6% increase. But in my opinion, to get that 6% increase, it is the COLA, it is the initial bump and then it is your performance review. Now anybody that works for the city more than five years, their performance review is in December. So yeah, you may get that 6% increase for one month of the year because part of that 6% increase is your performance review. And everybody that worked for the city before the last wage study gets their performance review, to my knowledge on December 1st. So it may be 6% at the end of the year, but you've worked 11 months to get there. Also, and this is in my opinion, they say that this wage study, the original wage study if implemented raises everybody's wage, 11%. Is that over the course of seven years? Is that where the 11% comes from? I mean that's the questions I have. So it's not like you're gonna get 11% this year, it's 11% over seven years. If that's the case and if that is the case, then obviously we're going to be behind again. So that's about all I got at this point. Thank you.

- Does anyone have any questions for our speaker? All right, thank you.

- Okay, thank you.

- Thanks Mark. Is there anyone else interested in speaking?

- Paul N 35, 92 Culets Road, Luxembourg. First of all, it's never easy following Mark. If you weren't sitting so close, I'd have probably got up here before you. But I would like to first of all thank Joe for taking the time. We've had multiple discussions and obviously a significant amount of time has been invested in this. We've had some person to person meetings and multiple phone calls. I've gone back and forth and I think he's done an admiral job trying to put something together in addition to what was proposed by Carlson Dettmann. As he stated, the plan's not perfect, the complexities of city finance and especially when you're dealing with 460 employees and trying to group everybody into the same categories can be very difficult. So he's acknowledged that he's willing to look at some individual things outside of this. But lemme give you some simple statistics. Asked for a list of names of employees who have left within the last handful of years or so, just as this is just from the operations division of the Department of Public Works. There are approximately 27 that we have lost. 17 of those went to other municipalities. We gained three from other municipalities at some point in time, don't we want to be the municipality who's stealing from others where these employees come to us trained instead of having to train them. The additional costs that we incur in training new employees can exceed $10,000. Most of the new employees that we're getting now do not come with ACDL. There's approximately 125 hours invested in training a new employee to get ACDL. That doesn't include the onboarding and some of the other stuff that gets included. It's simple training like the CDL forklift training, safety training, those types of activities. I appreciate your idea with stealing from the rich and giving to the poor. We're not here to advocate necessarily for that. I understand that while it's an easy target to look at someone who's making six figures versus somebody who's making 45 to 50,000. We're advocating for something that's fair, something that's a livable wage. If I ask for a show of hands, I'll bet you that easily the majority of people behind me would be working a second job just trying to get by. This is a small step in the right direction. Discussions have been great. They've been quality discussions. This is a problem that's been in the works for a significant number of years. The hole has been dug so deep that this is not something that's gonna be resolved in one year. This has to be a continued process. And it's not just about salaries, it's about equipment and other things that have been ignored and overlooked within the Department of Public Works. Okay, so we appreciate that. We've at least been heard at this point and yeah, you guys have some difficult decisions to make. Some money is gonna have to be spent, but we need to be the leader in this. We can no longer train people to go to other municipalities. Thank you.

- Next speaker. Todd Lackey, 24 26 Forestville Drive. I'm in my 25th year of service for the city of Green Bay. All in DPW, first question is the original pay thing that was proposed two weeks ago was basically putting at us 50%. I don't know why we want to be at 50%. Doesn't make any sense. Nobody wants to be at 50% anywhere in their life that I know of. And I think everybody here, if the Packers are 50% win loss season, everybody's gonna be mad. But anyways, go back to what's in the budget and what was proposed two weeks ago, somebody in their 25 years of service, first of the year is gonna get 11 cent raise. Other people, quite a bit more. And I don't want to take that away from them, I wanna be with them. And so I don't want that to get lost of what's being already in the budget. And I think with the new proposals that are out here, I think make that more justified and put everybody in a more level playing field. So I would hope some of those do get really looked at. Thank you.

- Excuse me sir, could you stay there a second? Alder Brunette.

- Would you be willing to answer a question? Would you be willing to answer a question?

- Absolutely.

- So thank, first of all, thanks for your service to city. That's great, thank you. Over your 25 years, was it in the same position or within the same department?

- Correct, yes.

- Department of Public Works.

