

MINUTES OF THE FINANCE AND HUMAN RESOURCES COMMITTEE MEETING HELD AT
THE GREENFIELD CITY HALL ON WEDNESDAY, OCTOBER 30, 2019.

1. The meeting was called to order by Ald. Saryan at 6:00 P.M.

Roll Call:	Ald. Saryan	Present
	Ald. Bailey	Present
	Ald. Kastner	Present

Also Present: Paula Schafer, Finance Director
Jeff Katz, Director, Neighborhood Services
Jay Johnson, Chief of Police
Michael Neitzke, Mayor
Julie Foley, Human Resources Administrator
Tim Sowinski, Deputy Comptroller

2. Approval of the October 9, 2019 Finance and Human Resources Committee minutes. Approve

10/9/19

Minutes

It was moved by Ald. Bailey, seconded by Ald. Kastner to approve the October 9, 2019 Finance and Human minutes as presented.

The motion carried unanimously.

3. Discussion and decision to consider amending the contract between the City and Johns Disposal regarding the annual rate increase.

N/A

Mr. Katz stated that in the packets there is a sheet that was provided by Johns Disposal that shows some other communities that they serve, the type of services they give each community and the rates. Mr. Katz stated that you cannot necessarily compare every community to each other and to Greenfield but the sheet gives you a pretty good idea. On the committee sheet, Mr. Katz mentions that one option is to consider a surcharge instead. The surcharge would not compound and would protect the City if the rates for recycles go back up again.

Mayor Neitzke stated that the sum and substance of the issue is recyclables are not being purchased like they were by China. Garbage disposal models were based on getting higher reimbursement rates through the sale of recycled material, basically metals and plastics and, to some extent, cardboard and paper. The City has two years of a contract left based on a recycling model where the price of recyclables dropped dramatically. Historically, the City has had Waste Management, Onyx, and Veolia prior to Johns Disposal. When the City went out for bid the very last time, Veolia was the last provider which had purchased Onyx, which had purchased some of the contracts for Superior. Johns Disposal came along because it was offering services in the City's neighboring community, Franklin, which had "glowing" customer satisfaction. Johns Disposal had a very competitive rate and enhanced services provided.

The City gets for the garbage pickup, recycling pickup, and for the recycling center where people do their drop-offs with regard to special pickups and with regard to picking up the garbage cans that the City placed the bus stops. The level of things that the City received

in the contract with Johns Disposal far exceeded anything that the City would have received from the others that bid in a very limited garbage collection environment. The Mayor also noted that there were typically a lot of garbage complaints from previously contracted garbage companies.

The Mayor notes he has very few, if any, complaints over the course of the Johns Disposal contract. The level of service that the City gets has been exemplary. He stated that before Johns Disposal, the recycling center charged \$8.00 a cubic yard. If you brought your pickup truck to a recycling center, you would basically spend about \$24.00. He stated that if you filled up a trailer, it would cost you about \$50.00 or \$80.00. He stated that the recycling center is now free to the residents of the City of Greenfield that pay for refuse collection on their tax bill. This is different for folks who live in apartments because they do not pay the City anything. They usually subcontract with their own provider. This is important because the City of Milwaukee recently changed their garbage rates and if you drop off things at a collection center. The public reaction has not been good. Mayor Neitzke notes that Johns Disposal is a smaller company and does not compete with the major players of the world driven by shareholders.

The City is one of Johns Disposal's biggest clients and the City has a very strong, transparent relationship with them. If there is an issue, there is someone the City can call and it is not someone in the corporate office in Paris or Chicago or somewhere else. The Mayor is not sure that if the City went out to bid today that the prices of Johns Disposal's multinational competitors would be anything near theirs and would be substantially higher. Johns Disposal is responsive and has strong customer service and the City is getting a lot of services.

Mayor Neitzke stated that he only recommends policy and the council creates it. This is probably subject to future further discussion, because the City has not seen the financials. The Mayor is not averse to creating some sort of surcharge, maybe not the extent that is requested by Johns Disposal, which is temporary to get one of the City's valued suppliers through this problem. He underlays the easiest answer is "hey they have a contract they should live up to it."

