

**Grant County Board of Supervisors
October 3, 2017**

The Grant County Board of Supervisors met on Tuesday, October 3, 2017 at 10:00 a.m. in Room 264 on second floor of the Administration Building, Lancaster, WI pursuant to the adjournment of the August 15, 2017 meeting.

Robert Keeney, County Board Chair called the meeting to order and the Pledge of Allegiance was recited.

Verification of compliance with the open meeting law was a notice in the Herald Independent stating the date, time and place of the County Board Meeting and posted in two public posting locations and the county website verified by Linda K. Gebhard, County Clerk.

Roll Call, October 3, 2017

	Present	Absent	Excused
Carol Beals	X		
John Beinborn	X		
Ronald Coppernoll	X		
Roger Guthrie	X		
Dale Hood	X		
Lester Jantzen	X		
Robert Keeney	X		
Mike Lieurance	X		
Grant Loy	X		
Dwight Nelson	X		
John Patcle	X		
Gary Ranum	X		
Gregory Fry	X		
Robert Scallon	X		
Donald Splinter	X		
Mark Stead	X		
Daniel Timmerman			X

The Clerk took the roll call resulting in 16 present, 1 excused; therefore a quorum was present.

Agenda: Lester Jantzen, seconded by John Beinborn, made a motion to approve the amended agenda. Motion carried.

Minutes: Ben Wood, Corporation Counsel clarified for the Board Members the action that was taken at the August 15, 2017 rescinding the motion of November 8, 2016 County Board of Supervisors Meeting regarding the per diem and County Board Insurance. Ben asked John Beinborn who originally made the motion at the August 15, 2017 meeting to rescind the motion, ***“John Patcle made a motion to rescind the motion made on November 8, 2016, and Mark Stead seconded the motion”***. Ben asked John if his intent in rescinding that motion was only to change the County Board per diem back to \$90.00 per meeting instead of the November 8, 2016 motion changing the per diem to \$45.00 per meeting effective April 2018 and the intent to change the County Board Insurance was not part of that motion. John Beinborn stated changing the per diem back to \$90.00 per meeting was his only intent. Dale Hood who seconded that motion in August was in agreement that was his only intent in seconding the motion. Therefore Ben Wood, Corporation Counsel stated the rescinding of the August 15, 2017 only pertained

to changing the per diem back to \$90.00 per meeting instead of \$45.00 effective April 2018 and there would be no changes to the County Board Insurance.

Mark Stead, seconded by Ron Coppernoll, made a motion to approve the August 15, 2017 corrected minutes with one additional change, changing the spelling of "Counsel" to "Council" referring to the Criminal Justice Coordinating Council. Motion carried.

Communications: Chair Keeney invited all the Board Members to attend a WisDOT meeting scheduled for October 12, 2017 from 5:00 p.m. to 9:00 p.m. at the Lancaster Library to discuss the plans for construction of Elm Street and the Lancaster Square in 2019.

Chair Keeney extended a thank you to all employees involved in working on the work comp claims and the back to work practices. The County will be receiving a 40% reduction on our rates next year for achieving a very low experience modification.

The Senior Center from Platteville was going to hold a presentation but because of the perceived length of this meeting they chose to attend the November 2017 meeting to give their presentation.

Ted Bay, Extension Crops and Farm Management Agent for Grant and Lafayette Counties asked to address the Board. Ted will be retiring on November 2, 2017; he started working for the County in October of 1991. Ted has enjoyed working for the County and has helped many farmers solve problems. He wished to thank all the Board Members for their continued support and oversight in the extension office programs and for participating as members on the Ag and Extension Committee throughout the years. He hopes their support will continue in the future.

Employee Recognition: Chair Keeney presented an employee recognition certificate to Ted Bay in recognition of his 26 years of service as the Extension Offices Crop and Farm Manager for Grant and Lafayette Counties.

