

Menominee County Finance Committee
Minutes of Meeting
August 7, 2015

*****DRAFT*****

The Finance Committee met on Aug. 7, 2015 at 11:00 AM at the Menominee County Administrator's office, Menominee Courthouse.

Present at the meeting were Coms. Cech, Schei, Hafeman and Nelson

Others present: Brian Bousley, Sherry DuPont, Diane Lesperance, Sheriff Marks, Mike Holmes, Marc Kleiman

Call Meeting to order: Chairperson Nelson called the meeting to order at 11:00 AM.

Pledge of Allegiance: The Pledge of Allegiance was recited

Roll Call: Roll call was taken; All Finance Com. members are present

Agenda was approved by Com. Hafeman and supported by Com. Cech as written. Motion approved 4/0.

Previous Meeting minutes: Com. Schei approved, Com. Hafeman supports previous minutes from July 17, 2015 were approved as submitted. 4/0

Public Comment: None

Business:

- **2015/16 Budget Discussion:** Brian: At the last meeting we discussed some personnel issues and we referred them back to the personnel committee. The first one they addressed was the FOC. The FOC requested one additional full time person in her office. The personnel committee heard from the FOC and ended up with a 2/2 vote. So they sent it back to the Finance committee because they couldn't agree with that one. Schei: Why couldn't they agree, they need to make a decision before we can appropriate money. Hafeman: And isn't a 2/2 decision a failure? Nelson: On the MERS report, our projections look pathetic. We have eaten up our surplus over the last few years. We really don't have anything in the budget for huge emergencies. We pay in about 886,000/year for retirement systems. Based on actuarial projections, we went back in debt about 380,000. We need to look at long term indebtedness. We could easily wipe out what we have. Schei: It didn't make a lot of sense to me John. Nelson: Pg. 20 investment income and payments. 931 goes to 1mil. Pg. 32 we owe 22mil we have 15mil. Pg. 35, service cost – 440,000 – that comes off of what we put in. When we look at this and look at adding positions, it becomes very difficult. I just don't see it. We've added some positions since we've had the defined contribution in place. So that didn't show up in our expenditures before retirement. FOC – how long have they had the same number of positions? Bousley: They used to have a secretary and another support staff. Now they're at four for the last ten years. Nelson: Based on that, you can look through the budget and see if you wanna wack something from someplace, it's up to you guys to decide. I just don't see anything promising. Hafeman: The only thing that we can really take out of the budget is from appropriations. And there aren't many places in appropriations where we can take out enough to pay for people. Nelson: (To Brian) there are some things you're going to have to take from the building fund this year, so that's decreasing. Cech: FOC-Can we move this ahead to another day? Schei: What day are you going to do it, we're not getting any more money. We're short on the money. I'd rather make a decision right now, then they know where they stand. Nelson: I will say the FOC does a good job. Cech: When she stated her case at the last meeting, with the extra person, they'll also get the revenue in. Where they can get on the backs of those who owe. Nelson: Does the revenue come to the county or go to the children. It goes to the children. Cech: don't

