

## ADMINISTRATIVE COMMITTEE

October 19, 2015

The Administrative Committee met on Monday, October 19, 2015 at 1:00 p.m. in Room 264, on second floor of the Administration Building in Lancaster, WI pursuant to the last meeting of September 29, 2015.

Members present: Robert Keeney, Mike Lieurance, Robert Scallon, Mark Stead, John Patcle, Dale Hood, and Roger Guthrie had asked to be excused. Other people present were Mayor Jerry Wehrle, Jeff Kindrai, Joyce Roling and Nancy Scott.

The meeting was called to order by Chair Robert Keeney at 1:00 p.m. Linda Gebhard, County Clerk verified that the meeting was in compliance with the open meeting law, posted in two places.

Agenda: Mark Stead, seconded by Dale Hood made a motion to approve the amended agenda. Motion carried.

Minutes: Robert Scallon, seconded by Mike Lieurance made a motion to approve the minutes of September 29, 2015 as written. Motion then carried unanimously.

Master Plan Update, Samuels Group: Kurt Berner, Samuels Group Vice President gave the committee an overview of the current Master Plan implementing the changes the committee had asked The Samuels Group to make at the last committee meeting.

Option A -- Building a structure to house Law Enforcement, Social Services downtown on Jefferson Street, placing ADRC on third floor of the Administration Building; construct a parking ramp with an underground tunnel to attach the two facilities. Demo the 52 building, demo existing Law Enforcement and jail building and construct a storage building on that site. Highway remains the same. Projected Cost: \$23,570,000

Option B -- Build a structure for Law Enforcement and Social Services on the existing Highway site, relocated Highway on the corner of Highway 129 and 61 on Orchard Manor property, move ADRC to third floor of Administration Building, demo the 52 building. Projected Cost: \$25,125,000

Option C -- Demo existing Law Enforcement facility; build a two story pod style structure to house Law Enforcement, 75 bed jail and Social Services on the same site, which would be very tight on the current footprint. Purchasing more property may be necessary or working out a trade for the private property may be an option to accommodate some of the designs The Samuels Group put together to best utilize the existing footprint. This project could be done in steps, construct the Law Enforcement and later add the Social Services structure. This would be an 18 month construction project before the county would think of adding Social Services on to the building; this would only be to have the facility occupied by the Law Enforcement. Move ADRC to third floor of the Administration Building, demo the 52 building. Projected Cost: \$18,825,000

Kurt brought up another option to consider is the Lease Agreement brought to the County by Dave Bainbridge. The County may want to go forward with a Master Plan for the Law Enforcement and Highway Building and then weigh the cost into a project with the lease option to house Social Services and ADRC facilities. Kurt warned the committee if they would in the future go with a lease option for the Master Plan; there should be a RFP for public proposals to bid the job; they should never name a

specific vendor for that in the Master Plan. This makes the process fair for all vendors to bid a building to lease to the county.

Security came up regarding Social Services. Fred Naatz, Social Services Director was in attendance. Mark Stead asked Fred what his thoughts were on the security. In a number of the options Social Services has been incorporated in with Law Enforcement insuring security. In Dave Bainbridge's option they would be housed in a building of their own. Fred stated that certainly a heightened level of security that can be provided with Law Enforcement would be better. Mike Leurance stated that security can be very difficult to plan for with the "lone wolf type incidents" that can also happen; distance sometimes does not matter.

Kurt stated that in all the studies they reviewed the Law Enforcement and jail issue came to the top as being the most important to take care of first on the Master Plan. As far as locating the facility downtown, the close proximity to a school came into question; it was brought up the original Law Enforcement and jail were located on the site of the Administration Building at one time. Also the committee had questions on how general public would appreciate a jail in the downtown area. Kurt stated with the proper building design most people will not be aware it houses a jail.

Kurt stated that by placing Law Enforcement on outlying sites does not remedy the transportation issue. The court system uses video conferencing as much as possible but court appearances are still required.

Robert Keeney stated that no matter where any facility is relocated; by moving Law Enforcement or Highway out to the Orchard Manor site that could cause a congestion issue with Highway 61 and 129.

Mike Lieurance stated that he has not found any support from the residents to house Law Enforcement downtown. Dale Hood stated the county owns enough property; we should be able to find a place to build these facilities without taking more property off the tax rolls.

Kurt stated that the past studies have proven to be very valuable in helping The Samuels Group develop the options. Now the counties job is to start focusing on just one of the options so they can start the process to move forward. They can start one project; upon completion the next phase can then be facilitated. Each year the projects are continually pushed out into the future that will add to the costs in the long run, the cost of delaying may not be cost effective to the County. No County can afford to complete all the facility needs at one time; this is why the Master Plan is so important to have in place. No option will be perfect but the county has to pick the plan that will meet most of the County Facility needs.

