

KENOSHA JOINT SERVICES BOARD

March 27, 2018

The Kenosha Joint Services Board meeting was **Called to Order** at 4:30 p.m. by Chairman Jeffrey Gentz in the Joint Services Administration Conference Room located in the Kenosha County Public Safety Building.

The **Members in Attendance** were Chairman Jeffrey Gentz, County Chief of Staff Jennie Tunkieicz, City Administrator Frank Pacetti, Chief of Police Daniel Miskinis, County Supervisor Daniel Esposito, Board Member Mark Modory and Youth in Governance Janaki Rawal.

Youth in Governance Jamal Hanson was excused and City Alderman Rocco LaMacchia Sr. was absent.

Under **Citizen Comments**, Darla Childers of the Evidence/ID department addressed the Board on behalf of the senior employees regarding the pay scale structure. Ms. Childers stated that approximately three years ago she approached the Board regarding that personnel with only 15 years of service were allowed to retire with full benefits, whereas, employees that have been here 30+ years were unable to retire at 55 years old due to no insurance coverage. At that time, the Board requested that the Director address them on this issue, but that it was decided not to proceed as Joint Services did not wish to lose their longevity employees.

Ms. Childers stated that she currently has 35 years of employment and found that she is one of the lower paid employees in her department and pay grade. She stated that she has a subordinate colleague with 22 years less her senior will be making more money than her and that they do the same job as herself. Ms. Childers reported that when the wage study was being performed, she requested that the Evidence department be re-evaluated and that a new job description be developed. She stated that this was not done and that Evidence was grouped into the same pay scale with the ID bureau and Records department; she does not feel that there was any rhyme or reason for how the pay scale was determined. Ms. Childers questioned why someone with 13 years of service is making more money than someone with 15 or 35 years of service, who determined the levels and pay rank for which employees were placed, and why wasn't years of service, education and skills taken into consideration. Ms. Childers is requesting to be placed in the higher pay scale for her pay grade when her fellow employee receives their raise this year.

Ms. Childers believes that the compensation study should have been implemented on a sliding scale according to years of service, pay increases to occur on the anniversary date of the first year in their respective grade and that anyone with 25 years or more of service should have been automatically placed at the top of the pay scale. She stated that this issue has been upsetting to the senior employees whom have dedicated most of their working life to the organization. She believes that treating longevity employees in this manner causes hurt feelings, lack of self-worth, anger and is demoralizing. Because of this, she feels that Joint Services is losing employees and that they need to have this matter resolved.

Under **Approval of Minutes of Open Sessions Held February 27, 2018**, Mr. Esposito made a motion to approve and Mr. Modory seconded. Motion approved unanimously.

Under **Director's Report**, Director Genthner reported that he would be happy to address any questions regarding the Director's report in their Board packet and wanted to remind everyone that the next Board meeting was moved to April 17, 2018, at 4:30 pm.

The Board accepted the information as presented.

Under **Public Safety Software Project**, Director Genthner reported that the first item is additional licenses. Back in June of 2017, he brought this issue to the Board. At that time, it was deferred as the Board wanted to see any possible savings in the PSSP budget to make a determination. In the memo included in the packet, it states that it is the understanding that KSD will be adding squads to their fleet and will need additional licenses. It delineates the cost for each license per squad. Director Genthner is looking for direction from Board on whether the licenses will be absorbed in the project, through Joint Services' budget, or through the agencies.

Chairman Gentz inquired whether the licenses were included in KSD's budget. Captain Hallisy stated that they are not in their budget and that the County purchased 15 squads last year and they were to be outfitted with existing equipment and have licenses transferred to the new squads. Mid-year Sheriff Beth changed philosophies and informed the County Board that they were moving towards retaining the old squads and expanding the fleet. Mr. Esposito questioned if this was in regards to the take home vehicles and Captain Hallisy stated yes.

Director Genthner reported that all of the licenses are currently being utilized and that if the fleet is expanded they would need additional licenses purchased for those squads.

Chief Miskinis stated that in addition to what KSD is looking for in licenses there is still a need for 9 to 10 more licenses to keep where they are currently. Chief Miskinis supports the additional 9 to 10 licenses being a Joint Services' expense, but the licenses needed for KSD adding more squads would be a KSD expense.

Mr. Pacetti agreed with Chief Miskinis. He stated that when the agencies needed modems in their squads each agency picked up the cost and that the same would hold true if KSD increases their fleet and needs additional hardware and licensing. In the beginning of the project, they went out and inquired what equipment was needed to convert squads over to the new software and they picked up the cost at that time. But since the Sheriff made the decision to add more squads after the fact, it would be up to KSD to pick up the cost; the same would hold true for KPD if they increased squads. He understands Joint Services picking up the expense for the maintenance on the license and the additional 9 to 10 NetMotion licenses needed for when the technicians are performing testing or installing new computers.

Chairman Gentz inquired whether Joint Services picked up the cost of software licenses in the past. Director Genthner stated that licenses have just come up with the New World project. Prior to that, there was no licenses needed. Further discussion ensued.

Chief Miskinis made a motion to allow the Director to pay for 9 - 10 licenses from NetMotion and corresponding maintenance. Ms. Tunkieicz seconded the motion. Motion approved unanimously.

Director Genthner reported that they are planning on upgrading the New World software, but because of some technical difficulties they are delaying it. It was initially planned for April and May of this year, but they are looking at July and August now.

Assistant Director Nielsen reported that Tyler Technologies had found some critical issues with the upgrade version and recommended that they push off the upgrade. They are currently waiting for a schedule.

