

County Zoning Agency
MINUTES
January 20, 2011 - 4:00 p.m.
100 West Walworth Street
Elkhorn, Wisconsin

Chairman Stacey called the meeting to order at 4:00 p.m.

Roll call – Committee members present were Chairman Rick Stacey, Vice Chairman Dave Weber, Supervisors Rich Brandl, Carl Redenius, and Russ Wardle and Citizen Member Jim Van Dreser. Citizen Member Richard Kuhnke, Sr. was excused. A quorum was present.

County staff present - Land Use and Resource Management Department Director Michael P. Cotter, Senior Planner Neal Frauenfelder, Planner Matt Weidensee, Senior Zoning Officer Deb Grube, Code Enforcement Officers Nancy Welch, Nick Sigmund, and Darrin Schwanke and County Administrator David Bretl.

Public in attendance – Anthony F. Balestrieri, Elkhorn; Robert E. McIndoe, Spring Prairie; Tim Peterson, Medford; Tony Coletti, Elkhorn; Anita LaCoursiere, ATC, Madison

A motion and second to APPROVE the agenda was made by Supervisors Brandl and Weber. The motion carried 6 – 0.

A motion and second to APPROVE the minutes of the December 16, 2010 meeting was made by Supervisors Weber and Brandl. The motion carried 6 – 0.

Zoning enforcement – No discussion took place.

Subdivision Items

Lost Nation Farms West Preliminary Subdivision Plat (Lost Nation Farms LLC, App.) Proposed 8-Lot 1-Outlot Planned Residential Subdivision located in Section 3, Town 3 North, Range 16 East, Town of Sugar Creek, Tax Parcel #'s G SC 300003, GLNF 00006, and GLNF 00007 (4:03:37 – 4:10:40) Senior Planner Neal Frauenfelder described the property as 46.24 acres zoned C-2. The parcel is served by a private road accessing onto County Trunk Highway “H” and an easement accessing onto Lost Nation Road. Also, two lots access directly onto Lost Nation Road. Mr. Frauenfelder said a revised plat has been submitted that addresses a couple of the issues raised in the initial staff report. This parcel has a conditional use permit that was approved by the County Zoning Agency on July 16, 2009. He said this plat contains within it a Certified Survey Map that is centrally located in the plat. He said this is being handled under a separate platting CSM review process and has been completed and signed today. Mr. Frauenfelder also said he had received correspondence from the Public Works Department dated January 13 asking that the approval ensure that the turn tapers onto County Trunk Highway “H” are constructed to current Wisconsin DOT standards. Staff has completed their review of this item. Atty. Bob Leibsle and Tony Balestrieri were present to represent this item. Atty. Leibsle said everything is in order. The Town of Sugar Creek has approved this proposed plat. There

was no one to speak for or against this item. **A motion and second to APPROVE was made by Jim Van Dreser and Supervisor Weber. The motion carried 6 – 0.** Approval is subject to the following conditions:

1. Approval is subject to constructing turn tapers on County Trunk Highway “H” to current Wisconsin Department of Transportation standards.
2. Approval is subject to meeting all applicable State Statutes and County Ordinances.

New Business

Discussion/Possible Action re amendment to existing conditional use for inn/hotel to allow extension of use of existing residence from 18 to 36 months (Fritz Kreiss and Catherine McQueen, Town of Delavan, Tax Parcel #F D 2500002B) (4:10:40 – 4:13:23) Matt Weidensee explained that the Greenleaf Inn was granted a conditional use for a 19-suite inn with three of the suites to be constructed in a separate building, which is a home on the site. The home was to be used as a caretaker’s residence for 18 months and then converted into the three suites. The conversion of the home has yet to occur. The applicant is asking for an extension to 36 months for this process. Atty. Dale Thorpe and Fritz Kreiss appeared before the committee. Mr. Thorpe explained that they are waiting for the economy to improve before moving forward. He said both the Town of Delavan Plan Commission and Town Board voted unanimously in favor of the extension. **A motion and second to APPROVE the extension to 36 months was made by Supervisor Brandl and Jim Van Dreser. The motion carried 6 – 0.** This approval will result in amending conditions #1 and 21 of the existing conditional use.

Discussion/Possible Action – Amendment to the Walworth County Fee Schedule Related to Conditional Use Applications for Campgrounds (4:13:23 – 4:25) Mr. Weidensee explained that our office has had a considerable number of campgrounds that they have been reviewing lately to bring them into compliance and another one is being proposed. He said that under the current County fee code they are charged \$575 for a conditional use review. There is quite a bit of work done to come up with the conditions to create campgrounds. Staff is suggesting that campgrounds be required to have a pre-application conference the same as subdivision and condominium plats so that the entire staff can meet with the persons proposing the campground and provide all the information necessary to allow them to come up with a plan that meets all the requirements of the ordinance. It was suggested to charge a per unit or per campsite fee in order to cover the costs expended in reviewing campsites. He said there are multiple pages in the zoning code to review regarding campgrounds and that requires considerable staff time. Michael Cotter said that Mr. Weidensee and Deb Grube have spent a considerable amount of time on this amendment to the fee schedule and that a pre-application conference is very beneficial to the applicant to iron out problems. **A motion and second to APPROVE the proposed amendment was made by Jim Van Dreser and Supervisor Weber. The motion carried 6 – 0.**

The committee recessed at 4:25 p.m. on a motion by Supervisors Brandl and Wardle.

Chairman Stacey called the meeting to order at 5:30 p.m. Mr. Cotter explained the public hearing procedure to the audience.

Amendment to Walworth County Code of Ordinances, Walworth County, Wisconsin, Chapter 74-51, 74-61, and 74-131 of the Zoning Ordinance and Chapter 74-178, 74-188, and 74-163 of the Shoreland Zoning Ordinance (5:32:16 – 5:41:36) Senior Zoning Officer Deb Grube clarified that there were no text changes proposed in Section 74-51 and 74-178 . She said it is listed for reference only to show that in the A-1 District there is an existing use called Farm Family Business. She stated the amendment was initiated by the Town of Spring Prairie. The proposed amendment is to permit A-1 zoned parcels another use option under the Farm Family Business. Currently the zoning ordinance permits a farm family business as a conditional use in the A-1 District. A farm family business includes those uses listed in the A-4 District, with some exceptions. The proposed amendment will add the use “Farm Food Service” to the A-4 District, which in turn, would permit farms the ability to prepare, serve and sell agricultural food products produced on the farm in a meal setting. This proposed amendment was reviewed by the Land Conservation Committee. The Land Conservation Committee supported the amendment and recommended language to address ancillary non-agricultural products. Language is proposed in Section 74-51/74-178 in the A-4 District to try to address the LCC recommendation. It reads, “The retail sales of ancillary non-agricultural items and agricultural items not produced on the farm are subject to detailed plan approval by the committee”. The proposed amendment was also reviewed by the Wisconsin DATCP and received support. Bob McIndoe, a member of the Spring Prairie Town Board, spoke in favor of this amendment. Atty. Tony Colletti, representing Yuppie Hill Farms, also spoke in favor. Bev Gamache spoke in favor and presented a letter from Spring Prairie Town Chairman Jim Simons, who was out of the state at the time of this hearing. There was no one to speak in opposition of this amendment. This item will be on the committee’s February 17th agenda for decision.

Delsie J. Everett (James Peterson Sons, Inc., App.) Town of Lyons, Rezone 47.3 acres of M-3 to A-1 & C-2 (5:41:36 – 5:47:14) Matt Weidensee described the property as being located in Section 2, Town of Lyons. The Town has approved the rezone. The property owner is requesting to rezone an existing non-metallic mineral extraction borrow site back to the pre-existing A-1 and C-2 zone districts following restoration of the site. Staff has yet to receive a letter of certification for the reclamation of the site. The County Land Conservation Office has indicated the site has been restored with the exception of removal of the stormwater sediment basins and replanting of trees that have died. The contractor responsible for the completion of the restoration still has a bond for the entire site and will keep the bond in place until final certification of the restoration is provided by the Conservation Office this spring. Mr. Weidensee said he spoke with the Conservation Office and they are alright with proceeding with the rezone as long as the bond remains in place for the entire site and they will see to it that the basins are removed and that the rest of the restoration occurs and provide the certification once the snow melts in the spring. Tim Peterson representing James Peterson Sons was present to answer questions. He said one of the requirements of the rezone to M-3 was that it be returned back to A-1 and C-2. He said that due to inclement weather this fall the sedimentation ponds are still open. There was no one to speak for or against this rezone. **A motion and second to APPROVE was made by Supervisors Weber and Wardle. The motion carried 6 – 0.**

Wisconsin Power and Light Company (American Transmission Company, LLC, App.), Town of Walworth, Conditional Use for expansion of an existing electrical substation on lands zoned A-1 (5:47:14 – 5:59) Mr. Weidensee described the property as located in Section 17, Town of

Walworth. The Town has approved the request. He said the application states they are proposing to upgrade an existing substation. Work to be done includes repair and/or replacement of facilities (i.e. transformers, breakers etc.), bump out the fence on the east side of the current substation area, and replace the ground grid, remove and replace the control house with a new prefab self-contained building. No communication work is being proposed (i.e. communication towers). Mr. Weidensee said this substation is fairly old and has never had a conditional use. Representing this item was Anita LaCoursiere from American Transmission Company. There was no one to speak for or against this item. **After the appropriate findings are made as required by State Farmland Preservation Program s91.75(5) Wis. Stats. a motion and second to APPROVE was made by Jim Van Dreser and Supervisor Brandl. The motion carried 6 – 0.** Approval is subject to the following conditions:

1. Approved as per plan submitted for an electrical substation with required conditions added.
2. Any proposed buildings shall be of an earth tone or neutral color (I.E. beige or tan).
3. Construction plans for the site shall be submitted to the County Zoning Office for review and permit approvals prior to the project beginning.
4. Construction related activities are only allowed on site between sunrise to sunset.
5. The easement must be used for the purpose for which it was granted.
6. The applicant must obtain a Land Disturbance Erosion Control and Stormwater Management permit from the County Land Conservation Office prior to any construction activities occurring on site.
7. All spoils spreading activities must be conducted in the approved identified locations.
8. All access to the site must be made as identified on the approved plan.
9. All contractor storage yards shall be located as identified on the approved plan and used as specified.
10. The applicant shall meet all applicable Federal, State and local regulations.
11. The applicant shall make all necessary arrangements for use and crossing of public roadways with the State, County and Town Highway Departments.
12. The applicant is responsible for removal of the substation if it is no longer in use. If the substation is not operated for a continuous period of 12 months, it shall be considered abandoned. Abandoned substation may be required to be removed within 90 days.

13. If the Land Management Department determines that changes in either the character of the use or the intensity of the use are not consistent with this approval, then those changes must be brought before the County Zoning Agency for approval.
14. Failure to actively exercise this conditional use within three years of the approval date shall result in automatic dismissal without prejudice. The property owner may request a time extension for actively exercising the conditional use. A time extension for actively exercising the conditional use must be requested in writing during the original three year period. Any extension requested during the three year active exercise period greater than one year beyond the original three year period shall require additional Town and County committee approvals.

Findings: Utilities are allowed in the Prime Agricultural District according to the Farmland Preservation Statute.

Adjournment - A motion and second to adjourn was made by Supervisors Brandl and Weber. The motion carried 6 – 0. The meeting was adjourned at 5:59 p.m.

Submitted by Marie Halvorson, Recording Secretary. Minutes are not final until approved by the committee at its next meeting.



**Walworth County Board Finance Committee
MEETING MINUTES
Thursday, January 20, 2011**

Walworth County Government Center
County Board Room 114
100 West Walworth, Elkhorn, WI

The meeting was called to order by Chair Russell at 9:30 a.m.

Roll call — Finance Committee members present included Supervisors Jerry Grant, Daniel Killenny, Nancy Russell, Joseph Schaefer, and Rick Stacey. A quorum was declared.

Board members present: No additional Board members were present.

County staff present: David Bretl-County Administration/Corporation Counsel; Nicki Andersen, Caroline Jens, Jessica Lanser, Dale Wilson-Finance; Linda Seemeyer-Health & Human Services; Suzi Hagstrom-Human Resources; John Orr-Information Technology; Tracy Moate-Lakeland School; Michael Cotter-Land Use & Resource Management; Shane Crawford-Public Works; Kurt Picknell-Sheriff's Office; Kathy Du Bois-Treasurer's Office.

Public in attendance: There were no members of the public in attendance.

Agenda withdrawals — Russell asked if agenda item 9C *Ordinance **-02/11 Amending Section 30-412 of the Walworth County Code of Ordinances Relating to Timekeeping Requirements for Employees* should be withdrawn. Bretl recommended preliminary discussion of the topic. **Motion by Schaefer/Stacey to approve the agenda; carried 5-0.**

Approval of minutes of last meeting(s) — December 14, 2010 — **Schaefer/Stacey moved to approve the minutes; carried 5-0.**

Public comment period — There were no comments from members of the public.

Unfinished business

Discussion and possible action regarding Langlade County Resolution #28-2010 Support Proposed Language Restoring the Authority of Local Elected officials to Set Spending Priorities for Their City, Village, Town or County (referred by the County Board; Tabled from May 20, 2010 meeting) — Bretl explained that Langlade County's resolution relates to freezing shared revenues and tax caps. The state is limiting the ability to tax but, at the same time, is mandating that municipalities can't cut public safety spending. Walworth County is in compliance with the state's requirements, but normal inflation will cause these costs to increase. The committee voted to table the resolution until the new legislature was in session, however, there may be more related to this overall issue than just this particular aspect. It is likely that we will see some type of tax cap. Bretl opined that this one resolution may not be particularly relevant to debates he feels will be coming in the future with regard to

spending and taxes. **Stacey/Grant moved to place Langlade County Resolution #28-2010 on file; carried 5-0.**

Consent items – Russell asked that bids on tax foreclosure properties be held for separate discussion. **Stacey/Grant moved to approve the balance of the consent items. Motion carried 5-0.**

Budget amendments

2010

Health & Human Services

- HS019 — Redistribute Children’s Services payroll budget to reflect actual activity
- SH006 — Reflect reimbursement to provide law enforcement security for Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation (FDIC) seizure

Bids/contracts

- Award sale(s) of tax foreclosure property — Crawford distributed to the committee the following bid recommendations. He noted that, after this, we have only about 6 or 7 foreclosed parcels remaining.
 - MPL 01742 — The only bid received on this unbuildable lot was \$52 from Alexander Skopis. He originally provided a personal check with his bid but staff contacted him and he then furnished the required cashier’s check. Staff recommend awarding the sale. **Stacey/Grant moved to award the sale of MPL 01742 to Alexander Skopis; carried 5-0.**
 - JLCB 01730 — This bid is the same as on the prior parcel, i.e., \$52 from Alexander Skopis with a cashier’s check replacing the personal check he originally provided. Staff recommend the sale. **Motion by Stacey/Schaefer to award the sale of JLCB 01730 to Alexander Skopis; carried 5-0.**
 - CS 00212 — David and Linda Hanson bid \$50 for this parcel. Staff recommend awarding the sale. **Stacey/Grant moved to award the sale of CS 00212 to David and Linda Hanson; carried 5-0.**

New business

Email communications received in the Treasurer’s Office from Margaret and James Weber, Tamara Weber, and Al and Nancy Muhlbauer in protest of their 2010 property taxes (Referred by the County Board) — Du Bois received emails from these individuals, who requested their correspondence be forwarded to the County Board, as a whole, and also to the Finance Committee. She feels that many taxpayers don’t understand that the net change on their tax bill is not solely the result of county action. She has already responded to one of the emails but thought

that further explanation, if recommended by the Committee, may be beneficial. The problem is that the equalized value decreased considerably in 2009 from 2008. Although the equalized value for the county – as a whole – decreased, equalized value in the Town of East Troy increased. As a result, taxpayers in the municipality saw a drop in their taxes the previous year but that increase in their equalized value is now reflected on their tax bills.

Bretl said Du Bois explained the tax bill well in her first communication but added that he and Chair Russell had talked further and would like to bring closure to the issue. He agreed that very few people understand how this works. They see an 8.6% increase on the county tax bill and say that county government is being irresponsible. In reality, we only raised the tax levy 2.89%, which equates to 8.6 on the tax bill. The property value in the Town of East Troy increased, whereas the county's equalized value – as a whole – decreased by 3.85%. Others who own property in different municipalities saw their tax bill decrease from what it was in 2009. Bretl added that the Town of East Troy froze their tax levy but still showed a 2.8% increase on their town taxes. Their property, even within the township and with a freeze, increased relative to other properties in the county, some of which decreased in value. When you move to the next level, the East Troy School District encompasses both the Town and Village of East Troy. Their levy increase was just over 3%, which is reflected as 6% on the tax bill. The assessed value of property is a function of the local municipality so perhaps taxpayers should question whether their assessment is accurate. Equalization comes into play because the State tries to ensure that assessments are consistent. Bretl noted that even he struggles a bit with that part of the process.

Du Bois researched tax bills for the parcel belonging to the first individual who contacted her. The assessed value of that property has not changed since 2007. In that case, Bretl said it is easier to understand if you realize that, although your assessed value may not have changed, everyone else's decreased so you were still affected. Russell would like to send a letter to these individuals in her capacity as County Board Chair, since they requested their emails be forwarded to the Board. Bretl and Du Bois could work together on the letter and specifically note that the county has no choice but to follow the State's direction with regard to equalized value. Stacey opined that, with so many foreclosures these days, he can see why the concept is difficult to understand.

Bretl feels many people just look at the bottom line but, unfortunately, the system is incredibly complicated. Their tax bill went up 8.6%, however, they can't sell their house for the amount at which it's valued. He added that the next step should be for the taxpayers to complain to their local assessor and then to the State of Wisconsin's Equalization Division because they're the ones who set the fair market value, and not Walworth County. Grant wondered if the parties complained to the Town of East Troy and Gateway Technical College as well, since those tax levies also increased. Du Bois' understanding is that they hadn't, as yet. Stacey asked if the parties were aware their correspondence was included on today's agenda. Du Bois affirmed.

Bretl will work with Du Bois to draft a letter of explanation for County Board Chair Russell's signature. Stacey asked if the Town of East Troy would be copied on the letter. **Grant moved to respond to the emails from Margaret and James Weber, Tamara Weber, and Al and Nancy**

Mihlbauer, with said letter to be signed by the County Treasurer and County Board Chair, and a copy sent to the Town of East Troy. Kilkenny seconded the motion; carried 5-0.

Ordinance **-02/11 Amending Section 30-185 of the Walworth County Code of Ordinances Relating to Establishment of Agency Funds — Andersen explained that the ordinance will allow us to properly record the account for Lakeland School's student council so they can carry funds forward. **Stacey/Schaefer moved to approve the ordinance; carried 5-0.**

Ordinance **-02/11 Amending Section 30-412 of the Walworth County Code of Ordinances Relating to Timekeeping Requirements for Employees — Bretl asked the committee to begin discussion of this topic, though no action is recommended today. Staff need to further research the direction in which we want to proceed. The State provided guidance in a Fact Sheet indicating salaried employees should have detailed time records with regard to times in and out. His concern is that we may not have received consistent direction. Crawford had contacted the State and was told that it is possible to reconcile with the Statutes that salaried employees are exempt. It surprised Bretl that a preliminary "read" from other counties indicated there are a fair number that do require detailed timekeeping records. We should have input from department heads, as well. When amending timekeeping requirements, we should be clear as to why we are doing it, e.g., is this a Statutory requirement, will it help us better account for staff time, etc. As an organization, we have struggled with this issue over the years. About 15 years ago, we determined that management employees should not be required to keep track of their hours because doing so puts them more in the category of an hourly employee who potentially should be getting overtime. Bretl added that a salaried sheriff's office employee, who had tracked his time separately on his own, sued the county for wages in 2001.

The issue of timekeeping for salaried exempt employees is complicated. For example, a person could work Monday and skip the rest of the week but the county would still have to pay the person for the full week. On the other hand, how should we treat the situation of a public works superintendent who may work 16 hours during a snow event? Bretl wouldn't begrudge the person taking a day off after putting in hours like that but he would discourage tracking it on paper in order to take a week and a half off during the summer, for example. Our salaried exempt employees are professionals who should be afforded some flexibility in their hours. Another concept in the mix is that we have vacation and sick leave banks which have value and for which we can require hour-for-hour accounting. The upshot is that we should require timecards that reflect 80 hours, in increments of less than a day, with the employee either being at work or drawing on his/her banks. Punching in and out wouldn't be Bretl's first preference but it may be something we are legally obliged to do. At a minimum, we should provide better guidance in the county ordinances. He recommended that staff discuss timekeeping with department heads, conduct further research, and report back to the Committee. We need to proceed with caution and determine if such detailed timekeeping is a legal requirement or just an accountability issue, which would then be in the Board's purview. Bretl suggested tabling this agenda item to next month. **Grant/Stacey moved to table Ordinance **-02/11 Amending Section 30-412 of the Walworth County Code of Or-**

finances Relating to Timekeeping Requirements for Employees to the committee's February 17, 2011 meeting; carried 5-0.

Ordinance **-02/11 Creating Section 30-143 of the Walworth County Code of Ordinances Relating to Payment of Public Service Organizations — Most public service organizations which receive budget appropriations from the county are paid in January, according to Andersen. One is paid on a quarterly basis, and the Walworth County Agricultural Society is paid in the fall, closer to Fair time. The impact of changing all of them to a January payment schedule would be spending \$36,000 earlier than we normally would. Russell asked that line 11 on page 1 of the ordinance be amended to read: "...all outstanding audit requirements have been met, unless a County Board resolution authorizes that the funds be held or funding divided over the calendar year." Grant asked if a Board resolution would be required in the future for each organization if we modify more than one payment schedule. Bretl said that would be up to the Board, however, the decision could be part of the overall budget process. We are simply looking at an easier administrative process for payment. We already have agreements with each of the organizations. Audit requirements were previously approved by the Board. Bretl reiterated that January 31 would be the default date for single payments to public service organizations unless the County Board were to give different directions. **Kilkenny moved to amend the draft ordinance pursuant to the committee's discussion. Grant seconded the motion; carried 5-0.**

Update regarding stop loss/transplant rider insurance bid — Bretl said this topic was discussed at fairly great length at the November Finance Committee meeting. Staff felt the transplant rider was a good idea but, in late December, subsequently chose not to proceed because data provided to us earlier was inaccurate. This was a complex situation, according to Andersen. We received input from Auxiant, our third-party insurance administrator, and our health care consultant, Rae Anne Beaudry, from The Horton Group. Horton initially informed us there were no exceptions for stop loss and that no one was excluded from the transplant rider. When Auxiant revised the list originally provided to the insurance carrier, however, there were 15-20 people who would have been excluded for one reason or another. The transplant rider carrier revised the list based on severity criteria but we still had a significant number of people who would be excluded. From our perspective, there would not be a financial benefit to the county based on those exclusions. Staff spoke with our health care consultant to determine why the list had been revised in such a drastic manner. Andersen added that a meeting with our TPA is pending, to ensure we are all aware of how this list will be developed in the future. Russell mentioned that the committee may recall how emphatic the comments were that there would be no lasers on the list, which is why we voted to proceed. She expressed disappointment regarding the misinformation, more so than people having been lasered. We pay the consultant to provide us with accurate information.

