

\*\*All present are expected to conduct themselves in accordance with our City's Core Values\*\*



## OFFICIAL NOTICE AND AGENDA

of a meeting of a City Board, Commission, Department, Committee, Agency, Corporation, Quasi-Municipal, Corporation, or Sub-unit thereof.

Meeting of the:	<b>Human Resources Committee</b>
Date/Time:	<b>Monday, July 8, 2019 at 4:30 PM</b>
Location:	City Hall (407 Grant Street) – Council Chambers – 1 <sup>st</sup> Floor
Members:	Becky McElhaney (C) Gary Gisselman, Dawn Herbst, Michael Martens, Tom Neal

### AGENDA ITEMS FOR CONSIDERATION

---

- 1) Approval of 06/10/2019 Minutes.
- 2) Human Resources Report for June.
- 3) Discussion on City of Wausau Longevity Plan.
- 4) Discussion and Possible Action on City of Wausau Nepotism Policy.
- 5) Future Agenda Items.

Becky McElhaney, HR Chair

This Notice was posted at City Hall and faxed to the Daily Herald newsroom on 07/02/19 at 2:30 PM

Questions regarding this agenda may be directed to the Human Resources Office at (715) 261-6630.

**It is anticipated that each item listed on the agenda may be discussed, referred, or acted upon unless it is noted in the specific agenda item that no action is contemplated. It is possible that members of, and possibly a quorum of members of other committees of the Common Council of the City of Wausau may be in attendance at the above mentioned meeting to gather information. No action will be taken by any such group at the above mentioned meeting other than the committee specifically referred to in this notice.**

"In accordance with the requirements of Title II of the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA), the City of Wausau will not discriminate against qualified individuals with disabilities on the basis of disability in its services, programs, or activities. If you need assistance or reasonable accommodations in participating in this meeting or event due to a disability as defined under the ADA, please call Human Resources at (715) 261-6630 or the City's ADA Coordinator at (715) 261-6620 or e-mail [clerk@ci.wausau.wi.us](mailto:clerk@ci.wausau.wi.us) at least 48 hours prior to the scheduled meeting or event to request an accommodation."

Other Distribution: Alderperson, Mayor, Department Heads, Union Presidents.

DRAFT

**CITY OF WAUSAU HUMAN RESOURCES COMMITTEE  
MINUTES OF OPEN SESSION**

DATE/TIME: June 10, 2019 at 4:30 p.m.  
LOCATION: City Hall (407 Grant Street) – Council Chambers  
MEMBERS PRESENT: Becky McElhaney (C), Gary Gisselman, Dawn Herbst, Michael Martens, Tom Neal  
MEMBERS ABSENT:  
Also Present: Mayor Mielke, T. Vanderboom

McElhaney called the Human Resources Committee meeting to order at 4:30 p.m.

**Approval of 5/13/2019 Minutes.**

Motion by Neal to approve the May 13, 2019 Human Resources Committee Meeting minutes. Second by Herbst. All ayes. Motion passes 5-0.

**Human Resources Reports for May.**

Vanderboom asked if the committee members had any questions about the report provided. No questions were posed. No motion on this item.

**Discussion and Possible Action Approving Addition of a Regular Part-time Administrative Assistant III in the Customer Service Department.**

Motion by Gisselman to approve the addition for a regular part-time Administrative Assistant III in the Customer Service Department. Second by Herbst. All ayes. Motion passes 5-0.

**Discussion regarding job anniversary date administration of annual increases.**

Vanderboom said that this item was asked for at a previous meeting. Vanderboom prepared documentation outlining the process that determined the decision to return the general employees to receiving annual increases on their job anniversary date.