- Yes.

- Okay, how has the job or the demands on the staff changed over the years? Like what I mean by that is understanding the equipment, the skill that's needed, the types of equipment that you're operating. What have you noticed over the last 25 years that have led you to this point?

- Well, one of the hardest part is the age of our fleet and our equipment makes it, when it gets old, the older it gets, the harder it is to find the parts, so I buy the inventory parts for all the equipment. It makes it very difficult when you're trying to find parts for a piece of equipment that's 20, 30 years old versus something under five, 10 years old. And with the pandemic a few years ago with COVID, a lot of, I don't know what all it was, but the availability of certain parts and it would change from month to month. I don't know if manufacturers is not manufacturing, made it very difficult even to find replacement parts. And then just, I think even being understaffed, they look for year more help. And another topic is we look at our truck drivers here that are up in the middle of the night plowing snow and they're not the only ones, I'm in when they do that. There's the supervisors are in, there's a lot of people in losing their sleep that to do their job for the city. And it is what we signed up to do, but it isn't just something that's real easy.

- So you started in the late nineties?

- Correct.

- At that time, based on your understanding of where you were compared to your peers and other municipalities, was Green Bay kind of considered a higher paying position compared to other municipalities in the late nineties?

- From what I was told when I applied for my position, there was 300 or more people that applied for it and I had to test for it. So there was always, I can't say always, but my first 15 years we had all the same mechanics and shop helpers, in the last 15 years, the door's been revolving. Just revolving, and you see it with the street laborers, you see it was sanitation, when I first started I had to learn 100 and some people's first name, let alone everybody had a nickname. Now I'm just trying to get caught up in everybody's first name.

- Okay, thank you, appreciate it sir.

- Anyone else? I'll entertain a motion to close the floor if no one else wants to speak.

- So moved.

- Second.

- All those in favor say aye.

- Aye.

- Aye.

- It passes unanimously. Comments, Alder Hutchinson.

- Is the assessment that the base that we're looking at, the $900,000 that's in the budget, is that based on a 50%? I just wanna make that clear. What's it based on? So what is in the budget is the proposed pay plan is the 50th and 75th percentile and what was allocated for increase in salaries as a projection, that includes the $900,000 implementation cost, and that is in the budget at this time. So there's the $900,000 for option two is already within the budget at this point.

- Okay, and then, so there's three alternative, there's three alternative proposals stated, which I think is what we're thinking about. Potentially each one has an additional cost proposal, one has two costs, 200,000, and then 335,000 is the 335,000 for 1A, do you add that to the 200,000?

- Yeah, that's a really good question. No, that's just total.

- That's total.

- Okay, so if we do everything in alternative proposal one and 1A, the total increase would be 335,000?

- Yep, that's correct.

- Okay, and then the increase for proposal two would be 590,000?

- Yeah.

- And then the increase for proposal three would be a total of 790,000. Okay, thank you.

- [Joe] Alder Johnson.

- Joe obviously I think one of the struggles that we have is we're trying to almost create this apples to apples comparison, right? Like what's happening with maybe other municipalities versus what's happening with Green Bay. But we're really not talking about an apples to apples situation here. So if we're trying to create some parody, if you will, around the discussion, if we were today to say, what we're going to do away with the survey. We're not listening to anything in here, and we're just gonna do a 5%, what would the financial impact of that look like? I'm not suggesting we do that, but I'm trying to create an even discussion level here.

- Yeah, so I think if you did a, it depends when the 5% goes into effect, but I think if you did a 5%, it'd be very close to what we have in the budget right now. And I think the consequences of that is on the last page, oh, excuse me. If you look at page nine of the packet where it talks about our current open positions and then what the new posting would be under the new pay plan, you basically, right now, those positions are going up $3 for your posting. You just cut that in half for the new posting is what you would do. So I think that would be the concern of doing that. And then I think the concern is in order to get to that 11% increase for every step and then the new proposed pay plan, you then would have to have like a five, 6% COLA next year. So that's why I think it's a very short term solution. And I'm not suggesting we do that. I'm trying to create a fiscal comparison.

- Yep.

- Right, and so right now with the proposal that is on the table, which of course includes the adjustments, we're showing a $900,000 impact, right?