Andersen said another concern to address with the TPA is that, between the committee meeting and when the application arrived for her signature, the list had been revised to reflect one individual. Theoretically, that can happen as the result of new diagnoses. The committee may recall that Beaudry advised we submit our application for the transplant rider fairly quickly to avoid that type of situation. Based on Andersen's conversations with her benefits staff, Horton was aware of

someone else when we were discussing the rider. At that point, we called our TPA to ask if the list was accurate since there was another individual who could potentially be added. That's when the list of exclusions came back with 15-20 people on it.

Russell asked Andersen to keep the committee informed with regard to any further discussions. Bretl advised a motion rescinding the bid since the committee did actually authorize the award. **Grant moved to rescind the bid award to National Union Fire Insurance and ratify the action by staff to not purchase the transplant rider and revise the county's stop loss insurance. Stacey seconded the motion; carried 5-0.**

Resolution **-02/11 Authorizing Closure of the Financial Systems Upgrade Project and Transferring Remaining Funds to the General Fund Unassigned Fund Balance — Andersen said the resolution will close the capital project related to our financial software implementation. She commended staff for their hard work. Due to their efforts, we utilized much less consultant time than originally planned. She feels we ended up with a better product overall and a much better knowledge of the system as a result. Russell offered congratulations on behalf of the committee. This was a lengthy project and staff managed to save the taxpayers approximately \$400,000. **Stacey/Grant moved to authorize closure of the financial systems upgrade project and transfer the remaining funds to the general fun unassigned fund balance. Motion carried 5-0.**

Discussion and possible action regarding distressed tax incremental financing (TIF) districts:

- **General guidelines**
- **City of Whitewater TIF #4**
- **Village of East Troy TIF #3**

Distressed TIFs may become more and more of an issue, according to Lanser. The equalized value dropped in several of the districts and she believes more municipalities will come forward to ask that their TIF(s) be declared distressed, as a result. She developed a list of factors to consider but requested the committee's guidance with regard to handling these requests when she sits on Joint Review Boards (JRB). Would they prefer to amend the county's ordinance pertaining to TIFs or leave each case to her discretion? The committee agreed that Lanser was thorough in preparing her list of criteria. Kilkenny added his belief that our key response should be ensuring that municipalities submit formal, detailed changes to project plans which are then approved by the TIF's JRB. He expressed concern that we have no control or serious oversight on their projected costs. Municipalities may stretch things out for the full 10 years allowed for a distressed TIF, rather than close it early. Kilkenny commented that the City of Whitewater proposed Jeff Knight, from their CDA, to sit as the citizen member on the TIF #4 JRB. He feels Lanser did a great job identifying the issues with regard to distressed TIFs. The key is to not extend just because they can, to amend the project plan if the need to extend is justified, and to specifically describe the municipality's proposed action. Russell feels some municipalities will be very conscientious with regard to extending their TIF(s) because their own taxing ability is affected when a TIF district is left open. She recommended the committee follow Lanser's criteria, with the stipulation that specific recommendations be presented at upcoming meetings if time allows. Our primary consideration should be whether

municipalities have funds to pay for proposed plan amendments themselves. There is no reason the county should pick up the tab if they are fiscally able to do so.

Grant commented that the City of Whitewater removed over \$11 million in property from their TIF, basically redrafting the boundaries, when they sought to be declared distressed. He was impressed that they did so. Kilkenny noted that choosing not to spend funds if a project can be deleted makes sense. However, he would be concerned if additional funds are being spent or the TIF exceeds its budget.

Lanser noted that the committee was in favor of the general guidelines she proposed. Next, she would like to specifically talk about the City of Whitewater and Village of East Troy TIFs.

City of Whitewater TIF #4: Whitewater spent around \$10 million in 2010 and is fairly close to being done spending. They have a lot of room for businesses to come in. They don't have commitments yet but everything is in place for that to happen so the equalized value of the TIF could increase very quickly. The Whitewater City Manager, Kevin Brunner, thinks the most they may need to extend TIF #4 is 4 years; the 10-year distressed status is a worst-case scenario. Lanser said we can approve, knowing that they may need up to 4 years, or suggest refinements before approving the request for distressed status. Initially, she wondered if the TIF could downsize or eliminate some of the planned projects but is not sure the City is willing to do that, after talking with Brunner. Second, she suggested shortening the timeline. If the City feels 4 years would be adequate, then state 4 years rather than the full 10. Third, a lot of their developers' agreements include language with regard to payment in lieu of taxes. Lanser contacted the State to determine if those were allowable special assessments, adding that we need to potentially address this issue with the State. Her suggestion was that Bretl work with the State in that regard. Bretl added that this issue illustrates the resolution included on last month's agenda which requested a change in the State law to allow counties to be more specific in terms of which specials they want to settle. Historically, settling specials has been workable but Bretl stressed that they used to be smaller ones related to unpaid sewer bills, lawns that had to be mowed by the municipality, or sidewalks that were installed. If the developers' agreements can be included on a municipality's list of special assessments, that could have a significant financial impact for the county. Lanser said one of Whitewater's agreements being put on as a special is approximately \$125,000 and would have to be settled in 2011 by the county. Bretl pointed out that the State may reiterate that counties can't pick and choose. We can emphasize our problem to the legislators but don't have the flexibility to settle some specials but not others, as some counties are currently doing. Second, the issue of developers' agreements can potentially be a significant amount of money. The value of the property may be such that we would never be able to recover the funds through a foreclosure sale.

Lanser asked the committee if they wanted to send a letter to the Whitewater CDA or would rather she take their concerns back to the JRB. Grant requested that staff confer with the State to ascertain their opinion. Kilkenny said there is often a tight timeframe put on the JRB to make decisions. If we don't feel sufficient information has been provided, he encouraged Lanser to ask her fellow JRB members to consider extending the time before making a decision. We can vote

to extend a TIF district as being distressed but, if the State sets a 0% increase in their budget, where do we find the funds to cover this? It is important to protect the county's financial status. Russell asked Bretl for his recommendation. He replied that we should ascertain the Department of Revenue's opinion regarding specials. We already have our own effort to amend the law but, with this specific issue, we can ask if it is appropriate to be a special assessment. With regard to a letter versus having Lanser talk with the JRB, he deferred to Lanser. She said it may be better to wait and talk to them since staff have been asked to research more issues. Andersen noted that the deadline to declare a TIF district to be distressed is December 31, 2011. Lanser asked if the committee felt the best approach would be for the JRB to table the City's request to the end of the year so more information is available or to have them go ahead and approve it. A public hearing is already scheduled for Monday, January 24, and the actual JRB meeting will be on February 9. Grant would like to see this wrapped up sooner than the end of the year. Russell reiterated that we should obtain an opinion from the State as to whether developers' agreements can be considered specials. **Russell moved to approve Lanser's criteria with regard to distressed TIF districts and attempt to postpone the decision of the City of Whitewater's TIF #4 joint review board until later in the year to allow county staff to obtain more information from the Wisconsin Department of Revenue. Stacey seconded the motion; carried 5-0.**

Village of East Troy TIF #3: Lanser reported that the Village of East Troy held their organizational meeting this past Monday. The Village's approach is that although they already have spent some funds in the TIF district for water, utilities and so forth, they propose not spending all of the project funds up front. They would rather hold onto some projects in the hope that the right business will come in and the Village can then work with that business on the infrastructure. Lanser feels this is a great step on their part to control spending. The Village has an agreement with the DOR to complete the Highway 120 interchange improvement. Right now, it's in their cash flow as a 2016 expense but would actually need to be done as soon as they reach a certain traffic count. They don't know when they will get to that point, however, this project could cost substantially more in 2016 than the \$1 million projected now. Calling the Village's TIF #3 distressed now makes it easier to handle because they haven't spent the money and will close the TIF as soon as they can. Kilkenny asked if the Village would be willing to amend their project plan accordingly. Lanser responded that they would have to close if they don't do those projects. She also complimented the Village on their process for providing choices for a citizen member of the JRB. The ran newspaper ads and ended up with 3 applications. She feels the Village has done what they could to follow the county's ordinance regarding TIFs, in addition to not spending before they have businesses interested in the area.

Russell asked if the Village would consider extending the TIF for 5 years instead of 10. Lanser did not feel they would do that. The municipality is looking for a "yes" or "no" with regard to classification as a distressed TIF but will close as soon as the money is there. Russell wondered if there are any specials related to this TIF. Lanser was not aware of any. A motion to proceed is not necessary. The advice provided by the committee is sufficient.

Discussion and possible action regarding award of the Government Finance Officers Association (GFOA) Certificate of Achievement for Excellence in Financial Reporting for Fiscal Year 2009 — Russell offered congratulations on behalf of the committee. Andersen said that every year she thanks the county departments and her staff – particularly Lanser for taking the lead – on the annual financial report. She doesn't think people understand how much, and how frequently, the reporting and its requirements continue to change. Federal grant reporting increased significantly, as did the complexities to calculate our other post-employment benefits (OPEB) liability. She appreciates how county staff remain current on those requirements and help us meet the goals. Bretl recommended presentation of the award at the upcoming County Board meeting. **Stacey/ Grant moved to forward presentation of the GFOA Certificate of Achievement for Excellence in Financial Reporting award to the Board; carried 5-0.**

Reports

- Quarterly investment report — Jens reported on banking changes which occurred during the quarter. Staff discussed the buy-out of M&I Bank by the Bank of Montreal with our M&I trust and M&I capital market brokers. Both felt this was positive in that the additional resources from the Bank of Montreal should provide more advantages in the market. Right now, staff have no concerns regarding the buy-out. Second, the 1st Banking Center in Lake Geneva was forced to close in December 2010, with assets transferred to the 1st Bank of Michigan. The county holds one \$225,000 CD with that bank. The CD was transferred to the new institution and remains fully insured by FDIC. Jens requested committee approval to amend the list of approved financial institutions to include the 1st Bank of Michigan. **Kilkenny/Grant moved to add the 1st Bank of Michigan to the county's list of approved banking institutions; carried 5-0.**

Portfolio performance in the 4th quarter of 2010 yielded .26% which outperformed the 3rd quarter slightly. Staff continue to work towards diversifying the county's investments over multiple sectors in a concerted effort to reduce risk. Year-to-date investment income exceeded the budget projection by approximately \$173,000, ending the year at \$775,000, of which \$130,000 included adjustments to the market. Economic indicators and input from brokers point to the market being fairly stagnant in 2011. The anticipation is for positive changes to start occurring in 2012. With that in mind, staff will continue laddering the county's investment portfolio and focus more on short term investments with 1-2 year earnings. Russell complimented Jens for her work. We are on the right track by being conservative and maximizing income for the county. Jens was asked if staff plan to hold municipal bonds to maturity. Are there any concerns about defaulting? Jens affirmed that we would hold to maturity. We have been very careful in our research when looking at the municipal bond market. Andersen added that a number of municipalities participated in the Federal Government's program for taxable Build America Bonds (BABs), which ended on December 31, 2010. There may be a slow period since some municipalities may have pushed projects ahead of schedule to take advantage of BABs.

Jens reported that we recently purchased Tracker, software that came highly recommended by the GFOA to generate investment activity reports. Instead of having to spend 3 hours

manually create such reports, Tracker will generate them for us in about an hour, thus giving staff more time to analyze data.

The county's other post-employment benefits (OPEB) portfolio showed a total return of 6.5% since its inception. The 4th quarter periodic return was 2.3% which is 9.6% annualized.

Jens corrected figures in the OPEB Portfolio Summary and Performance table on page 54 of the agenda packet. The grand total of securities in the cost column should be \$7,811,278 instead of \$9,970,088. The figures in the column are correct; only the total was off. The market value total should be \$11,547,120 rather than \$10,281,256. The unrealized gain/loss total is correct.

- Update on tax incremental financing (TIF) district(s) — Russell noted that the county received a check when the Village of Sharon's TIFs #2 and #3 were closed.
- Quarterly delinquent real estate tax report — Russell was pleased that current delinquent taxes decreased in 2009 vs 2008.

Correspondence — There was no correspondence presented.

Confirmation of next Finance Committee meeting:

- February 17, 2011 at 9:30 a.m. in County Board Room 114 at the Government Center

Adjournment of Finance Committee

Upon motion and second by Schaefer/Stacey, Chair Russell adjourned the meeting at approximately 11:22 a.m.; carried 5-0.

Submitted by Kate Willett, recording secretary. Minutes are not final until approved by the Finance Committee at its next regularly scheduled meeting.

NOTE: Items distributed at the Finance Committee meeting may be reviewed in the County Clerk's Office.

Walworth County Lakeland Health Care Center Board of Trustees

MINUTES

January 19, 2011 Meeting – 1:00 p.m.

Walworth County Meeting Room 111
Government Center – Elkhorn, Wisconsin

The meeting was called to order by Chairman Grant at 1:02 p.m.

Roll call – Committee members present included Chairman Grant, Supervisors Hawkins, Ingersoll, Schaefer and Redenius. A quorum was declared.

Others present – Linda Seemeyer, Director of Health and Human Services/Lakeland Health Care Center Superintendent; Elizabeth Aldred, Deputy Director of Health and Human Services; David Thompson, Deputy Director of Health and Human Services; ETTY Wilberding, Health and Human Services Manager; Liza Drake, Health and Human Services Supervisor; Juliet Young, Health and Human Services; Bernadette Janiszewski, Lakeland Health Care Center Administrator, Ella Eva Pious, Citizen Representative Health and Human Services, David Bretl, County Administrator; Nancy Russell, County Board Chairperson, Dave Weber, County Board Supervisor, Nicole Andersen, Deputy Counsel Administrator – Finance, Michael Cotter, Corporation Counsel

Public in attendance – There three members of the public present.

There were no agenda withdrawals. **Supervisor(s) Hawkins/Ingersoll moved to approve the agenda. Motion carried 5–0.**

The Lakeland Health Care Center Board of Trustees committee minutes of the November 17, 2010 meeting were approved. **Motion and second made by Supervisor(s) Hawkins/Ingersoll to approve the minutes. Motion carried 5–0.**

Public Comment – There were no comments from the public.

Unfinished Business – There were no items of unfinished business.

New Business –

LHCC Chapter of the Walworth County Code of Ordinances - Ms. Janiszewski is looking for the Board's approval of the adoption of this code. The code consists of approved policies and procedures.

Supervisor Grant asked that the section on smoking and alcohol consumption include verbiage that this is to take place only in the consumer's room and only by patient. Supervisor Ingersoll asked for clarification that it will be residents only not family. Mr. Cotter stated that it would be changed to clarify the location and by residents only.

Motion and second made by Supervisors Hawkins and Ingersoll to approve the amended Code of Ordinances. Motion carried 5-0.

Walker Administration and Long Term Care - Ms. Janiszewski wanted to share with the Board information for the meeting last week. In recent years the number of citations issued has increased from 2-3 on average to 6-9. It is felt that there needs to be a better interpretation of the regulations.

Supplemental Payment Program (IGT) - Ms. Janiszewski presented summary of this program for the Board's information.

Supervisor Ingersoll asked if there was going to be any more funding in 2011. Ms. Janiszewski stated that there are estimated amounts for June and December.

Reports –

LHCC Administrator's Report and Financial Update – Ms. Janiszewski reported that the LHCC is on track with regard to budget. Ms. Janiszewski handed out the December income statement summary. All the finances are on target with the budget. End of year figures are still being calculated.

Supervisor Ingersoll asked if all injuries sustained by staff are reported. Ms. Janiszewski stated that this is encouraged to protect both staff and LHCC. It's up to the Board if they want a change in this practice.

Correspondence – There were no correspondences. Ms. Janiszewski asked if the Board would like to see all the letters since they get many thank you letters from residents and families.

Supervisor Hawkins asked if these letters were shared with staff. Ms. Janiszewski stated that they were.

Supervisor Grant stated the Board would want to review any complaint letters and asked Ms. Janiszewski to make a judgment call on positive correspondence received.

Announcements – There were no announcements.

Next Meeting Date – The next meeting is tentatively scheduled for February 16, 2011 at 1:00 p.m.

Adjournment – **On motion and second by Supervisor(s) Hawkins/Schaefer, Chair Grant adjourned the meeting at approximately 1:18PM. Motion carried 5-0.**

Submitted by Juliet Young, Recorder. Meeting minutes are not considered final until approved by the committee at the next regularly scheduled meeting.

Walworth County Health and Human Services Committee

MINUTES

January 19, 2011 Meeting – 1:00 p.m.

Walworth County Board Room
Government Center – Elkhorn, Wisconsin

The meeting was called to order by Chairman Grant at 1:19 p.m.

Roll call – Committee members present included Supervisors Grant, Hawkins, Ingersoll, Schaefer and Redenius; and Citizen Members Pious and Seegers. Citizen Member Troemel was excused. A quorum was declared.

Others present – Linda Seemeyer, Director of Health and Human Services/Lakeland Health Care Center Superintendent; Elizabeth Aldred, Deputy Director of Health and Human Services; David Thompson, Deputy Director of Health and Human Services; Eddy Wilberding, Health and Human Services Manager; Liza Drake, Health and Human Services Supervisor; Juliet Young, Health and Human Services; David Bretl, County Administrator; Nancy Russell, County Board Chairperson, Dave Weber, County Board Supervisor, Nicole Andersen, Deputy Counsel Administrator – Finance

Public in attendance – There three members of the public in attendance.

There were no agenda withdrawals. **Motion and second made by Supervisor Hawkins/Schaefer and to approve the agenda. Motion carried 7-0.**

The Health and Human Services minutes from the November 17, 2010 meeting were approved. **Motion and second made by Supervisors Ingersoll and Citizen Representative Pious to approve the minutes. Motion carried 7-0.**

Public comment – There were no comments from the public.

Unfinished business –

Ordinance Relating to Interjurisdictional Agreements for Out-of-County Residents – Dr. Thompson is asking for the Board to make a motion to approve this ordinance.

Supervisor Grant asked for clarification that there is not a similar agreement like this in the state and that other counties have an interest in drafting similar legislation. Dr. Thompson said he could not find a comparable ordinance and stated he knows there is interest from other counties of adopting an ordinance like this one.

Chairperson Russell asked if penalties were strong enough to be a deterrent. Dr. Thompson feels it is but it could be revisited in the future. Discussion followed.

Supervisor Grant asked if anyone from the public wished to speak regarding this ordinance. Machelle Moffat of Pell Lake and Renee Michals of Burlington are foster parents and asked for some clarification. Discussion followed.

Supervisor Russell asked if contracted companies of foster parents would be financially responsible. The license holder is the responsible party.

Supervisor Schaefer asked if all clients are on BadgerCare. Approximately 95% of them receive this aid.

Supervisor Ingersoll asked if the public was properly informed of this pending ordinance. Dr. Thompson explained that it was mailed to all licensed foster homes and other interested groups.

Supervisor Schaefer asked how addresses were obtained. Dr. Thompson stated it was from the state files of licensed homes.

Supervisor Grant asked if someone would be placed in an unlicensed home. Such a placement would not occur.

Supervisor Ingersoll asked if there was anything more required for notification for this ordinance. Mr. Bretl feels that Health and Human Services has gone above and beyond for notification.

Supervisor Russell asked about a mechanism to disseminate to other counties the signed intergovernmental agreements. Dr. Thompson said there is something in place to notify all counties.

Supervisor Russell asked if a copy of the ordinance can be sent to all counties. Mr. Bretl stated his office would send out the signed ordinance to all counties.

Motion and second made by Supervisors Hawkins/Redenius to approve this ordinance. Motion carried 7-0.

Update on Echo/General Ledger Reconciliation – Ms. Seemeyer stated that Health and Human Services is currently processing and that the reconcile difference is less than \$100. November and December will need to be processed but it is felt that the reconciled difference will stay around \$100.

Supervisor Grant asked how much of the billing problems are based on the new computer system. There were problems transitioning from the old system to the current system and there was a learning curve for dealing with the new system. Ms. Andersen feels good about the progress and the new procedures. The current processing will prove if the procedures are correct.

New Business –

Health and Human Services Board Vacancy Recommendation – Ms. Seemeyer announced that former Board member Pauline Parker has applied for the vacancy.

Motion and second made by Supervisors Hawkins/Schaefer to approve this recommendation to the executive committee. Motion carried 7-0.

Truancy Abatement Pilot Project – Dr. Thompson wanted to introduce the Board to this new project that Health and Human Services has developed. The program will be tested in the Delavan school district.

Supervisor Grant asked if Delavan has a truancy ordinance. Dr. Thompson stated that they do and it is enforced. The truancy officer and a municipal judge are working on the project.

Supervisor Ingersoll asked if all schools have a truancy ordinance. Dr. Thompson stated the state has one and some cities also have an ordinance on truancy.

Citizen Representative Seegers asked if this project has been done before. Dr. Thompson stated there has not been much work done in this area. Dr. Seegers asked if a paper would be published on the results. Dr. Thompson stated there would be one in a few years.

Supervisor Ingersoll asked if the Delavan school district is cooperating. Dr. Thompson stated that the school administration is working with Health and Human Services on this project. Discussion followed.

Reports

Updated Hospitalization Protocols including Inpatient Statistics for 2010 – Ms. Aldred and Ms. Drake gave a brief overview of the change in protocols.

Supervisor Grant asked if the state asked for this information to share with other counties. Ms. Drake stated that the state is interested in other counties adopting similar protocols. Ms. Aldred added that the auditors acknowledged our pro-active approach to this problem. Discussion followed and Supervisor Grant asked that Health and Human Services keep up the good work.

Correspondence – There were no correspondences.

Announcements

2011 WPHA/WALHDAB Day at the Capitol – Ms. Seemeyer stated this is for the Board's information only.

Next Meeting Date – The next meeting is scheduled for February 16, 2011 at tentatively 1:15 p.m. following the Lakeland Health Care Board of Trustees meeting.

Adjournment – On motion and second by Supervisors Hawkins/Schaefer, Chair Grant adjourned the Health and Human Services meeting at approximately 2:28 p.m. Motion carried 7-0.

Submitted by Juliet Young, Recorder. Meeting minutes are not considered final until approved by the committee at the next regularly scheduled meeting.

DRAFT

**Walworth County Board of Supervisors
Public Works Committee
MEETING MINUTES
Monday, January 17, 2011 – 4:00 p.m.
Walworth County Government Center, County Board Room 114
100 West Walworth Street, Elkhorn, Wisconsin**

Chair Russell called the meeting to order at 4:00 p.m.