Neal asked for Vanderboom to explain some of the issues that have come up with the implementation of the increases occurring on the job anniversary dates and ways to address the issues. Vanderboom said that this year, if an employee's anniversary date was in February, they had to wait until April 21<sup>st</sup> to get their performance increase. If an anniversary date occurs later in the year, they have to wait until then to receive their performance increase. Vanderboom said that she does not see of any way to address the issue except by going through the transition to allow for everyone to get implemented and on a yearly schedule. Neal asked if there was a way to transition employees gradually into the annual cycle. Vanderboom said that this would have been something to look at prior to the implementation of the wage study. Neal asked how many employees feel inflicted by this. Vanderboom said about 5-10 people have come to Human Resources to talk about this issue.

Gisselman asked if this item was voted on with the rest of the wage study items by Human Resources and Council. Vanderboom said that this was included and voted on by Human Resources and Council to adopt annual increases to occur on job anniversary dates. Gisselman said that because it was voted on and adopted, he doesn't see how it can be changed at this time.

Toni Rayala asked to speak in front of the Human Resources Committee regarding this issue. Vanderboom explained the difference of implementation raises, anniversary raises, discussed how employees were placed in the new pay ranges and how they will move forward. Herbst said that she doesn't feel option 2 was fair to

employees and that finance needs to find a way to pay for option 3 for next year so employees can be paid what they're worth. Neal expressed his views and said that he doesn't feel that the City is at the level it should be with rewarding its' employees for longevity, institutional knowledge, and loyalty. McElhaney said that she would like to see a longevity policy that would rewards employees who are redlined. McElhaney concluded by saying that the discussion needs to be brought back to an agendized item.

Captain Bliven said he feels the wage study has been a good thing overall. Bliven discussed his lieutenants and their promotion dates. Vanderboom said that they can come up with an item for this on next month's agenda, as well as pay compression issues for police.

Groat said that she has had budget discussions with the mayor and they will be including option 3 in the 2020 budget that will be presented to Council in the fall. Groat added that she has experience several salary studies over the years and believes that this one has gone well and that many employees are satisfied overall.

**Future Agenda Items.**

Vanderboom has the social media policy, police pay compression issue, lieutenants, longevity policy, and nepotism policy.

**CLOSED SESSION pursuant to 19.85(1)(c) of the Wisconsin Statutes considering employment, promotion, compensation or performance evaluation data of any public employee over which the governmental body has jurisdiction or exercises responsibility and 19.85(1)(g) of the Wisconsin Statutes conferring with legal counsel for the governmental body who is rendering oral or written advice concerning strategy to be adopted by the body with respect to litigation in which it is or is likely to become involved regarding a police lieutenant.**

McElhaney took rollcall of members present and said that the committee would be adjourning in closed session, with no action on the closed session item.

---

Rebecca McElhaney  
Human Resources Committee, Chair



## HR PERFORMANCE REPORT

### Core Services

#### *Classification & Compensation*

##### Open Reclassification Requests

Current Job Position	Current Salary Range	Requested Job Position	Requested Salary Range	Request Date

##### Completed Reclassification Requests

Original Job Position/Salary Range	Requested Job Position/Salary Range	Approved Job Position/Salary Range	Request Date	Council Approval Date

### *Employee Benefits*

#### Family Medical Leave (YTD)

Requests Received	Approved	Pending	Denied
50	39	1	10

#### Reasons why denied under FMLA

Paperwork not returned	Insufficient years of service	Condition does not qualify	Paperwork not authentic
7		2	1

#### Workers Compensation (YTD)

Number of Claims	Lost Time	Medical Only
21	6	15



## HR PERFORMANCE REPORT

---

### *Employee and Labor Relations*

#### Grievances (YTD)

Number of Grievances	Open Grievances	Closed Grievances	ATU (Metro) Grievances	WPPA (Police) Grievances	WFA (Fire) Grievances
2	1	1	1	0	0

#### Open Grievances

Employee Name	Union	Issue	Date Filed	Status
Justin Fisher	Metro	Vacation Denial	6/17/18	Step 2

#### Closed Grievances

Employee Name	Union	Issue	Date Filed	Status
Kraig Kruzan	Fire	Acting Battalion Chief Assignments	2/26/18	The City and Union signed MOU's governing the assignment of acting Battalion Chief and Acting Lieutenant.