- It's closer I believe to like 1.5 when you include the step increases and everything, right? Yeah, so I can explain the implementation cost. So January one you take your current wage and then you go to the wage and the new proposed plan, let's say it's $20 in December 31st and then January one you're getting $21. You take that $1 times 2080 hours that people are working, you get a number, you do that for every single person. That is the cost right there. So that's the implementation cost. So the overall cost of the year is a little higher than that when you include the increases in the steps, things like that.

- Okay, and I just wanna understand clearly, if we said no study, we're just gonna do a 5% raise across the board, you're thinking that's approximately how much?

- I think it's like 1.5 million.

- Okay, so whether we do a 5% or we implement the study that you're proposing here, we're at roughly the same amount. It's just that some folks are impacted differently. So an aggregate, same number, but individually, certain positions are getting impacted differently.

- That's an accurate statement.

- Okay.

- Yeah.

- 'Cause I'm trying to get really at the heart, where the source of maybe hurt or unfairness is coming into play, right? And I just kind of want to make it really simple for us. And that really is, is attributed, I mean, because what we're trying to do is if you've got outliers up here or outliers down here, meaning paid high, paid low, we're trying to bring them to the equilibrium, right?

- That's ultimately the goal.

- So what the consultant is providing is a new proposed pay structure that is at the 50th and 75th percentile. That's what that is. The intent is not to give anyone an increase, it's to place them at that target market. So the, the increase I see is based on the COLA that the council wants to provide. The issue with that is that there's a cost to implementing the plan and there's a cost to the COLA. I mean that's really what it comes up to, right?

- Yeah, and that's kind of what I was getting at. Right, so we're kind of dealing with two different issues and they have two different cost structures. And so when we're looking at the cost of, your 1.5 million total you said. So really the cost of the COLA is about the 600,000 and then the plan implementation is the 900,000. Is that how you would kind of split that up?

- Yeah, I think that's pretty, yeah, that's close.

- Okay, yeah.

- Alder Eck.

- Mark had asked a question, so I thought it would be maybe helpful if you explained the 11% increase.

- Yeah, I can explain that. So if you take our old, or I should say our current pay plan and you just go at the control point, which is step seven and I'm pretty sure it's across the board, you can do it for every step as well. You take the control point, you add 11% to that, that is what the new control point is for the new proposed plan. So that is where the pay plan gets changed. And then where people get implemented or they get placed on the structure isn't 11% increase, it's based upon your placement. So some people are like, it's outlined in page seven, some people are between, most people are between two and 4.9%, some people are above 5%. So I mean, the 11% across seven years, I think that really comes down to I think the COLA discussion as well. I mean, I think you can get more than 11% from your wage today if the COLA's higher down the road. So it increases the pay structure by 11%.

- Joe, I'm having a hard time understanding the 50 to 75. Okay, so we want to be between 50 and 75 with this proposal. This will get every employee somewhere between 50% and 75%. So what this proposal does is it takes our current pay structure and it moves us to the 50th 75th percentile blend pay structure. So what that means is our control point step seven will be at the midway point between 50 and 75%, which is like 62.5. So that is control point step number seven. What it does then is it puts every employee on the pay structure. So if you're below step seven, you're below that 50th 75th percentile. If you're in the performance range, you're above that. And that's the same as our current pay plan, except our current pay plan. Right now, step seven is the 50th percentile. So if you're below step seven, you are below the market rate.

- Okay, and so if we maintain this for seven years, we will be up about 11%, is that what you're saying roughly?

- So yeah, I wish I was more of a mathlete than an athlete, if you take every step in our pay structure, currently, it goes up 11%.

- [Speaker] Okay.

- So I'm not the math genius to figure out when it takes you to get 11% from your current wage to get 11% increase. But I don't think you need to wait seven years to get 11% increase. Like you might have to wait three, four, or five years, whatever it is to get to the control point, which is gonna be the target market. But that control point is going to change based on the COLA we do each year.

- Well and that to me seems like the problem is the COLAs haven't been keeping up and that lowers the value of the wage they're making if we're not staying up with the COLA. And I mean it's the way it's been. And so how do we address that? I mean, that's a year to year thing and that has to be the policy of the city, The mayor and the council to maintain those COLAs to keep these employees up within that bracket that we want to try and be up at.