Chairman Gentz would like to know how the upgrade will fit into what they are doing. Assistant Director Nielsen stated that they would apply the version upgrades to the test system and each department will have personnel that will spend time testing the software and its functionality. This will take approximately three months of testing to make sure that the functionality is present.

The Board accepted the information as presented.

Under **Firing Range**, Director Genthner reported that they are continuing working with FGM Architects and Kenosha County Purchasing to put together the bid package. One item that came up was some suspicious material that they believe may be asbestos; a consultant was in to take several samples and perform asbestos testing.

The Board accepted the information as presented

Under **E911 Telephone Equipment Platform**, Director Genthner reported that there is no change in the project at this time; they are still waiting for the Text-to-911 to be implemented.

The Board accepted the information as presented.

Under **Communication Supervisor**, Director Genthner reported that within their Board packet was a job description update for the position of Communication's Supervisor. He is requesting to make a couple of changes to the description and believes it will help to facilitate some of their hiring processes. If these changes were to be approved, he would then ask for the hiring practice be changed from internal/external advertising to just internal advertising. The last hiring practice for this position was advertised internally and externally. They received nine applications, but only one was qualified. This candidate was offered the position and subsequently turned it down. Director Genthner believes that with these changes they will be able to have internal candidates apply that are better suited for the position.

Ms. Tunkieicz asked that if they are choosing to hire internally to take a look at any hiring steps that may seem to be unnecessary; she seems to recall a prior hiring being held up waiting on the psychological exam. Director Genthner explained that all Communication staff go through a psychological exam before hiring; once they transition on to supervisor they do not receive another psychological exam. On the other hand, entry level Record's Clerks do not receive this work trade assessment, therefore, when they transition to a supervisor they receive this work trade assessment.

Ms. Tunkieicz made a motion to approve the wording changes to the Communication Supervisor job description. Chief Miskinis seconded the motion.

Mr. Pacetti requested clarification on only looking at internal candidates. Director Genthner stated that they would post the position internally first. As they have employees with qualifications come forwards, they would screen them to determine if they have someone qualified, and then offer a promotion. Going internal and external adds a number of steps to the hiring process that takes approximately 6 months instead of a 2 month process.

Mr. Pacetti stated that there could exist the possibility that no internal candidate would come forward and at some point someone may need to come from the outside of the organization. As long as they are being asked that the first preference would be to post internally, he does not want the Board to be called together and be asked permission to go back out externally in the future. Mr. Pacetti wanted to clarify that he is ok with their first preference being to advertise internally. If a qualified internal candidate is not found, they then take the next step and advertise externally and internally, if needed. He stated that Joint Services would not need to come back to the Board and ask permission to go external if the need arouse.

Motion approved unanimously.

Under **2017 Budget**, Director Genthner reported that for many years they have been carrying over an amount of money and that he is hoping to take it off the books this year. Director Genthner requested that \$18,408.11 be carried over from 2017 to 2018's budget.

Chief Miskinis made a motion to approve carrying over the 2017 funds. Mr. Esposito seconded the motion. Motion approved unanimously.

Under **Financial Review**, Director Genthner reported that the contract with the accounting firm Feld and Schumacher has expired. Director Genthner asked the Board for the ability to sole source Feld and Schumacher for another 5 year contract. He stated that they are generally satisfied with Feld and Schumacher and requested a 5 year estimate of services.

Mr. Pacetti inquired how the contract would read and whether there was a cap on annual increases. Director Genthner stated that the estimate increase incrementally over the 5 year life of the contract. Mr. Pacetti reported that the City of Kenosha doesn't get many 3 to 4% increases and asked whether the Director could negotiate the firm down to a 2 to 2.5% increase.

Chief Miskinis made a motion to approve that Director Genthner move forward with the 5 year contract and negotiate the best deal possible. Mr. Modory seconded the motion. Motion approved unanimously.

Under Board Member Comments,

- On behalf of the KPD, Chief Miskinis wanted to express sympathies to Fleet Maintenance Manager Pat Sepanski for the passing of his mother.
- Ms. Tunkieicz inquired if there is any more information regarding the concern that Ms. Childers brought up in Citizen's Comments and if the Director can bring it to the next meeting. Director Genthner understands that the implementation has been difficult for many employees, but believes they chose was the most viable option. Ms. Tunkieicz inquired whether there were reports that could be provided that would show employee's years of service and how it compares in each job. Director Genthner stated that they can provide that information and they did look at that option, but given the monetary estimate from the consultant it was not viable.

Chairman Gentz stated that when they did this study it was mentioned that they go out every few years and updating the study. He inquired when they were looking to go out and possibly update the study, would they have the same company perform it and how the County handles there wage studies. Ms. Tunkieicz stated that they redo their wage study as soon as they determine there may be a problem or if an individual department believes their employee is not in the right category. She does believe that in the current market of employers, they are going to have to do a study more frequently to determine if the market is changing.

Director Genthner reported that they recently lost a Record's Clerk because her former employer recruited her back with better benefits and the shift she preferred. He stated that every position in the organization had the opportunity to add their job duties individually or as a group collectively. Previously, the Evidence/ID department was at a little higher grade than the Records department, but after the study they were brought to the same level.

Mr. Pacetti stated that they performed a wage study approximately 3 years ago and that they did not experience some of the problems that Joint Services experienced. Assistant Director Nielsen informed the Board that this issue regarding Ms. Childers arose because her co-worker's anniversary dates are before her anniversary. Mr. Pacetti stated that the way the City worked around that type of issue was that anyone at work with the City as of the date of the study would have their new date for a raise would be January 1st; anyone hired afterwards would receive their raise on their anniversary.

At 5:22 p.m., Mr. Pacetti made a motion for **Adjournment**. Mr. Modory seconded the motion. Motion approved unanimously.