Appointment(s) None

Grant(s): None

2018 Budget—Nancy Scott, Finance Director presented the 2018 Budget for recommendation to be sent on to the Executive Committee for final approval. As it stands at this point it is approximately 46.8 million similar to last year; Nancy stated there still is a gap of \$49,000 that will need to be addressed in the next couple months. There was a sum of \$139,000.00 taken from the general fund to cover some onetime costs such as a new vehicle for Emergency Management, increase in Election costs because there will be 4 elections in 2018, the Courthouse Security officer was added, a couple new jailer positions were added for the transition into the new Law Enforcement Facility, Conservation, Sanitation, and Zoning has lost their NRC Teck Pro Program losing about \$15,000.00 in revenue and their rent will be increasing about \$12,000.00; plus the proposed wage study increase. Nancy stated there is a lot crammed into this budget and this is a testament to the Department Heads in working so hard on the budget to try and balance it.

County share of health insurance premiums increased 6%, (County's share is based on the lowest cost plan) Medical Associates increased 6%, Dean increased 11.9%

Retirement contribution rates are:

	<u>2018</u>	<u>2017</u>
General employees	6.70%	6.80%
Elected Officials	6.70%	6.80%
Protective Service	10.93%	10.80%

Levy limits allow the county to increase the levy by the amount of net new construction which is 1.42%. This compares to 1.28% for the 2017 budget and 1.14% for 2016. This budget fully utilizes the allowable levy.

The budget assumes sales tax will increase 2% over projected 2017 receipts.

Shared revenue and computer tax aid are budgeted to decrease \$12,676 over the 2017 budget based on estimates from the Department of Revenue. This is due to the continuing phase out of utility aids for the Cassville plants.

Motion was made by John Patcle, seconded by Roger Guthrie recommending the 2018 budget be sent back to the Executive Committee to make the final changes to balance the budget and then it will come back to the full County Board at the November 2017 meeting for the final approval. Motion carried.

Progress Report, Discussion & Possible action on LEC, SS & ADRC Facility: Brad Bierman, EPIC gave the updates on the new construction project. Brad presented some change orders. Ben Wood, Corporation Counsel stated that each change order should be presented to the Board of Supervisors for their determination.

- A) Change order for Over Excavation and Fill**
- B) Change orders pertaining to sub floor wall material exchange**
- C) Addition of Family Restroom / Doors on entrance of Social Services Restroom**

First change is to use poured concrete walls instead of using masonry concrete blocks which would be a \$17,536.00 deduction of cost for the project. This change has already been moved forward because it has been discussed in the construction meetings and would be structurally better and faster in the field to use the poured concrete walls and more cost effective for the County.

John Beinborn, seconded Lester Jantzen, to allow for the change order to use poured concrete for the foundation subfloor walls instead of concrete blocks on the Law Enforcement/Emergency Management/Social Service/ADRC Construction Project, for a net deduction of \$17,536.00 to the project. Motion carried.

Second change is for the sub floor depth. It was known when the soil borings were done there was not sustainable dirt to support the new facility. In the bidding process the depth was stated to a minimum of 7 feet in depth, knowing in some places 9 to 11 feet would be needed. Each excavator bidding was asked to put a unit price, so much a yard to remove the soil and so much a yard to bring back rock to replace. Wiederholt Excavation who got the bid as moved a total of 26,022 cubic yards of soil has been

removed. During excavation they did run into the debris from the old Orchard Manor structure, DNR was contacted, there was no problem in letting them use the dirt for fill. That soil went behind the Orchard Manor facility to use on the parking lot in the future. One section they did run into a foundation that had to bring equipment in to break through what had to be removed. The total for this change order would be \$422,482.71. This will come out of the contingency fund because this issue was expected in the beginning. The contingency fund originally included a half million dollars. The original cost does not change, it is in the overall project because of the contingency fund but Ben Wood suggested a roll call vote be taken. Brad stated there is about \$100,000.00 left in the contingency fund, he is comfortable with that.