Roll call was conducted with a quorum of members present, to-wit: Kathy Ingersoll, Nancy Russell, Joe Schaefer and Russ Wardle. Supervisor Stacey was absent with excuse.

Others present:

County Staff: County Administrator David Bretl; Deputy County Administrator-Central Services/Director of Public Works Shane Crawford; Public Works Director of Operations Larry Price; Assistant Public Works Superintendent John Miller; Office/Purchasing Manager Peggy Watson; Deputy County Administrator-Finance Nicki Andersen; Capt. Scott McClory-Sheriff's Office

Members of the Public:

William Henry, Kehoe-Henry & Associates Architects; Al Delgado and Lisa Debattista, Chestnut Street/STH 11, Burlington, Wisconsin.

Supervisors Wardle and Ingersoll moved to approve the Agenda as presented. The motion carried 4-0. Carried 4-0.

Supervisors Schaefer and Ingersoll moved to approve the December 20, 2010 meeting minutes as prepared. The motion carried 4-0.

No one from the public asked for recognition during the period allotted for public comment.

Ongoing/unfinished business

Report on Government Center multi-purpose room project

Crawford referred to the budget summary in the agenda packets. There is a balance remaining of \$14,129.30. **Committee directive was for staff to provide a project summary with each capital project final pay request.**

Regular Business

Bid award for Jail/Huber workstation project

Supervisors Wardle and Ingersoll moved to approve the bid award for the jail/huber workstation project to John Ransom Construction, in the amount of \$42,377.00, contingent upon approval of a budget transfer to fund the project. The motion carried 4-0.

Correspondence from the Wisconsin Department of Transportation regarding CTH D and CTH DD system changes

This item is informational only, Crawford reported. It is the approval of the jurisdiction transfers from Walworth County to the State of the segments included in the Burlington bypass project.

Fox 6 news report concerning the woman who reported her driveway being mistaken for a county highway

Crawford invited Larry Price, Public Works Director of Operations, to speak, and commented that Supervisor Schaefer asked to have this item on the agenda. Schaefer expressed his concern with the State

Department of Transportation's (DOT) configuration of the STH 11 bypass, adding that the signage is inadequate for people not familiar with the area. Lisa Debattista and Al Delgado live right at the top of a "T" intersection where CTH DD connects to STH 11. There was an accident there a week ago, with the driver missing the stop sign and nearly plowing into the couple's home. Unfortunately, their driveway aligns directly with the roadway. Debattista said the stop signs are not lighted properly and are difficult to see. Schaefer thought placing a directional arrow for Burlington 100 feet before the intersection would be helpful. Schaefer said he spoke with an official from DOT about the problem. Price said he certainly understands Supervisor Schaefer's concerns about the signage, and the homeowners' concerns about their safety. However, Walworth County has not taken over ownership of CTH DD, and we won't accept it until it is brought up to our standards. It is not officially CTH "DD" yet, Price said, and at this time it is old STH 11 from Chestnut Street. Price added that the planning for the bypass originated over 10 years ago, and during the initial stages the State did have an option to buy the land and condemn the property in question. County staff contacted the DOT after the accident last week and stated that the signage is not adequate. Next week the State's liaison is coming out to inspect the roadway. Capt. McClory distributed a diagram which showed the intersection and the roads in question so the committee could see where the problem lies. Ms. Debattista was invited to express her concerns. She said she has talked to state highway representatives and presented options to them, including rumble strips, street lights and flashing LEDs. People are sliding through the stop sign and their house is extremely difficult to see at night. State officials informed her that rumble strips were too expensive, as the roadway was already done; although a section failed and had to be redone, and she thought rumble strips could have been installed then. When she asked about guardrail they told her it was too expensive and wasn't included in the plans. She was told the LEDs were cost prohibitive. When she asked about street lights, she was informed it would disturb nearby residents, but in fact she has no neighbors close by. She said if she hadn't had a woodpile in front of a tree in her yard to stop a car that ran the stop sign that there could have been a fatality. She is concerned for her safety and said you cannot put a price on a life. Crawford suggested the issue be referred to the Highway Safety Commission, which has been successful in negotiating the implementation of safety enhancements from the DOT. Chair Russell expressed her concern about having to wait two months for the next Safety Commission meeting. County Administrator Bretl said that the road does not yet belong to the county, and that right now the signage is the responsibility of the state. Capt. McClory said that our state highway maintenance coordinator, Dennis Schmunck, spoke to officials and they advised him that guardrail installation is under consideration. **Supervisors Schaefer and Wardle moved to give county staff 30 days to work with the Sheriff's Office, the homeowners and State officials to make a recommendation to the committee for safety enhancements at the intersection. The motion carried 4-0.**

Change order requests

Public Works Department expansion project

The five change orders are all under the \$5,000 threshold for committee approval, Crawford said. He added that when the finish work is complete he would invite members to tour the Public Works Department. **Supervisors Schaefer and Ingersoll moved to approve change orders DPW-TI-001 through DPW-TI-005. The motion carried 4-0.**

Final pay requests

County parking lot renovation projects (B.R. Amon & Sons)

Crawford said there are a couple of small items remaining to be done this spring, such as silt fence removal. Amon sent an acknowledgement promising to complete the work by the end of April, and Crawford said he has no problem issuing the final payment. **Supervisors Schaefer and Wardle moved approval of the final pay request from B.R. Amon & Sons for the County parking lot renovation projects. The motion carried 4-0.**

Government Center west wing roof project (Nations Roof)

There is some flashing still remaining to be installed, but Crawford recommended deferring the work to spring, when the center and east wing re-roof project commences. Nations Roof signed an acknowledgment that they will complete the punchlist items on the west wing project no later than April

30, 2011. Supervisors Ingersoll and Wardle moved to approve the final payment to Nations Roof for the Government Center west wing roof project. The motion carried 4-0.

Next regularly scheduled Public Works Committee meeting date and time: Monday, February 14, 2011 - 4:00 p.m.

Concern was expressed whether there would be a quorum at the February 14 meeting, and Crawford suggested that he would see if possibly the February meeting could be held prior to the county board meeting, if there were few agenda items.

Adjournment

Supervisors Wardle and Schaefer moved to adjourn the meeting. The motion carried 4-0, and the meeting adjourned at 4:35 p.m.

Minutes recorded by Becky Bechtel, Public Works Department

Note: meeting minutes are not considered final until approved by the committee at the next regularly scheduled meeting.

Walworth County Board of Adjustment
MINUTES

January 12, 2011 - Hearing – 8:00 AM

January 13, 2011 – Meeting – 8:00 AM

County Board Room

Government Center – Elkhorn, Wisconsin

A hearing and decision meeting of the Walworth County Board of Adjustment was held on January 12 & 13, 2011, in the County Board Room of the Government Center in Elkhorn, Wisconsin. Those present on January 12, 2011, were Secretary Ann Seaver, 1st Alternate Gregory Guidry and 2nd Alternate Roy Lightfield. Deb Grube, Senior Zoning Officer, and Wendy Boettcher, recording secretary of the Land Use & Resource Management Department were in attendance. Those present on January 13, 2011, were Secretary Ann Seaver, 1st Alternate Gregory Guidry and 2nd Alternate Roy Lightfield. Deb Grube, Senior Zoning Officer, and Wendy Boettcher, recording secretary of the Land Use & Resource Management Department were in attendance. A “sign-in” sheet listing attendees on January 12, 2011, and January 13, 2011, is also kept on file as a matter of record.

The January 12, 2011, hearing was called to order by Acting Chair Ann Seaver at 8:00 A.M. Wendy Boettcher conducted roll call and verified that there was a quorum. Those present were same as listed above. **Roy Lightfield motioned to approve the agenda as printed. Seconded by Gregory Guidry. Motion carried. 3-favor, 0-oppose. Roy Lightfield motioned to approve the December 8 & 9, 2010, Minutes and dispense with the reading. Seconded by Ann Seaver. Motion carried. 3-favor, 0-oppose. After testimony of all cases, Gregory Guidry motioned to recess until 8:00 A.M. on Thursday, January 13, 2011, in order to view the properties in question. Seconded by Roy Lightfield. Motion carried. 3-favor, 0-oppose.** The January 12, 2011, hearing went into recess at approximately 10:00 A.M.

On January 13, 2011, at 8:00 A.M., Acting Chair Ann Seaver called the decision meeting to order. Wendy Boettcher conducted roll call and verified that there was a quorum. Those present were same as listed above. **Roy Lightfield motioned to approve the agenda as printed. Seconded by Gregory Guidry. Motion carried. 3-favor, 0-oppose. After the decisions were completed, Gregory Guidry motioned to adjourn until the February 9, 2011, hearing at 8:00 A.M. Seconded by Roy Lightfield. Motion carried. 3-favor, 0-oppose.** The January 13, 2011, decision meeting adjourned at approximately 9:04 A.M.

One variance hearing was scheduled and details of the January 12, 2011, hearing and the January 13, 2011, decision is on a recorded disc which is on file and available to the public upon request.

New Business – Variance Petitions

Disc #1 Hearing - Count #8:04:48 – 8:45:59 / Disc #2 Decision – Count #8:03:26 – 8:52:32

The First Hearing was Grant Louis, Sr., & Linda Sabo, owners / Knutson Bros. II, LLC, applicant – Section(s) 35 – La Grange Township

Applicants are requesting a variance from Section(s) 74-167 / 74-181 / 74-221 of Walworth

County's Code of Ordinances – Shoreland Zoning to tear down and rebuild a house, deck and patio / deck, construct landings and stairs, make grade changes within 75' of the shore (south) and install a retaining wall in the shore yard (south).

REQUIRED BY ORDINANCE: The Ordinance requires a 66' shore yard setback (average), a 15' side yard setback, a 75' shore yard setback for grade changes and a retaining wall in the shore yard only where necessary for erosion control.

VARIANCE REQUEST: The applicants are requesting a 21' shore yard setback, an 8.6' side yard setback, grade changes within 75' of the shore (south) and a retaining wall in the shore yard (south). The request is a variance from Section(s) 74-167 / 74-181 / 74-221 of Walworth County's Code of Ordinances – Shoreland Zoning to tear down and rebuild a house, deck and patio / deck, construct landings and stairs, make grade changes within 75' of the shore (south) and install a retaining wall in the shore yard (south).

BOARD OF ADJUSTMENT DECISION: The Walworth County Board of Adjustment, during the meeting on January 12 & 13, 2011, for the petition of Grant Louis, Sr., & Linda Sabo, owners / Knutson Bros. II, LLC, applicant, voted to modify and **APPROVE** a 22' shore yard setback, voted to **DENY** an 8.6' side yard setback, and voted to **APPROVE** grade changes within 75' of the shore (south) and a retaining wall in the shore yard (south) with the condition that a shore yard buffer be established.

A motion was made by Gregory Guidry that a shore yard buffer is required and have a conservation plan as requested, with this variance approval. Seconded by Roy Lightfield. Motion carried. 3-favor 0-oppose

A motion was made by Gregory Guidry to deny the 8.6' side yard setback variance request. Seconded by Roy Lightfield. Motion carried. 3-favor 0-oppose

DENIAL of a house addition (south) of 3' into the side yard setback for an 8.6' side yard setback: The Board found to approve the request would allow the residence to be more non-conforming. The Board found to approve the request would greatly increase the amount of land disturbance in allowing the foundation to come out an additional 3 feet. The Board found the request to be for personal preference rather than a safety issue. The Board found the variance request did not meet the criteria necessary for approval.

A motion was made by Ann Seaver to approve a shoreyard variance for a 5' increase in height and a 3' west side addition to the residence. Seconded by Roy Lightfield. Motion carried. 3-favor 0-oppose

APPROVAL of a 5' height increase outside the envelope and a 3' addition (street yard / west) to the residence within the 66' shore yard setback: The Board found to approve the 5' height increase would help to better direct runoff. The Board found to approve the request would cause no harm to public interests and cause no harm to the public's interest in navigable waters. The Board found to approve the request would make a better transition for ingress / egress from the garage and stairs to the landing with the steep slope of the property. The Board the 5' height increase would cause no harm as the height of the residence would remain within the ordinance requirements.

A motion was made by Ann Seaver to approve grade changes within 75' of the shore, as shown on the plan and the minimum necessary by working with staff to implement the other variances approved by the Board. Seconded by Roy Lightfield. Motion carried. 3-favor 0-oppose

APPROVAL of the grade changes within the 75' shore yard setback: The Board found minimum grade changes for backfilling purposes are approved for the south, west and north sides of the foundation only. The Board found minimum grade changes proposed on the north side, west side and south side of the residence, and the retaining wall on the south side, are needed to implement the variances proposed and approved by the Board. The Board found no grade changes / fill is permitted on the east (lake) side of the property. The Board found the Land Use & Resource Management staff must be notified of any changes proposed in what was reviewed and approved by the Land Use & Resource Management Department and the Board of Adjustment. The Board found the owner will work with the Land Use & Resource Management staff to maintain erosion control during backfill of the foundation and until which time the dirt is stabilized.

NOTE: NO CHANGES ALLOWED IN ELEVATION ON THE EAST (LAKE) SIDE.

A motion was made by Gregory Guidry to approve the decks, patios, landings and stairs on the south side, west side and north side of the house. Seconded by Ann Seaver. Motion carried. 3-favor 0-oppose

APPROVAL of decks, patios, landings and stairs all in the shore yard setback requirement coming off the house, per plans submitted: The Board found to permit additional ingress / egress for the residence would improve safety. The Board found to approve the request would improve drainage on the property. The Board found the proposed changes would be less invasive than what is existing. The Board found to approve the request would cause no harm to public interests or the public's interest in navigable waters. The Board found to approve the request would not undermine the purpose and intent of the ordinance.

A motion was made by Ann Seaver to approve the deck at 21' from the shore, as built. Seconded by Roy Lightfield. Motion was modified.

A motion was made by Ann Seaver to approve the deck at 22' from the shore as proposed. Seconded by Roy Lightfield. Motion carried. 3-favor 0-oppose

APPROVAL of a deck in the shore yard with a 22' shore yard setback: The Board found the deck was not constructed as approved and permitted in September 1976 but was included in the Board of Adjustment approval of January 2010. The Board found the deck has existed with no harm to the shoreland or public interests since 1976. The Board found to approve the request would permit a portion of the deck to be removed, as per the proposed plan, which will allow the deck to meet the 22' shore yard setback and the 11.6' side yard setback.

Other

A. Discussion / possible action regarding filling the Board of Adjustment vacancy

Gregory Guidry's application has been accepted to fill the Board of Adjustment vacancy. An interview has been scheduled with Administration.

Staff Reports

- A. Court cases update
 - 1. None

- B. Distribution of reports, handouts and correspondence
 - 1. Board members received copies of the 2010 Annual Report and 2010 Follow-up Report.

Proposed discussion for next agenda

The following items were requested to be put on the February 2011 agenda:

- A. Court cases update
- B. Discussion / possible action regarding filling the vacant Board of Adjustment Vice-Chair position
- C. Distribution of reports, handouts and correspondence

ANN SEAVER
WALWORTH COUNTY BOARD OF ADJUSTMENT

These minutes are not final until approved by the Board of Adjustment at the next scheduled hearing date.

HONEY LAKE

P.O. Box 565

Protection and
Rehabilitation District

Burlington, WI 53105



Commissioner's Meeting

December 21, 2010

Chairman Lutz called the meeting to order at the Rochester Public Library at 7:05 P. M. Commissioners present were John Lutz, Judith Correll, Gerald Schwarten, Robert McIndoe and Michael Weinkauf.

The minutes of the Nov. 2010 meeting were read. There was one correction that might be misleading regarding the dam boards. There are eight gates with two boards per gate. A motion to approve the minutes with the correction was made by Michael Weinkauf, seconded by Robert McIndoe and carried.

The treasurer's report was read, copy attached. There are two corrections. Southern Lakes Printing should be \$110.60 and EMC Insurance is workman's comp. not liability ins. A motion to approve the report with the two corrections was made by Robert McIndoe, seconded by Michael Weinkauf and carried.

OLD BUSINESS

The evacuation plan will be put on hold until after the holidays. Chairman Lutz will contact the Rochester fire chief to set a time to get together to discuss the plans.

Chairman Lutz did contact Craig Webster through Pam Shensey regarding the Hy. DD bridge project stating that the lakes have been lowered for the winter and this would be a good time to look at the water levels.

Contacted Pam Shensey stating that the equalization pipe project is complete and all payments have been made.

The fall cleanup will have to be done in the spring due to snow.

The road signs and a couple of stop signs have been replaced and the dam boards raised by CDF Enterprises. There is a new design for road signs but because we ordered them already we get the old design. The new design calls for the first letter of the name to be capitalized with the rest of the name in lower case letters. The sign on Hy. DD & East Lakeshore Drive was knocked over. The post is ordered and Chairman Lutz will straighten the street signs.

Asphalt Contractors have done the crack filling on the Spring Prairie side. The material they used is a very good quality and the job is more extensive than past fixes because they fixed the edges where the blacktop was washing away.

Chairman Lutz did not contact the fence company regarding the repair of the fence. He will do that and leave the fence company do the repairs as weather permits.

People are ignoring the signs regarding no motorized vehicles on the dike. Will check with the sheriff to see if the sheriff can enforce this or if we have to go through the DNR. Chairman Lutz contacted Deputy Shaw regarding trespassing on the dam. Unfortunately, Chairman Lutz has to be the signer of the complaint. If someone sees a trespasser they can call the sheriff who will contact Chairman Lutz. The Lake District has to officially make the complaint.

Chairman Lutz received new paperwork from the insurance company that has to be returned before the end of 2010. It is in regard to the dam safety plan and that we are in the new dam safety program. Most of the information required does not apply to the district.

The Rochester Fire Dept. received a notice regarding the removal of the dry hydrant by the Hy.DD bridge over Sugar Creek. The bridge is scheduled to be replaced in 2011.

Chairman Lutz mentioned that the Spring Prairie Town Board members have decided not to run in the spring of 2011. Robert McIndoe has been a great asset to the Lake District board because of his broad knowledge. He will be greatly missed. Roy Lightfield is no longer with the county but was granted an interim appointment until a replacement could be appointed.

BILLS SUBMITTED AS FOLLOWS:

Comm. Comp.	John Lutz	\$ 175.00
“ “	Judith Correll	\$ 150.00
“ “	Gerald Schwarten	\$ 150.00
“ “	Robert McIndoe	\$ 25.00
“ “	Michael Weinkauff	\$ 25.00
W E Energies	Del Rio Light	\$ 18.78
CDF Enterprises	Raise dam boards/ fix & install signs	\$ 306.54
Asphalt Contractors	Sealing cracks on Spring Prairie Roads	\$5,265.00

A motion to approve the bills was made by Robert McIndoe, seconded by Michael Weinkauff and carried.

A motion to adjourn, subject to recall, was made by Robert McIndoe, seconded by Michael Weinkauff and carried at 7:56 P. M.

Respectfully submitted,



Judith Correll,
Secretary, HLPRD

County Board Executive Committee
December 20, 2010 – 8:30 AM
County Board Room 114
Walworth County Government Center
100 W. Walworth St., Elkhorn, Wisconsin
Draft Minutes

Chairman Weber called the meeting to order.

A quorum of the committee was in attendance, including Chairman Weber, Vice Chairman Kilkenny and Supervisors Brandl, Hawkins and Russell.

Others in attendance included Chris Schultz, journalist for the *Lake Geneva Regional News*; Maureen Vandersanden, journalist for the *Elkhorn Independent*; Mike Schmitz, Jail Administrator and Kathy Loveless, Administrative Assistant in the Walworth County jail; Captain Kevin Williams, Emergency Government Director; Kimberly Bushey, County Clerk; Kurt Picknell, Undersheriff; Tom Miller, probation agent with the Wisconsin Division of Community Corrections, Elkhorn office; Nicole Andersen, Deputy County Administrator – Finance; Supervisors Kathy Ingersoll; Shane Crawford, Deputy County Administrator - Central Services; Sheriff Dave Graves; Scott McClory, Captain – Sheriff's Patrol Division; Lisa Yeates, Field Supervisor, District 2 Probation and Parole Office; and, Penny Vogt, Supervisor of the Elkhorn Probation and Parole office.

Agenda approval was moved and seconded by Supervisors Hawkins and Kilkenny, and carried 5 – 0.

Approval of November 15, 2010 executive committee minutes. Supervisor Brandl noted that he had not voted in favor of an April 21, 2011 committee of the whole meeting because of a schedule conflict he has in April. The minutes were approved as revised on motion and second by Supervisors Kilkenny and Russell. The motion carried 5 – 0.

Public comment period. There was no public comment.

