

MINUTES
TOWN OF NEW GLARUS
Regular Town Board Meeting
Town Hall – Swiss Miss Center 1101 Hwy 69 New Glarus
06/11/2014 - 6:30 p.m.

ATTENDING: Board Members: Keith Seward, Dean Streiff, Chris Narveson, Jim Hoesly, Robert Elkins, Pattie Salter and Dennis

ALSO ATTENDING: Tim Schleeper of Vierbicher

K. Seward called the meeting to order at 6:35 p.m.

- 1) Proof of Posting: P. Salter confirmed proper posting.
- 2) Approve Town Board Minutes:
 - a) 05/13/14 Regular Town Board Meeting: D. Streiff moved to approve the minutes as presented, R. Elkins 2nd. Motion Carried.
- 4) Pioneer Road Update – Tim Schleeper, Vierbicher Associates: Without objection, Mr. Schleeper's presentation was moved up on the agenda to accommodate his schedule this evening.

T. Schleeper distributed and discussed the Preliminary Pioneer Road Reconstruction Project. He explained that in drafting the plan he tried to balance safety with community sensitive design. Schleeper also noted that he wanted to make sure that this preliminary design fits in with what the Town Board is looking for. Schleeper recommended lowering speed limit to 45 MPH on the majority of Pioneer Road because the cost of reworking the curves would be prohibitive. He also recommended a few advisory postings of 35 MPH (refer to page 8 as it pertains to the intersection at Klassy Road). Their preliminary design within the green part of the West Phase of the project would be posted for 45 but built for 50 MPH.

Schleeper recommends splitting the project in two phases starting the project at West Phase which would include the hill to the West of Titus Lane, the long stretch from County O up to the split to Titus Lane. The second phase would begin at Blue Vista and continue to the end of Pioneer Road . The entire project is approximately 2 miles of road and by spreading the project out over two phases traffic would be minimally effected. Residents and emergency vehicles will be able to come and go but there may be short interruptions to allow for lowering and raising hills, hauling excavation materials. It would be reasonable to close the road for the duration of the project which would speed construction.

Without objection we will finish the engineering this year and bid the project this Winter to begin construction in the Spring of 2015.

- 3) Refuse and Recycling Recommendation for Hauler: K. Seward handed out a summary of the three waste haulers. Haulers were asked to quote on a 5 year contract. Advanced is highlighted because they are the lowest bidder. The quotes are based on automated weekly garbage pickup and bi-weekly recycling. C. Narveson noted that each resident would have a \$28 annual savings to go with the automated service. Receptacles would be the property of the hauler.

J. Hoesly mentioned that residents such as K. Talarczyk are opposed to the automated process as it would be difficult for her to haul the carts down to the road. P. Salter noted that we were told that there are trailer hitch attachments that would allow residents to haul the cart down to the road with their vehicle.

C. Narveson was not comfortable making the decision to go with the automated service without getting more input from residents. Narveson felt hauling the larger bins will be difficult for some residents and therefore we will get a lot of complaints. R. Elkins objected to the automated system as he was concerned that the containers won't hold enough waste and they would be cumbersome for some residents.

R. Elkins moved to stay with our present hauler with manual weekly pickup and bi-weekly recycling, C. Narveson 2nd

and requested time to review the full comparison spreadsheet before next month's meeting. K. Seward asked if C. Narveson wanted to go through the negotiations with the Board and Contractors. Narveson stated that he wanted to get more information on the options. K. Seward asked if the Board wanted all three haulers to come before the Board so that the Board could ask questions, negotiate with them each and make a decision, rather than accept the recommendation that he and Pattie made. C. Narveson said yes. R. Elkins felt he would like more time to talk with the constituents and get their input before making a final decision. K. Seward asked if the board members wanted to have the haulers at the next board meeting. C. Narveson stated that he was very leery because he's nervous that if he has extra materials that won't fit into the bin the new hauler pick it up. J. Hoesly moved to table R. Elkins' motion until next month so he could talk to neighbors and make a decision. D. Streiff 2nd. K. Seward noted that we need to act on the decision soon because we'll need time to implement any changes. Motion Carried.