# HR PERFORMANCE REPORT

## Recruitment & Selection

### New Hires

Employee Name	Department	Job Title	Hire Date
Scott Peterson	Police	Police Officer	01/09/19
Josiah Kaetterhenry	Police	Police Officer	01/09/19
Andrew Bloch	Police	Police Officer	01/09/19
Mason Hagenbucher	Police	Police Officer	01/09/19
Henry King	Assessment	Property Appraiser	02/04/19
Thomas Ponik, Jr.	Assessment	Property Appraiser	02/18/19
Ashley Schroeder	Fire	Firefighter/Paramedic	02/25/19
Jared Thompson	Fire	EMS Division Chief	04/08/19
Robert Barteck	Fire	Deputy Fire Chief	04/08/19
John Langren	Water	Water Distribution Maintainer	05/06/19
Charlotte Baneck	Police	School Crossing Guard	05/09/19
Jonathon Lindloff	Water	Water Distribution Maintainer	05/13/19
Mitchell Harris	Public Works	Street Maintainer	05/13/19
Robert Pfaff	Police	Police Officer	05/29/19
Ivy Tiry	Police	Police Officer	05/29/19
Brady Olson	Police	Police Officer	05/29/19

Seasonal Hires: (1) Youth Apprentice (DPW Motor Pool), (2) Yard Waste Site Attendants, (3) Engineering Technicians, (2) Wastewater Technicians, (7) Seasonal Aide - DPW, (2) Seasonal Aide - Water (5) Community Resource Officers

### Separations YTD

Total Number of Separations	Resignations	Retirements	Terminations
17	9	7	1



## HR PERFORMANCE REPORT

### Promotions/Transfers

Employee Name	Old Job Position	New Job Position	Previous Incumbent	Effective Date
Cody Wiesman	Firefighter/Paramedic	Fire Lieutenant	Steven Robers	01/08/19
Justin Fisher	Bus Operator I	Bus Operator II	Gregory Hayes	01/28/19
Nicholas Olson	Bus Operator I	Bus Operator II	(n/a – Council Approved)	02/18/19
Adam Malzahn	Street Maintainer	Property Inspector	Richard Grefe	03/25/19
Dustin Kraege	Equipment Services Mechanic	Fleet Supervisor	(n/a – New Position)	05/28/19
Solomon King	Equipment Services Mechanic	Senior Equipment Services Mechanic	Todd Mendlik	05/28/19

### Active Recruitments

Job Title	# of Vacancies	Date Vacant	Status
Bus Operator I	3	01/08/18	Collecting Applications - Ongoing
School Crossing Guard	1 reg. + substitutes	11/21/18	Collecting Applications - Ongoing
Firefighter/Paramedic	1	01/03	Application Deadline 7/14
Street Maintainer	3	04/08, 06/03, 06/09	In Process
Equipment Services Mechanic	2	05/28	In Process
Assistant City Attorney	1	(New Position)	Application Deadline 7/07
Police Officer	1	06/02/19	In Process
Plant Maintenance Mechanic	1	07/08	In Process
Accountant – Revenue & Payroll	1	06/03	In Process
Administrative Asst. I – DPW	1	07/01	In Process
Public Work Supervisor	1	06/21	
Administrative Asst. II – Court	1	(New P/T Position)	Application Deadline 7/07
<i>Battalion Chief</i>	1	06/05	<i>Internal Recruitment by Fire Dept.</i>