Greg Fry, seconded by Gary Ranum, made a motion to approve the change order for the additional cubic feet of soil that had to be removed in the site work by Wiederholt Excavating using the Contingency Fund to pay for the \$422,482.71 additional cost. Roll call vote was taken.

ROLL CALL VOTE

DATE: October 3, 2017

QUESTION: Approval of the change order for \$422,482.71 taken from the contingency fund to pay the additional cost for the removal of additional cubic yard of dirt from the site work.

	YES	NO	ABSTAINED	EXCUSED
1. GARY RANUM	X			
2. GRANT LOY	X			
3. ROBERT SCALLON	X			
4. ROBERT KEENEY	X			
5. ROGER GUTHRIE	X			
6. JOHN PATCLE	X			
7. GREGORY FRY	X			
8. RONALD COPPERNOLL	X			
9. MIKE LIEURANCE	X			
10. MARK STEAD	X			
11. DALE HOOD	X			
12. DWIGHT NELSON	X			
13. CAROL BEALS	X			
14. LESTER JANTZEN			X	
15. JOHN BEINBORN	X			
16. DONALD SPLINTER	X			
17. DANIEL TIMMERMAN				X

County Clerk took roll call vote resulting in 15 yes votes, 1 abstained, 1 excused absent. Therefore motion carried.

Third change was for a change in the Social Services section for a family/gender neutral bathroom to the main entrance area and to also add doors. Potter Lawson would have to draw up the plans to convert a couple of the existing rooms to accommodate for the gender neutral bathroom. This revision would

entail the added services scope of services, architectural, mechanical, electrical and plumbing engineers, documentation services only to update the construction documents. Preparer and issue a construction bulletin and construction will proceed concurrently with the remainder of the project. For the services of Potter Lawson the cost will be \$800.00, Mechanical Plumbing contract for \$1,500.00, and Electrical contract \$500.00, for a total of \$2,800.00 for a plan for the addition changes.

During discussion, there were pros and cons stated. Grant Loy stated the difficulty in getting into a bathroom with doors with a wheel chair or walker. Mark Stead stated facts from two studies regarding the trends in bathrooms of today which suggests less contact to surfaces is more hygienic, and less obstacles for a handicap person tends to be better and safer. Better security is also heightened when there are no doors present. Brad Bierman stated the trend in today's world seems to be bathrooms with no doors.

Brad Bierman suggested that he will request all the costs be separated so the issue on doors or no doors can be added at a later time during the construction.

Carol Beals, seconded by John Beinborn, to authorize the additional services for a change notice to Potter Lawson at a cost of \$2,800.00 to draw up the change of plans in the design for a neutral gender/family bathroom in the entrance of the Social Services new facility. Roll call vote was called for.

ROLL CALL VOTE

DATE: October 3, 2017

QUESTION: Authorize Potter Lawson to draw the design of a gender neutral/family bathroom as a change notice for a cost of \$2,800.00.

	YES	NO	ABSENT
1. GARY RANUM	X		
2. GRANT LOY		X	
3. ROBERT SCALLON	X		
4. ROBERT KEENEY	X		
5. ROGER GUTHRIE	X		
6. JOHN PATCLE		X	
7. GREGORY FRY	X		
8. RONALD COPPERNOLL		X	
9. MIKE LIEURANCE	X		
10. MARK STEAD		X	
11. DALE HOOD	X		
12. DWIGHT NELSON		X	
13. CAROL BEALS	X		
14. LESTER JANTZEN	X		
15. JOHN BEINBORN	X		
16. DONALD SPLINTER		X	
17. DANIEL TIMMERMAN			X

County Clerk took roll call resulting in 10 yes votes, 6 no votes and 1 excused absent. Therefore motion carried.

