

ADMINISTRATIVE COMMITTEE

May 28, 2013

The Administrative Committee met on Tuesday, May 28, 2013 at 10:00 a.m. in Room 266, on second floor of the Administration Building in Lancaster, WI pursuant to the last meeting of March 6, 2013.

Members present: Larry Wolf, John Patcle, Mark Stead, Robert Scallon, Lester Jantzen and John Beinborn. Robert Keeney, Lynda Schweikert, Joyce Roling, Nate Dreckman, Jack Johnson, Fred Naatz, Neal Blackburn, Nancy Scott and Jeff Anderson were also present.

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 two places.

Agenda: John Beinborn seconded by Robert Scallon, made a motion to approve the agenda. Motion carried.

Minutes: Mark Stead, seconded by Lester Jantzen, made a motion to approve the minutes of March 6, 2013. Motion carried.

Possible Committee Restructure for the Sanitation/Zoning and Land Conservation: The committee asked Lynda Schweikert, Land and Water Conservation Director what her opinion was in regard to the committee structures for Sanitation/Zoning and Land and Water Conservation. She stated that she would like to keep them as they are until April of 2014 when the Board Members will be up for election. After discussion; John Patcle, seconded by Robert Scallon, made a motion to keep both committees (Planning and Zoning and Land Conservation) the same at this point, but hold both committees on the same date following one another. Changes in committee structure being addressed in April 2014 when the Board Members will be up for election. Motion carried.

Courthouse Façade and Moisture Infiltration Plan: Larry Wolf, Chair reiterated the project cost for the Courthouse would be stating the three options that InSite Consulting Architects as follows:

Phase 1: Projection to compete the project in a two year period completing all the work at once for a cost of \$2,051,940.00.

Phase 2: To divide the project in three phases over a number of years for a cost of \$2,270,516.00.

Phase 3: No nothing at this time, within a 5 year period the deterioration could then cost the County \$4,103,880.00.

The committee was in agreement that if this project is to go forward their choice would be Phase 1 to complete all work at once.

Discussion of space Study for Administration Building: Larry Wolf, Chair presented the recommendations of Venture Architects for the restructuring of the Administration Building to include ADRC and Social Services as follows:

1. Board Room would be moved to the basement, taking out the current break room, adding two bathrooms.

2. First Floor, Tax Lister Office would move to the room currently used by IT, moving IT to third floor. When the offices of Sanitation/Zoning are moved out to the Land Conservation Facility, one of those rooms will be utilized by the Veterans Officer giving him the use of two offices on First Floor, possibly adding the break room and/or conference room on this floor.
3. Second Floor; expand the Health Department to add more clinical rooms. Move Personnel and County Chair office to third floor, in those current spaces implement the ADRC Department offices.
4. Third Floor, Personnel Office, County Board Chair Office, IT and Social Service Offices. Adding bathroom facilities.

The challenges of this project stated by Venture Architects would be that the current boiler and AC systems would have to be upgraded to facilitate the adding of the third floor space.

The projected cost of this project would be \$2,925,000.00.

The parking issue was discussed with the following possible remedies:

1. Add a parking lot adjacent to the existing parking lot in the Courthouse Lawn adding 14 stalls.
2. Work with the City of Lancaster to reserve the parking spaces on the north side of the Administration Building as handicap stalls.
3. Change the existing parking spaces to angle parking on the south side of the Administration Building to gain some parking spaces.
4. Work with the City of Lancaster to make a loading zone area in the alley back of the Administration Building.
5. Possibly purchase three vacant lots east of the Courthouse on Monroe Street to construct a parking lot adding 66 stalls for the County employees.

Added cost for the parking issues could be \$300,000.00.

To completely remodel the 52 Building to continue to house Social Service and ADRC would cost \$5,500,000.00

Larry Wolf asked Nancy Scott, Finance Director her opinion regarding the amount of money that could be saved on operating costs if Social Services and ADRC would be housed in the Administration Building. She stated that \$85,000.00 could probably be cut from the budget for these costs.

Proposal by Dave Bainbridge: Dave Bainbridge submitted a proposal to the committee to build the County a building that will house ADRC, Social Services and Unified with ample parking. The building would be 29,500 square feet for a cost of \$3,678,000.00.