- 4) Pioneer Road Update – Tim Schleeper, Vierbicher Associates: Discussed earlier in the meeting.
- 5) Patrolman's Report:
 - a) Road Maintenance Update: D. Nielson reported that Green County Highway has completed most of the paving and crack and chip sealing will be done in the fall. Dennis reported that he has been spraying weeds and will begin mowing next week.
 - b) Legler Valley Drainage Issue: Bob Falsey who lives on Legler Valley Road, West of Ashley Lane, experiences a lot of drainage on his property. Eddie Klitzke laid breaker rock down. Falsey thought that Vierbicher had removed a culvert sometime back but neither Nielson nor Seward remembered removing a culvert. D. Nielson felt the water should be run from the west across the road. This whole section of the road is swampy and Dennis did not feel a culvert would help and suggested waiting until the next time the road is repaired and have the engineers look at it.
- 6) Public Comments: Dennis would like to request direct deposit of paychecks. Without objection, issue will be added to next month's agenda.
- 7) Finance Committee Report:
 - a) Accounts Receivable Aging List: Not available at the time of this meeting.
 - b) Accounting Reports w/Monthly Bank Reconciliation: P. Salter distributed the accounting reports for May and explained that due to technical difficulties the June reports would not be available until the July meeting.

Request for Driveway Refund Request: Mike Fenley submitted a driveway refund request for Brian and Stacy Alt of W5376 Windmill Ridge. Mike approved their driveway on May 29, 2014.
 - c) Payment of Bills: D. Streiff moved to approve May Checks 17605-17626 and ACH Payments 23283, 29209, 53052, 77324, 82102 & 20146. C. Narveson 2nd. Motion carried.

Although the June reports were not available at the time of the meeting, C. Narveson moved to approve checks 17627-~~17649~~–17635, D. Streiff 2nd. Motion Carried.
- 8) Clerk-Treasurer Report:
 - a) Correspondence: P. Salter distributed a Public Service Notice encouraging farmers to recycle their ground silo plastic.
 - b) Accounting System Update: System has been balanced through May and should be finished by next month.
- 9) Chairman's Report:
 - a) HR Committee Proposed Revision to Policy XV – Health Insurance: K. Seward reported that the HR Committee has been working on revisions to the Health Insurance Plan Policy. R. Elkins reported that our employees' plan does not have any deductibles or co-pay. P. Salter reported that there are co-pays for ER visits, and a co-pay for prescription medications up to an annual maximum out of pocket expense.

K. Seward's task was to find out what others in our area pay. The Village pays 81.5% of Average Tier 1 plan in the area. We have two board members whose spouses have the state plan. J. Hoesly's wife contributes \$219 per month with a plan cost of \$1,718.50 month for 2013. That equates to the employer paying 87.3%. C. Narveson's family pays \$2,628 per year or 13.8% of the annual plan cost of \$19,106 .04 meaning the employer pays 86.2%. K. Seward handed out a sheet that showed the calculation used by the Village in determining their contribution rates. The sheet also included what J. Hoesly pays and a proposed motion to amend Policy XV.

K. Seward moved to revise paragraph four of Policy XV from the existing language " The Town of New Glarus Board has set the Employer paid portion of the Employee Trust Fund Health Insurance premium for full time Benefit Eligible Employees not to exceed 88% of the average of the Tier 1 premiums set within Green County for the year 2014" to read "The Town of New Glarus Board sets (effective June 1, 2014) the Employer paid portion of the Employee Trust Fund Health Insurance premium for full time Benefit Eligible Employees not to exceed 88% of the premium cost of the Plan as chosen by the Benefit Eligible Employees within the given year. A maximum Employer paid portion of the Employee Trust Fund Health Insurance premium shall be 88% of the average of the Tier 1 premium cost as set by the Employee Trust Fund Health Insurance for policy providers within Green County, Wisconsin for the current year." J. Hoesly 2nd.

P. Salter asked for clarification, stating that under that scenario "even though I have selected a plan that is less expensive than the lowest average cost plan in Green County by going with a plan in Dane, County, I would have to pay 12% of that premium." K. Seward replied that is correct and if you chose a more expensive plan, the most the Town would pay is 88% of the average of the Tier 1 plans in Green County. Seward continued on to state that " regardless of what plan you chose you would have to pay something towards your coverage". "You pay nothing now. You have paid nothing for quite a few years." C. Narveson stated "You've been suckling at the public teat. We got to get you." P. Salter replied that was because she and others were told they would receive paid insurance as a full-time employees. C. Narveson stated he was just kidding and didn't mean his comment to be mean spirited. Seward said that policy changed two years ago and has changed several times since then.