Ald. Kastner stated that in comparison to other cities and other states, in Illinois for example, their recycling means is if you want to recycle, you are allowed to drop it off at their location. If Johns Disposal are allowed to do that then the City would have a single garbage pickup then we would not be recycling things that may very well end up in garbage anyhow.

Mayor Neitzke added that there are landfills, single stream garbage collection where everything is together and somebody separates it somewhere, there is dual stream with a single stream compartment with recyclables, there are companies that only take cardboard and metals. There are all sorts of options. The City collects about \$117,000.00 a year from the State of Wisconsin in the form of a recycling grant. This ensures that the City meets the State's standards and public policy of recycling.

Mayor Neitzke stated that if the City did single stream that goes straight to the landfill, it would jeopardize \$117,000.00 in State aid, which would jeopardize leaf collection, which would really get people upset.

Mr. Nate Austin from Johns Disposal stated that the biggest difference between Wisconsin and Illinois is that Illinois does not have state laws or ordinances which require them to recycle. In Wisconsin we do, so we are a little bit bound by that. In Illinois, what Mr. Austin is finding is that with the crises, it costs about \$2.00 a month to save recycling, Mr. Austin has not seen a single city do away with recycling. So even with a similar problem in Illinois, it is being paid for.

Mayor Neitzke states that he sees polling that asks if people are in favor of recycling. It is one of those overwhelming 80 or 90% that say yes we are. The difficulty right now is all the plastic, paper, and metal is being stored in warehouses because the Chinese market is not buying it. It is cheaper to destroy and dump than it is to store it until the tariffs and trade relationships improve. The City needs to come up with something in the middle that works, at least on a temporary basis, the City has to figure out how this fits in the budget and figure out whether or not it has anything to do with expenditures and how that works. The City has to figure out whether State considers a surcharge something that adversely impacts the state aids that the City is receiving somewhere else. The legislature has not been kind to municipalities in regards to raising any revenue stream under almost any circumstance.

Ald. Kastner stated that this is not really a revenue stream to the City it is a straight “pass through”.

Mayor Neitzke stated that a surcharge is considered a fine, fee, or forfeiture or if this truly just the surcharge and a “pass through”. He is not sure if the City can even surcharge legally.

Ald. Kastner stated that he presumed that since this issue was presented that the City looked into what the Mayor stated. Mayor Neitzke confirmed that he did not look into a wide variety of options. The City would have to talk to Common Council about that. Mr. Austin stated that the other communities are slightly different in that the avenue Johns Disposal is exploring involves service changes as well.

Mayor Neitzke added that the other solutions are that the drop off center stops, special curbside collection stops, garbage can collection stops, the free allocation of dumpsters terminates or become more limited.

Mr. Austin added that on the sheet handed out, not saying that the services would be ended, the biggest difference from Greenfield and any community Johns Disposal serves out of Franksville and Norway, even out of the communities that they serve out of Whitewater, the single largest difference is the drop off center. This year, Johns Disposal serviced about 12,000 people. A couple hundred “roll offs”, several semis of electronics, that represent a major cost. When you look at the price column, Mr. Austin believes that the City of Greenfield is at a very comparable rate. The idea of getting rid of all the services the Mayor stated would be very ugly. Mr. Austin believes that this is the number one difference in terms of what Johns Disposal provides to the City of Greenfield than any other community they serve.

Mayor Neitzke stated that he understands that the volume of garbage that goes through the drop off centers has increased pretty substantially. Mr. Austin agreed to the Mayor's statement.

Ald. Kastner asked what percentage of the residents use the drop off center. He guessed maybe in the volume of the area, ten. Mr. Austin answered that 12,000 to date servicing 9,000 units. Ald. Kastner rephrased his question to ask not how many per day, but how many households actually use the service. Each household would get charged \$20.00, 80% are not using that service.