Resolution: DNR County Conservation Aids Resolution for 2017 - 2018: James Schneider, Communication Resource Agent presented the Department of Natural Recourse Resolution. James explained there has been a delay this year in getting the information out because of the delay in the State Budget to possible recipients for this grant funds. There could be roughly about \$3,000.00 available. There are some projects identified by Dave Lambert, Highway and Linda K. Gebhard County Clerk that could have use for this money. James will apply for these funds, there may be access funds available, and he will also apply for those at the same time.

Roger Guthrie, seconded by Robert Scallon, made a motion to authorize James Schneider to apply for the Department of Natural Resource Funds and also apply for the access funds that may be available for DNR related projects for Grant County. Motion carried.

**RESOLUTION NO. 41-16
GRANT COUNTY CONSERVATION AIDS PROGRAM**

WHEREAS, Grant County desires to participate in county fish and game projects pursuant to provision of s .23.09 (12), Wis. Stats. ;

WHEREAS, financial aid is desirable to install the project(s); and

WHEREAS, the Wisconsin Department of Natural Resources (WDNR) has grant funding available through the County Conservation Aids program specifically for the installation of fish and game projects under s. 23.09(12), Wis. Stats. ;

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED, that Grant County has budgeted an amount equal to the local share of the proposed project costs and

HEREBY AUTHORIZES the UW-Extension/Grant County CNRED Agent to act on behalf of Grant County to:

Sign and submit an application to the WDNR for any financial aid that may be available;

Submit to the WDNR reimbursement claims along with necessary documentation within one (1) year of project end date; and take necessary action to undertake, direct and complete the approved project.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that Grant County will comply with all state and federal laws related to the County Conservation Aids programs and will obtain approval in writing from the WDNR before any change is made in the use of the project site.

Respectively submitted:

Grant County Ag/Extension, Education Committee/Fair Board adopted this 18th day of September, 2017.

/s/ Roger Guthrie, Chair
/s/ Mark Stead, Secretary

/s/ John Patcle, Vice Chair
/s/ Mike Lieurance

/s/ Grant Loy

Daniel Timmerman

I hereby certify that the foregoing resolution was duly adopted by the Grant County Board of Supervisors at a legal meeting on day 3 of October, 2017.

Authorized Signature: /s/ Robert C. Keeney, County Board Chair

ATTEST: I Linda K. Gebhard, Grant County Clerk, do certify that Resolution # 41-16 Conservation Aids Program was approved by the Grant County Board of Supervisors at a meeting held on this day 3 of October , 2017. /s/ Linda K. Gebhard, Grant County Clerk

Resolution #40-16 Support for the Wisconsin Veterans 2017 Farm Bill: Lynda Schweikert, Conservation, Sanitation and Zoning and Ken McAndrew brought this Resolution to the County Board. Both of their committees recommended for passage.

Robert Scallon, seconded by Lester Jantzen, made a motion to approve Resolution 40-16 to provide greater workforce opportunities for Wisconsin Veterans in the field of agriculture and farming. Motion carried.

**Resolution #40-16
Support for the Wisconsin Veterans 2017 Farm Bill**

Whereas, the Wisconsin Legislature has proposed Assembly Bill 302 and Senate Bill 224 to provide greater workforce opportunities for veterans to transition from the battle field to the farm field, and;

Whereas, Wisconsin veteran-farmers play an integral role in the economic success of our state, and;

Whereas, Assembly Bill 302/Senate Bill 224 tasks the Wisconsin Department of Agriculture, Trade and Consumer Protection to integrate veterans into the field of agriculture, and support veterans current working in agriculture, and;

Whereas, the ability of the next generation of family farmers to continue to produce food, fiber and fuel is critical to the economy, health and security of our nation and local communities, and

Whereas, in order to address this critical concern, the necessary programs must be in place and funded in order to meet the unique needs and barriers facing beginning farmers and ranchers, with special emphasis on returning military veterans, and ensure they can enter and sustain farming or ranching as a viable livelihood, and;

Whereas, this legislation is supported by the Wisconsin Farm Bureau, Wisconsin Farmers Union, Wisconsin Potato and Vegetable Growers Association, and many other agricultural groups, now therefore;

Be it resolved, that the Grant County Board of Supervisors supports the passage of Assembly Bill 302 and Senate Bill 224 to support Wisconsin Veterans and Wisconsin agriculture, and that a copy of this resolution be forwarded to Governor Walker, Department of Agriculture, Trade and Consumer Protection Interim Secretary Jeff Lyon and Secretary of the Wisconsin Department of Veteran Affairs Daniel J. Zimmerman.