C. Narveson wanted to know how the policy would affect our employees' premiums. R. Elkins asked what plan each employee was currently enrolled in. P. Salter reported that D. Nielson was enrolled in Unity Community and she was enrolled in Unity UW out of Dane County which is less than the allotted 88% average tier 1 premium within Green County. K. Seward reported that Dennis' premium for single coverage is \$612.80 per month or \$7,353.60 per year and Pattie's premium for family coverage is \$1,399.20 per month or \$16,790.40 per year. C. Narveson asked if these premium levels were set last fall for this year.

At this point P. Salter apologized and stated she could no longer sit through this discussion and got up to leave. K. Seward said that's fine and went on to say that this policy would change the current policy. That it is hard to do. On her way out the door, P. Salter stated to the board that she works hard for the Town of New Glarus and this was another attempt by K. Seward to attack her insurance. K. Seward stated that this has nothing to do with her losing her insurance. It was not personal. P. Salter rebutted that she does take this personally because it is personal. That Seward had been on her case about the cost of her insurance for over 3 years. K. Seward told her she was out of line and Salter left at approximately 9:25 p m and did not return to the meeting.

K. Seward continued by stating that the change was tough but the Town supported the employees in a lot of different ways over the years and believes the offered packages are pretty decent. Seward noted that we just bumped one employees salary and would have to face the health insurance cost issue sooner or later. C. Narveson was in support of later. Seward said it was unfortunate that we had to tap the employees to pay for some of their health insurance, but it is for their benefit. Seward stated that the board would have to do something sooner or later and it wouldn't be any easier to kick the can down the road. He explained that this motion was a way of doing that and staying relatively consistent with the community that we live in and limit our liability a little bit.

K. Seward asked Narveson, what the percentage did he pay of his health insurance premium. C. Narveson noted that what the Town pays for Salter's premium is approximately the same as what his employer pays for his insurance coverage. Seward noted that he looked at private insurance opposed to WRS a couple years ago and the

premium costs would have been much harder on the employees. He felt that the insurance offered to the employees was fair and asked if the board members felt the same in their own lives. J. Hoesly noted that he once lost his insurance and had to go on COBRA for 6 months and really appreciates the insurance their family gets through his wife's work. When her work increased the employee paid percentage he still felt he had good insurance. C. Narveson noted that with his job, the company increased the employee's share of the premium at a time when they were cutting back on hours and the extra cost was hard on their family. K. Seward stated that is the grim reality of the times and this motion is intended to mitigate some of those costs.

C. Narveson recalled that the board already set the premium percentages back in October to be effective from January 1, 2014 for the entire year. K. Seward replied that the intent was to set the rate in October and carry it through for the ensuing years and that's what was set. He went on to say that the board could change the rate at any time as long as they stay within 50% to 88% of tier 1 range to stay in the WRS System.

Narveson was not in favor of changing the policy in the middle of the year. He noted that we have a policy that we set these rates at the end of the year for the ensuing year. K. Seward said that the board had made a change during the current year and were considering another change and if that comes into effect he was not interested in passing another opportunity. K. Seward opinioned that the board did this once back in January and that's a mistake he was not interested in making again. K. Seward stated they could do something now that was effective immediately or something that would be effective later on but given the scenario they're facing now, he would like to see something done now even if the board wanted to see a later effective date. K. Seward stated that he would like to see a policy that reflected this need.