## HR PERFORMANCE REPORT

---

### Vacant Positions (Not Being Recruited)

Job Title	Number of Vacancies	Date Vacant	Status

# Human Resource Committee Packet

July 8, 2019

Agenda Item																		
Discussion on City of Wausau Longevity Plan																		
Background																		
<p>Union represented employees of the City of Wausau currently and historically have negotiated to receive longevity pay. After the passing of Act 10, the union which represented a number of the City's employees did not re-certify and these employees became non-represented. In 2012, the City of Wausau made a final full longevity payment to this group of non-represented employees and again limited the longevity program to represented employees only. Longevity pay was built into the base compensation plan for non-represented employees at that time.</p> <p>In 2016, the City of Wausau conducted a survey of municipalities regarding their longevity programs. At that time, six municipalities still had longevity and 31 municipalities no longer had longevity programs. I contacted those six municipalities again and was able to confirm that all six municipalities still have longevity programs. The vast majority of municipalities eliminated longevity as part of a wage study after Act 10, and built longevity into the pay scales; this is the same approach that the City of Wausau followed.</p> <p>The City currently has three unions, all of which have negotiated longevity pay:</p> <table border="1"><thead><tr><th></th><th>Metro</th><th>Fire/Police</th></tr></thead><tbody><tr><td>5 years</td><td>\$15/month</td><td>Monthly amount equal to .32% of monthly base rate</td></tr><tr><td>10 years</td><td>\$25/month</td><td>Monthly amount equal to .62% of monthly base rate</td></tr><tr><td>15 years</td><td>\$35/month</td><td>Monthly amount equal to .9% of monthly base rate</td></tr><tr><td>20 years</td><td>\$45/month</td><td>Monthly amount equal to 1.2% of monthly base rate</td></tr><tr><td>25 years</td><td>\$55/month</td><td>Monthly amount equal to 1.47% of monthly base rate</td></tr></tbody></table> <p>The longevity negotiated by MetroRide closely mimics the City's previous longevity program. I compared that longevity program to five of the six municipalities mentioned above (all of which use a flat rate), and MetroRide's longevity program was more generous than all but one municipality.</p>		Metro	Fire/Police	5 years	\$15/month	Monthly amount equal to .32% of monthly base rate	10 years	\$25/month	Monthly amount equal to .62% of monthly base rate	15 years	\$35/month	Monthly amount equal to .9% of monthly base rate	20 years	\$45/month	Monthly amount equal to 1.2% of monthly base rate	25 years	\$55/month	Monthly amount equal to 1.47% of monthly base rate
	Metro	Fire/Police																
5 years	\$15/month	Monthly amount equal to .32% of monthly base rate																
10 years	\$25/month	Monthly amount equal to .62% of monthly base rate																
15 years	\$35/month	Monthly amount equal to .9% of monthly base rate																
20 years	\$45/month	Monthly amount equal to 1.2% of monthly base rate																
25 years	\$55/month	Monthly amount equal to 1.47% of monthly base rate																
Fiscal Impact																		
<p>According to the Fair Labor Standards Act, longevity pay must be included in the base rate for overtime calculations for non-exempt employees. This will result in an increase in overtime costs that cannot be calculated at this time.</p> <p>This is a continuously growing commitment. Under MetroRide's current negotiated longevity (which mimics the City's previous longevity scale) estimated fiscal impact for 2019 could be as high as \$49,200, with an increase in 2020 to \$53,460 and an increase in 2021 to \$57,420.</p>																		
Staff Recommendation																		
<p>If the City of Wausau chooses to bring back a longevity pay program, there are a number of factors to be determined:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"><li>1. Who will be eligible for longevity? Previously, this program was limited to union-represented employees. As such, management and exempt professionals were largely excluded from the program.</li></ol>																		

# Human Resource Committee Packet

July 8, 2019

This could exacerbate some of the feelings of pay compression between management and non-management staff.

2. Is this program intended to alleviate the effect of red-lining? Under the current pay system, employees who are hired at the minimum salary rate will be red-lined at either 16 or 20 years in a position. If the intention is to alleviate the impact of red-lining, I would start paying longevity pay at 15 or 20 years of service, or establish a system where longevity only comes into play after an employee is redlined. (For example, a monthly payment of \$1/every year an employee is red-lined.) This would also take into account that the current compensation plan already progresses employees up the salary scale according to seniority.
3. If the Committee moves to bring back longevity pay, is the intention to seek a budget modification or work this item into the 2020 budget?