- Yeah, I mean it's really gonna come up to the council every single year for that decision. But I think what I was talking about with Alder Johnson is when we increase our pay structure by 11%, the proposal, that is a very good thing and it kind of solves the COLA issue for a couple years because it increases our pay structure up 11% already. Whereas if you do a 5% for 2024, you essentially gotta do a five or 6% in 2025. Now employees, if you did a 5% across the board next year, I think some might see bigger increases. But you're then shortsighted in that, you are not looking at the long term recruitment, you're looking at recruiting at a lower wage. I'm sure that's as clear as mud. I know, it's difficult understanding the finances.

- Yeah.

- Which is why I was neither an athlete nor a mathlete, so, all right, thank you. Anyone else, Alder Hutchinson.

- That was my essence of my first question. The plan, okay, if we call it the plan in the steps, that's a step up based on numbers of years of service and job. See I'm having a problem jiving COLA with that. It seems to me, if I'm on this pay plan, I want the plan step to go up because it's there forever. I mean, it's there, I'm on the step, I'm going up the COLA is just the one time deal. I mean, every year we gotta look at the COLA. So if the step is in, so what you just said just now made sense to me because the step assures an increase by itself with no COLA.

- Yep.

- The COLA is trying to bring the salaries up to the different, the higher prices and whatever we pay for everything. So it's trying to address that. So this plan, let's call it the 900,000 does the step and then we're looking at COLA and then these other proposals are adding onto to that. Okay, but the important feature is the plan is gonna help every year. Okay, I'm sorry, it is just my first time going through this where we're changing the plan and now we got COLA, I want to do the right thing. So thank you. Looks like Alder Steuer has his hand raised.

- Sure, put him on.

- Thank you Chair, can you hear me?

- [Speaker] Yes.

- All right, very good discussion. You know, a number of us have gone through a number of budgets over the years and usually it's the one to 2% that has been brought forward. I've been trying to wrap my mind around the 5% that's been brought forward, even though it's not definitive. But I think with, with anything like this or even development projects that I've seen in the past, a lot of people want instant results. They wanna see something happen right away instead of waiting the course. And I think this report has done a good job of at least getting it into the discussion and people are talking about it. I think that there could be some minor adjustments over time, but I'm thinking instead of the one quick fix, like one or two years of increasing the COLA, I think it's wiser to look at the long-term, seven year movement, so to speak. So I'm still listening, I'm taking notes, talking to people. I've talked to a number of city employees as well, and I really rely on their thoughts and ideas on all of this. My concern too is, and I'll probably be talking to Director Falls about this, but as far as what positions are open and all of the departments and kind of seeing how some of this wage stuff over time I think has really affected that. So that'll be something that I'd like to see as well coming into budget, talking about that. But I think overall, I feel that Director falls and the staff has done a nice job, a good job of at least getting this going and I'll look forward to more discussion on it. That's what I have for now.

- Thank you Alder Sauer. Alder Johnson?

- Thank you, Joe. Just two more questions. One is, Mr. Bergland brought up the performance reviews and how they're conducted in December, and so that essentially staff would've to await 11 months before an increase would kick in. Can you comment on that? Help us understand that.

- Yeah, so in 2017 when we implemented the last pay structure, if I remember correctly, what occurred was that was when the 2% COLA was usually around October and I think they pushed it back, or it was a 2% either October or late November. So everyone got a COLA then. And then after the COLA, people were placed onto the new pay structure. And if you look at the distribution back then, 202 employees did not get an increase when they were placed on the structure, they got the COLA and then they went on like a step that was where their wage was. So those employees at that time would get an annual increase every December. And I think part of it was the pay structure was implemented late in 2017 to help with that 2017 budget. And then the cost for 2018 would be a little less as well, because now performance evaluations are now really in December for a lot of people. So those employees that are still here from 2017, their annual performance evaluation date is still December. So that's why it hasn't changed. But for other employees that have if there's been turnover in positions, they keep their hire date or maybe six months after that, depending on where they get hired as their performance evaluation date. So that's why there's employees waiting until December. 'cause that's their annual review date.

- [Speaker 2] So how many of those employees do we have? Is it still 200?