Recommended Approval this 5th day of September, 2017, by the Grant County Conservation, Sanitation and Zoning Committee:

/s/ Dwight Nelson, Chair

/s/ Lester Jantzen, Secretary

/s/ Grant Loy

/s/ Gabe Loeffelholz, FSA Representative

/s/ Mark Stead, Vice Chair

/s/ Roger Guthrie

/s/ Dale Hood

Recommended Approval this 7th day of September, 2017 by the Grant County Veterans Committee:

/s/ Robert R. Scallon, Chair

Gary Erickson

/s/ John DuCharme

/s/ Lester Jantzen, Vice Chair

/s/ James Knautz

Grant County Board of Supervisors dated this 3rd day of October, 2017

By: Grant County

/s/ Robert C. Keeney

County Board Chair

Attest: Grant County Clerk

By: /s/ Linda K. Gebhard

Resolution Relating to the Aging & Disability Resource Center of Grant County 85.21/5311: Lori Reid, ADRC Director presented the State based transportation grant to the County Board of Supervisors for their approval. There is a 20% match, the match is budgeted and the money comes from the Department of Transportation.

Mark Stead, seconded by Ron Coppernoll, made a motion to approve the Transportation Resolution 42-16 grant funds for ADRC in Section 85.21 of the Wisconsin Statutes. Motion carried.

Resolution #42-16

RESOLUTION RELATING TO AGING & DISABILITY RESOURCE CENTER GRANT COUNTY

WHEREAS, Section 85.21 of the Wisconsin Statutes authorizes the Wisconsin Department of Transportation to make grants to the counties of Wisconsin for the purpose of assisting them in providing specialized transportation services to the elderly and the disabled; and

WHEREAS, each grant must be matched with a local share equal of not less than 20% times the amount of the grant; and

WHEREAS, this body considers that the provision of specialized transportation services would improve and promote the maintenance of human dignity and self-sufficiency of the elderly and the disabled.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED, that the Board of Supervisors of Grant County on this 1st day of October, 2013, authorizes the Aging and Disability Resource Center - Grant County to prepare

and submit to the Wisconsin Department of Transportation an application for assistance during 2014 under Section 85.21 of the Wisconsin Statutes, in conformance with the requirements issued by that Department and also authorizes the obligation of county funds in the amount needed to provide the required local match.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the Board of Supervisors of Grant County authorizes the Chairman of the County Board of Supervisors to execute a state aid contract with the Wisconsin Department of Transportation under Section 85.21 of the Wisconsin Statutes on behalf of Grant County.

Recommended for passage this 3rd day of October, 2017 by the Aging and Disability Resource Center - Grant County Committee.

/s/ Vickie Hirsch

/s/ Greg Fry

/s/ Dave Janney

Steve Wetter

/s/ Mary Lou Bausch

/s/ Dan Timmerman

/s/ Arnold Rawson

/s/ Joe Brayer

Robert Keeney

ATTEST: I Linda K. Gebhard, Grant County Clerk, do certify that Resolution #42-16 Relating to Aging & Disability Resource Center Section 85.21 Grant County was approved by the Grant County Board of Supervisors at a meeting held on October 3, 2017.

Linda K. Gebhard, Grant County Clerk

Resolution Relating to the Aging & Disability Resource Center of Grant County 85.20: Lori Reid, ADRC Director presented the Federal based transportation grant to the County Board of Supervisors for their approval. This goes to the taxi operated in Iowa County. If Grant County would come up short in the funding, Iowa County will be asked to contribute more for their share.