we realize some from the extra collection. DuPont: 66% for the position. Nelson: That comes from the state, but not to the county as revenue. Bousley: If we paid out 10,000 for that position we'd get 66% back from the state for that position. Cech: Not for the collections. Bousley: no, not for collections. Schei: Where does the 66% go, where is it put? Bousley: back to pay salaries. Nelson: Is that all conclusive with benefits? Bousley: As far as I know. Nelson: I will also say we've had positions funded by the state before where they've come back and said, now you're paying for more of it. So we may or may not get what the state says they'll pay. **All commissioners concur, they're not in favor of the FOC position at this time.** Bousley: Prosecuting Attorney's office. Dan has a half time person that he wants to make full time. About five years ago that position was full time, but he gave up a half time position with the county was in financial trouble. With the casework and the load that that office has now, he's requesting a full time person. Nelson: What's the projected cost for the position? Bousley: At part time it's \$26,000; at full time with family ins. and benefits, it's an increase of \$37,000. The personnel committee agreed to make the position to full time. Cech: right now for the temp worker, we're paying \$25,000? Bousley: No. Right now there is a manpower person in there. If it were a part time employee, it would be \$26,000. Cech: at the personnel meeting he said when the county was cutting positions, he voluntarily cut one of his full time people to help. Nelson: what were your feelings on this? Cech: At the time, I listened. But to increase from \$26,000 to \$63,000, that's a lot of money. Nelson: There appears to be a lot of activity there. If I were to favor a position, it would be this one. Nothing moves unless the Prosecutor does it. Hafeman: If we had to figure a second attorney, \$37,000 would be a drop in the bucket instead of another attorney. Nelson: As long as it's clear that this could be a short fill. It may not be in the budget next year. DuPont: the projections are in at 29 hrs. not 25 hrs. Schei: I move that we concur with the personnel committee and approve the full time position in the PA's office, Com. Hafeman second's the motion. Nelson: Again as long as we're clear that this may be a short term fill. All coms. agree. Bousley: Sheriff Dept.: What they want to do is hire an additional full time person and move a part time to full time. The Personnel committee felt that they didn't want to move the part time to full time but are in favor of hiring a full time person for courthouse security. Any additional moving from part time to full time, no. Schei: As stated at the board meeting I'm in favor of courthouse security. I concur with the personnel committee, we need a full time person for security in the vestibule at the courthouse. As far as saving the part time personnel, I concur with that also. Hafeman: I agree with courthouse security, but will this start after the vestibule is completed? Bousley: what they said is put it in the budget. In October hire someone and when the vestibule is ready move this person to the courthouse for security. Nelson: What's the projected cost of this? Bousley: \$61,000 with benefits. Hafeman: Is this moving the part time person to full time? Bousley: No, they wanted to hire a full time person. Not move a part time to full time. Schei: this would be a dedicated person for security then? Bousley: They want to use more than one person. All corrections officers will be trained. It will rotate between personnel so if someone is sick or on vacation. Sheriff: You want experienced people at that door. Nelson: Is every current position being filled, mandated by law? I wonder if within this budget if there's money available to cover half of the unrequired positions? Is there someplace within the budget to pick up \$30,000 to cover at least half of the expenses? Hafeman: One of the things we could do is possibly a millage for Mike's (veteran's service officer) position. Nelson: I don't know why we haven't done that. Millages are not very popular. Bousley: With that position, we can levy taxes for the position. DuPont: But the full time position we're talking about in the Sheriff dept., they're giving up two part time for the full time. Nelson: Brian, You didn't tell me that. Nelson: now we're looking at \$18,000, that's a huge difference. Schei: **I'll make a motion that we concur with the Personnel committee to have a dedicated full time person at the vestibule. Cech seconds the motion.** 4/0 Cech: An issue like courthouse security, this is clearly on everyone's mind. We all realize how important security is, especially in the courthouse. Nelson: We have the highest millage you can get without going to the taxpayers. We should not go back to the taxpayers for more money. Not a very popular idea. I don't think anyone's opposed to courthouse security. I'm just looking at money. Bousley: Animal control will be discussed on Tuesday. Nelson: Do we have information on that regarding the City? One of the other counties (Dickinson) brought that up. Bousley: Kenny spoke with the Chief at the City. They are trying to work something out. I will be meeting with the City manager on Tuesday to discuss this and Hazardous waste. Enforcement in the county is our responsibility, enforcement in the city is not our responsibility. Nelson: We currently have a position that does animal control that we pay for... Bousley: he does investigations, he does a lot of things. Sheriff Marks: He does my statutory duties. Animal cruelty complaints; His position is a CSA. He's a corrections officer, he works on a 12 hr. shift at the jail; he does security in the courtroom; he does civil process and he does some animal control duties. That is not the same animal control officer you see in your ordinance. Article 3 of our ordinance: That's a department, a budget, at one time the county did have an animal control officer. That is not present at this time. Nor is it