Ald. Saryan also added that Ald. Kastner is asking what percentage of households in Greenfield use the drop off center. Mr. Austin answered that it is a small number because only 50% of the households possess cards. Many people do not use the drop off center. The drop off center is used by a small fraction.

Mr. Austin stated that Johns Disposal could actually look at their system and figure it out because now they have the cards and can scan them. Mayor Neitzke added that this should be done.

Mr. Austin added that the 12,000 number plus or minus, that is individual visits. Mayor Neitzke stated that if only 10% are using it, that is 900 people with 12,000 individual visits, if those numbers are right. Mr. Austin stated that he is not sure, some of those users are repeat users. This would drive that number even lower.

Ald. Kastner added that he has used the drop off center multiple times this year, which would make him a repeat user. Mayor Neitzke asked Ald. Kastner how he would feel if he had to pay \$20.00 every time he used the drop off center. Ald. Kastner answered that the downside of not providing the service would be people would just leave "stuff" in their yards and that makes the City look like trash.

Mayor Neitzke stated that this is sort of the issue too. That was one of the biggest things in Milwaukee that people that have that mattress or that TV, they just dump it somewhere.

Mr. Austin added that the City still has an avenue for disposal with the special pickups. Ald. Kastner added to Mr. Austin's statement that this is because Johns Disposal is a good company. Ald. Saryan clarified that this service is provided twice a year. Mr. Austin confirmed that this service is provided twice a year. Ald. Kastner stated that this is an excellent service.

Mr. Austin stated that his point is if he was a resident in Greenfield, would he want to go to the dump or call and say pick trash from his yard. It is an opinion. The majority of the communities that are on the provided worksheet that have special pickups monthly or several a year, none of them have drop off centers because those residents can call and schedule or is already prescheduled for pick up.

Mayor Neitzke stated that between eliminating the drop off center and having special pickups or just having two special pickups and that is it, if either one is an advantage.

Mr. Austin states that he is not trying to pitch those ideas, the goal is the recycling but if there is another way to do it. Johns Disposal has other communities that say they want to keep the company and will look at limiting services or changing services or, frankly, adding services to make an increase more palatable. Johns Disposal has seen all three this year. The only thing the City does not have that Johns Disposal offers is every week recycling. He is not sure what that cost would be. Ald. Saryan stated that she does not believe the City would need that, some do.

Ald. Bailey stated that this is a problem and he understands the reason for the increase and that Johns Disposal is a great company and the complaints have gone way down. He is not sure he can support an increase at this time. Mayor Neitzke added that the City can continue looking at different levels of service or continue looking at the surcharge. Ald. Saryan stated that she is open to try to figure something out. There are many options that the City can look at.

Ald. Kastner asked if \$20.00 is a hard number. Mr. Austin answered that that is Johns Disposal's proposal. Mayor Neitzke asked where this number came from.

Mr. Austin answered that a lot of that is from the move to the real number of the value of today. This is strictly recycling. This has been the hard thing, in the majority of their communities that have passed this, it has an appearance sort of like greed. The hard thing for Johns Disposal is that they are going to receive these large increases but it is recycling only, not driver wages or some of the other things like cost of living.

Mayor Neitzke stated that the City has to have some sort of information by November 19, 2019. There is another Finance meeting on November 13, 2019. Mayor Neitzke stated that between now and November 13, 2019, the City should come up with some solutions to try to figure out whether it is a change in the level of service or something else.

4. Discussion and decision to approve an ordinance amending Section 3.12 (5) (c) of the Municipal Code adding annual permit fees for small wireless facilities in the right of way.