Ongoing/unfinished business

Jail study – discussion with staff of Community Corrections, formerly known as Probation & Parole division. Chairman Weber and County Administrator Bretl indicated the committee began its jail study one year ago in December of 2009. The committee had invited Lisa Yeates, a supervisor from the District 2 Probation and Parole Office and Penny Vogt, Supervisor of the Elkhorn Probation and Parole office. Ms. Yeates is the field supervisor for all agents in Walworth, Kenosha and Racine counties. Ms. Vogt supervises agents in Elkhorn. Agent Tom Miller, who was also in attendance, supervises sex offender cases. With growth in Walworth County's population, agents have seen an increase in drug and alcohol offenders. Drunk driving incidents are more frequent as well as multiple OWI convictions and more violations of probation conditions. Jails are holding a higher number of prisoners for OWI offenses, said Yeates. Under Wisconsin ACT 100, Yeates indicated that to her knowledge, two offenders have

thus far been placed on probation for OWI offenses. On average, each probation and parole agent supervises 80 to 100 offenders. There are approximately 1,600 offenders presently under supervision. Including the caseloads of four probation agents in the Burlington office (part of the southeast Wisconsin region), the caseload total is approximately 2,000. Client/offender assessment is conducted upon conviction and sentencing to determine risk to the community. If a violator is not a sex offender but is determined to be high risk or has medical issues or drug and alcohol issues that warrant treatment, they usually are required to be seen once monthly by their probation agent. If offenders are compliant with all rules and requirements, they are seen once every three months. When there are referrals for offender participation in drug and alcohol treatment programs, probation agents communicate with the providers of the programs to ensure probationers pay supervision fees, which are determined upon a probationer's income. Eligibility for full discharge from probation is dependent upon full compliance with all program requirements. Yeates handles cases involving those convicted of misdemeanor offenses, and has authority to approve client discharge from probation. The Division of Community Corrections is currently investigating use of a risk assessment tool, the COMPAS Case Manager program by Northpointe. The case management program is a comprehensive software program that manages all aspects of offender processing and case management. It will be utilized for pre-trial risk assessment in Wisconsin and is currently being piloted in Eau Claire County, said Yeates. The risk assessment tool will be validated on Wisconsin offenders, she said. The committee asked what percentage of probationers is on ankle bracelet monitoring. The probation agents did not know what the percentage is, but Vogt said those under Act 28 releases are given ankle bracelets as are those classified as high risk offenders. The use ebbs and flows, said Yeates. GPS tracking is utilized for sex offenders. Both Yeates and Vogt said they could provide specific data as requested by the committee and indicated they had not known what information the committee would want when asked to attend today's meeting. Some out-of-state offenders, approximately 2%, are under Wisconsin probation supervision; however, most offenders are sent back to their home state. Interstate contact is maintained but day-to-day supervision occurs in the offender's home state. Supervisor Russell asked why there is a higher percentage of OWI convictions in Walworth County than in other counties. Vogt said that her perception is that perhaps law enforcement is doing a good job regarding arrests, and the District Attorney is doing a good job of prosecuting cases and obtaining convictions in court. Yeates said because there is no public transportation in Walworth County, those with alcohol or substance abuse problems that become intoxicated and cannot take public transportation will often make the choice to drive drunk. Mr. Bretl asked Yeates to clarify the difference between probation and parole. Yeates explained that probation includes those offenders who, upon sentencing, are given an opportunity and time to make restitution for their offense under supervision of a probation agent before being sentenced to jail. Parolees are those released from prison to extended supervision, with conditions, prior to the end of the maximum sentence imposed by the court. For example, under Wisconsin Act 28, October 2009, certain offenders can be released early by participation in intensive drug and alcohol treatment programs. Some are released through other types of programming, such as the earned release program. Each case is reviewed by the earned release commission, formerly known as the parole commission. Approximately 15% of the caseload are those coming out of prison that are placed on parole; the other 85% are those on probation. Supervisor Kilkenny asked for clarification regarding probation holds, which he said he understood are indicative there is a violation of the conditions of probation. Ms. Yeates said when an offender has probation and parole revoked, once

sentenced to jail time, they are no longer on probation but serving a sentence. Probation holds are for rules' violations. Those who violate the conditions of probation are placed in custody in the jail while the probation agent of record conducts an investigation to determine whether the violations warrant a revocation of probation. The time between revocation by an agent and the time the violator returns to the court for revocation sentencing can be long, sometimes as much as 45 to 60 days. Yeates suggested this is an area the committee might want to study further. Some of the lower level felonies can be treated as an "imposed and stayed" sentence. Milwaukee County employs this approach and the court calendar is, as a result, less overburdened. Ms. Vogt said she routinely attends judges meetings in Walworth County and stressed that judges need to "buy in" and feel satisfied that the outcome of revocation will be good. Many judges want the opportunity to see the offender back in court, to review what went wrong during probation and supervision. Defense attorneys also need to buy in. One of the committee's goals is to achieve a reduction in the number of jail bed days, stated Chairman Weber. He commented that committee members, the judges, district attorney, Sheriff and probation and parole division appear to be on the same page as far as the goal. Supervisor Kilkenny asked whether staff of the Division of Community Corrections keeps statistics on the number of jail bed days that occur as result of probation holds. Corrections staff did not provide statistics. Yeates explained that Community Corrections must see the violator within three days to begin investigation of the violation and may request an extension for complicated cases. The violator must then see the regional supervisor, Yeates, and then her supervisor. Six days are allowed to figure out what to do in regard to the probation violation. Within 50 business days, a revocation hearing (court) is required to be held. There are essentially sixty days for the full revocation process. Attorneys may appeal, which extends the process by an additional ten days. The total can end up being roughly two months in the case of a withheld sentence. Some counties are looking into utilizing video conferencing for revocation hearings, said Yeates. It is being reviewed statewide. More programming is needed. Ms. Yeates said Corrections staff try to be conscientious with regard to being good stewards of taxpayer dollars. Ms. Vogt said document scanning has been utilized in the Elkhorn office, in regard to probation holds and other cases, for about a year, to ensure timely transmission to the clerk of courts for the judges' upcoming court calendar. Supervisor Kilkenny noted that it sounded like Corrections is not keeping statistics specific to each case or the number of revocations and jail bed days resulting from probation violations and holds. Corrections staff indicated that in the case of imposed and stayed sentences, these sometimes can backfire. Yeates said she covers the three-county area (Kenosha, Racine and Walworth) with a staff of sixteen in Walworth County plus up to an additional four agents in the Burlington office. Yeates was asked to comment about her sense of the technology used in Walworth County and whether it is meeting the needs, and what recommendations she would make as far as risk assessment tools and how they assist in bond setting. Yeates said she thinks the COMPAS Risk Assessment is a good tool to consider. If defendants are not considered risky, electronic monitoring can be utilized. Rock County has utilized e-monitoring extensively as well as a jail reduction program, which have both been successful. Yeates said she was aware that a large percentage of Walworth County jail inmates are being held pending trial (pre-trial population). Vice Chairman Kilkenny commented that from the information provided by Yeates and the others, it seemed the agents can exercise a fair measure of discretion in supervision. When a judge places probation conditions, Kilkenny asked, how do agents determine how to enforce the conditions and when conditions are violated, how is the burden to the jail system measured? Ms. Vogt said that from her perspective, agents

tend to impose additional conditions upon probationers rather than imposing fewer condition. For example, agents may require parenting skills classes or counseling if they feel it is appropriate after becoming familiar with the probationer and his/her individual case. Some of these services are available through the county's Health and Human Services (HHS) department. Ms. Vogt said she did not think Walworth County judges tend to impose unreasonable sentences and conditions of probation, and they are receptive to suggestions from probation agents. Agents make sure judges are made aware when defendants are not meeting probation conditions. There is a good working relationship between the judges and Corrections, from Vogt's perspective. Tom Miller said agents utilize a wide range of progressive sanctions. All factors and dynamics of individual personalities are considered in each case. For example, anger management issues are considered and reviewed. The offense determines an agent's recommendation. Sometimes revocation is considered immediately; at other times, it is not. Chairman Weber stated that committee members were anxious to have some sort of summary about the corrections process as well as recommendations concerning reducing the cost of incarceration. Yeates said she would work with other agents to compile data for the committee regarding jail holds, interventions and early intervention, jail processing, the COMPAS risk assessment, etc. She indicated that any other data the committee thinks of can be added to that list and included in Corrections staff's report.

Jail Study – review Pretrial Justice Institute (PJI) analysis report of Walworth County jail population. Sheriff Graves, Undersheriff Picknell and Mike Schmitz, Jail Administrator were in attendance. Chairman Weber asked Sheriff's Office staff to give their perspective on the report. Mr. Schmitz said there were no surprises in the report. He indicated the Criminal Justice Coordinating Committee (CJCC) will move forward with study of the incarceration alternatives program. His staff has provided CJCC members each with a copy of the PJI publication, Pretrial Services Starter Kit, which may be useful as the CJCC continues to explore ways to introduce pretrial services as part of incarceration alternatives. The CJCC will review the core functions to begin working on alternative programming, said Schmitz. He agreed that the pretrial jail population is not tracked very well, as indicated in the PJI jail population analysis. Schmitz said he thought that PJI didn't do a bad job with the jail population data it analyzed. The report supports what staff has been saying for the last twelve months, said Schmitz. Supervisor Russell commented that from her perspective, PJI made good recommendations. Sheriff Graves said he agreed the PJI report included good recommendations. Supervisor Kilkenny concurred with Supervisor Russell. Questions remain as to why Walworth County incarcerates more than other counties, why we are spending more on incarceration, and what should be done next to address these problems. Undersheriff Picknell stated that at the recent CJCC meeting, Judge Reddy committed to bringing the Rock County pretrial coordinator to visit and interact with the CJCC and provide input regarding what Rock County is doing. County Administrator Bretl said the momentum at the CJCC and executive committee has been growing over the past few months. There is money in the 2011 budget to do something in regard to incarceration alternatives. Mr. Bretl said the money could be spent on programming. It appears there is general acknowledgement, after a year of studying jail space needs, that it is time to move forward. The question is how to get an incarceration alternatives program off the ground. Bretl suggested the committee could tell him what they want to see next or could finalize their review process. Supervisor Weber suggested focusing on one of the three PJI recommendations. **Supervisor Russell stated she would prefer to have a recommendation**

from the CJCC before the Executive committee formulates a recommendation.

Supervisor Hawkins agreed and stated he would second that as a motion. Vice Chairman Kilkenny agreed a recommendation from the CJCC was a good idea before proceeding.

Mr. Bretl asked if the committee was prepared for a recommendation from the CJCC that the county create or support a position to address jail overcrowding and incarceration alternatives. Supervisor Kilkenny said that simply requesting a recommendation from the CJCC to the Executive committee might not be the best approach. Supervisors then discussed whether the CJCC had a vision or mission statement. Mr. Bretl said he was not aware of a vision statement having been established by the CJCC. Sheriff Graves agreed there probably is not a CJCC vision statement. Mr. Bretl said he wasn't sure that, in the Executive committee's monthly meeting, carrying out a vision statement was viable. Undersheriff Picknell said staff recognizes the need to move forward and not to get stopped by "analysis paralysis." The question, again, is how to move forward on the goal of carrying out some sort of incarceration alternatives program. Sheriff Graves asked Mike Schmitz to provide the committee with a description of the Pretrial Services Starter Kit and six core functions he had mentioned. Schmitz said staff is struggling with the process of moving forward, taking into account the views and desires of the District Attorney, judges, Sheriff's office and others. The Pretrial Services Starter Kit, which was provided to CJCC members, contains good information, Schmitz said, and he indicated he would provide a copy to Mr. Bretl's office to distribute to Executive committee members. Supervisor Kilkenny expressed appreciation for Sheriff's staff cooperation throughout the committee's jail study. Mr. Schmitz asked if it would make sense to request that the Executive committee put in writing its specific request of the CJCC to help move the process forward. Discussion continued, and Mr. Bretl indicated the cost of jail expansion was estimated at \$11 million. If it is eventually recommended that a position should be created to address jail overcrowding and incarceration alternatives, that expense together with programming for alternatives would not be as much as the cost of a jail expansion. Alternatively, if the CJCC recommends a position to address jail overcrowding and incarceration alternatives, providing the CJCC with a structure as a starting point for moving forward would be a good approach. Mr. Bretl indicated that the motion and second offered by Supervisors Russell and Hawkins, to request a recommendation from the CJCC, was fine as it stood. He said he could review the Executive committee minutes of the last year and summarize the committee's jail study. The committee could then send its summary or preliminary findings to the CJCC with a request that the CJCC formulate a recommendation concerning incarceration alternatives. Supervisor Russell said she had not intended, in her motion, to leave a "wide open door" but, rather, to request that the CJCC develop a mission [statement] and recommendation concerning the best use of the current jail. Undersheriff Picknell said that to be fair, the CJCC probably would appreciate direction from its oversight committee (Executive) to assist in prioritizing the implementation recommendations. Whatever incarceration model the county finally implements needs to be efficient, cost-effective, ensure public safety (risk assessment) and have a positive effect on recidivism, said Vice Chairman Kilkenny. **Supervisor Russell withdrew her first motion and made a motion that County Administrator Bretl proceed in summarizing the committee's jail study over the last year, and Executive committee members reviewing the *Pretrial Services Starter Kit*, and then providing a summary to the CJCC and requesting the CJCC's recommendation regarding implementing incarceration alternatives. Supervisor Hawkins withdrew his second to Russell's first motion and seconded this**

motion. The motion carried 5 – 0. Mr. Bretl indicated he would provide the committee with an initial jail study summary outline at the committee's January 2011 meeting.

Community Development Block Grant (CDBG) emergency relief funding, 2008 flood damage. Kevin Williams, Emergency Government Director, said the \$138,000 remaining in the county's account (from state funding) was borderline adequate with respect to purchasing and demolishing the home in Whitewater previously discussed by the committee. Williams learned last week that there is an additional \$100,000 available from the state. He estimated the "ball park" cost at approximately \$180,000 to carry out the project, including purchasing the house for its pre-disaster value and then demolishing it. Amending the hazard mitigation application and accepting the additional State funding would be the first step in moving forward with the project. If the committee supports proceeding, Williams asked whether Supervisors wanted detailed information about the purchase and demolition price or wished to authorize Williams to work within the guidelines of the grant and available funding. Williams said the family is willing and hopeful the county will purchase the property. Committee members asked about any down side to accepting the additional State funding. Williams said the county's obligations remain the same; there are no additional requirements associated with accepting the additional \$100,000. Supervisor Russell asked if County Administrator Bretl saw anything wrong with authorizing full use of the grant money and Mr. Bretl working with Williams to carry out what the committee authorizes. Mr. Bretl asked Williams whether any administrative expenses are chargeable against the grant. Bretl explained that whenever government acquires land, certain steps must be followed and that individuals and homeowners have certain rights. He asked Williams if he thought the CDBG specialist would be available to help guide the county through the process. Captain Williams stated that the grant allows 10% administration fees as part of the grant funding. He indicated he is comfortable with the county's initiatives and progress in helping homeowners whose residences incurred damage. **Supervisor Russell moved to proceed in using the money in the county's fund, up to and not to exceed the amount available in the grant (including administration costs), to purchase the property and demolish the house, and directing Captain Williams to work with Administrator Bretl to accomplish this and then report back to the committee. Supervisor Hawkins seconded the motion, which carried 5 – 0.**

Ordinance relating to pawn brokers and secondhand article and jewelry dealers. Staff requested holding this ordinance until January when Captain Nigbor could attend the committee's meeting. Mr. Bretl indicated he had asked staff to incorporate changes into the draft ordinance relative to the committee's discussion about it in November. **Supervisors Brandl and Kilkenny moved and seconded holding this item and including it on the January 2011 agenda. The motion carried 5 – 0.**

Ordinance amending article III of the Walworth County Code of Ordinances relative to massage. Abbey Provident Venture staff had requested the county review its ordinance, earlier in the year, with respect to some of the ordinance language which was outdated, said Attorney Bretl. The ordinance required all massage technicians to be fingerprinted and have a mug shot on file. The second part of the ordinance had to do with a preemptive practice by the State to exempt those who hold a state license. Under the amended ordinance, the county would have the ability to regulate the massage establishment itself even if the business is being managed by

a state-licensed massage therapist. Sheriff Graves said his staff has thoroughly reviewed the ordinance and is supportive of the proposed amendments. **Supervisors Russell and Hawkins moved and seconded supporting County Board adoption of the ordinance amendment. The motion carried 5 – 0.**

Appointments

- a) Lakeshores Library System Board
 - i. Discussion regarding filling a vacant position on the Board. Mr. Bretl requested anyone who might be aware of someone interested in serving to let him know. He said there is always difficulty in filling positions on this library board, which holds its meetings in Waterford.
 - ii. County Administrator Bretl had submitted his nomination of Susan Metzner for reappointment to an additional three-year term. Supervisors Brandl and Hawkins moved support of the County Board appointment Ms. Metzner for an additional 3-year term; motion carried 5 – 0.

- b) Veterans Service Commission. Supervisors Kilkenny and Hawkins moved and seconded County Board appointment of Administrator Bretl's nominees John Allen, to fill an unexpired term through December 31, 2012, and Les Allen for reappointment to an additional three-year term to end on December 31, 2013. The motion carried 5 – 0.

Consent items. Both of the items below were approved by a 5 – 0 vote on motion and second by Supervisors Brandl and Hawkins.

- a) Mileage reimbursement claim of Supervisor Rick Stacey in the amount of \$17.00
- b) Mileage reimbursement claim of Allan Polyock, County representative on the Wisconsin River Rail Transit Commission (WRRTC), in the amount of \$75.00

New business

Communication from David Shaw, General Manager, regarding 2011 camping operational plan for Alpine Valley Theatre. Mr. Bretl had recommendation the committee receive the communication only without holding discussion. He explained that Alpine's camping plan and conditional use permit (CUP) request would be considered by the County Zoning Agency (CZA) in February, as a noticed public hearing. Any discussion now by the Executive committee, prior to that hearing, could compromise that process. He suggested Executive committee members consider attending the February CZA meeting. Assuming the plan and conditional use is approved by the CZA, the Executive committee can re-review Alpine's 2011 business license specific to the camping plan. **Supervisor Russell moved to place Alpine's communication concerning the camping plan on hold until the CZA has held the public hearing and voted on the CUP. Vice Chairman Kilkenny seconded the motion, which carried 5 – 0.** Chairman Weber requested that Sheriff's staff attend the February CZA meeting.

Ordinance Amending Chapter 2 of the Code Pertaining to Membership of the Health and Human Services Board. The State Statutes are ambiguous with regard to a residency requirement, said Mr. Bretl. The Health and Human Services (HHS) Board discussed this and

expressed a preference that the ordinance require Walworth County residency for all citizen members of the HHS Board. **Supervisors Hawkins and Brandl moved support of County Board adoption of the ordinance; the motion carried 5 – 0.** Chairman Weber asked about a possible instance where a different level of professionalism might be needed for participation on the HHS Board and possible difficulty finding a qualified applicant among County residents. The HHS Board was aware of this possibility when it recommended requiring county residency for all citizens, said Bretl. He cited the example of trying to fill the position on the board over the last year and half, following Dr. Henry Mol's resignation. With assistance from Supervisor Grant, the medical position was eventually filled by County Board appointment of Dr. James Seegers.

Brown County Resolution to U.S. Senators and Congressmen urging the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers to rebid the Renard Island Causeway Project and to award the contract to the low bidder. Mr. Bretl indicated this is an advisory resolution. Deputy County Administrator Crawford indicated he had discussed this with the Brown County Executive. There is apparently an issue in Brown County concerning award of the bid on the project. **Crawford recommended receiving and placing the resolution on file. Supervisors Kilkenny and Russell so moved and seconded. The motion carried 5 – 0.**

Vilas County Resolution 2010-143 Rescinding Changes Made to Prevailing Wage Laws. The Executive committee has discussed the prevailing wage issue in the past year on at least a couple of different occasions upon referrals of resolutions from other counties. Mr. Crawford did not know whether this issue will gain momentum when the State Legislature is back in session but stated it could be addressed in the future if it does gain momentum. **Supervisors Hawkins and Brandl moved and seconded placing the resolution on file; the motion carried 5 – 0.**

Walworth County redistricting plan following 2010 U.S. Census. The county is approaching the time when it needs to move forward on this issue. Mr. Bretl indicated that redistricting can be an extraordinarily political process. In Walworth County, it was very non-political in 2007 with a plan developed by SEWRPC according to a +/- 3% population deviation from district to district. Supervisor Russell agreed the process then was very non-political and commented that she thought SEWRPC had done a very good job with the last redistricting plan. **She moved to follow the same criteria used in 2007, as stated on pages 15 and 16 of the 2007 SEWRPC redistricting plan adopted by the County Board, and to utilize the services of SEWRPC to prepare the new plan for the 2012 redistricting. She also wants instructions included that Supervisors not contact SEWRPC staff while the plan is being prepared and before it is adopted, as was done during the last redistricting.** SEWRPC had prepared the plan at no charge in 2007. There will be a fee for SEWRPC's services this time. Vice Chairman Kilkenny asked if the county shouldn't wait until Census results are announced before requesting SEWRPC to prepare a redistricting plan. Administrator Bretl said once Census results are announced and it is known what the county's population distribution looks like, mapped out, it is, unfortunately, more likely the process could become political. The Census numbers will be released April 1, 2011, and the county has 60 days from then to establish its redistricting plan. That plan then goes to the municipalities, which then have 60 days to develop their plan. Good maps are essential, said Bushey. In 2000, there was no statewide voter registration program.

Latitudinal and longitudinal points (GIS mapping) are now used to created voter lists. GIS mapping is SEWRPC's area of expertise. **Supervisor Russell incorporated Bushey's suggestions about maps into her motion, which was seconded and carried 5 – 0.**

Reports/announcements by Chairperson. Supervisor Weber had no announcement or reports.

The next Executive committee meeting was confirmed for January 17, 2011 at 10 AM.

Claims and litigation. Supervisors Kilkenny and Brandl moved and seconded convening in closed session pursuant to the exemption contained in Section 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," relative to the items listed below. All members voted "aye."

- a) AT & T notice of claim for damages to telephone pedestal and buried cable on or about July 29, 2010 at W7785 Wisconsin Parkway in Delavan, Wisconsin
- b) AT & T claim for damage to telephone pedestal and buried cable on or about September 2, 2010 at N4144 County Highway NN in Lake Geneva, Wisconsin

At approximately 10:50 AM, Supervisors Kilkenny and Brandl moved and seconded reconvening in open session. **Supervisors Brandl and Russell moved and seconded the County Clerk serving notice of disallowance on AT & T relative to the claim for damages to a telephone pedestal and buried cable at N4144 County Highway NN in Lake Geneva. The motion carried 5 – 0.** There was no action regarding item a) above.

Chairman Weber adjourned the meeting on motion and second by Vice Chairman Kilkenny and Supervisor Brandl.

Respectfully submitted by Suzanne Harrington, administrative assistant to the Walworth County Administrator. These minutes are subject to approval of the committee.

**Walworth County Board of Supervisors
Public Works Committee
MEETING MINUTES
Tuesday, December 14, 2010
Walworth County Government Center, County Board Room 114
100 West Walworth Street, Elkhorn, Wisconsin**

Call to order and roll call. Chair Russell called the meeting to order at 4:00 p.m.

Roll call was conducted with all committee members present: Kathy Ingersoll, Nancy Russell, Joe Schaefer, Rick Stacey and Russ Wardle.

Others present:

County Board of Supervisors: Jerry Grant and David Weber

County staff: Deputy County Administrator-Central Services Shane Crawford; Assistant Public Works Superintendent John Miller, Office/Purchasing Manager Peggy Watson; County Administrator David Bretl; Public Works Director of Operations Larry Price; Deputy County Administrator-Finance Nicki Andersen

Agenda withdrawals

There were no requested withdrawals from the Agenda. **Consensus was to approve the Agenda as presented.**

Approval of meeting minutes

Approval of November 15, 2010 meeting minutes. Supervisors Stacey and Schaefer moved approval of the minutes as prepared. Motion carried 5-0.

Public comment period. No one from the public was present.