The committee asked Jeff Anderson, Information Technology Director his opinion on the costs regarding his department that would be involved with these projects. Jeff brought up the cost for Internet Services of \$500.00 per month that would involve moving and/or adding these services for departments that would be new to the Administration Building, some could involve cost sharing. Jeff stated that to move the phone service could cost up to \$1,000.00, moving modules and adding voice mail if Unified was to be moved. There could possibly be added cost to the microwave and the wireless system in adding offices in the Administration Building; to install the fiber optics and equipment needed could be

very costly. In Jeff's opinion having all the offices under one roof would be most beneficial for the County.

Fred Naatz, Social Services Director was asked his opinion. He had some concerns if there would be enough room available to house his department; although he can see investing money in the 52 Building may not be good for longevity. He speculated the Unified and ADRC may be a better fit to combine than Social Services. He could see the benefit to house all under one roof.

John Beinborn asked if there would be any available room to expand in the Administration Building. Larry Wolf stated there would not be a lot of room left to utilize.

Larry Wolf asked for a five minute break, 11:20 a.m.

Meeting was reconvened at 11:30 a.m.

Discussion to Remodel the Law Enforcement Building: Nate Dreckman, Sheriff was present to give the committee an overview of the expansion for the Law Enforcement Center. The project is to construct a 4,040 square foot addition to the existing jail consisting of booking, pre-booking and vehicle Sallyport. Also included is 2,750 square feet of remodeling to the existing jail including relocating and/or expanding the Jail Laundry, Nurse's Exam/Office, Control Center, addition of Jail Administrator's Office, two Special Needs Cells, three Receiving Cells and a Group Holding Cell. The total cost of this project would be \$2,610,800.00. ***(This amount does not include Fire Protection of existing Sheriff's Department and Jail of \$185,000.00.)***

The new construction to house the Jail Dorms would be an addition cost of \$710,650.00.

Discussion of possible bonding: Nancy Scott, Finance Director was asked about possible bonding for these projects. In contacting Baird Financial Advisor, they stated the following; "Targeting roughly \$778,000.00 in annual debt service payments on new debt of \$8.7 million would have the County issuing a 13-year bond at current market interest rates of 2.10% to 2.25%."

Larry Wolf asked the committee for their comments. Robert Keeney asked if there would be any relocation costs involved during construction. It was stated that there should be none, the Sheriff Department could work through the construction, though it may be disruptive; Nate stated that it could be done. The Administration Building would have minimal disruptions because third floor is not being used at this time. The 52 Building would entail the biggest relocation.

The question was asked if the County would hire a local Contractor who would act as the County's Construction Manager, this was not addressed at this time.

The time frame is projected for a two year completion for the Courthouse, one year completion for the Administration Building and one year completion for the Jail project.

The committee was asked to prioritize the projects. They were in agreement that the Courthouse should be the first priority, the Law Enforcement Center should be the second priority and the Administration Building should be third.

Because there are two options on the table to deal with the Administration Building; to renovate third floor or go with Dave Bainbridge's offer to build a new building. Larry asked the committee members to prioritize both options, they are as follows:

John Patcle—renovate third floor, no other option.

Lester Jantzen—first option to renovate third floor, second option build new building by D. Bainbridge.

Bob Scallon—first option build new building by D. Bainbridge, second option to renovate third floor.

Mark Stead-- first option to renovate third floor, second option build new building by D. Bainbridge.

John Beinborn-- first option to renovate third floor, second option build new building by D. Bainbridge.

The committee discussed the parking issue; Mayor Wehrle was present and suggested that the committee come and talk to the City Council so their questions can be answered and they could find a solution for this issue by working together. The committee was in agreement that any solution could hinge on the parking issue.

Lester Jantzen made a motion, seconded by John Beinborn that the committee makes a recommendation to the Executive Committee on June 11, 2013 to consider all three projects for approval so the County can move forward. The priorities as follows:

1. First priority the Courthouse refurbish.
2. Second priority the Law Enforcement Center remodel.
3. Third priority the remodeling of the Administration Building with the two options to consider.

Motion carried unanimously.

Adjournment: Robert Scallon, seconded by Mark Stead, made a motion to adjourn the meeting pursuant to the next meeting at the call of the chair. Motion carried.