- No, I don't believe so. It is a pretty big amount, but the number of employees that have that increase in December and are in the performance range is pretty low, I believe. So, I mean, if you make that change for those employees, which I wouldn't say I'm opposed to, you just have some other employees that are in the step increase that might be like, well, how come I'm not gonna change in that? So that's part of the reason why we're proposing to change the performance range step or performance range increase from 1% to 2% to help with that. And that's why also proposing the COLA earlier in the year will give employees a earlier raise if that, and it's one of the options.

- And it just seems to me at the end of the day, right, no matter what decision we make, I mean someone's not gonna get the same value impact, right? And so it just sort of becomes a discussion about, how do we bring as many people along as possible while maybe trying to find ways to mitigate those that are, I don't wanna say negatively impacted, but maybe aren't being adjusted the same. And I think, and I certainly don't wanna speak for the folks that were up here sharing information with us, but I got the sense that leapfrogging was maybe one of the primary concerns. Could you maybe speak to that? Is there a way for us to mitigate that? Or do you feel that that's, if we adopt the plan, that's what comes with the plan? Like is there a way,

- I believe there's a way to do that. What I would like to focus on more for the budget is to focus on the plan itself. But I believe working with departments and specific positions with their 2020, 2024 budget, no matter how it's adopted, I think you could still work on the leapfrogging issue because I don't think that's gonna be a huge increase to overall cost. So I think things you could do is based on seniority, have individuals with earlier performance review, review dates, then less senior employees. I think that would be a way to fix it. And I don't think that would impact too many people, but it's not just the DPW labor positions, there's other positions across the board that would be impacted, but I think it can be done.

- Well, and that's kind of where I'm going with this, right? So I feel like even if you split these things into two discussion points, which is there's the budget and the numbers and the financial piece of it, and we've gotta figure that out so we can adopt the budget, but then there's the policy side of it, right? And the policy side of it seems to me like we could address the performance reviews that happened in December. We could address the leapfrogging, we could address a number of things kind of in there, but if you don't have the funding in place, right, like I feel like that's the first step. Second step is sort of recalculating maybe any policy moves that could make this whole process fair for those that maybe aren't keeping pace with any adjustments.

- Yeah, I can try and see how many people are impacted by the leapfrogging and get an estimate of what that cost would be with some proposed changes and we can have that ready for joint finance personnel.

- [Speaker 3] Oh yeah, I looked, the people that have a review date in December that are in the performance range is 63.

- 63, okay.

- And then, yeah. Yeah, I think if you could get that number Joe, for the leapfrogging as well. I think that would be helpful. And of course when you look at feedback, you commented that you felt here are some of the concerns that have been coming up. Are there any other issues that have really been raised to you that are a consistent theme that we need to be aware of?

- No, I think what I talked about and what they've talked about is pretty much the main concerns. I think the other one that I don't really see that can really be addressed a whole lot is when employees are placed on like the minimum step, whether it's one or two, and then we have new hires coming in next year. I mean, that's gonna be pretty hard to address. In the past, what we have done is we've looked at it very closely and we've kind of ensured in certain positions that people didn't get leapfrogged when we've hired new hires. So, and if that comes up, we can always address it as well. So like if someone was on step two and we brought in someone step three, usually what we do is move them both up to step three, something like that.

- Okay, so right now though, the way that your proposal is submitted here with that roughly $1.5 million impact, that is an aggregate again, right? But the, it is the cash equivalent of a 5%, it's being applied in different areas.

- Yep, that's correct, and I mean, the reason why it's being applied differently is because I guess if you look at the results or the distribution, there are gonna be employees that are technically based on the consultant would be paid in the performance range next year and some that are well below. So there's 158 employees out of 464 that if we implement this new pay plan at the 50, 75th percentile, they're going to step one or the minimum step. So if you do a 5% across the board, that's 158 employees that are probably getting a pretty lower increase in comparison to the study.

- Okay, and I think, again, that's gonna be a hard piece for us to solve tonight, but I think if we can get some of that data that we've asked for the joint personnel finance, I think it'll help us continue to guide that discussion.