Regular Business

Request from City of Elkhorn to install lights on south side of Government Center

This item is the request from the Elkhorn Chief of Police to install four additional lights on the south side of the Government Center. Currently, the lighting is insufficient, rendering their security cameras nonfunctional. The picture in the packets shows the proposed location of the lights they City wishes to install, marked with a black dot. The Elkhorn Plan Commission has already approved the Police Department's proposal. Crawford said because the City is planning on installing the lighting, he got cost estimates from the City to install four additional lights on the south side of the building. The lighting fixture the roof is obsolete and energy inefficient. In essence, the County would split the cost of the eight lights and the City would install the lights, as their utility buys posts and fixtures in bulk and thus gets favorable pricing. He said the county would also save money if we did the project concurrently with the City. Crawford emphasized that this project is not a necessity and that the decision is entirely at committee discretion; however, upgrades to the building were deferred for a few years when the future of the building was in question before the decision to build the Judicial Center and, as a result now need attention. The cost to the county for the 4 lights would be approximately \$20,000. Crawford said the resolution (next item of business) is to approve taking \$25,000 from the county contingency fund to cover the project, plus \$5,000 for contingency. There is a balance of approximately \$219,000 remaining in the 2010 contingency fund. **Supervisors Stacey and Schaefer moved approval of the City's request to install four additional lights on the south side of the Government Center.**

Supervisor Wardle asked if we were obligated to have the City install the lights, or could the project be bid? Crawford replied that it could certainly be bid, but that he felt the City's pricing was the most favorable we could probably obtain, and due to the number of poles/fixtures the City purchases annually, the price for the equipment is reasonable. Undertaking the

the project concurrently with the City would also keep costs down. **The motion carried 5-0.**

Discussion/possible action concerning county lighting project on south side of Government Center Supervisors Schaefer and Ingersoll moved to approve the county lighting project on the south side of the Government Center (purchase and installation of 4 lights).

Assistant Public Works Superintendent John Miller said that the City of Elkhorn had already installed the necessary infrastructure for the lights around the square. Crawford said that the lights would be separately metered and we would pay the utility costs only on the lights the county installed. Chair Russell said that since we have new parking lot lights, it would be nice to have more energy efficient lighting that is uniform in style. The county has done a great job in renovating the interior and upgrading the façade of the building, and she said it would be an attractive and cost sensible addition. Supervisor Schaefer expressed concern about the lack of lighting at the far entrance of the building next to the County Board Room. Miller said that lights would be installed by the steps for safety. **The Chair called for a vote and the motion to approve carried unanimously.**

Next regularly scheduled Public Works Committee meeting date and time: Monday, December 20, 2010 - 4:00 p.m.

Adjournment

Supervisors Wardle and Stacey moved adjournment. The motion carried 5-0, and the meeting adjourned at 4:16 p.m.

Meeting minutes recorded by Becky Bechtel, Public Works Department

Note: Meeting minutes are not considered final until approved by the committee at the next regularly scheduled meeting.

**WALWORTH COUNTY METROPOLITAN SEWERAGE DISTRICT
MINUTES OF REGULAR MEETING
December 14, 2010
1:30 P.M.**

CALL TO ORDER

The Regular Meeting was called to order at 1:30 p.m. by Commissioner Logterman.

ROLL CALL

Present: Thomas Eck, Dean Logterman, Ron Henriott, Harold Shortenhaus,
Brandon Johnson

Others Present:

Karla Eggink, Administrator
Cindy Moehling, Assistant Administrator
Gail Vangen, Confidential Secretary
Timothy Fenner, Axley Brynelson
Steven Scheff, Maintenance Manager
Thomas Johnson, Collection Services Manager
Ron Altmann, Operations Manager
David Wagner, Ehlers and Associates, Inc.
Steve Godfrey, Baxter and Woodman

VISITOR COMMENTS

None

APPROVAL OF MINUTES OF REGULAR MEETING NOVEMBER 9, 2010

Commissioner Eck made a motion to approve the minutes of the Regular Meeting November 9, 2010. Commissioner Henriott seconded and the motion carried.

**PRESENTATION BY DAVE WAGNER, SENIOR FINANCIAL ADVISOR OF
EHLERS AND ASSOCIATES**

Mr. Wagner presented a discussion of methods to provide enough cash to abate the General Obligation (G.O.) debt levy in the years 2011 through 2015. The anticipated deficit in cash reserves is due to a significant decrease in connection fee and interest income. Mr. Wagner proposed refinancing the 1994 Clean Water Fund G.O. debt with Revenue Bonds which do not require tax abatement. This would require an extension of the repayment period on this debt. The commission advised Ehlers to proceed with putting in place an 18 year plan. A formal resolution will be presented at the next meeting.

COMMISSIONER RON HENRIOTT APPOINTMENT

Commissioner Shortenhaus made a motion to adopt the proposed letter and recommendation for Mr. Ron Henriott's reappointment to another 5 year term, March 1, 2011 to February 28, 2016, as a Commissioner of WalCoMet. Commissioner Eck seconded and the motion carried.

ADMINISTRATOR'S REPORT

Administrator Karla Eggink presented the Administrator's Report that included:

2010 Maintenance Projects Status Report.

Small over expenditure in Plant Maintenance Repair for the SLD Tractor Annual CFR DOT for unexpected repair of a chiller.

Station/Interceptor Maintenance Repair & Replacement.

Projects in this budget were completed under budget by roughly 14%. The County O easement appraisal will be available at the next Commission meeting.

WWTP Plant Improvements Project Update

This is the last report in which a line item will be included for improvements; the project is now closed out.

Permit Compliance Update

The wastewater facility met all permit requirements for the month of November. Notification was received that WalCoMet's new permit will require adherence to the newly adopted thermal rules. Staff is working with DNR to determine steps necessary for compliance.

WalCoMet also received notice that the TMDL (Total Maximum Daily Load) evaluation for the Rock River is complete and the first public hearing occurred on December 16, 2010.

Staff Training Activities

Administrator Eggink and Ron Altmann attended the Central States Webinar on the phosphorus rule. Tom Johnson attended a GIS demonstration and workshop by Ruckert & Mielke. Thomas Johnson, Jared Loofboro and James Synowiec attended a webcast on Perspectives on Collection System Rehabilitation and Replacement by DLSD. Steven Scheff and Nick Moehling attended a preventative maintenance class for Grasshopper mowers.

AGC Award

Administrator Eggink attended the annual Association of General Contractors (AGC) banquet on December 2, 2010. The AGC presented Miron Construction and WalCoMet with an Award of Excellence for the renovation of the wastewater treatment facility.

January 11, 2011 Presentation of Team Building and Reorganization

WalCoMet is working with Springsted to develop a team building/reorganizational plan. Mr. Dave Unmacht is planning to attend the next commission meeting to present his recommendations. Administrator Eggink requested a closed session as appropriate for his presentation.

RECEIPTS AND DISBURSEMENT REPORT

Commissioner Eck motioned to approve the Receipts and Disbursement Report for November as presented. Commissioner Johnson seconded and the motion carried.

ACCOUNTS PAYABLE LISTING

Commissioner Eck motioned to approve the Accounts Payable Listing in the amount of \$109,692.66 for the General Account. Commissioner Henriott seconded and the motion carried.

OLD BUSINESS

None

NEW BUSINESS

- a. RESOLUTION 2010-7 TO APPROVE THE SEWER PLANS FOR THE GENEVA STREET APARTMENTS IN THE CITY OF ELKHORN.
Commissioner Shortenhaus motioned to approve the sewer extension for the Geneva Street Apartments. Commissioner Eck seconded and the motion carried.
- b. FINAL PAY REQUEST FOR THE WASTEWATER TREATMENT FACILITY IMPROVEMENT PROJECT in the amount of \$44,512.00 and final change order #3, a credit of \$1,500.00 for the repair of coatings on the new primary enclosures.
Commissioner Johnson motioned to approve the Final payment and Change Order #3. Commissioner Henriott seconded and the motion carried.
- c. PUMP REPAIRS AT ELKHORN LIFT STATION #1. Commissioner Johnson motioned to approve repairs to the Elkhorn Lift Station #1, not to exceed \$8,422.00. Commissioner Eck seconded and the motion carried.
- d. WET WELL GRINDER REPAIR. Commissioner Johnson motioned that repairs to the wet well grinder be approved, for an amount not to exceed 50% of the value of the grinder. Commissioner Henriott seconded and the motion carried.

ADJOURNMENT TO CLOSED SESSION: Motion for consideration of a closed session pursuant to the provisions of section 19.85 (1) (e) and (g) Wis. Stats., for the purpose of annual goal setting and Administrator review.

Commissioner Eck made a motion for closed session, seconded by Commissioner Shortenhaus and roll call as follows:

Commissioner Eck	Yes
Commissioner Shortenhaus	Yes
Commissioner Logterman	Yes
Commissioner Henriott	Yes
Commissioner Johnson	Yes

The closed session convened at 3:00 pm.

RECONVENED INTO OPEN SESSION – ACTION, IF ANY, ON CLOSED SESSION MATTERS

Commissioner Eck made a motion to reconvene into Open Session at 4:05, seconded by Commissioner Shortenhaus and roll call as follows:

Commissioner Eck	Yes
Commissioner Shortenhaus	Yes
Commissioner Logterman	Yes
Commissioner Henriott	Yes
Commissioner Johnson	Yes

No action taken.

ADJOURNMENT

Commissioner Johnson made a motion to adjourn, seconded by Commissioner Eck, and the Regular Meeting adjourned at 4:07 p.m.

APPROVED: _____

PUBLISHED: _____

Wisconsin River Rail Transit Commission

Executive Committee Mtg – Friday, 10 Dec 2010 @ 10am • Dane Co. Hwy, 2302 Fish Hatchery Rd, Madison, WI

1. Karl Nilson, Chair, called the meeting to order at 10:00 a.m.
2. Commissioners present for all or part of the meeting:

Crawford	Tom Cornford	X- Committee	X
	Rocky Rocksvold		X
	Vacant		
Dane	Gene Gray	Treasurer	X
	Jim Haefs-Fleming		X
	Forrest Van Schwartz	Advocate	X
Grant	Ivan Farness		
	Margaret Ruf (arrived at 10:15)	Secretary	X
	Robert Scallon	2nd Vice Chair	X
Iowa	Charles Anderson	X- Committee	
	Gerald Dorscheid	Vice Treasurer	X
	Robert Zinick		

Rock	Ben Coopman	Alternate	
	Wayne Gustina		
	Alan Sweeney	Vice Chair	
	Terry Thomas		X
Sauk	Joel Gaalswijk		
	Rob Sinklair	Assistant Secretary	X
	Scott Alexander		X
Walworth	Marty Krueger	Alternate	
	Jerry Grant		
	Richard Kuhnke	X- Committee	X
Waukesha	Allan Polyock		
	Karl Nilson	Chair	X
	Richard Manke		
	Fritz Ruf		

Others present for all or part of the meeting:

Amy Seeboth (SWWRPC / WRRTC Administrator); Frank Huntington, Ron Adams, & Roger Larson (WisDOT); Ken Lucht (WSOR); Alan Anderson (Pink Lady RTC); Jim Matzinger (Dane County, WRRTC Accountant).

3. Motion accepting Seeboth's certification of Public Notice. *Thomas / Kuhnke- passed unanimously.*
4. Motion accepting the Agenda with noted changes (Executive Commission should be "committee", add a subject line to the Commission Meeting memo notices and change financial report to just November), prepared by Seeboth. *Kuhnke / Sinklair - passed unanimously.*
5. Motion approving the draft Nov. Minutes. *F. Ruf / Farness – passed unanimously.*
6. Public Comment – None
7. Correspondence & Communications – Chairman Nilson passed around a copy of Shanghais High Speed Rail Plan, Commissioner Van Schwartz passed around yesterdays Federal Register with an FRA notice about an Environmental Impact Statement for the Milwaukee, WI to Minneapolis, MN Rail Corridor. Seeboth informed the Commission that they received notice of liability insurance coverage from the Sno Busters Snowmobile group.

REPORTS & COMMISSION BUSINESS

8. WRRTC Financial Report– Jim Matzinger, Dane County CPA / WRRTC Accountant provided copies of the treasurer's report to each Commissioner. He pointed out that the budget is a concern, that in the past there have been county assessments for administrative expenses and WSOR voluntarily increased their lease payment, but that is not enough. Van Schwarz said that it is important that the RTC continue to pursue having Jefferson County join the Commission.
 - Motion accepting the treasurer's report for Nov. and payment of bills - *Kuhnke / Gray – passed unanimously*
 - Motion to move Item 13 (Audit Review) to after Item 8 – *Sinklair / Crawford – passed unanimously*

Consideration of approving 2009 WRRTC Audit by Johnson Block – The Commission reviewed draft copies of their 2009 Audit that they had received in the mail earlier. Nilson said that in his review he found more boiler plate in the Audit than he used to find and it looks like Johnson Block is trying to be held not responsible for more than they used to be. On Page 18 the Audit commented on the format of WRRTC Financial Statements, Matzinger addressed this by saying he will change the format to match the needs of the Audit in 2011. Nilson said that page 18 journal entries do

not make sense and asked Matzinger to work with Johnson Block to sort this out. Nilson said that the audit is not ready to be sent to the Counties in this condition. Van Schwartz raised the question of whether Johnson Block wants the WRRTC to establish an internal Audit Committee and asked if the RTC has ever had an internal audit committee - Huntington said the Commission has not. Commissioner Gray asked if Matzinger and Seeboth can include notes in the January minutes based upon conversations Matzinger has with Johnson Block and Seeboth has with HUD regarding SWWRPC and an internal Audit Committee. Seeboth was also asked to check if the Commission has a contract for 2011 with Johnson Block.

- **Motion to have Jim Matzinger review the conflicting language in the Audit with Johnson Block – Gray / Van Schwartz - passed**

9. Wisconsin & Southern Railroad's Report on Operations – Ken Lucht, WSOR, reported on the following:

- *Monthly Maintenance Activities* – WSOR has been quiet the past couple of weeks. They have been plowing the lines and brush cutting on Reedsburg Line, starting from Madison. They have been doing a lot of work on bridges and are about to start work on a bridge outside of Reedsburg which suffered damage during the 2008 flood.
- *Update on Capital Projects Underway* – They are still finishing up work on the welded rail project between Milton and Madison. They just hired a contractor for the switches. Hopefully WSOR will get state/local funding for the welded rail into Madison to complete that project next year. They are finished with the Janesville-Monroe welded rail project. Lucht added that business has been expanding and there is a lot of interest on the northern and southern division. They are still pursuing the UW-Madison heating plant biomass project, but the media has been reporting that they may operate entirely on natural gas. The topic of the asphalt pile in Spring Grove, IL came up and Commissioner Sinklair offered that he will stop by and look at it on a future trip out to that area.

10. WRRTC Administrator's Report – Seeboth had no report.

11. WDOT Update – Huntington reported that the High Speed Rail project was placed on hold last month and that that caused a pause in the decision on the freight rail grant projects. With the announcement yesterday that the HSR project is not going to happen, the DOT now has a clearer vision for where monies may need to be allocated and they are ready to move ahead with allocating those program funds. Some projects in the WRRTC area that have applied for funding, include the Madison-Milton Jct. welded rail project, a re-alignment in Waukesha, and a few projects in the East Wisconsin Counties Rail Consortium. WDOT is not sure yet which may fund, but they will be able to fund quite a few of them. In next week or two, WDOT should be ready to proceed with those project announcements and they should be able to break ground this spring.

Ron Adams added that the WDOT submitted their budget for the next biennium including bonding authority at \$60 million, which is the same as the current level. They are now waiting to see what the new governor does.

Huntington added that the proposed UP acquisitions discussed in prior months are not dead by any means, but if they move ahead on the negotiations at a reasonable pace, WDOT will still not be able to spend money on it by July 1st, so funding will be spent into future years.

12. Update on Sauk County Rails to Trails Stakeholder Group – Sauk County cancelled the last meeting. Mary Krueger said that the options that were to be discussed at that meeting were no longer available. No one at the WRRTC meeting knew more about this- Lucht said that WSOR had two meetings with both villages and discussed their interests and needs. Lucht said he thought that the second meeting was very productive where WSOR and the villages (Sauk City and Prairie du Sac) came to an understanding that WSOR was very happy with. WSOR said that after that decision, the conversation took a different direction. Lucht is unclear of what happened between that second meeting and the cancellation of the current meeting. Van Schwartz said that he wants more details submitted to the group.

The Commission recessed for a 10 minute break at 11:05

13. Review and possible changes to the WRRTC Fee Schedule – Seeboth requested that the Commission review the fee schedule to create a set rate for private crossing requests. The Commission discussed the various ways that a private crossing fee structure could be established, requiring a different rate for the size of the applicant, etc. The Commission eventually agreed that a single, flat rate was the easiest fee structure, as well as the most fair.

Huntington explained to the Commission that the WRRTC has historically not had the institutional memory for annual permit renewal fees, that is why the Commission does not have these.

- **Motion to change the WRRTC Fee Schedule to require initial and transfer of private crossings to cost a minimum of \$500, paid up front with the application, and require that the crossing be completed within 12 months or is voided.** – *Van Schwartz / Gray – Passed Unanimously*

14. Consideration of transferring WRRTC website to SWWRPC office. Seeboth explained to the Commissioners that she would transfer the website to another site and manage it at no additional costs to the Commission. She said that there are several benefits to this, including a greater ease of making updates on her end, as well as ease of management for the organization by having the website information kept in the same location as their other information. Hosting the website would also be free which would save the Commission approximately \$180 / year. Seeboth provided the Commission with an example of another website she created (www.swsaferoutes.org). Their current hosting contract ends March 26th and their current web designer, Pat Weeden, has been volunteering for the work, but has agreed that it makes sense to have the WRRTC Administrator host and manage the website.

- **Motion to transition the WRRTC.org website to WRRTC Administrators management by the end of March-** *M. Ruf / Thomas – Passed Unanimously*

15. Consideration of the 2011 Staff Services Agreement with SWWRPC for Administrative Management – Seeboth brought her contract up for Commission review at the same levels as the past two years. Scallon recommended that Seeboth request an increase of the Contract value in 2012.

- **Motion to contract with SWWRPC for Administrative Services in 2011, with direct costs to not exceed \$22,5500 without authorization by the WRRTC** – *Scallon / Van Schwartz – passed unanimously*

16. Motion adjourning the meeting at 11:48 a.m. - *Scallon / Cornford - passed unanimously.*

**Walworth County Criminal Justice Coordinating Committee
MINUTES**

December 10, 2010 at 11:30 am

Walworth County Sheriff Office - Media Room

Task Force members present: Circuit Court Judge David Reddy, Jail Administrator Mike Schmitz, County Board Chairperson Nancy Russell, Public Defender Eric Nelson, Tom Miller – Dept of Corrections, Carlo Nevicosi – Dept HHS, Clerk of Courts Sheila Reiff, and Professor John Kozlowicz
Also present: County Administrator David Bretl, Sheriff David Graves, Undersheriff Kurt Picknell, Assistant Jail Administrator John Delaney, Jail Inspector Greg Bucholz, Pastor John LaGalbo – Mt. Zion House

1. Meeting called to order at 11:33 am by Committee Vice Chair Mike Schmitz.
2. Roll Call taken by Committee Secretary Kathryn Loveless, see list of members above.
3. Withdrawals from Agenda: None
4. Approval of Agenda for the December 10, 2010 meeting **A Motion to approve the agenda was made by John Kozlowicz and seconded by Nancy Russell, all in favor, motion carried.**
5. Approval of November 12, 2010 minutes – **A motion was made to approve minutes from the previous meeting by Judge Reddy and seconded by Nancy Russell, all in favor, motion carried.**
6. **Public Comment** – No comments from any members of the public
7. **Unfinished Business**
 - a. **Update on Pre-trial Justice Institute Assistance** – Mike Schmitz noted that the handout provided gave the report from PJI of the study they conducted regarding Walworth County's Jail Population and trends. This report will be presented to the Executive Committee at their next meeting. The report was discussed it was determined that the data seemed a little skewed. Some felt that it was a little broad and the results seemed a little bit "generic". It was noted that by the way the data was pulled and/or what was available may have attributed to that. If there are specific comments or questions about the report, we need to gather those together and submit to John Clark. Mr. Schmitz mentioned that with the new RMS system, to be made available in 2011, the numbers may have been a little more detailed. Undersheriff Picknell noted that in the summary portion on page 10 of the report, the bullet points serve as road map to what areas we need to do to follow up and go forward with. Judge Reddy felt that it could maybe use some further follow up if that is possible whether PJI can do that for us or we need to look further into an analysis done by someone else. PJI will follow up with the data they have provided for us but they will not follow up on completing specific pretrial services for our jail perse', we did this solely for population analysis only. Sheriff Graves noted that the average stay for pre-trial inmates is 12 days, it was mentioned that there may be some programs outside the jail setting that could assist a lot of pre-trial inmates outside of the jail setting. This led into a discussion regarding what direction do we go in to look at pretrial services more in-depth. This topic really affects the DA, Clerk of Courts and the Public Defender so it was suggested that this type of option be looked into further by those parties as a core group.

County Administrator Bretl mentioned that there is money in the budget that could be used to develop more specific data if that is what we needed to move forward. Sheriff Graves suggested possibly looking into Day Reporting more in-depth, he would be for that. The question then came up – Do we need programs in lieu of sentencing? Is our goal to determine the risk of pretrial inmates and focus on ways to provide intervention/structure for them prior to possibly serving jail time? Carlo from HHS gave some ideas of studies that have been done and research that he would be glad to share more information on when needed regarding the Relapse Prevention Model. John LaGalbo also talked about his ideas through IM Counseling Services and what options might be out there through him and his contacts with Drug and Alcohol Treatment facilities. It was asked by the committee that Pastor LaGalbo provide a proposal at the next meeting of what options may be available through his services and what the cost of that would be. It was clarified that the numbers used in the PJI study are only Jail side numbers, no numbers reflect the population of Huber/Work Release inmates. As part of this topic it was also talked about the fact that maybe the money that could be made available for help with this project could possibly be used to hire someone to head up the project and spearhead the specifics. Judge Reddy volunteered to contact Elizabeth Pohlman-McQuillen from Rock County and speak with her about her job description and duties. Mike Schmitz will contact Holly Szablewski from Milwaukee County for the same information and this will be presented at the next meeting.

- b. Update on Application for DWI Court Training** – We received word from District Court Administrator Andrew Graubard that the DWI Training application was approved by the WI State Highway Safety Office and now the NCDC will determine which training location we will be assigned to. The email information stated that this will be done at the beginning of the year so we should be hearing something soon.
- c. CATE Report** – At this time the CATE program is up to 12 individuals in the program and 13 more have been screened. There are currently two 4th offense OWI's in the program, Carlo believes that 3 or 4 4th offense candidates have been screened. Once all the applicants that have been screened and any others that are in the works, a third group may get started up. The funding and cost to the participants is a valid issue and if money was available to help fund the CATE Program would that help more candidates to participate. It was discussed that when the CATE Program started that it would be of zero cost to the taxpayer and was designed to make the cost a motivator for success. After some time has gone by and the success rate data is formulated there may be more discussion regarding this topic or aid with funding but not at this time. Supervisor Russell suggested if there was funding available so that those without financial means could participate, then that person could maybe pay that money back in other ways ie. Performing Community Service, etc, we'll discuss this again. It was noted by Carlo that the average cost for a person to participate in the CATE Program runs anywhere from \$4,450 up to \$6,550 or higher that is an average of 6 to 9 months to complete.
- d. Discussion on DRUG Court** – Some of the committee members that should be present for this discussion were not at the meeting so this topic will be continued to the January 2011 meeting. It was the feeling of the committee that the DA and as many judges as possible really need to be present to speak to this topic in detail. County Board Supervisor Nancy Russell did speak a little bit about continuing forward with Drug Courts prior to going forward with OWI Court but it was noted that we have made the commitment by putting in our application for OWI Court Training to proceed with OWI Court first.