R. Elkins stated that he was also in favor of making policy changes effective the first of the year. C. Narveson stated that he was not sold on the proposed method. He countered that they could change the percentage from 88% to 85% of the Tier 1 and if the employee chooses a lower cost plan they benefit and if they choose a higher cost plan they pay more. K. Seward noted that the 88% of Tier 1 is a policy somebody else is setting and the board has better control over the plan if the board sets the policy. C. Narveson stated that in the past the Town chose to pay the full premium and now we're mandated to set a limit of 88%. Narveson continued to state that over the last few years the board has elected to go up to the 88% but in any given year the board could for example elect to pay 85% of the premium and if Dennis or Pattie would like to choose a less expensive plan it's their choice. D. Streiff interjected that Pattie did choose a less expensive plan and she benefits and that is why she is upset. K. Seward replied that she would be upset with whatever we do. C. Narveson was not interested in picking up the issue at this time and felt the issue should be brought up at budget time when wages and benefits should all be decided at the same time. He explained that he understood anniversary dates but felt consistency was important. K. Seward asked C. Narveson if he wanted a policy like the Village has where the Village Board sets the percentage. C. Narveson asked if he meant the percentage of the Tier 1 insurance premium? K. Seward replied, no. I'm talking about wages. Seward went on to say at the beginning of the year, the Village board says we'll pay 1% for everybody regardless of performance or differences. C. Narveson began to say no, not necessarily for health insurance. K. Seward went on to say that in our scenario, the supervisor reviews the performance and recommends a percentage adjustment based upon the supervisor's interpretation of the employee's performance in the relative world. The Village Board says we'll pay 1% or whatever their number is for the non-union people and the union contract determines what the union people do. K. Seward asked C. Narveson is that what you suggest we do? C. Narveson replied no. K. Seward asked C. Narveson if he was saying that the Town Board shall do the performance evaluation for each employee? C. Narveson replied that he wasn't saying that either. C. Narveson clarified that he was suggesting that percentage adjustments for wages and insurance premiums should be set during the budgeting process so that everyone knows what to budget for the upcoming year. C. Narveson noted that what K. Seward was proposing went against this concept. K. Seward responded that the board already made an exception to the policy already. C. Narveson replied that was because it wasn't set at the right rate and felt it was now brought up to where it should be. That they disagreed with what that amount should be. K. Seward replied that you did that for one person. C. Narveson said yes, and I would do it for D. Nielson, too. K. Seward noted that the reviews were done and hopefully the process establishes a rapport with the employee and the employee knows how the process goes. C. Narveson stated that he felt the base wages were wrong and needed to be adjusted not that the review process was wrong. He felt it was absolutely necessary to have the supervisor help determine the annual adjustment but when the base rate is off it is up to the board to determine what the base rate

should be. K. Seward stated that there should then be a policy to address that.

J. Hoesly clarified that what he was hearing was that C. Narveson did not believe that the employees were being paid enough. He asked C. Narveson if he would be happy if the wages were increased the employees would have to contribute something on the health insurance? Narveson stated he was fine with having the employees pay something towards their health insurances, but that it should not be done during the current calendar year. K. Seward asked C. Narveson if he would agree to the proposed policy change if the effective date were next year. C. Narveson asked if the policy would be based on 88% of whatever plan they chose. K. Seward stated that's correct. With the proposed policy change the maximum liability to the Town residents would be 88% of the average Tier 1 plans in Green County. C. Narveson replied that is what we have now, only some employees contribute and some don't. K. Seward replied that that is a bad plan because someone else is telling you what you have to pay, in his opinion that is derelict of duty. C. Narveson noted that we cannot change our policy outside what guidelines have been set for us.

K. Seward noted that there was a motion on the table could he get a second. J. Hoesly 2nd so they could move forward. Seward then asked if there were any recommended changes to the motion. K. Seward suggested amending his original motion to change the effective date to January 1, 2015. C. Narveson suggested that since they were entertaining changes to the motion that they change the Town's contribution rate to 85% of the average Tier 1 plan in Green County which would still give the Town a savings, the employee pays some and it would still give the employee a choice of selecting a plan that fits their ability to pay, and we make the effective date January 1, 2015. C. Narveson noted that this whole discussion brings up an appearance to Pattie that it's spiteful to her because she got a raise and this is just retribution against her and that's what it is. K. Seward replied that might be her interpretation but that was not the intent. C. Narveson stated that is what it feels like to him as well. K. Seward commented that he cannot help her feelings about the issue and stated that Salter would be mad at him for a month. He noted that Salter had stress issues lately and that he could understand it. K. Seward made a calculation using Narveson's suggested contribution percentage and commented that it didn't do much. C. Narveson replied that it was a start.

K. Seward asked what the board thought. C. Narveson stated he would be willing to go with his suggested changes otherwise he was out. R. Elkins stated he would be willing to go with 85% of Tier one beginning January 1. R. Elkins asked K. Seward what the difference was between 88% and 85%. K. Seward replied that it wasn't much. R. Elkins noted that Seward had calculated the figure, and asked what the amount was. K. Seward replied that Salter would pay \$15 per month instead of nothing. R. Elkins felt it was a start. K. Seward suggested giving the employees plenty of time to make the adjustment. D. Streiff asked what the difference to an individual taxpayer the proposed policy would be based on 1342 people. K. Seward replied you can calculate it a lot of different ways, but Pattie would pay \$2,015 per year and Dennis would pay \$882 for a \$7,000 package for Dennis and a \$16-17,000 package for Pattie, which in Seward's opinion was not unfair. R. Elkins asked what Pattie was paying now. Seward replied that she doesn't pay anything now and Dennis pays \$115 per year. D. Nielson said he would pay more for his insurance, but that he only had to pay it for 3 more years.

