

## ADMINISTRATIVE COMMITTEE

November 27, 2012

The Administrative Committee met on Tuesday, November 27, 2012 at 12:02 p.m. in Room 266, on second floor of the Administration Building in Lancaster, WI pursuant to the last meeting of September 6, 2012.

Members present: Larry Wolf, John Patcle, Vincent Loeffelholz, Mark Stead, Robert Scallon, Lester Jantzen and John Beinborn. Joyce Roling, Personnel Director was also present for a part of the meeting.

The meeting was called to order by Chair Larry Wolf. Linda Gebhard, County Clerk verified that the meeting was in compliance with the open meeting law, posted in County newspaper, The Herald Independent and posted in two places.

John Beinborn, seconded by Mark Stead, made a motion to approve the agenda. Motion carried.

Vince Loeffelholz, seconded by Lester Jantzen, made a motion to approve the minutes of September 6, 2012. Motion carried.

Revision to Summary of Expectations: Vince Loeffelholz, seconded by John Beinborn, made a motion to add the following statement to the Grant County Board of Supervisors Summary of Expectations under Closing Statements "b) A board member may not bid upon, negotiate nor enter into a contract with the county in which the board member has a direct or indirect financial interest if said contract or contracts exceed \$15,000.00 in any one year. Doing so is considered a class 1 felony pursuant to Wisconsin Statute Section 946.13. Please note that merely abstaining from a vote on such a matter is not sufficient and could still subject the individual to the felony conviction." Motion carried with 5 yes votes and 2 nay votes.

Closed session per state statute 19.85 (1) (f): Considering financial, medical, social or personal histories or disciplinary data of specific persons, preliminary consideration of specific personnel problems or the investigation of charges against specific persons except where par. (b) Applies which, if discussed in public, would be likely to have a substantial adverse effect upon the reputation of any person referred to in such histories or data, or involved in such problems or investigations as it pertains to interviews for District 1 County Board Supervisor appointment. Motion was made by Lester Jantzen, seconded by John Beinborn to go into closed session. Motion carried.

Return to Open Session: Mark Stead, seconded by Lester Jantzen, made a motion to come back to open session. Motion carried.

Motion: John Beinborn, seconded by Robert Scallon, made a motion that the Administrative Committee recommends to the full County Board the appointment of Dorothy Hackl to replace the unexpired term of Ivan Farness, District 1 for the remainder of his term. Roll Call vote was called for by Larry Wolf resulting in 7 yes votes. Motion carried.

Short recess was taken, called back in session at 2:25 p.m. by Larry Wolf, Chair.

Update on the 52 building: Larry Wolf stated the alternative that has been discussed on this issue in the past as follows:

1. Do nothing; \$0.
2. Expand the current building housing ADRC and Social Services, cost of \$5,700,000.00.
3. Remodel the Unified Building to add ADRC Offices, cost of \$7,700,000.00.
4. Build a new building to house ADRC and Services, cost of \$8,800,000.00.
5. Dave Bainbridge to sell the Unified Building to the County and build a new building on the property next to the Unified Building, cost of \$4,200,000.00.

The costs to the County projected for the next 20 years would be as follows:

1. Do nothing, cost to County \$4,040,000.00
2. Remodel with no Unified, cost to County \$8,680,000.00
3. Remodel adding Unified, cost to County \$9,020,000.00
4. New building, cost to County \$9,190,000.00
5. David Bainbridge proposal to build, cost to County \$5,190,000.00

There had been a study conducted by Todd Johnson, Extension Comm. Resource Development Agent previously regarding the County Departments space needs. Larry Wolf asked the Department Heads present in the room if their situations and feelings had changed since that study regarding the 52 building. There have been many water issues that have occurred since that study; Larry also stated that they should keep in mind that any project the County may look at would take at least 2 years to finish.

Gayle Mason, ADRC Director stated that she was aware that if her staff is going to continue to work in the 52 Building the water issues would definitely need to be addressed and there are security issues that would need to be dealt with. She stated her staff is split 50/50 on wanting to stay in their building or moving somewhere different. The ADRC Board is open to listening to different options. Gayle has been concerned with the loss of productivity that has happened since all the water issues started. Gayle stated that she took a tour of the Unified Building to see if it could possibly meet the needs of ADRC. She felt it offered assessable parking, it offered ample office space because she feels there may be growth in the ADRC Department in the future making the need for more offices. Gayle stated that if the Board could offer a solution and devise a plan to present to the employees for the future; her staff would make the best of it.