8. **New Business**
 - a. **Jail Statistics** – The statistics for November 2010 show a decrease 2% or by 24 people for OWI offenses. Unfortunately the drug population is up 61 to 64%. However, OWI offenses still are very large and need to be focused on.
9. **NEXT MEETING DATE** – Friday January 14, 2011 at 11:30am in the Sheriff's Office Media Room.
10. **Adjournment** – Motion made by John Kozlowicz and seconded by Eric Nelson, all in favor, motion carried and meeting adjourned at 12:43 p.m.

Minutes submitted by Kathryn K. Loveless. Minutes are not final until approved by the Committee.

Walworth County Land Information Advisory Council

MINUTES

December 1, 2010 – 10:00 a.m.

Conference Room 214 – Government Center
Elkhorn, Wisconsin

Draft

The meeting was called to order at approximately 10:04 a.m. by Connie Woolever, Chair.

Roll Call – Committee members present included Connie Woolever, Donna Pruess, Kathy Du Bois, Dr. Kurt Bauer, Craig Workman, Michael Cotter, Rich Colbert, Jerry Kroupa, and John Orr. Capt. Kevin Williams was absent. A quorum was declared. Nancy Russell arrived at approximately 10:15 a.m.

Others present – Shane Crawford and David Bretl.

Approval of the agenda was moved and seconded by Cotter and Orr with no withdrawals, and carried 9-0.

Approval of the September 2, 2010 Land Information Advisory Council committee minutes was moved and seconded by Bauer and Pruess. The motion carried 9-0. Bauer wanted it to show in the minutes that the secretary did a great job on the minutes. He stated that he has to serve on several of these land councils, including Milwaukee county, and these are the best set of minutes anyone has gotten out there for these councils.

Public comment period. None.

Discussion/Possible Action concerning the Update to Land Records Modernization Plan: 2010. Bauer stated that he thought the plan was well-written and suggested the council should consider formally approving the plan. He also stated that the report does note a plan to update planimetry of the topographic maps especially to get the building locations. He stated he thinks at some point the council should ask the staff to come forward with a proposal on how to do this. There are some alternatives and they all involve costs. Cotter asked if Bauer means to put the as-built where a house would be built on a parcel. Bauer stated that all of these land information systems have four foundational elements that are essential and you cannot proceed without them. You have to have map projection. You also have to have datums, which are not mentioned and may want to add those to the report, such as the North American Datum of 1927, which state plain coordinates refer to. You also have to have a control network, such as section and quarter section corners with state plain coordinates, and this is included in the plan. The control network has to be maintained and it is. And you also have to have topographic maps, which are your ground features, and matching cadastral maps. Bauer added that everything is built on these, whatever you add, such as land use, parcel identifications, and assessments. He added that at some point, the topographic maps are going to have to be updated to get the changes that have been done, primarily building locations, but also new pavement edges and new construction that has taken place. It is recognized on the plan that this needs to be done, and, at some point, the staff is going to have to become real about it and decide how it is going to be done. He added that the staff needs to decide if they are going to selectively update where changes have taken place and where to selectively prepare the new topographic maps of those areas. This is kind of the cadillac approach. The staff needs to decide if they are going to skip the planimetry which is cheaper but it is not as good, or if they are going to use orthophotography. It is something that the staff is going to have to address and bring to this council. The council should then help the

staff if it has to go to the county board depending on how much money you have. Colbert stated that they did do building outlines when they initially did the planimetrics, such as showing a house, factory, and went as far as showing trees.

Cotter added that with the update to the cadillac, he was approached by the Chair from the County Zoning Agency about having setbacks added to the lots on all parcels. He can see how people would benefit from it. For example, if you own a home on the lake and you want to know where your setback is. This would be advantageous to a person as you can just click on it, and see where your setback is; however, it is a huge undertaking. He added that he is referring to the unincorporated areas of the county that the zoning agency deals with. Bauer added that in 2004, the county board had topographic maps done for the entire county, and these are getting old. He added that large areas of the county will have no changes and you wouldn't have to worry about updating those maps. It will just be where development has taken place and you want to map that development. Kroupa asked if you could only focus on lakes in regard to the setbacks or if it would have to be for the entire county. Cotter stated that the Chair from the County Zoning Agency wanted it for everywhere, such as the unincorporated areas that they deal with. The zoning agency feels it would help answer questions early on and avoid problems down the road for a buyer of a home or a resident that wants to make a change or addition to their house. Colbert asked if setbacks are the same for everyone. Cotter stated they are different, such as Village of East Troy has different setbacks than City of Whitewater than the Town of Whitewater. And to complicate things even more it would have to be by the zoning district, such as C-2 is different than R-1. Colbert asked Cotter if he could send him all of the setback information. Cotter answered yes but thought that Colbert would have to work with someone to help figure it out. Bauer suggested moving approval of the plan to Woolever. Workman asked if approval would be of entire packet or just the Update to Land Records Modernization Plan. Woolever stated that approval is for the plan included in the packet. Cotter wanted to mention in regards to scanning the historical maps, they have a volunteer in Land Use and Resource Management scanning all their old files and is doing a really great job.

Russell asked if the projects listed in the project initiative of the plan are intended to be in priority order. Colbert stated they are not in priority order. Russell added that something that has recently come up; and it has been discussed before. There is more and more urgency to get this project [new tax software and new tax numbering scheme] completed to be able to not accept the assessed specials. She added that we are finding that there is borrowing going on in the TIF districts. She added we are finding that we are going to be responsible for these if the TIF districts are over-extended. If this becomes a regular practice, the county taxpayers are going to be picking up a big burden that should not belong to the county. Woolever stated this is something that could go forward as a project for 2012. Colbert added that they are reviewing how this will be done and will be included in the amended plan. He will come back at next meeting with new version of Update to Land Records Modernization Plan: 2010. He added they have been doing analysis for the new tax system and the new tax parcel numbering scheme; however, the Update to Land Records Modernization Plan cannot be amended at this time.

Bauer and Cotter moved and seconded approving the Update to Land Records Modernization Plan: 2010. Motion Carried 10-0.

Woolever added that Colbert will be adding a few things to the plan and bring it back to the council in the future. Colbert stated that if there are any more comments to forward them to him.

Bauer asked if the plan has been submitted to the state yet. Colbert stated the plan is currently in county peer review, and then it will be submitted to the state. He added the counties doing the peer review were Racine and Ozaukee counties.

Establish a general spending policy. Handout provided by Colbert. Colbert stated it is a spreadsheet displaying annual review and the effect of different spending percentages over the next five years. Colbert added that what is most telling is with expenses at 175%, the land modernization fees will be in the negative by 2015. He also stated that fees and interest totals are from this year. Woolever added that with the change in the statute we are collecting more for land modernization and public access fees. Orr added that they are not sure on the totals for this year with the change in the statute; therefore, they used the same estimate from this year across the next five years on the spreadsheet. Colbert added that something we need to remember is that these funds are specific, such as land modernization fees are for internal and public access fees are for external. Also, with the addition of these new systems, there will be more information readily available to the public. Since there are two components, we can split the costs between these two accounts. Bauer added this is a conservative analysis having kept the fees constant through 2015. He added that hopefully the recession will end soon and will take in more fees. Woolever asked Colbert if he had a recommendation on a spending policy. Colbert stated that taking 125% from both funds gives us almost \$170,000 for 2011 and it's a considerable amount of money. It will leave the funds at over \$440,000. However, considering that we do have the tax system and potentially a LURM system in the next two to three years, we need to decide if we are going to be more aggressive. We received a rough estimate of \$350,000 for the tax system. This money will be in competition with the departmental budget as well. Workman asked if there is any reason why we need to take the same percentage from each account. He added that expenses at 175% still leaves us with a balance in the public access account in 2015. Colbert added that as stated before there are internal and external differences in the accounts. Cotter added that since we are being conservative, he likes the idea of splitting and going at 175% on the public access fund and 150% on the land modernization fund, then review it after one year. He added that perhaps we should be more aggressive coming out of the gate. Woolever added that maybe the spending plan should be reviewed every year. Russell asked if this is just for 2011. Colbert stated this is actually for 2012. Cotter added the budget for 2011 has already been adopted. Orr added for the 2011 budget, they put \$50,000 into the consulting budget in the event the council decided there was something they wanted to do next year, then there is some money available. He added that the council needs to decide spending for 2012. Russell asked if we should decide for 2012 now or wait until further into 2011 but before the budget. Orr stated we could wait to set the percentage until 2011. Colbert added that we know the tax system will be purchased in 2012 and have received a rough estimate of \$350,000. Russell asked if we should set spending at 175% of land modernization fees for one year. Colbert added that if Du Bois has her tax software paid for by 175% of land modernization funds, we'll be short on funds if Cotter decides he wants to pursue the new system for Land Use and Resource Management. Colbert added to also take 50% out of this so the department knows what to budget for and we would know what the allocation would be next year. Orr added that we are making the assumption that the council would agree to purchase a new program for Land Use and Resource Management. Cotter asked if the new program for Land Use and Resource Management is in the capital improvement plan. Orr stated that it was taken out. Cotter added that this is may be something we would need to look at. He added that he may have to purchase a vehicle down the road, but has no other major items in his capital improvement plan. He

thought the new program would have to be in the plan. Colbert added that we should be able to get rough costs in 2012 to do the new system in 2013.

Woolever asked if there are any recommendations or if want to wait and see where we are on the project going forward. Orr added that there is a definite need for a new tax system in 2012. The current system is antiquated, and this is included in the capital improvement plan for the budget. There is an urgency for this new program. There will be a complete analysis of the tax numbering system done by Colbert and his staff. They will determine what it's going to take to develop the conversion. We could go out early in 2011 for an RFI, and then go out for an RFP after the budget has been adopted. This is kind of the plan that we have been working off of. Russell stated that she would make a motion to go forward with the track that Orr mentioned. She can understand and appreciate to have the setbacks; however, the longer we wait to act on the new tax system, the more it's going to cost the county. She asked Bretl to comment on the assessed specials and the distressed TIF district in Whitewater. Bretl stated the county has been settling assessments for a very long time. It is part of the guarantee of a development agreement. At some point, we have to get out of at least a portion of these. We are going to have to change the way we have to pay or settle the district. We know this has been coming for a long time. He also added that he would be supportive in moving forward with this. Du Bois added that currently the county is paying the specials in full in August. If the county changes how it is going to settle these, we would have to monitor on a monthly basis what we have received as a special assessment, and then pay it out on a monthly basis. We do not have the capability of doing this with our current system. Colbert added this will all be part of the specifications of the new system.

Workman suggested taking some of the projects in the plan and prioritizing them. He also added that it sounds like the new tax system should be high priority. He also suggested approving a prioritized list before establishing how much to spend. He added that cash can be endless with TIF districts that are over-extended. If this is something that is going to protect the county against having to collect for these TIF's, he thought this will be a project that pays for itself. Orr added that Workman was making a good point. He also stated to keep in mind that we didn't have this council when we initially drew up the Update to Land Records Modernization Plan. We went ahead as a department to decide what to go ahead with. Orr added they are looking for assistance from this council to prioritize projects. It is very high priority for the tax system right now because of the costs it could incur to the county in the future. Bauer added that he thought what Workman was suggesting was for the staff to provide the council with a prioritized list of the proposed projects to look at. Workman added this is something we need to work on pretty quickly in an effort to get ahead of the game. He also added that it does make sense to set up a preliminary spending plan for 2012. Orr stated that the plan for next year is to go out for an RFI in the first quarter, then go out for an RFP after the budget is adopted. He also added that in working with Du Bois, they have seen a fair amount of interest in other counties that are looking for new tax software. He hopes to see some aggressive dollars since there is a pool of individuals looking for software in 2012. Woolever reiterated that the plan is to go out for an RFI in early 2011 to get the numbers for the budget. Then after the budget is adopted, go out for an RFP to choose who we will purchase the software from. Orr added that an RFI is a strip down of some of the requirements we are looking for and requesting information on costs. An RFP is much more specific and includes everything we are looking for and how we want the software to work. It is to his understanding that the purchasing department will not allow RFP's before the budget has been adopted. There is a tremendous amount of time that a vendor has to

put in for these proposals. Woolever stated there is a motion on the floor to move forward with an RFI early in 2011 and an RFP to be followed later on; and this would be the first project for this group. Workman asked if this would be specifically adopting 150% out of the land modernization fund and 175% out of the public access fund. Russell suggested 175% out of both funds just for 2012, so we have as much money as we need for next year. We can always cut it back in the future. Colbert added that if we take 175% out of the funds, it will leave about \$70,000 left over for 2012 for other things that may come up. He added the anticipated cost for the tax software is \$350,000. Orr added that we received that price from another county that recently purchased new software. Workman referred to the handout and asked if the projected totals are the numbers that we would be looking at for spending. Colbert added that the projects totals on the handout show what the balances of the funds are after the expenses. Workman added that what we can spend is the \$182,000 of the land modernization fees and the \$54,000 of the public access fees, which is not going to cover the new tax software. Colbert added that it covers the software when we go with the 50% rule [50% rule refers to 50% of costs for the software are to be covered by the affected department and the remaining 50% of costs come from the fees regulated by the Land Information Advisory Council]. Cotter added that he can support this for the first year, but he knows the 50% rule will be hard to sell to the county board with the budget. He added he would have a hard time going in front of the administrative review and asking for \$200,000 for this project. It will be a challenge and he wanted everyone to be aware of that. Woolever asked if there is a second to the motion to do an RFI early in 2011 followed by an RFP using 175% from each of the funds. Cotter stated he will second the motion if going to do 175% from both funds, but just for one year.

Russell and Cotter moved and seconded to move forward with an RFI in early 2011 followed by an RFP using 175% from both land information funds. Motion carried 10-0.

Rough cost estimates on future projects that have been identified. Colbert referred to page 8 of the Update to Land Records Modernization Plan: 2010 for the list of proposed projects. He stated that the web mapping application is up and running. He added they have some new widgets for the system they are working on and funds have already been allocated for these. GIS integration is up and running as well. They have started communicating with DPW on not only GIS but applications in the program they can write for them. There are no costs associated with this at this time. He added that it appears that we will be able to do the sign inventory in house, therefore, no costs associated with this program. As far as integration for other organizations, we have been approached by the City of Elkhorn to house their data and create a website for them that will be housed internally. He stated he would like this added to the agenda for the next meeting to discuss what we would like to do about this and what we are going to charge them. He will come back at the next meeting with more information on a tentative approach and what costs will be. He added that the council may want to look at doing this for other municipalities where they take advantage of our hardware and software. Training comes out of the land modernization fund, which we budgeted \$9,000 for. He added that they already have the automated training videos. We had also budgeted \$12,000 for scanning the historical aerial photos next year. Since there is a volunteer in Land Use and Resource Management, we may want to consider going in that direction, which could potentially save us some money. Also, the topographic maps update, as already mentioned by Bauer. Besides the tax system and a new system for Land Use and Resource Management, we do not have a lot of funds to be allocated for.

Discussion concerning additional future project ideas. Woolever referred to pages 27-28 of the agenda packet, which shows the current values of the land information accounts as of October 31, 2010. She asked if anyone has any ideas or suggestions on future projects. Cotter referred back to his earlier suggestion about having the setbacks added to parcels. He added this may be some thing to do in the future and would qualify as a new project. He also added that it may not be a bad idea to add the setbacks just for the parcels around the lakes. Colbert added he would like this information as he is currently working with Crispell Snyder and could talk with them to get ballpark costs for this. Cotter added that people will need to understand that they will still need to have a survey done and they will not be able to put emphasis on the setback information on the website. He stated that he tried to emphasize this to the Chair of the County Zoning Agency. He is not fully comfortable having all that information out there. It is a nice generalization, but it can be a problem when you are drawing lines on a 200 foot scale map. Russell added that what we need to determine is who are the people that are going to benefit from it and are they going to use it versus what the costs will be. Also, if it will lead people to mistakenly think they have more room than they actually do. Bauer added that they are going to have to have a survey done anyways, and as Russell stated, it will mislead people showing this on a 200 scale map. Bauer referred back to updating the topographic maps. He stated we have to give it some serious thought on how these maps are going to be updated. It can be done selectively, and another thing that can be addressed is the scale of the maps. The county may want to consider changing to the 100-foot scale maps because where changes have taken place is apt to be more densely developed. He suggested having the staff come back to the council with the alternatives on how to update these maps and the costs for doing so. He added this is going to have to be done in order to keep the foundational elements up to date. He added this does relate to problems we are discussing and he suggested not skipping over this in the plan. Orr added that they have not skipped over it; they do not have an answer today. Colbert added that what he plans on doing is talking with McDougal about this, draw up what the costs will be, and bring this back at a future meeting. Cotter added that having the 100-foot scale maps would benefit everyone. Colbert asked if annotations would help with the setback information. Cotter stated that it would help but knows people would use it improperly to make changes or additions to their properties. For example, an individual prints off a map from the GIS system and it shows the setbacks, therefore, they build their garage without getting the proper permit. Then, he would have to turn around and tell them to tear down the garage because the map they used was not accurate. Colbert stated that a disclaimer could be added to the system. Pruess stated that not everyone reads or sees the disclaimer. Cotter stated he understands and can appreciate the idea, but costs might outweigh the benefits. Pruess added that it may cause more problems down the road.

Kroupa added that anyone who is investing \$500,000-600,000 will have a due diligent period in their offer to purchase verifying that a survey will be completed which will show exactly where the footprint is and where they can build. This is part of the procedure. Cotter asked Kroupa if he can see an advantage of having this information out there. Kroupa stated that he thought that anyone who is selling property on the lake and who has experience doing that sort of thing will have an idea where the footprint is without having to look online. He added that he gives his buyers a general idea of where they can build just by looking at the houses on either side then verifies it with a survey. Russell asked if this is also regarding the substandard lots where people have said you can build anything on these lots even though it was never meant for someone to buy that few of lots. She added that this is going back to the 1920s and you were actually

supposed to buy five lots, not just one. Cotter added that he is speaking for Chair Stacey of the County Zoning Agency and he thinks it is everything that comes into the County Zoning Agency they want this done for. He added that he doesn't want to make the rule for the exceptions since there are a handful of people that come in that are not paying for a surveyor, are not having any type of representation for anything, and doing it on their own. He added he doesn't know if that is what we should be spending our money on to help those individuals. He added he had to bring this to the council on behalf of Chair Stacey of the County Zoning Agency. He also added that he thought the 100-scale maps are a great idea at least for the unincorporated areas the zoning agency deals with. It would also really benefit the public.

Bauer added that we are not going to update the topographic maps for the entire county as there is not enough money to do that. He stated that we could update a certain number of square miles each year where development has taken place. And as you update these, you can convert the maps in the rural areas from 200-foot scale to 100-foot scale. Municipalities are generally mapped at the 100-foot scale. The 200-foot scale maps for the rural areas are okay, but not as good. The county is not going to be able to do this for 2011 as it's too late, but some time in the future, the county may be able to do certain areas. You have to keep the foundational elements maintained just like any part of your infrastructure. He added that he thought this was the best approach to go about doing this. Woolever suggested to Colbert bringing back some ideas about updating these maps to the next meeting. Orr added that they will work with Cotter, pick an area for updating, and get some costs. Bauer added that he can give some representative costs and could help with that when the county is ready to do that. First we have to talk about ballpark figures, what kind of programs you might consider doing, and how many square miles you are going to be able to update. There is also going to be a difference if you go with the full topographic maps or by orthophotography. The planning department is going to have a voice in deciding this as well as the local government. Again, it is too late to do this for 2011, but have to keep in mind that the fly over is in March for orthophotography. Colbert added that he will work with McDougal, Cotter, and Dale Drayna, and he will come back with a proposal on what might be the plan for the next few years. He added we definitely need to work at this so it is not a dramatic hit on our funds.

Workman stated he is very interested in the historical aerial photos as they will be a great tool. He is also interested in the update to the topographic maps and building footprints. The Village of Fontana has had a lot of infrastructure development in the last five to seven years, and this development does not appear on the county system yet. He added that having these features will help. The Village of Fontana has a GIS system and went web-based last year. Colbert added that he would like to work with Workman and take a look at Fontana's system to get some ideas for the City of Elkhorn website. Workman added there were no other pressing projects that were not on the list. Bauer added that there were a number of projects on the list where he would have to question the utility of. He asked why we would want digital elevation and digital terrain models and bring them in house. Colbert stated that McDougal had suggested them. Bauer added that the digital elevation models are primarily used by photogrammetrists when they prepare orthophotographs. He added that if prioritized the list, these would be at the bottom of the list. He asked if you have the contours why you would want the terrain model. The terrain model was used to make the contours, therefore, why would you want to clutter your database with these. Bauer added these projects are going to have to be prioritized and brought back to this committee. Colbert added that they are counting on this group to assist with prioritizing the projects.

Reports/announcements by Chairperson. Woolever thanked everyone for coming and sharing their time as she knows everyone is very busy. She stated for next meeting's agenda, items will include prioritizing the list of proposed projects, updating topographic maps, and discussion about charges for the City of Elkhorn for housing their data. She asked everyone to forward her anything else they would like included on the next meeting's agenda.

Set/confirm next meeting date and time. The next meeting for the Land Information Advisory Council was scheduled for Wednesday, March 9, 2011 at 10:00 a.m.

Adjournment. On motion and second by Bauer and Orr, Chairperson Woolever adjourned the meeting at approximately 11:10 am.

Respectfully submitted by Nicole Hill, Recording Secretary for the Land Information Advisory Council. These minutes are not official until approved by the committee.

Lake Benedict/Tombeau District
P.O. Box 668
Genoa City, WI 53128

LAKES MANAGEMENT DISTRICT

Agenda for 4th quarter meeting November 20, 2010

Pledge of Allegiance

Meeting Called to Order: By: Robert Meyer 9:00 am

In attendance Larry Belenki, Rose Badame, attorney Kim Lewis and several lake district members. Bob Gerhing and Rose Nolan, Randall Town Board members, were in attendance.

Secretary's Report:

1. Reading of Minutes from third quarter meeting August 21 2010, minutes were approved.

Treasures Report:

1. Larry Belenki provided an update in regards to the Lake Districts current financial status.

Dam Update:

1. Water Levels. No current report

Water Quality:

1. No current report

2.

3. Nippersink Bowl project

Discussion occurred in respect to The Nippersink Bowl project. Several district members voiced their concern regarding the projects potential to have an adverse effect on Lake Benedict. A hand out was provided by Ruekert Mielke the engineering company responsible for the project explaining the purpose of the project and its design specifications.