Mr. Katz stated that up to now, cell phone towers were big tall towers with multiple antennas. Now what the cell phone providers are instituting is putting up small antennas the size of a telephone pole to fill in the gaps and also, in the future, are going to provide enhanced services. You can see this mostly in large, metro areas right now. These antennas are about as tall as a power pole or could be attached to a power pole, attached to a street light, or they could go on their own pole. There are federal and state laws that strictly benefit the cell phone providers and limit the municipalities from regulating these. One thing that the City can do as a community is the City can charge a permit fee just like you would do any utility, which would be charged \$100.00 per installation. This new fee that the City can charge the cell phone providers can charge \$20.00 per installation per year. In other words, if the cell phone providers put these cell antennas up, the City would receive \$20.00 per year every year as long as it is there. Verizon is planning to put up about 100 of these antennas up in Greenfield. So the City is carefully working with Verizon and following the state and federal laws to make these as inconspicuous as possible and having Verizon put them on decorative poles and making sure the location is in an area that it blends in, as best as we can. Milwaukee is probably the first community around here that has received them because they are trying to prepare for the democratic

Approve an ordinance amending Section 3.12 (5) (c) of the Municipal Code adding annual permit fees for small wireless facilities in the right of way.
Council

convention. Greenfield is another one of the firsts, Verizon came to the City first. The City has been very strict with Verizon and they have been pretty compliant. Verizon has been good to work with so far and have not put any antennas up yet. The City has just received a call two weeks ago that AT&T is now looking at Greenfield because each company has their own system and they do not share antennas.

Ald. Bailey asked if the most the City can charge is \$20.00. Mayor Neitzke asked Mr. Katz if the federal government has basically preempted the City and whatever the federal government did not do the state preempted the rest of it. He also asked that the \$20.00 is the maximum and that the state will let the City charge, it does not cover the kinds of costs the City would incur when we are trying to figure out where the antennas go and working with the companies to co-locate.

Mr. Katz answered that the City can collect \$100.00 per location for the initial installation.

Mayor Neitzke stated that that amount does not cover the costs it would incur upon the City. The danger is that the City needs to pass, in order to collect the \$20.00, an ordinance.

It was moved by Ald. Kastner, seconded by Ald. Bailey to approve an ordinance amending Section 3.12 (5) (c) of the Municipal Code adding annual permit fees for small wireless facilities in the right of way.

The motion carried unanimously.

5. Discussion and decision to replace the Detective Sergeant position with a Captain position, set salary, recruit and hire for a Captain of the Criminal Investigation Bureau in the Police Department coinciding with the 2020 budget.

Chief Johnson stated since 2012, the Police Department has had five different supervisors rotate through the Bureau. The Police Department is young, when this was first brought on it was to expose a Detective or a Sergeant to the Bureau to make them more rounded, and put them back in patrol. Because the Bureau is so young, they do not even spend a year and then rotate back. With the DNC, with the new Act 348, with the officer involved shooting, investigated by independent agency, the City is one of the five agencies that do these types of investigations along with Milwaukee, Waukesha, West Allis, where we take our Bureau and basically plant ourselves in that officer involved shooting. This is intense, there are one hundred plus Detectives. Chief Johnson is looking to change this, so a Detective, someone with experience in that field, is someone who would be orchestrating organizing the investigation. Currently if you look at the salaries, if you look at the amount of money the City spends on overtime for a Detective Sergeant, it is more than it would be for a salaried position.

Ald. Bailey stated that years ago the Detective Bureau was run by a Lieutenant, so somewhere along the line someone thought a Sergeant is going to be in charge and that this was thought to be a good idea. At some point in time, this went away.

Approve replacing the Detective Sergeant position with a Captain position, set salary, recruit and hire for a Captain of the Criminal Investigation Bureau in the Police Department coinciding with the 2020 budget
Council

Chief Johnson agreed with Ald. Bailey's statement and stated that his predecessor was the first Detective Sergeant that made that position. It was to make the Bureau more well-rounded and more marketable for promotions. The fact of the matter is that when you look at expertise in this day, this year alone the City has had a homicide, a major multi-state burglary ring, along with an unfortunate electrocution that just happened. The Bureau needs people in there to take over and manage those serious situations. For Chief Johnson personally, it has to be someone who is in investigations who knows what they are doing, such as search warrants, all that stuff which incorporates. Right now, the Detective Sergeant, they lean heavily on the expertise of the Bureau to know how to do that stuff.

Ald. Bailey stated that Chief Johnson's proposal makes sense to him and 90% of the job is learning on the job, experience, and that means so much in police work. You can go to school all you want, but that experience as a Detective makes a lot of sense to be the Captain of the Detective Bureau.