- And one thing that came up as well was the market review every five to seven years, things like that. I mean, there's some municipalities that have market reviews on quicker timeframes. And when I met with DPW and Parks employees, what I explained was, the best practice is to have a market review almost every five years and then every maybe 10, 15 years have a internal review of your positions as well. And that's what we did in 2017. I think just because you're doing a review every five to seven years doesn't mean that the recommendation would be a huge increase. And that's based upon what a lot of people have said, if the COLA maintains what other municipalities are doing, you can still do a market assessment and they can come back and say you're not far behind or you're above. And that could be good news as well. And I'm not sure how much you pay for that, but I would assume the more often you do a market assessment, less work would be done on the consultant to update it. Okay, any other questions or comments? I'll entertain a motion. Alder Brunette.

- Yeah, because it's in the budget and I'm sure that we're gonna be debating it at the budget, I would just make a motion to refer to the Joint Personnel Finance Committee with no recommendation and we take it up there.

- Second that.

- Any discussion? All those in favor say, aye.

- One second, aye, can I just make a comment?

- Sure.

- Yeah, just for those assembled, thank you all for attending sincerely, I think it's important when we make decisions that we hear from the people that it most impacts. And I think it probably is frustrating for you all to be here and then probably have us vote with no recommendation and just basically refer it. It's not because we're afraid to make a decision, it's just because it gives us the opportunity to address it at the Joint Finance and Personnel Committee and we'll give it the proper attention that it requires. And this allows us to continue to engage with our staff and get more questions answered before we consider it at the Joint Finance and Personnel Committee. And then that is the body that you see here, the four of us make up that committee and then that will be recommended to the full city council for our budget meeting, which will happen a little bit later in November. So, apologize if you're gonna go away frustrated that we're not taking a stand. But I think you kind of know based on our questions and the way that we're deliberating it, that we're giving it the necessary thought. We is, in my opinion, don't have enough to make any changes because we're gonna be discussing it in a few weeks anyways.

- Yeah, and just to kind of add to that, great comments Alder Brunette, just to add to that, we really, because we don't have the authority to, to modify a budget proposal right now. We actually lack the authority even to make a substantive change to this. We can make a recommendation, it says do this, but that's the same thing we're gonna hopefully deliberate at that joint personnel finance. So none of the timing of this changes. It all is still on the same timeline and I think I know a lot of the other members of council watch these meetings, even if they're not here. So they're gonna hear all the same discussion and great comments from all of you too that, that spoke. So, same, thank you for being here.

- I would add to that, that it wasn't until you folks showed up at that meeting two weeks ago that there's been some real movement in action and change. And I think that that speaks loudly to the fact that we do listen, but it speaks even louder to the fact that when you stand up for yourselves as a group, you're gonna get some action. And so I would recommend that, I know this is a pain to sit here. I know it was a worse pain last week squeezed into that little room two weeks ago. But the more you stay involved, not just your reps, your reps do a great job, but everybody that can attend these meetings should attend these meetings to let the council know that you're there and that you're concerned and you're listening to what they have to say. I mean this is not easy stuff to understand. I've been doing this for a few years and I'm still learning every year that we go through this process. But I highly recommend if you can, if you have the time and if you can make the effort, the more of you that show up, the more that people are gonna be listening to you. Thank you. All right, and with that, we'll take a vote. All those in favor say aye.

- Aye.

- Aye.

- Any opposed? That passes. On the item number three for consideration with possible action on the 2024 City of Green Bay and City of Green Bay Firefighters, local 1 41 International Association of Firefighters, AFLCIO 158 Labor Agreement. Motion to go into closed session.

- Second.

- All those in favor say aye.

- Aye.

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

- All right, all those in favor say aye.

- Aye.

- Aye.

- Any opposed, that passes unanimously. All right.

- Make a motion to return to regular order of business.

- Second.

- All those in favor say aye.

- Aye.

- Aye.

- Any opposed, that passes unanimously. Move to direct staff to, excuse me, motion for staff to proceed as directed in closed session.

- Second.

- All those in favor say aye.

- Aye.

- Any opposed, and that passes unanimously. Onto the informational. Anyone have any questions or concerns about report of routine personal action items? Our next meeting is November 28th, 2023. I'll entertain a motion to adjourn.

- Second.

- All those in favor say aye.

- Aye.

- Aye.

- And we are adjourned. We'll take a couple minute break and get ready.