A motion was made to request that the Town of Randall prohibit pumping of the bowl until question regarding water quality and flow rates can be answered. The motion was approved and seconded

A second motion was made requesting that the Town of Randall place on their agenda the Nippersink Bowl project and at meeting have a representative from Rubert Mielke engineering so that Lake District members can voice their concerns directly to the Randall Town Board. The motion was approved and seconded.

4. 2011 meeting schedule

1st quarter meeting: February 20, 2011;

2nd. Quarter meeting: May 15, 2011

Budget meeting; July 17, 2011

Annual meeting: August 21 2011

3rd. quarter meeting: August 21, 2011 immediately after Annual meeting

4th. Quarter meeting: November 20, 2011

All meeting to be held at the Bloomfield Village Hall at 9 am.

5. Motion to adjourn: Meeting adjourned 10:00 am.

Walworth County Human Resources Committee

MINUTES

November 17, 2010 – 3:00 p.m.

County Board Room 114 – Government Center
Elkhorn, Wisconsin

Draft

The meeting was called to order at approximately 3:27 p.m. by Chairperson Ingersoll.

Roll call – In attendance were Chairperson Ingersoll, Vice Chairperson Grant, Supervisors Redenius, Brandl and Wardle. A quorum was declared.

Others present – Supervisor Nancy Russell; David Bretl, County Administrator; Suzi Hagstrom, Labor/Employee Relations Director; Nicki Andersen, Deputy County Administrator – Finance; Dale Wilson, Payroll/Benefits Manager; Dave Graves, Sheriff; Kurt Picknell, Undersheriff; Linda Seemeyer, LHCC Superintendent/HHS Director; Liz Aldred, Deputy HHS Director; John Orr, Information Technology Director; Shane Crawford, Deputy County Administrator – Central Services; Jessica Lanser, Comptroller; Liza Drake, HS Supervisor – Crisis Intervention; Michael Cotter, LURM Director/Deputy Corporation Counsel; Bernie Janiszewski, LHCC Administrator; David Gerber, Lieutenant; Jay Maritz, Captain; Scott McClory, Captain; Donna McIntyre, Human Resources Specialist; Dr. Thompson, HHS Deputy Director; Chrissy Register – UW-Extension Department Head; Bill Chesen, Civil Service Board Member.

Approval of the agenda was moved and seconded by Supervisor Brandl and Vice Chairperson Grant, with no withdrawals, and carried 5 – 0.

Approval of the October 20, 2010 Human Resources committee minutes was moved and seconded by Supervisors Wardle and Brandl. The motion carried 5 – 0.

Public comment period – Bill Chesen, Citizen, stated that he has had the pleasure of serving on the Civil Service Board. He urged the committee to support the motions the Sheriffs Office is trying to put in place with the upcoming retirements, etc.

Discussion and possible action regarding 2011 wages and benefits for non-represented employees. Bretl explained that the committee had held this item last month pending the union contracts. The County has now reached settlements with all but one union for a 1% wage increase. Bretl urged the committee's approval of a 1% wage increase for non-represented employees as well.

DRAFT

Vice Chairperson Grant and Supervisor Wardle moved and seconded approving the resolution regarding 2011 wages and benefits for non-represented employees.

Supervisor Wardle asked about Union dues for represented employees. Hagstrom stated that the amount depends on the Union. Dues range from approximately \$20 to \$40 per month. Supervisor Wardle wondered if non-reps were paid the same as represented employees when you factor in the Union dues that represented employees must pay. Hagstrom stated that there are not any non-represented positions that are exactly the same as Union positions.

The motion carried 4 – 1. Supervisor Brandl opposed.

Amendment to Section 15-545 of the Walworth County Code of Ordinances Relating to Benefits Provided. Hagstrom explained that this ordinance would increase the basic life insurance coverage for non-represented employees to \$25,000, which was the same as the increase that was agreed to for the Unions. **Vice Chairperson Grant and Chairperson Ingersoll moved and seconded approving the amendment to 15-545 relating to benefits.** Vice Chairperson Grant asked if a person keeps the insurance once they leave employment with the county. Hagstrom stated that the insurance continues through the month of termination of employment plus the one month following; then they can choose to roll it into their own plan, but they would be completely responsible for the cost. Supervisor Wardle asked if the increase to \$25,000 was something the county had agreed to with AFSCME. Hagstrom said yes and explained that life insurance coverage for county employees ranges up to \$100,000, depending on the group. It is \$50,000 for management employees.

The motion carried 3 – 2. Supervisors Brandl and Redenius opposed.

Resolution Approving a Collective Bargaining Agreement by and between Walworth County and the Health and Human Service Professionals for the Period of January 1, 2011 to December 31, 2011. Hagstrom explained that this agreement is for one of the full contracts that was open. She pointed out that the agreement included a 1% wage increase and a stipend for dual certification in AODA. Aldred stated that the AODA and mental health units see many of the same clients, so they are duplicating services. There are two separate treatment plans and two separate assessments. The department is asking the mental health clinicians to be certified in both AODA and mental health, so as to serve more individuals and provide more clinically appropriate services. This benefits both the agency and the consumer. Each person identified in a specific group would have the opportunity to achieve the subspecialty and receive \$100 per month to maintain the certification. **Vice Chairperson Grant and Supervisor Wardle moved and seconded approving the Collective Bargaining Agreement by and between Walworth County and the Health and Human Service Professionals for the Period of January 1, 2011**

DRAFT

to **December 31, 2011**. Vice Chairperson Grant asked how many of the employees are currently certified. Aldred stated that out of seven employees, two are currently dually certified. There are three others who are in the process of becoming dually certified. Vice Chairperson Grant asked if the goal is to have all of the mental health clinicians dually certified. Aldred said yes. Seemeyer added that 85% of their clients are diagnosed with mental health and AODA problems. Supervisor Wardle asked if it costs \$1200 to become certified. Aldred stated that it costs \$100-200 annually, as there is training to maintain the certification, but the cost would vary per person. Seemeyer explained that it is an incentive for employees to earn and maintain the certifications. Aldred clarified that employees will only receive the \$100 per month stipend if their certification is active. Bretl pointed out that employees with the dual certification can help the department draw down more revenues. Supervisor Russell asked about the cost of the exam. Drake stated that the exam costs the employee \$265. Aldred pointed out that the employee has to pay for the application, etc. Supervisor Wardle asked if there would be \$1200 of cost savings realized by the county given that they were looking to offer a \$1200 incentive to employees. Aldred stated that the county would see more than \$1200 in additional revenue because we can serve more people and reduce other expensive services. Seemeyer pointed out that all of the employees getting dually certified are master's prepared, and the county can bill higher for master's positions. Bretl stated that in this case, it may seem counterintuitive because the county is paying the employee more, but the county is getting more revenue back. He also added that there are high qualifications necessary in terms of credentials. Aldred stated that if the master's prepared employees are not certified in AODA, the department has AODA employees, but because those employees are not master's prepared, the county gets less reimbursement.

The motion carried 5 – 0.

Resolution Approving a Collective Bargaining Agreement by and between Walworth County and the Deputy Sheriffs Association for the Period of January 1, 2011 to December 31, 2011. Hagstrom explained that this is the other full contract that was open. The agreement is very straightforward. The 1% wage increase was the only economic issue. **Vice Chairperson Grant and Supervisor Brandl moved and seconded approving the Collective Bargaining Agreement by and between Walworth County and the Deputy Sheriffs Association for the Period of January 1, 2011 to December 31, 2011.** Supervisor Russell questioned the item referring to holiday pay and Alpine Valley. She pointed out that currently, Alpine must reimburse the county for those hours, but that is not in the contract. Supervisor Russell wanted to make sure the county is still covered. Bretl stated that Alpine's business license states that Alpine must pay those expenses. The Union contract just says that the employees get paid. Supervisor Russell asked if the county's service at Alpine would cease if the payment from Alpine ceased.

DRAFT

Bretl stated that we would have to pay deputies if we sent them to Alpine to work on a holiday. Picknell assured that Alpine would not be “let off the hook” in terms of reimbursement, as was the case this past July 4th. The county is fully reimbursed. Supervisor Russell just wanted to make sure that the county is not creating a scenario where we are not being reimbursed. Supervisor Wardle was concerned with the amount of sick time and vacation time deputies can accrue. He thought it seemed like a lot. Hagstrom stated that the accruals are the same for other units as well, not just the deputies. Bretl pointed out that while that does look like a long time to have off, most of the workforce doesn’t use up all of their time. When the committee is being asked to refill positions, this is a good thing to look at. This is very germane to the discussions. Supervisor Wardle asked if they had ever considered negotiating a paid time off bank that would combine sick and vacation time. He thought this might be something to look at next year. Bretl agreed that the paid time off concept is something the county needs to look at. The county ended retiree insurance for new hires after 2005, so there is an incentive to use up sick leave since an employee would not get anything for their sick leave when they leave the county’s employ. In the past, employees could convert sick leave into health insurance credits. Some employees who have been here a long time have 7 hours of sick leave while others have 200 hours. Supervisor Wardle noted that the sick leave accumulation is unlimited. **The motion carried 5 – 0.**

Resolution Approving a Collective Bargaining Agreement Re-Opener by and between Walworth County and AFSCME Locals 1925, 1925A, 1925B and 1925C for the Period of January 1, 2011 to December 31, 2011. Vice Chairperson Grant and Supervisor Wardle moved and seconded approving the Collective Bargaining Agreement Re-Opener by and between Walworth County and AFSCME Locals 1925, 1925A, 1925B and 1925C for the Period of January 1, 2011 to December 31, 2011. Hagstrom explained that the four AFSCME units were all included in the one resolution. AFSCME had a re-opener on WRS, wages and insurance for the second year of their two-year contract. The agreement includes a 1% wage increase. **The motion carried 5 – 0.**

Discussion and possible action regarding releasing one or more positions “frozen” pursuant to Section 15-3 (b) of the Code in the following departments:

- UW-Extension – Clerk III position. Bretl suggested that the committee begin by making a motion to consider all unfreezings; then they can make a motion on each individual position to unfreeze it. **Supervisors Brandl and Wardle moved and seconded considering all of the position unfreezings.** Bretl asked the committee to keep in mind that this is an attempt to be proactive to keep the budget in check. The idea is to make corrections as we go along. The committee’s feelings may change as the state makes decisions. Bretl feels that even if the committee chooses to unfreeze everything, the process is still a good

DRAFT

one because they learn about vacancies. The committee has many options when it comes to the unfreezing requests: they can choose to unfreeze a position; they can choose to hold off on refilling it and see how the department does with the vacancy; they can specify that a position be refilled internally. Regester explained that the Clerk III position in UW-Extension had been filled, but the incumbent recently took a position in a different department. Currently, there are two county employees in Extension, and the rest of department is state employees. In the recent past, there had been three county employees, but after a retirement, a position was transferred to the state. The state pays for 60% of the employee's salary and benefits. As the department was considering the position, they looked at how it would look without refilling the position. Extension provides services and education to communities to reach needs. Currently, without this position, the educators are doing more clerical work than educating. Regester is coming to the committee to request this unfreezing so that the educators can be out in the community doing what they should be doing. Supervisor Wardle asked if this position is mostly clerical. Regester said yes. Supervisor Wardle wondered about the possibility of outsourcing given the amount it would cost to hire someone as a county employee. Regester stated that there are some counties that have outsourced. One of the concerns is that they are having to send out different things to be done. Regester pointed out that as they educate the community through different programs, they bring in some revenue, but if they are stuck in the office tackling clerical duties, they cannot be out in the community educating. Chairperson Ingersoll asked about the requirements for the position. Hagstrom stated that a Clerk III would require a high school diploma and a couple of years of clerical experience. The starting pay is about \$16 per hour. Supervisor Russell suggested using a volunteer and seeing how that works out first. If that doesn't work out, they could always decide to hire someone later. Supervisor Russell pointed out that if this is a clerical position, there is probably not a great deal of training required. Regester stated that they already have volunteers coming in to do things, so they could definitely take a look at that. Supervisor Brandl asked how long the position had been vacant. Hagstrom stated that it had been vacant for three months in 2009 and essentially the whole summer in 2010. Supervisor Brandl asked if there was any way that Extension [the State] would pay for this position. Regester explained that Extension doesn't support the support staff positions. Supervisor Brandl asked if it was possible for this position to be part-time. Chairperson Ingersoll asked if the position was seasonal, i.e. is the position utilized more so after during the fair, etc. Regester stated that there is definitely a slow period after the fair. That is when they focus on getting programs ready for the next year. Regester felt that a part-time position might be possible, but she pointed out that state employees are furloughed. If the part-time employee was not in the office, and the state employees were on furlough, the office would have

DRAFT

to be closed. Regester stated that they do try to scatter the furloughs so that everyone is not out of the office on the same day. Regester stated that they could look at a part-time position. Hagstrom stated that they could have a differing schedule to make sure that the office was staffed. Regester added that the vacant position provides clerical support for essentially six people. That would be a lot of work for one part-time person. During the fair period, they need someone in the office on a full-time basis because everyone else is working at the fair. Vice Chairperson Grant expressed that he didn't think it was a major concern if the phone went unanswered in the Extension office during the fair. Regester stated that there are many people who depend on them, and if there is some sort of 4-H emergency, there needs to be someone in the office. Vice Chairperson Grant asked how much trouble it would be to have two part-time employees. Because of them being part-time employees, the county would be relieved of providing benefits. Hagstrom pointed out that a 0.5 FTE was still eligible for insurance, but the employee would have to pay half of the premium. Vice Chairperson Grant suggested that by having two 0.4 FTE positions, they would not be eligible for insurance. Bretl did not recommend that as a long-term solution. By doing that, the county may be ruling out quality employees who don't want a part-time position. Bretl stated that they could supplement with contract services, etc. Supervisor Wardle asked what would happen if the position is outsourced and the department is not happy with the person who comes in. Bretl stated that there have been cases where the outsourced person shines in a position. Vice Chairperson Grant pointed out that with outsourcing, there could actually be a different person in the position all the time. Hagstrom stated that if it is going to be a permanent part-time position, they are more likely to get the same contracted person for the duration. She added that other departments have experimented with limited-term employees, but the problem is that the county ends up having to pay their unemployment once they leave. **Supervisor Wardle and Vice Chairperson Grant moved and seconded trying to outsource the position.** Chairperson Ingersoll asked Regester what her preference would be if the choices were outsourcing or using a volunteer. Regester stated that it would all depend on the person. Vice Chairperson Grant would like Regester to come back to the committee 30 to 60 days from now to let the committee know how it is working out with the outsourced worker. Regester stated that if they can get a person in the position who is consistent, they would definitely be able to tell how it is working. Her main concern is that she doesn't want it to impact programming. Chairperson Ingersoll asked the difference between outsourcing and part-time. Hagstrom stated that they would most likely pay an agency \$17-20 per hour for a clerical position. A part-time county employee with no benefits would cost the county approximately \$30,000-\$35,000 with WRS, FICA, workers comp, etc. In addition, the employee would progress through the pay scale. Supervisor Brandl

DRAFT

was concerned about whether or not the person was going to be bonded if they are responsible for handling money. Bretl stated that there were a couple of alternatives to that. There are other people in Extension who can receipt money, or it could be made part of the contract. Chairperson Ingersoll thanked Register for doing an excellent job with her report to the committee. Vice Chairperson Grant reiterated that if the committee approves of outsourcing the position, he would like Register to come back in the next month or two to let the committee know how it is working. If it is not working, they will need to do something else. Register asked about hiring an LTE who had two other jobs, meaning that unemployment would not be an issue. Bretl stated that is uncharted territory. He felt that a review period is a good idea. He thought they should give it at least 60, and maybe even 90, days to give it a fair evaluation. He would not recommend eliminating the position at this point. Bretl stated that they may have to do budget amendments to make the wages available for contracted services. Vice Chairperson Grant does not want them to do any budget amendments. Bretl clarified that the budget amendment would be to allow using wages for purchased services. **Supervisor Wardle amended his earlier motion to include a review of outsourcing the position at the February meeting. The motion carried 4 – 1. Chairperson Ingersoll opposed.**

- Sheriff's Office – The Sheriff requested to address the captain position first. Chairperson Ingersoll okayed the change. The Sheriff explained that this position as captain of support services will become vacant in January when Captain Maritz retires. They need to get the new captain on board to begin training. Vice Chairperson Grant asked for clarification on which position this is. He thought that Captain Williams had been promoted to fill the position in question. The Sheriff explained that Captain Maritz has been doing both communications and support services since Captain Schiefelbein left the county's employ. Vice Chairperson Grant pointed out that when the Sheriff was requesting to promote Williams to Captain, he had stated that not all of the work was being completed. Captain Maritz stated that when he was doing both jobs, the essential duties were being done, and non-essential duties are being postponed. Things like working on ways to make things more efficient were not being done. Performance evaluations were not a high priority either, so those were not being completed on a timely basis. When Captain Schiefelbein was in communications, Captain Maritz was able to start making changes in support services, but then Captain Schiefelbein retired. At that time, Captain Maritz had to stop his work on the records management system. The new captain will be the system administrator, so he or she will have to be trained. The Sheriff is requesting the position be filled early so that the incumbent can begin working with the new captain on the different aspects of the job. Vice Chairperson Grant asked about the promotion

DRAFT

taking effect on January 4th. The Sheriff explained that two lieutenants had been promoted at the same time, but one of them was told that his promotion wasn't effective until January (when Captain Maritz retires). Supervisor Brandl asked if it was more important to keep a patrolman on the road or to fill the captain position. The Sheriff stated that for the command staff, this captain position is the most important. Supervisor Wardle questioned whether this will make the Sheriff come back in the future to fill the two patrol vacancies. The Sheriff reminded the committee of the study he had passed out a while back. He stated that the activity hasn't decreased since that study was done, and the study had said the county needed more patrolmen then. Vice Chairperson Grant asked what would happen to the duties if the captain position was approved but the lieutenant position was not. He questioned whether the duties would be assigned to a sergeant. The Sheriff was not sure how they would handle that situation. He was concerned that doing so would mean assigning non-union duties to a union employee, which would then involve a reclassification. Hagstrom further explained that the employee would argue that they are doing lieutenant work, so they should get lieutenant pay. Supervisor Wardle was concerned that if these positions are approved, and the state makes budget cuts, we will have to make further cuts next year. Supervisor Wardle questioned whether the Sheriff's office would take a 5% pay cut because they need all of the employees they have. The Sheriff stated that they can certainly look at things, as there will definitely be a budget crunch in 2012. The Sheriff feels that these are not the positions to say no to in the Sheriff's organization. He needs these positions. The Sheriff's office has suffered cuts like other departments have. Picknell stated that the department has a history of looking to consolidate. Supervisor Wardle's concern is for the overall budget, and he stated that something is going to have to change. **Supervisor Wardle and Vice Chairperson Grant moved and seconded approval of unfreezing the captain position. The motion carried 5 – 0.**

- Boat patrol LTEs. The Sheriff explained that they had contracted with the town of Whitewater to do the boat patrol, and the town would like them do it again. The positions are paid for by a DNR program. The County, however, has to pay for psychological evaluations and physicals for the new employees. They are requesting six LTEs. Captain McClory was confident that three of the six LTEs from this year would be returning next year, so they would not have to have new evaluations done. He added that these positions don't get overtime. Most of the LTEs already work somewhere else. Chairperson Ingersoll questioned why they would begin recruiting in November for the summer season. Picknell stated that the lake patrol is unique. If they look for the employees early, they have a better pick of the candidates. They would like the flexibility to begin looking for the candidates soon. The positions would typically start in April/May. Bretl pointed

DRAFT

out that they come very close to breaking even with the boat patrol. Picknell stated that the expenses were less than had been anticipated. Supervisor Russell was concerned that there are going to be big changes in the state, and it is common for DNR to be the first to suffer cuts. Supervisor Russell suggested that if the funds come from DNR, perhaps the committee wants to make this provisional on having the DNR or Whitewater fund the positions so that the county doesn't get stuck paying for them. Picknell stated that the Town of Whitewater gets the funding from the DNR, then the county bills Whitewater. If the DNR stopped paying, the Town of Whitewater would be responsible, and they would have to decide what to do. Captain McClory explained that the town had budgeted for a certain amount, and the county has to work within their budgeting constraints. Supervisor Redenius asked how many hours are spent patrolling the lake. Picknell stated that the boat patrol is typically only out on the lake on the weekends, but they did send them out a few times during the week to throw people off. Captain McClory stated that the contract didn't specify hours, so they kept an internal schedule. Supervisor Brandl asked if the \$2000 cost for the psychological evaluations and physicals could be added into the contract. The Sheriff said they could talk to Whitewater about that. Supervisor Redenius stated that he had heard everything went well this past summer with the boat patrol. **Vice Chairperson Grant and Supervisor Brandl moved and seconded the unfreezing of the boat patrol position, with the stipulation that they would try to work the cost of the physicals and evaluations into the contract with Whitewater. The motion carried 5 – 0.**

- Lieutenant position – (Chairperson Ingersoll left at 4:45 p.m., but returned at 4:51 p.m.). The Sheriff explained that Lieutenant Gerber, who will become the captain of support services as of January 4th, is currently in the lieutenant position they are requesting to unfreeze. Supervisor Brandl stated that if the Sheriff comes back in the future, the committee may not approve the patrol positions. He added that everyone is under pressure, and they have to look to make cuts. Picknell stated that they view this position as a priority. Supervisor Wardle asked why the position had to be filled with a lieutenant. Picknell stated that lieutenants are non-represented employees, whereas once you get to sergeants and deputies, they are Union employees. The Sheriff explained that this position was reclassified by the state to be non-union because of the decisions they make. Because there are administrative duties, federal regulations dictate that the position must be non-union. This position has independent decision-making authority. Supervisor Wardle asked about what the position entails. Lieutenant Gerber explained that there is the supervisory aspect – the position oversees the six deputies in court security. He added that two of the court security deputies have been on leave, so he has been helping to cover for them. This position is also in charge of training

DRAFT

for the department. The lieutenant makes sure everyone in the department gets in their 24 hours of required training. In addition, the position is responsible for training on any piece of equipment the department uses. This also includes the field training program for new recruits; the lieutenant coordinates the training to make sure they are up-to-speed. The position is also in charge of all ammunition, etc. The lieutenant also oversees a use of force committee that ensures the department is abiding by the use of force procedures. Lieutenant Gerber is currently the assistant manager of the SWAT team, which he will continue to do as captain. Lastly, the Lieutenant is responsible for the overall operations of the shooting range. **Supervisors Brandl and Wardle moved and seconded the unfreezing of the lieutenant position. The motion carried 5 – 0.**

(The committee took a brief break at 5:02 p.m. and returned at 5:05 p.m.).