Chief Johnson stated that the Police Department has wonderful people and both sides, patrol and the Bureau, the amount of money they saved and the amount of time and resources, it was amazing to see how they worked together. The Bureau is filled with a bunch of qualified candidates.

Mayor Neitzke stated that having someone go from non-exempt to exempt is always a beautiful thing from a financial standpoint. There are a few concerns that he has. First, it is a Captain like the other three Captains so the job descriptions need to be very similar. They are almost interchangeable. This job would have to be part of the command staff and someone who is looked up to and is the go-to person for sure.

Chief Johnson stated that this is how the Detective Sergeant is treated now. They are part of the command staff and in the Monday morning meetings they are already there.

Mayor Neitzke stated that as a Captain, they would also need to step in to maybe non Detective CIB functions at some point. The City does not have dozens and dozens of leaders. The second thing, there are a lot of capable candidates in the Bureau that could go into this position, the Mayor has gone through the process where every time there is a promotion that that alliance is sometimes drawn and people feel like they did not get the chance based on the person the Police Department and Bureau would pick. This is one of those critical times where if someone feels like they did not have the chance or they feel that they were on the outs or somebody was predisposed to the position, which can create organizational problems for a very long time.

Chief Johnson stated that they are starting to address these issues that are starting to come about. Every single person in the Detective Bureau are on board with that promotion coming within the Bureau. Chief Johnson referred to the fact that the Police Department will have some retirements at the beginning of 2020. There is a need to go in this direction.

Mayor Neitzke stated that his two concerns are that the job description do not become too specialized, that they remain a Captain. A Captain is a Captain, and that the process to fill the position is very open and that schisms are not created within the department.

Ms. Foley stated that the job description came from an old Captain job description and there was only the one. This was updated to the current format and had a few minor changes to incorporate a couple responsibilities that the Captain that will be overseeing the CIB would be responsible for, basically the qualifications. All Captains, regardless of department that they are assigned to, are going to fall under one job description. There is no separation.

Mayor Neitzke stated that historically, the Chief can assign a Captain to head up the radios, or head up IT, or head up projects, or head up certain areas, utilizes their certain skills. It is important that the City does not get too specific with descriptions, again, a Captain is a Captain. It is at the discretion of the Chief to assign the Captain positions that they are most competent in or has the best skill set.

Ald. Kastner states that he agrees with Mayor Neitzke and asked if the job description matches what the Mayor is saying. Ms. Foley answered that it does.

Ald. Bailey stated that this Captain would have to understand that they might have to take a command of a patrol function, other Captains might be on vacation that they will have to perform the functions of a regular patrol Captain. Ms. Foley stated that this it outlined in the job description.

Mayor Neitzke stated that if a job description states exactly what a person would be in charge of it reduces the flexibility of that person.

It was moved by Ald. Kastner, seconded by Ald. Bailey to approve to replace the Detective Sergeant position with a Captain position, set salary, recruit and hire for a Captain of the Criminal Investigation Bureau in the Police Department coinciding with the 2020 budget.

The motion carried unanimously.

6. Approval of schedule of disbursements in the amount of \$862,489.18.

It was moved by Ald. Bailey, seconded by Ald. Kastner to approve the following schedule of disbursements:

Approve
schedule of
disbursements
in the amount
of \$862,489.18
Council

AP DISBURSEMENT SCHEDULES:

AP CHECKS	10/4/2019	\$	393,214.01
AP CHECKS	10/11/2019	\$	37,310.09
AP CHECKS	10/18/2019	\$	280,235.63
P-CARDS /SEPTEMBER 2019 STATEMENT	9/23/2019	\$	151,729.45
TOTAL \$			862,489.18

The motion carried unanimously.

7. Approval of mileage reimbursements in the amount of \$837.00.

It was moved by Ald. Kastner, seconded by Ald. Bailey to approve the mileage in the amount of \$837.00.

The motion carried unanimously.