Fred Naatz, Social Services addressed the committee stating that some things had changed for his Department since the last study. He stated that the 52 building has always caused a challenge in the heating and cooling, being difficult to control. There are probably many common areas that could be shared if departments were to be combined such as intake. At the time of the study, there was an uncertainty of the number of employees that would be needed because of the changing of the programs which to some extent still is an issue. There has been a change in the new call centers that the public can call to receive information. There tends to be less public traffic through the Social Services building because of this. Fred stated that he tends to go toward the concept to combining certain departments which would help solve some of the space issue.

The Unified Building was discussed. Dave Bainbridge has offered to sell this building to the County. The building is about 12 years old, there would be no elevators to maintain, and there are plenty of green areas to push snow in the winter.

The committee also recognized that the Administration Building third floor still sets empty. Mark Stead stated that it could be possible to remodel the building to accommodate department needs better.

The parking issue was addressed by the committee stating different ways to add more parking spaces; handicap parking will always be needed no matter what department would be in the building. Security would have to be addressed per departmental use.

Larry Wolf asked Donna Haines how this would affect Orchard Manor if there were no departments using the 52 building. Donna stated that it would increase their cost for the sewer plant about \$15,000.00 per year. There are been new window put in the building and upgrades through the years that have been done that have been paid for by Orchard Manor. Donna pointed out that the county does own the land out at Orchard Manor and would not have to buy more land to build on.

Update on the future jail needs: Nate Dreckman, Grant County Sheriff updated the committee on possible solutions to remedy their space needs. Nate realized that the 52 Building was a big concern to the County at this time; the Sheriff's Department is trying to address their space needs in a realistic manner. Yes, he stated; they are experiencing jail overcrowding at this time, but this may be a temporary issue that could change from year to year. He stated the main concerns with the Law Enforcement Building are as follows:

1. Medical assessment rooms.
2. Drug cart storage area.
3. Receiving and holding cells not adequate.
4. Adequate Recreation space not available mandated by the State.
5. Storage space needed.
6. Laundry area not safe.
7. Jail office to small.
8. Records are currently stored in the hallways.
9. Booking room inadequate.
10. Vehicle port does not have enough room to support ambulance accessibility.
11. No bus area to access in case of an evacuation.
12. No direct observation cells.
13. No intake rooms available.

A recent extra cost to the Law Enforcement Department has been the expense to maintain an RN for suicide watch. This extra cost to Law Enforcement could exceed their budgeted amount by \$10,000.00 because there are no proper observation cells available. The addition of two-way glass mirrors in direct observation cells could correct this added cost. Better design of the intake and booking areas would be a plus. Recreation area would not have to be big or enclosed just a fenced in outdoor area would work.

Nate stated that they had projected adding the new addition on to the back of the existing building into the parking lot which would add the needed space. The Law Enforcement has invested in new cell doors

already which this cost would not be lost by upgrading their existing building and be more economical in the long run.

Nate stated that the department had looked into the use of Monitoring Bracelets for the Huber Prisoners; this would alleviate the need for jail space. Nate felt that if this new addition to the Law Enforcement Center could be made this would possibly take care of the jail needs for the next 15 to 20 years.

Nate stated that a building to house all the departments would be a benefit for the County, but in his opinion it may prove to be impractical and too costly of an investment for the County. He realizes that a project like this may take 2 to 3 years, but they could remain on site during the construction, they would not have to be relocated.

The committee felt that there had been a lot of information shared at this meeting and needed time to digest all the suggested ideas. They were all in agreement that these issues need to be addressed soon because any building or remodeling project will take a number of years to complete. Larry Wolf stated that if nothing is done in the near future; the County could experience unnecessary expenditures down the road. The committee will revisit this issue at the next Administrative committee meeting.

Adjournment: Mark Stead, seconded by Vince Loeffelholz, made a motion to adjourn the meeting to the call of the chair. Motion carried.