Staff contact: Toni Vanderboom 715-261-6634

# Human Resource Committee Packet

July 8, 2019

Agenda Item
Discussion and Possible Action on City of Wausau Nepotism Policy
Background
<p data-bbox="203 527 1416 682">At the April 8, 2019 Human Resources Committee meeting, the HR Committee voted 4-1 to approve the nepotism policy revision as recommended by outside legal counsel, the City Attorney, and the Human Resources Director. When the item was advanced to Council, the Common Council moved to return this item to the Human Resources Committee. The motion requested that Department Directors be surveyed on the topic, and that private organization policies also be surveyed.</p> <p data-bbox="203 720 1382 814">The Human Resources Director conducted a survey of department heads, attached. Specifically, Department heads were asked their thoughts on nepotism policies; their stance on nepotism for direct reporting, indirect reporting, and department heads; and their opinion on covered individuals. To summarize:</p> <ul data-bbox="269 821 1403 1045" style="list-style-type: none"><li>• All department directors believe that a direct reporting relationship of covered individuals should be prohibited</li><li>• 5 department directors feel that indirect reporting relationships should also be prohibited, and 3 thought this should be allowed (in either some or all circumstances)</li><li>• 6 department heads stated that Department Directors should be prohibited from having a covered relative in their department, while 2 believed this should be allowed so long as the individual is not a direct report</li></ul> <p data-bbox="203 1083 1243 1108">There was more variation among Department Directors during discussion of covered individuals:</p> <ul data-bbox="253 1115 1403 1276" style="list-style-type: none"><li>• 2 Department Directors recommended the removal of temporary, occasional or seasonal employees</li><li>• 2 Department Directors stated that marital relationships that begin at work would need to be handled carefully but should still be considered covered individuals</li><li>• 1 recommended the removal of in-laws and cousins, and 1 was torn on in-laws</li><li>• 5 recommended no changes</li></ul> <p data-bbox="203 1314 1386 1373">Interestingly, five department heads began the conversation of the topic of nepotism with a “horror story” of nepotism in the workplace that they have experienced in their careers.</p> <p data-bbox="203 1411 1386 1470">The Human Resources Department also conducted a survey of private organizations regarding their nepotism policy, attached. Sixteen organizations were contacted, and ten responded.</p> <ul data-bbox="253 1476 1403 1738" style="list-style-type: none"><li>• 9 companies prohibit direct reporting relationships</li><li>• 6.5 companies prohibit indirect reporting relationships (the half value comes from a company that prohibits only next-level supervision)</li><li>• 2 companies specifically prohibit department heads from employing a covered individual in their work area; most were silent on this issue</li><li>• Many companies neglected to define relative/family member</li><li>• Half of the private companies surveyed consider individuals in a dating relationship as covered individuals.</li></ul> <p data-bbox="203 1776 1411 1866">The public tends to hold municipalities and public institutions to higher ethical standards (for example, a family-owned business can use its profits to advance a family member, while a city cannot use public funds for same); for this reason, I would be cautious while considering private employer policies.</p>

# Human Resource Committee Packet

July 8, 2019

During the previous Human Resources Committee discussion, Alderman Neal requested HR survey non-city employers for an outside-the-box approach and expressed concern about the traditional nature of our policy in light of non-traditional relationships. Our survey of private employers revealed policies similar in structure to those of public employers; no private employer provided a policy structurally different, or more “creative” than our current policy. Since same-sex marriages were made legal in 2014, the Human Resources Department received instructions from legal counsel to treat all relationships equally. For this reason, no specific effort has been made to regulate LGBTQ relationships within this policy.