The committee asked Nancy Scott, Finance Director if the county could look into bonding now for these future projects. She stated that would be an option so that process could be in progress while the county was deciding what the best Master Plan would be. Kurt stated that would be a good idea so there can be a level of financial planning added to the Master Plan for a better idea of what the costs would be in 2016, 2017, 2018, etc. The Samuel's Group will then attach escalators to those projected costs for a better financial picture. Mark Stead asked that Nancy draw up a worksheet on how much money the county could borrow for loan purposes and debt loads that county would have.

The question was discussed if the City of Lancaster would have any input in the plan. To this point only conversations have happened between county and city, no options have been discussed. One alternative was to implement new business spaces on the ground level and building parking ramps over them. This could benefit both city and county. There was discussion regarding the demo of some of the county buildings; those properties could potentially be put back on the tax roll.

Robert Scallon brought up the possibility of including a facility to handle mentally challenged people. Kurt stated that could be added in the future he knows this is an issue in many counties but he does not have any experience working on that type of structure to date.

Kurt stated his thoughts were that the committee would drop Option A from consideration and go with B and C. They would need work to make them more attractive, but in the meantime; he suggested he would go forward to contact a bonding company to see what the county would be up against with those options. The Samuels Group could then work with the bonding company to help lay out the phases so the capital costs could be laid out. Once the costs are in place, contact Dave Bainbridge to give him a date when the county would want him to build his building. Dave could submit his offer with firm costs in today's cost; the committee could then take that option into consideration. This would shorten up the time in preparing because the time line and capital costs will be outlined for the county up front.

After more discussion, a motion was made by Mark Stead, seconded by Mike Lieurance, to drop Option A as presented by the Samuels Group from the Master Plan for Grant County (building Law Enforcement, the jail and Social Service structure downtown. Motion carried.

Robert Keeney brought up the Lippert Property as maybe being an option. To build a Law Enforcement, Jail and Social Services on that site selling the exiting property back to the city to put back on the tax rolls. That would leave the issue of were to move the Highway Department if they would not have the use of the Lippert Property.

ADRC remains to be a problem with the location on third floor with no appropriate parking available.

Kurt felt the best direction to go after all the discussion was to incorporate Options B and C together and focus on changing the current Option C to the following:

**Option C** – Building on the Lippert Property currently owned by the Highway; to facilitate a structure to house Law Enforcement and the Jail. The county would want to move the current operations of the Highway that are housed in the Lippert Building to a different site but to move it so it ties into the future location that the county would move the total Highway operations to so you are not moving the Highway twice, the Highway project being the last phase in this option would be moved out to the old 52 Building site. Phase two would be to deal with Social Services and ADRC. That would be the variable, whether the county wants to use owned property or a lease option. That would have to be locked down first so the county had that information to be able to take the next step for Social Service and ADRC; whether it would be built out by Law Enforcement or a lease option would be used.

**Included in Option C** -- The Samuels Group will incorporate plans to build a parking ramp on the square adjacent from the Administration Building so ADRC could be moved to third floor; possibly incorporating business spaces on the lower level of the parking ramp for city use.

The committee asked Kurt to come back to present Option C to the committee on November 30, 2015 at 1:00 p.m. so the final draft could be presented to the full county board on December 15, 2015 at 10:00 a.m. Kurt asked if the county could go forward and contact the bonding company to have a proposal ready so he could incorporate that layer for financing on the option so the Committee and Board had all the information available to consider.

Discussion of Strategic Plan Items: As part of the Strategic Planning the Grant County Board had done last fall, Robert Keeney updated the committee on the concept "Through our Eyes". Todd Johnson, UW-Extension, and Tom Martin, CESA #3 had worked on this to involve youth in government through social

media. There will be a meeting on October 20, 2015 to get more input from local, elected and business people of the community.

Mike Lieurance said the American Legion has tried for years to implement a Government Day in the county; this had been done in the past but had been discontinued. They would like to get this going with the school districts of Grant County again to demonstrate what County Government does for our community.

Committee Structure: Robert Keeney handed out the committee structure from Washington County and the current committee structure for Grant County. He made a rough draft of a possible eight committee structure for the committee to review with a Proposed 2016 Expenditure Budget from Nancy Scott, Finance. Committee discussed length of prospective meetings; this would have to be considered if the committees would be combined. Maybe the contents currently addressed by the committee's may have to be reviewed.

Mark Stead, seconded by Mike Lieurance made a motion to share all the information with the full county board; this information should be sent out in the County Board Packets for the November meeting. Motion carried.

Adjournment: Mark Stead, seconded by Dale Hood made a motion to adjourn the meeting pursuant to the next meeting scheduled for Monday November 30, 2015 at 1:00 p.m. Motion carried.