Approve
mileage in the
amount of
\$837.00
Council

8. Investments and reinvestments

It was moved by Ald. Kastner, seconded by Ald. Bailey to approve the investments and reinvestments as follows:

<u>LOCAL GOVERNMENT INVESTMENT POOL</u>					
September 2019 Statement					
August Ending Balance				\$	24,821,792.64
0 Deposit (s) in September					-
3 Withdrawal(s) in September					3,500,000.00
September Interest Earnings @ 2.18%					41,996.31
			TOTAL	\$	21,363,788.95

Institution	Princ Amt Invested	Investment Date	Maturity Date	Yield	Interest Earned	ID #
Money Mkt/Tri-City Bank	\$642,751.48	12/31/2001	variable		\$79.24	21901270
Money Mkt/BMO Harris Bank	\$509,921.67	6/28/2011	variable		\$208.33	46370511
Ehlers Investment Partners X-2055705 GRD GEN INV	\$6,431,807.18	12/9/2014	variable			
Associated Bank Investments	\$6,323,857.73	12/10/2014	variable			
Totals	\$13,908,338.06				\$287.57	

The motion carried unanimously.

9. Accept September 2019 financial statements

It was moved by Ald. Kastner, seconded by Ald. Bailey to accept September 2019 financial statements.

The motion carried unanimously.

Accept
September
2019 financial
statements
Council

10. 2020 budget discussion.

Mayor Neitzke stated that the budget is pretty good to go. He has not heard anything from anyone. There will be some minor adjustments coming up. State transportation aids were higher than the City originally proposed, the City is getting more money. The City, with regard to expenditure restraint and levy and capital funds there will be some adjustments internally to make sure it all works the way it is supposed to. This has been the most trying year for health insurance in the twenty years Mayor Neitzke has been with the City. He feels comfortable with the budget to present this in closed session, including all the

Approval to
publish the
2020 budget

ramifications will be alright. The budget is the blueprint going into the future, the City does not know exactly what is going to happen in the next year in any way. Operationally, we can adjust for any potential increases, they are absorbable. The final number is unknown, but the Mayor thinks the City will be okay.

- | | | |
|-----|--|----------------|
| 11. | It was moved by Ald. Kastner, seconded by Ald. Bailey, for Committee to go into closed session at 6:55 p.m., pursuant to Wisconsin Statutes, Section 19.85(1)(c)(e) to consider the following: | Closed session |
|-----|--|----------------|

- | | | |
|--|--|--|
| | a. Discussion of specific personnel problems as related to personnel matters | |
| | b. Deliberating or negotiating the purchasing of public properties, the investing of public funds, or conducting other specified public business, whenever competitive or bargaining reasons require a closed session (wages, insurance, or investing of public funds) | |

On a roll call vote, the motion carried unanimously.

- | | | |
|-----|---|-----------|
| 12. | It was moved by Ald. Kastner, seconded by Ald. Bailey, to adjourn closed session and reconvene into open session at 7:38 p.m. | Reconvene |
|-----|---|-----------|

The motion carried unanimously.

- | | | |
|-----|--|------------------|
| 13. | Decision of specific personnel problems as related to personnel matters. | No Action Needed |
|-----|--|------------------|

No action needed.

- | | | |
|-----|--|---|
| 14. | Decision of deliberating or negotiating the purchasing of public properties, the investing of public funds, or conducting other specified public business, whenever competitive or bargaining reasons require a closed session (wages, insurance, or investing of public funds). | HR Administrator to Proceed As Directed |
|-----|--|---|

It was moved by Ald. Kastner, seconded by Ald. Bailey, for the Human Resources Administrator to proceed as directed.

The motion carried unanimously.

- | | | |
|-----|----------------------------------|--|
| 15. | Other topics for future agendas. | |
|-----|----------------------------------|--|

Johns Disposal Contract.

- | | | |
|-----|----------|---------|
| 16. | Adjourn. | Adjourn |
|-----|----------|---------|

It was moved by Ald. Kastner, seconded by Ald. Bailey to adjourn the meeting at 7:43 p.m.

The motion carried unanimously.