D. Streiff noted that we gave Pattie a \$4,000 raise and then we take \$2,000 away from her. K. Seward said it was a little more than that, we gave her \$4,300. Streiff replied that we would be making her pay \$2,200. K. Seward replied it's better than not giving her a raise. K. Seward asked if the board would consider doing this effective January 1. C. Narveson clarified at the 85% he would. K. Seward replied no, at the 88% of their cost. Narveson said he was still having a hard time with that. Seward encouraged board members to "think of it this way, Pattie would have gotten a full year of her adjustment." K. Seward continued that Dennis would get whatever he gets and they would have 6 months to adjust to the change. C. Narveson felt it was just too much. R. Elkins noted that the difference to the taxpayer would be about \$2,300 per year. K. Seward confirmed this but said that's every year and that's where the dilemma lies, not now but what's going to happen in future years. He reminded board members that there was an 11% increase in health care costs this year. C. Narveson suggested having less meetings and Seward agreed stating that they have had less Plan Commission meetings.

Hearing no other comments, K. Seward moved to amend his motion to change the effective date to January 1, 2015. J. Hoesly 2nd. Amendment failed with 2 in favor of the amendment and 3 opposed. K. Seward called for a

roll call vote on the original motion: K. Seward voted aye; C. Narveson voted nay; D. Streiff voted nay; J. Hoesly voted aye and R. Elkins voted nay. Motion failed 3-2.

10) Plan Commission Report:

- a) Appoint Sub-Committee to Study the Effects of Acts 74, 272, and 280 on the Town of New Glarus Ordinances and within the ETZ Agreement: K. Seward reported that the Plan Commission recommended appointing a sub-committee to study the effects and impacts of Acts 74, 272, and 280 on the Town of New Glarus Land Use Plan. K. Seward made a motion to appoint Dean Streiff, Reg Reis and himself to the sub-committee. C. Narveson 2nd. Motion carried.
- b) Appoint Sub-Committee to Consider Mailbox Ordinance: K. Seward reported that the Plan Commission recommended that a sub-committee be established to study the mailbox placement issue. K. Seward made a motion to appoint John Ott and Robert Elkins. J. Hoesly 2nd. Motion carried.

11) Parks Report:

- a) Consider Parks Recommendation of Pool Scholarship: C. Narveson reported that the Parks Commission is working on establishing a swimming pool scholarship program to help with the costs of a Village pool pass for our residents. C. Narveson stated that in the past the Village administered the application process and would request reimbursement from the Town Board for our residents who had received a scholarship.

Narveson explained that they spoke with Carol Nawrocki, attorney for the Wisconsin Town's Association. Who cautioned that the policy needed to have a public purpose, that anyone is eligible (based on criteria), and it could be covered under the public purpose of health/welfare. C. Narveson noted that Nawrocki noted that the criteria identifies eligibility and that she was concerned about what would happen if two people tied in criteria, how would one person be selected over the other. Narveson noted that they want to budget up to \$300 in \$50 certificates and divide the money available by the number of applicants. C. Nawrocki felt that it was not a good policy decision to award additional certificates to a party if they had a lack of applications. Her final concern was if a resident complained about the program would the Town Board be able to justify it.

C. Narveson opinioned that it was probably too late in the season to establish the program this year, but wanted to get a feel for how the Town Board felt about it.

K. Seward noted that we have reimbursed the Village for the passes. No action was taken

- b) Workshop Update: C. Narveson reported that their last workshop was not well attended. They plan to hold their next workshop in the Fall at the park.

C. Narveson would like the Town Board to consider using some of the Trails portion of the Impact Fees to develop low impact walking trails along the Sugar River Trail.

- c) Consider Girl Scout Troop 2037 and Boy Scout Troop 106 Tree Workshop Payment: C. Narveson reported that the tree sale went well and that they made \$1,261. C. Narveson made a motion to divide the \$1,261 between Girl Scout Troop 2037 and Boy Scout Troop 106 for their help in the sale. J. Hoesly 2nd. Motion carried.

12) Closed Session per §19.85(1)(c) to consider employment, promotion, compensation or performance evaluation data of any public employee over which the governmental body has jurisdiction or exercises responsibility. Closed Session did not take place.

14) Next meeting: The Regular Town Board meeting was scheduled for July 22, 2014 at 6:30 p.m.

15) Adjourn: J. Hoesly moved to adjourn at 10:00 p.m., 2nd by D. Streiff. Motion carried.