- Health and Human Services – HHS is requesting to unfreeze two HS Specialist I positions and one HS Specialist III position in the crisis unit. Seemeyer distributed a financial assessment. She explained that this is a 24/7 unit, and these are the employees who are responsible for deciding who meets the statutory requirements for a commitment when a police officer brings someone in. With benefits, each position costs approximately \$79,000, but the department expects to recoup \$10,000, for a net cost of \$69,000. The HS Specialist III position is a master's position that costs more but can bill more. The net cost of that position is \$59,000. Seemeyer explained that emergency detentions allow staff to place someone on a 72-hour hold. These detentions are very costly but are state-mandated. Transportation is another cost associated with such detentions. Transportation can cost anywhere from \$324 to \$1155. In order for the HS Specialist I positions to pay for themselves, they would have to prevent 20 emergency detentions. In 2006, Walworth County had 426 emergency detentions. Milwaukee County was the only county in the state who had more. The county has reduced the number of emergency detentions by 155 in 2009. This does not count protective custodies. Seemeyer feels that these are positions that pay for themselves and then some. They save the county a great deal of money in hospital costs. Aldred pointed out that the original cover memo had stated that they wanted early implementation for these positions, but that is no longer the case. She added that they are upgrading HS Worker IVs to HS Specialist Is in the 2011 budget and explained that they have not hired anyone who doesn't hold a bachelor's degree. Aldred further explained that they have five staff members budgeted for the after hours coverage. They also have three casuals at 0.3 FTE. These positions cover all after hours, holidays and weekends. Quite often, there is only one person working. These employees are independent clinical responders to some of the most high-risk clients. By state statute, the county is required to

DRAFT

provide crisis intervention services to anyone in our county, even if they are not residents. In addition to mandated services, the county provides medication monitoring, which helps to reduce hospitalizations. These employees also provide CPS backup, handle all after-hour access reports, provide on-call services, and complete risk assessments at the jail. If, for example, someone is suicidal, they do assessments and decide what to do with the person. Before the law changed last year, law enforcement made the decision if a person was hospitalized or not, but now HHS decides. Aldred added that the department has employees who can provide case management to those people who can't make it in during daytime hours. As of December, crisis intervention is in charge of investigating elder at-risk cases. If a family has been accused of abuse or neglect, these staff member can reach them after hours when they are more likely to be at home. Currently, the unit has been using casual staff to fill in the positions. However, the casual employees do not have to come in when called. Full-time coverage during off-hours is very important. Supervisor Wardle questioned why the county must pay when someone is placed in emergency detention. Seemeyer explained that it is state-mandated. Aldred added that the person is supposed to reimburse the county, but many of them don't have the money or insurance coverage for that. Even if they do have insurance coverage, the county pays the portion that the insurance won't. Supervisor Brandl asked if the department could make it work with four people instead of five. Aldred stated that they are covering a lot of hours with weekends and holidays. If an employee had to take someone to the hospital, it might leave no one in the office. An employee could spend five hours of their shift at the hospital with a client. Supervisor Wardle asked for clarification on the positions previously being classified as HS Worker IVs. Seemeyer stated that they want to have a bachelor degreed person in the position (HS Worker IVs do not have to have a bachelor's degree). Also, AFSCME only requires a six-month probationary period, and they would like one year for these positions. Drake added that the state statute says that the department can't bill for mobility services if the employee does not have a bachelor's degree. Supervisor Wardle reiterated that having a qualified person in these positions theoretically saves the county money. Aldred pointed out that the county's certification requires that the department has walk-in services covered by a master degreed employee eight hours a day, five days a week. Aldred also added that the state is going to be implementing a program providing early intervention services for children, and the crisis intervention workers would be able to do that. This would be an additional duty for those employees. Drake stated that would be much more difficult with only four employees. Seemeyer explained that they are willing to compromise. They have outsourced transportation, but they need these positions. If they don't have qualified people in these positions, it will end up costing the county more money. Vice

DRAFT

Chairperson Grant and Chairperson Ingersoll moved and seconded unfreezing the HS Specialist I positions. Supervisor Wardle asked about the crisis intervention lead worker position. Aldred stated that Drake is the supervisor for that position. The lead worker is a union position that would be there to provide consultation and backup/additional support. The level of decisions that they are asking these employees to make is very high. Vice Chairperson Grant asked what would happen if the committee did not approve the lead worker position. Drake stated that without the lead worker position, they would not be able run the collaborative response program. This lead worker position would be the person to funnel in all referrals and assessments. The estimate provided for billing is a very low estimate. Supervisor Brandl pointed out that either way, citizens are still paying for this, as taxpayers, through Medicaid. Seemeyer concurred and stated they can either ask for more federal aid or more property tax. Bretl stated that the county's program is one that has been recognized by the state, and he has a great deal of confidence in the program. He pointed out that if a phone goes unanswered, it could turn into a life threatening situation. Supervisor Brandl asked if the lead worker position could pick up some of the slack of a fifth person in the unit. Aldred stated that if she had to choose, she would choose to fill the lead worker position. She feels very strongly that there needs to be someone on shift with clinical background/training to do assessments. Vice Chairperson Grant asked if the positions could be filled from within. Aldred stated that there is a good chance they would be able to fill the HS Specialist I positions from within, but they don't know about the HS Specialist III (lead worker). Hagstrom stated that this department is always thinking ahead and looking at how they might move things around depending on who fills the positions. **The motion to unfreeze the HS Specialist I positions carried 4 – 1. Supervisor Brandl opposed. Vice Chairperson Grant and Chairperson Ingersoll moved and seconded unfreezing the lead worker position as well. The motion carried 4 – 1. Supervisor Brandl opposed.**

- Lakeland Health Care Center (0.20 FTE CNA; 0.50 FTE LPN; 0.50 FTE RN; 0.20 FTE RN; 1.00 FTE Food Service Manager) – Janiszewski distributed additional information. She explained that she is not opposed to outsourcing. They started with janitors and laundry, and most recently, they have begun outsourcing dietary. Dietary is a little different because there are more rules and regulations. By law, they still need a food service manager. While there is still room to make changes, they need a manager who understands the department. With the nursing department, however, outsourcing is not the right way to go. Many of the CNA positions they are looking to fill are 0.2 or 0.5 FTEs. With RN and LPN positions, outsourcing is much more expensive. She added that the RN position they are asking for is directly attributed to the medical unit. Typically,

DRAFT

there are 8-10 residents in that unit, but currently there are 15. Those people come into the facility with hopes of returning to the community. If the committee were to suggest that they try outsourcing the nursing department, she would suggest only outsourcing the full-time positions. Those are the positions that are more costly for the agency. She does not suggest outsourcing positions on the memory care unit. Bretl pointed out that the food service manager and the 0.5 FTE RN were included in the 2011 budget, which was just approved. He recommended approving those positions. With respect to the nursing home, he pointed out that it is a non-mandated county service. If the county is going to be in the nursing home business, they should do it right. As far as outsourcing, he explained that unless they are outsourcing full-time positions, they are not gaining much. The food service manager position was created with the goal of outsourcing portions of the operation, but they cannot do that with how the position is currently staffed. There will be a short-term cost but long-term savings. Hagstrom clarified that the food service manager and 0.5 FTE RN position were created with the adopted budget, but the other positions are vacancies, not new positions, so they were already included in the budget. Supervisor Brandl asked about the 65 FTEs for CNAs. Janiszewski explained that is FTEs, not actual bodies. Supervisor Brandl asked how many full-time CNAs there are. Hagstrom estimated that there were approximately 30 full-time CNAs, but they could confirm that information. Supervisor Brandl asked if there were any way to move the positions around. Hagstrom stated that the 0.2 FTE is an every other weekend position. The Union contract states that the employees get every other weekend off, so the 0.2 FTE switches off. Supervisor Wardle asked if part-time county employees were less expensive than outsourcing. Bretl stated that the 0.2 FTEs were definitely less expensive because they are not eligible for insurance. The 0.5 FTEs, while eligible for insurance, probably wouldn't take it because of the cost. Bretl stated that the problem with outsourcing the food service manager was that there are still employees in that unit, and having outsourced employees supervise county employees hasn't always worked out. With food service at the jail, the five county Union employees who had been in food service were moved to other positions when food service was outsourced. If the county outsources, we have to find a place for the displaced Union employees. If people retire or quit, their positions can be eliminated, which makes it easier to move to outsourcing. Janiszewski added that with housekeeping at LHCC, outsourced staff can take on more duties than Union employees can. It just takes time to get to the point of outsourcing through attrition. In terms of outsourcing food service at LHCC, having someone put the plan together is one of the major issues, Bretl explained. Currently, the LHCC has an in-house dietician, but the concern is whether or not they can sustain that. Supervisor Russell asked if the manager position could be filled with an at-will

DRAFT

employee so that if the workers were replaced, and they were looking to outsource the food service manager, they could just eliminate the position. Bretl stated that the manager is a non-represented position, so they would be free to let that person go as they wish. Chairperson Ingersoll asked how many employees are under the food service lead worker. Janiszewski stated there are 13.88 FTEs food service workers and 2.0 FTEs cook IIs. This new position will have a varied schedule, so if there is a problem with coverage, they will help take care of that. Bretl urged that there needs to be a plan with respect to food service. Janiszewski stated that the food service manager will be able to look at the department to see where to make cuts. **Supervisor Wardle and Vice Chairperson Grant moved and seconded unfreezing the food service manager position and returning in six months with a plan of attack as part of that employee's probation. The motion carried 5 – 0. Vice Chairperson Grant and Supervisor Wardle moved and seconded all of the other requested positions at LHCC.**

Supervisor Brandl reminded the committee that they have been asked to bring the budget in line for next year, and he feels as though they are failing miserably. Vice Chairperson Grant disagreed. Bretl does not feel like the committee is failing; they sent one position back to the drawing board. It is the small steps that will help them reach their goal. He feels that the committee is sending a message. Supervisor Brandl thought that perhaps if the committee says no now, the department could come back in six months if it is still not working, and the committee could address it then. With respect to unfreezing requests, Bretl suggested taking a month off to slow down a bit. Bretl stated that the committee will need to look at what they would cut. He feels that some positions just can't be cut, like those in the crisis unit. He feels that the committee is asking very good questions. Vice Chairperson Grant pointed out that when he started on the board, there were 1500 county employees, and now we are down to 850. He is unsure of what else can possibly be cut. Seemeyer stated that she is asking her managers to cut wherever they can. Vice Chairperson Grant added that the county may have to start cutting non-mandated services. Supervisor Wardle asked what would happen if they didn't fill the RN position. Janiszewski stated that they would have to stop admitting to the rehabilitation unit because those residents typically come in the late afternoon, and there would be no one to admit them. Currently, those hours are being covered by overtime. Chairperson Ingersoll asked about how many of the half-time FTEs take the insurance. Wilson said almost none of them. Typically, an employee doesn't take the insurance until they are at least a 0.8 FTE. **The motion to unfreeze the remaining LHCC positions carried 4 – 1. Supervisor Brandl opposed.**

The next meeting of the human resources committee was confirmed for January 19, 2011 at 3:00 p.m. Hagstrom will bring the market study to the committee at that time. There

DRAFT

will be no December meeting. Hagstrom will let department heads know that unfreezing requests will have to wait until January.

Adjournment. On motion and second by Supervisors Brandl and Wardle, Chairperson Ingersoll adjourned the meeting at approximately 6:24 p.m.

Respectfully submitted by Tammy Werblow, assistant to the county administrator.
These minutes are subject to approval by the committee.

Walworth County Lakeland Health Care Center Board of Trustees
MINUTES

November 17, 2010 Meeting – 1:00 p.m.

Walworth County Meeting Room 111
Government Center – Elkhorn, Wisconsin

The meeting was called to order by Chairman Grant at 1:03 p.m.

Roll call – Committee members present included Chairman Grant, Supervisors Hawkins, Ingersoll and Redenius. Supervisor Schaefer was excused. A quorum was declared.

Others present – Linda Seemeyer, Director of Health and Human Services/Lakeland Health Care Center Superintendent; Elizabeth Aldred, Deputy Director of Health and Human Services; David Thompson, Deputy Director of Health and Human Services; Juliet Young, Health and Human Services; Bernadette Janiszewski, Lakeland Health Care Center Administrator, Ella Eva Pious, Citizen Representative Health and Human Services, David Bretl, County Administrator, Nancy Russell, County Board Chairperson, Nicole Andersen, Deputy Counsel Administrator – Finance, Michael Cotter, Corporation Counsel

Public in attendance – There two members of the public present.

There were no agenda withdrawals. **Supervisor(s) Hawkins/Ingersoll moved to approve the agenda. Motion carried 4–0.**

The Lakeland Health Care Center Board of Trustees committee minutes of the October 20, 2010 meeting were approved. **Motion and second made by Supervisor(s) Hawkins/Ingersoll to approve the minutes. Motion carried 4–0.**

Public Comment – There were no comments from the public.

Unfinished Business – There were no items of unfinished business.

New Business –

Should Registered Sex Offenders be Denied Admission to LHCC - Ms. Janiszewski is asking the board to decide whether convicted sex offenders should be denied admission to the Lakeland Health Care Center. In addition, should Walworth County conduct criminal background checks on each applicant for admission? There has not been an issue with a sex offender at LHCC. There was an issue where a hospital wanted to place a patient at LHCC who was a registered sex offender. That admission was denied due no open beds. Michael Cotter from Corporation Counsel advised the board that sex offenders are not a protected class and therefore can legally be denied admission. Mr. Cotter is concerned about liability issues with admitting sex offenders.

Supervisor Hawkins asked if an ordinance was needed to deny admission to sex offenders at Lakeland Health Care Center. Mr. Cotter stated it would be better to have the policy as an ordinance.

Supervisor Ingersoll asked about clarification on the liability issue. Mr. Cotter described a hypothetical situation where LHCC knowingly admitted a registered sex offender and something bad happened that there could be liability issues for the facility.

Supervisor Grant stated that registered sex offenders need to live with the decisions they have made and should not receive consideration for placement.

County Board Chairperson Russell asked if persons convicted of theft or assault could also be denied admission.

Ms. Janiszewski stated she would be concerned with staff making decisions regarding charges other than registered sex offenders.

Mr. Bretl stated it would be a slippery slope to go beyond sex offenders. He urged caution if moving beyond sex offenders.

Supervisor Grant asked if people convicted of crimes other than sex offenses are considered a protected class. Mr. Cotter would have to look into this issue.

Motion and second made by Supervisors Hawkins and Ingersoll to move forward with an ordinance to deny admission to all registered sex offenders and proceed with background checks for all admittance. Motion carried 4-0.

Ms. Janiszewski asked for clarification on whether the ten dollar charge for the criminal background checks would be paid by LHCC or the potential resident. Supervisor Hawkins stated that LHCC should pay the charge.

Supervisor Ingersoll ask if any background checks are done at this time. Ms. Janiszewski stated they were not done on residents, but were done on staff every four years per the state statute.

Ms. Seemeyer asked how long it takes to process a criminal background check. Ms. Janiszewski stated they are done electronically and it takes about 15 minutes.

Supervisor Grant presented a hypothetical situation involving theft of a resident's valuables and asked if room searches are prohibited. Ms. Janiszewski stated that the laws regarding investigating cases of alleged misappropriation of resident property became more strict in March and searches are allowed.

Supervisor Grant asked if law enforcement was called on thefts. Ms. Janiszewski stated they have called the authorities on a few occasions.

Beauty Shop Services at LHCC - Ms. Janiszewski stated there is one part-time beautician and they are not able to meet the needs of the residents.

Supervisor Grant asked if the family can make arrangements to have another beautician come to the facility. Ms. Janiszewski stated they would need a copy of the liability insurance coverage and that coverage should meet the county standards.

Supervisor Grant asked if the part time position can be bid out. Ms. Janiszewski stated it cannot because it is a union position. She is asking the board to consider Walworth County soliciting bids from outside vendors to provide additional beautician and barber services. Supervisor Grant also asked about the rates for beauty services. Ms. Janiszewski stated that the board decides the rates and the rates are lower than most places in the public. Ms. Janiszewski added that a contract provider would set their own rates.

Supervisor Grant asked if the motion is approved how notification would be sent out. Ms. Janiszewski stated this would go through the Purchasing department.

County Board Chairperson Russell asked if the residents pay for beauty services. Janiszewski stated that they do.

Motion and second made by Supervisors Hawkins and Redenius to solicit bids for beautician and barber services and to allow outside vendors to provide beauty shop services in-house. Motion carried 4-0.

Reports –

LHCC Administrator's Report and Financial Update – Ms. Janiszewski reported that the LHCC is on track with regard to budget. Ms. Janiszewski handed out the October income statement summary. All the finances are on target with the budget.

Supervisor Grant asked if minor work compensation injuries of staff are documented in case the injury becomes a major health issue. Ms. Janiszewski stated that this is encouraged.

Supervisor Grant asked if deaths are considered discharges. Ms. Janiszewski stated that they are. However, on the monthly reports provided to the Trustees, it is a separate statistic.

Correspondence – There were no correspondences.

Announcements – Chairman Grant wishes everyone a Happy Thanksgiving.

Next Meeting Date – The next meeting is tentatively scheduled for January 19, 2011 at 1:00 p.m.

Adjournment – **On motion and second by Supervisor(s) Hawkins/Redenius, Chair Grant adjourned the meeting at approximately 1:28PM. Motion carried 4-0.**

Enclosure 1

Submitted by Juliet Young, Recorder. Meeting minutes are not considered final until approved by the committee at the next regularly scheduled meeting.

Walworth County Health and Human Services Committee

MINUTES

November 17, 2010 Meeting – 1:00 p.m.

Walworth County Board Room
Government Center – Elkhorn, Wisconsin

The meeting was called to order by Chairman Grant at 1:29 p.m.

Roll call – Committee members present included Supervisors Grant, Hawkins, Ingersoll and Redenius; and Citizen Members Pious and Seegers. Supervisor Schaefer and Citizen Member Troemel were excused. A quorum was declared.

Others present – Linda Seemeyer, Director of Health and Human Services/Lakeland Health Care Center Superintendent; Elizabeth Aldred, Deputy Director of Health and Human Services; David Thompson, Deputy Director of Health and Human Services; Eddy Wilberding, Health and Human Services; Juliet Young, Health and Human Services; David Bretl, County Administrator, Nancy Russell, County Board Chairperson, Nicole Andersen, Deputy Counsel Administrator – Finance, Michael Cotter, Corporation Counsel

Public in attendance – There were no members of the public in attendance.

There were no agenda withdrawals. **Motion and second made by Citizen Representative Pious and Supervisor Hawkins to approve the agenda. Motion carried 6-0.**

The Health and Human Services minutes from the October 20, 2010 meeting were approved. **Motion and second made by Supervisors Hawkins/Ingersoll to approve the minutes. Motion carried 6-0.**

Public comment – There were no comments from the public.

Unfinished business –

Updated on Echo/General Ledger Reconciliation – Ms. Seemeyer stated due to a recent problem in the software she is unable to provide a detailed update on the reconciliation. Ms. Seemeyer estimated the difference between the general ledger and Echo is under \$5,000. This will be discussed with the auditors and an update will be on the January 2011 agenda. Ms. Andersen stated that a lot of progress has been made.

Supervisor Grant asked if Information Technologies is able to fix the problem. Ms. Seemeyer explained that staff from Finance, Information Technologies and Health and Human Services are working together to fix the problem in the software.

New Business –

Citizen Representative Appointments – Ms. Seemeyer mentioned that the statutes for this board are not clear on the residency requirements for citizen representation. Supervisor Hawkins stated he felt the citizen representatives on this board should be Walworth County residents. Supervisor Ingersoll agreed due the fact that this board sets policies.

Citizen Representative Pious asked if an exception would be made to an ideal candidate that was not a Walworth County resident. Supervisor Grant documented the history of the citizen representation and that exceptions have not been made in the past.

County Board Chairperson Russell also agrees that the citizen representatives should be Walworth County residents. Mr. Bretl suggested that the motion should be sent back to the Executive Committee for them to write the ordinance.

Motion and second made by Supervisors Hawkins and Redenius to ask the Executive Committee to draft an ordinance stating that citizen representatives need to be Walworth County residents. Motion carried 6-0.

Ordinance Relating to Interjurisdictional Agreements for Out-of-County Residents – Ms. Seemeyer gave a background on Family Care and introduced Dr. Thompson to discuss the proposed ordinance.

Supervisor Ingersoll asked if there are any laws or ordinances that require counties to take responsibility for these patients. Dr. Thompson explained the only law is that a county is responsible for the first seventy-two hours to stabilize a patient but there is not a law that their county of residence has to take fiscal responsibility for them after that time period.

Supervisor Ingersoll asked if Walworth County stays fiscally responsible after the seventy-two hour period. Dr. Thompson stated that because they are disenrolled from Family Care and if the county of their residence does not take responsibility for them then Walworth County is taking the fiscal responsibility.

Dr. Thompson introduced the proposed ordinance using a hypothetical situation to show how this ordinance would work. This is a groundbreaking ordinance will regulate signed inter-county agreements, will enforce penalties for noncompliance and give the option to use the court system to recoup money.

Supervisor Grant felt that due to that this ordinance will effect Community Based Residential Facilities (CBRFs) that they should be notify prior to this board making a motion on this ordinance. He suggested the possibility of a public hearing to invite comments from the public.

Mr. Bretl feels there are four issues the CBRFs will have with this proposed ordinance 1) the fines if counties are noncompliant 2) loosing money due to noncompliance 3) moving a resident who is placed and stable and 4) feeling they are being punished for something a county's noncompliance. Mr. Bretl feels this motion should be table until the January

meeting to give Health and Human Services a chance to notify providers. Supervisor Grant and County Board Chairperson Russell agreed that the providers and taxpayers should be given a chance to be heard on this issue since this ordinance will be setting a precedent. Discussion followed.

Mr. Cotter expects this ordinance to be litigated if passed with either another county suing Walworth County or a CBRF suing one or more counties. Supervisor Hawkins suggested that other counties should be invited to the public hearing.

County Board Chairperson Russell asked if the ordinance would include out-of-state situations. Dr. Thompson stated that the wording in the ordinance will include out-of-state situations.

Motion and second made by Supervisors Hawkins and Redenius to have the ordinance on the on the January 2011 agenda as an action item to the County Board. Motion carried 6-0.

Dr. Thompson asked for clarification that Health and Human Services contacts contract providers, other counties and Family Care about this proposed ordinance. Supervisor Grant said yes all should be contacted.

Reports – There were no reports.

Correspondence – There were no correspondences.

Announcements – Chairman Grant wishes everyone a Happy Thanksgiving.

Next Meeting Date – The next meeting is scheduled for January 19, 2011 at tentatively 1:15 p.m. following the Lakeland Health Care Board of Trustees meeting.

Adjournment – **On motion and second by Supervisors Hawkins/Redenius Schaefer, Chair Grant adjourned the Health and Human Services meeting at approximately 2:09 p.m. Motion carried 6-0.**

Submitted by Juliet Young, Recorder. Meeting minutes are not considered final until approved by the committee at the next regularly scheduled meeting.