

LABOR RELATIONS & EMPLOYEE SERVICES COMMITTEE MINUTES
1st Floor Conference Room, Oneida County Courthouse
December 10th, 2018

LRES COMMITTEE MEMBERS PRESENT: Ted Cushing/Chairman, Billy Fried, Dave Hintz and Sonny Paszak

LRES COMMITTEE MEMBERS ABSENT: Scott Holewinski (excused)

ALSO PRESENT: Jenni Lueneburg, Lindsey Kennedy (Labor Relations/Employee Services); Darcy Smith (Finance); Linda Conlon (Public Health); Brian Desmond (Corporation Counsel); Robb Jensen (County Board); Steve Schreier (County Board); Tammy Javenkoski (Veteran's Services); LuAnn Brunette (Buildings & Grounds); Grady Hartman, Dan Hess (Sheriff's Office)

CALL TO ORDER AND CHAIRMAN'S ANNOUNCEMENTS

Chairman Cushing called the LRES Committee to order at 11:00 a.m. in the First Floor Conference Room of the Oneida County Courthouse. The meeting has been properly posted in accordance with the Wisconsin Open Meeting Law and complies with the Americans with Disabilities Act.

APPROVE AMENDED AGENDA

Motion by Fried to approve the amended agenda. Second by Paszak. All Committee members present voting 'Aye'. Motion carried.

VOUCHERS, REPORTS AND BILLS

Lueneburg provided the vouchers and bills for Committee review. Brief discussion held. Motion by Fried to approve the vouchers and bills as presented. Second by Cushing. All Committee members present voting 'Aye'. Motion carried.

CARLSON DETTMANN WAGE & BENEFIT STUDY

- **REVIEW INFORMATION FROM CARLSON DETTMANN AND MAKE DECISION ON HOW TO PROCEED**

Cushing stated that the first decision the committee needs to make is what counties should be included on the market wage study. The options are: the prior comps (from the previous wage study), the full data set or a modified data set. The market ratio (Includes 2.25% for 2019) using the prior comps is 94.6%, full data set is 93.3% and a modified data set is 92.0%. Lueneburg presented the map of the counties that was provided by Patrick Glynn, Carlson Dettmann Consulting, at the last committee meeting. Brief discussion held. Using the Full Data Set comparisons shows that Oneida County is 6.7% below the labor market in wages. The committee agrees they should go with using the Full Data Set to include more comparable counties in the study; Lueneburg stated that prior to the meeting Holewinski asked her to communicate that he agreed with going with this full data set but he thinks that Marathon County should be excluded. Cushing made a motion to go use the Full Data Set comparisons for the Market Wage Study, Second by Paszak. All Committee members present voting 'Aye'. Motion carried.

Hintz stated that one of the easiest decisions that the committee can make today is to determine where they want to position Oneida County in the labor market. High, low or average. Hintz stated during the previously wage study the committee decided they wanted to pay at the 50th percentile and he felt that Oneida County should continue paying at the 50th percentile. Hintz made a motion to position Oneida County at the 50th percentile position within the labor market, Second by Cushing. All Committee members present voting 'Aye'. Motion carried.

The next decision the committee members discussed was implementation. Fried recommended the positions that have the most turnover be implemented first: Highway, Social Services and Sheriff's Office positions. Smith suggested the committee get Glynn's input on which positions he recommends be implemented first or if the implementation should be across the board. Hartman discussed his concerns regarding the actions that may need to be taken by Departments Heads in order to be able to afford implementation of the wage adjustments. Jensen offered the idea to start 3 different sub committees to determine how the wage adjustments should be implemented. Schreier stated that more research needs to be done by the committee on what other counties are doing to retain and recruit and how they implement higher wages.

Lueneburg called Patrick Glynn by telephone to get his input on the following questions from the committee members: Which positions did he use for the 59 positions (benchmarks) for the wage study? Is the implementations across the board? Did he benchmark positions in each grade level? Lueneburg informed Glynn that the committee members have agreed to go with the Full Data Set for the Market Wage Study and would like Oneida County at the 50th percentile position within the labor market. Glynn stated that with the 59 positions (benchmarks) evaluated, on average, Oneida County on the whole is 6.7% below the market when using the Full Data Set Market Ratio. Some of the positions evaluated are higher, some lower but the average is 6.7% below the market. Lueneburg asked if the county could get a breakdown of each of the 59 positions evaluated. Glynn stated that information can be provided but that the county should be careful with what they ask for because once he provides that information to the county that information is then eligible for open records requests. He said that this information may show that positions that the county is not having difficulty filling are well below the market but that the county doesn't have problems recruiting so that information would not be financially beneficial to provide. That is why the overall implementation is recommended to avoid the "winners or losers" for the wage adjustment implementation. Glynn stated that he could provide Oneida County with the breakdown of the 59 benchmarks if the county wants and it would be included in the cost of the current wage study. Glynn didn't have the information available but he believed that positions in each grade level were used in the benchmarks. Smith asked Glynn what most counties do for the implementation of the adjusted wages. Glynn stated that it varies so greatly between counties that there is no set implementation process. Glynn reiterated another factor that the committee needs to consider is that Oneida County wages are 6.25% behind in pay just based on having a 37.5 hours work week for most county employees.

Cushing gave Smith the direction to work up budget number for implementing the 6.7% wage adjustment across the board and also a budget for implementing the wage adjustment as it was with the prior study. Smith stated that when the prior wage adjustment was implemented everyone was not given the percentage increase outright but given at least a \$0.15 increase and each employee was placed on the wage schedule with this in mind, this implementation may change what step an employee is on and they could possible move down a step on the wage schedule but still get a pay increase.

FUTURE MEETING DATES

December 19, 2018 at 9:00 a.m.

FUTURE AGENDA TOPICS

Carlson Dettmann Wage study

PUBLIC COMMENTS

None

ADJOURNMENT

Cushing adjourned the meeting at 12:18 a.m.

Ted Cushing, Chairman

Date

Lindsey Kennedy, Committee Secretary

Date