present at the city. The city disbanded theirs ten years ago. Licenses, I got an estimate from Nancy at the animal shelter, we're probably losing out on a minimum of \$90,000 worth of dog licenses in this county. But if you don't have a program, it's pretty hard to enforce it. We propose getting a BS&A software module, a little under \$5,000 which will track dog licenses. Also we can send out bills for subsequent years for dog licenses. I got an estimate of almost half of the dogs are in the city. Nelson: What's the fee on licenses? Sheriff: \$10. Hafeman: Is that statutory, is that the most we can charge? Sheriff: No, we can charge more. It hasn't been raised for years. Our Kennel licenses are \$10/yr.; most counties are charging \$40 or \$50/yr. Nelson: I will say this, if in fact you peruse this, there might be a lot of backlash on this. Sheriff: this is a health and safety issue. Dog licenses are tied to rabies vaccinations; you know how many dogs are running around the county without vaccinations? Veterinarians can tell us. Hafeman: Can vets be mandated to give those shots and to charge for the dog licenses? Holmes: I don't think that will work. If you want this program to work, you'd have to find someone that is willing to go out and find the people with dogs, approach them about licenses. I think once people get used to getting the bill, I think the program will fund itself. Bousley: That's the goal, to make the program self-sufficient. Sheriff: My vision is to model it much like Marinette County's program. The revenue coming in on the licenses is what should fund the program. Nelson: The law does not require children to have this done. Parents don't have to vaccinate their children if they choose not to. Sheriff: If we're not going to do it, then we should rescind this 1981 ordinance. There's a lot of heat on this issue right now, more so in the city than in the county. Bousley: What I'd like to do is an independent contract, that way it can be a program where we can see how it works. If the program doesn't work out you can drop it. Schei: all those people that came to the board meeting, majority of them were from the city of Menominee. Our money has to be spent in the whole county. The city of Menominee is one entity and they probably have the largest population of animals. But we can't have an animal person that will be located in the city full time. If they get a call from Bark River/Harris, they're three hrs. away. This program should be effective for the whole county, and probably from the city north, than the city itself. Nelson: when dogs are picked up, off the leash, no tags or whatever, there's going to be a fines. On the other aspect, people dumping dogs because they won't get them vaccinated etc., where are we going to store the animals? Schei: we need some place in the central part of the county to place the animals when picked up. Nelson: how much do we get for dog licenses/year? Bousley: right now it's only about \$3,600/yr. Nelson: That's a far cry from \$90,000. Diane: What's brought it down a lot, used to be that everybody came to the local unit to pay their taxes. The local treasurers sell them when collecting taxes. More people are not going to the unit anymore to pay their taxes, they're mailing them in. Nelson: Let's reserve this for the full board to hear the rest of it. Bousley: There was a discussion of a discrepancy between the sheriff and undersheriff pay, where the undersheriff will make more money than the sheriff. So the personnel committee wants me to get with the elected officials and discuss options there. Marc has contacted MAC to get a salary comparison for counties our size. There's 8 in the UP that submitted it. Marc: Us, Schoolcraft, Delta, Gogebic, Houghton, Mackinaw, Chippewa. Schei: As the budget stands right now, we don't have any other discussion. Before we go to the board meeting for the animal control officer, there is money in the budget for what, for animal control? Hafeman: Animal Shelter. Nelson: (to Brian) you were going to send me the PD we already have for animal control. One of the problems I've run into, when people run for office, it's a four year term, and the salary is listed. To be fair and honest, that four year term should stay consistent for the full term or as we budget, we should say the first year is this, the second year is this, etc. We should be clear when we do positions so we know and the elected official knows exactly where their pay is at.

Public Comment: None

Commissioner Comment: Nelson: Thank you for your time today.

Adjourn: Moved by Com. Hafeman supported by Com. Cech to adjourn the meeting at 12:07 P.M. Motion approved 4/0.