Because most private companies fail to define family members or relatives, very little additional research was available on the inclusion of cousins as a covered family member. A review of the public sector nepotism policies from our previous survey, including two additional municipalities who replied after the Committee last discussed this item, shows that only 18% of municipalities specifically define cousin as a prohibited family member. (NOTE: as written, the policy’s inclusion of “cousin” is limited to first-cousin only.)

## Fiscal Impact

None

## Staff Recommendation

In an effort to ensure that the nepotism policy is universally applied and non-discriminatory, we have emphasized quantifiable and definable relationships only. This should combat the impression of favoritism or unfairness during administration of the policy.

When attorneys at Buellow Vetter were contacted for a recommended review of the policy, they were asked to not only check our existing policy for legality, but also were asked to provide any revisions that were in line with current best practices. For this reason, I continue to recommend the approval of the policy revision.

Staff contact: Toni Vanderboom 715-261-6634

### Nepotism - Department Head Survey

Director	Department	Thoughts on Nepotism Policy	Direct and Indirect Reporting Relationship	Covered Individuals
Tracey Kujawa	Fire	there are some advantages to hiring relatives especially when hiring is tough; the fire service has a history of families in the field and these family members are often good employees of good character; used to be an advocate of a stronger nepotism policy; it is difficult to manage perception and morale even for a strong manager	Department heads still have influence even if not directly supervising, indirect reporting is ok but only if the staff person is on a different crew or shift (i.e. no reporting relationship)	No recommended changes to the list of covered individuals in the current policy; the most difficult relationship is when two employees marry
Rick Rubow	Assessor	Nepotism is an issue/problem; "good old boy system" allows accusations of favoritism	Department heads should not have relatives employed in their department; no direct supervision; indirect should be handled on a case-by-case basis (except Dept. head)	Parents, siblings, and aunt/uncle should definitely be included in policy; torn on in-laws due to divorce rates; would exclude part-time and seasonal employees
MaryAnne Groat	Finance	supports nepotism policy; perception of bias is concerning; we are transparent but nepotism eats away at morale and employees struggle with favoritism issues	Indirect supervision is still a problem area and should be prohibited by policy ("we always think this will be okay but it ends up sticky")	the list of covered individuals seems reasonable; would exclude occasional employees like election workers
Greg Seubert	MetroRide	surprised that this is a divisive issue because it seems very logical; supports the anti-nepotism policy; always marveled that you can hire family in private industry and market yourself as a family business; don't want to be put into the position of hiring/supervising a relative and wouldn't do it even if it was allowable by policy	No indirect supervision; department heads have a share of influence that can be used improperly	marital relationships that start in the workplace would need to be handled carefully
Chris Schock	Community Development	not sure his opinion is relevant but would advise following other municipal employers ("don't look to be more restrictive or blaze a nepotistic trail"); we should not mimic the private sector; believes that the tone is set by the department head	Indirect supervision is ok except department head; concerned with the small department sizes effectively limiting flexibility due to lack of depth in organizational structure	inlaws and cousins: refer to best practice and what is common with other cities
Anne Jacobson	Attorney	policy is appropriate, necessary, in the City's best interests; the legal opinion on file reflects HR best practice; the policy exists for the protection of managers and is defensible and consistent; recruitment concerns should not override ethical considerations	no changes recommended	no changes recommended
Eric Lindman	Public Works		Direct report is an issue; does not see an issue with indirect report; department heads should shift reporting responsibility	

### Nepotism - Department Head Survey

Ben Bliven	Police		No direct supervision, indirect ok, indirect ok for Dept heads	removal of inlaws and cousins
------------	--------	--	---	-------------------------------

#### Summary

Direct:           8 prohibit       0 allow  
Indirect:        5 prohibit       3 allow  
Dept Head:      6 prohibit       2 allow if reporting restructured

Note: five department heads began their conversation of this topic with a "horror story" of nepotism gone wrong that they have experienced in their career