Mark Stead, seconded by Greg Fry, made a motion to approve the Transportation Resolution 43-16 grant funds for ADRC in Section 85.20 of the Wisconsin Statutes. Motion carried.

Resolution 43-16
RESOLUTION RELATING TO THE
AGING & DISABILITY RESOURCE CENTER OF GRANT COUNTY

WHEREAS, Section 85.20 (State Aid) and 5311 (Federal Aid) of the Wisconsin Statutes authorizes the Wisconsin Department of Transportation to make grants to the counties of Wisconsin for the purpose of assisting them in providing subsidized taxi transportation service to residents of Grant and Iowa County; and

WHEREAS, this body considers that the provision of subsidized taxi transportation services would improve and promote the maintenance of human dignity and self-sufficiency of Grant and Iowa County residents.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED, that the Board of Supervisors of Grant County on this 1st day of October, 2013, authorizes the Aging & Disability Resource Center of Grant County to prepare and submit to the Wisconsin Department of Transportation an application for Public Transportation Operating Assistance during 2014 under 85.20 of the Wisconsin Statutes, in conformance with the requirements issued by that Department.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the Board of Supervisors of Grant County authorizes the Chairman of the County Board of Supervisors to execute a contract with the Wisconsin Department of Transportation under 85.20 (State Aid) and 5311 (Federal Aid) of the Wisconsin Statutes on behalf of Grant County.

Recommended for passage this 3rd day of October, 2017 by the Aging & Disability Resource Center - Grant County Committee.

/s/ Vickie Hirsch

/s/ Greg Fry

/s/ Dave Janney

Steve Wetter

/s/ Mary Lou Bausch

/s/ Dan Timmerman

/s/ Joe Brayer

/s/ Arnold Rawson

Robert Keeney

ATTEST: I Linda K. Gebhard, Grant County Clerk, do certify that Resolution #43-16 Relating to Aging & Disability Resource Center Section 85.20 Grant County was approved by the Grant County Board of Supervisors at a meeting held on October 3, 2017.

/s/ Linda K. Gebhard, Grant County Clerk

Resolution Regarding Opioid Litigation: Wisconsin Counties Association brought this resolution to the attention of all the Counties in Wisconsin. They are encouraging all the counties in Wisconsin to join in on this resolution in the collection of information necessary to form a good faith basis for filing a claim against the Opioid Manufacturers.

The Executive Committee recommended this resolution come before the full County Board; a unanimous vote was not received from the committee. Ben Wood, Corporation Counsel did not think the County would see a big check at the end of the day but a message could be sent if we all would unite this could help deter this opioid epidemic.

Greg Fry, made a motion seconded by Robert Scallon, to enter into this engagement with Crueger Dickinson L.L.C. and Von Briesen and Ropert s.c. Attorney at Law and join in the litigation to have Grant County's voice heard. Motion carried with one negative vote.

RESOLUTION NO. 44-16

TO THE HONORABLE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS OF GRANT COUNTY, WISCONSIN

MEMBERS,

WHEREAS, Grant County is concerned with the recent rapid rise in troubles among Grant County citizens, residents, and visitors in relation to problems arising out of the use, abuse and overuse of opioid medications, which according to certain studies, impacts millions of people across the country; and

WHEREAS, issues and concerns surrounding opioid use, abuse and overuse by citizens, residents and visitors are not unique to Grant County and are, in fact, issues and concerns shared by all other counties in Wisconsin and, for that matter, states and counties across the country, as has been well documented through various reports and publications, and is commonly referred to as the Opioid Epidemic ("Opioid Epidemic"); and

WHEREAS, the societal costs associated with the Opioid Epidemic are staggering and, according to the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, amount to over \$75 billion annually; and

WHEREAS, the National Institute for Health has identified the manufacturers of certain opioid medications as being directly responsible for the rapid rise of the Opioid Epidemic by virtue of their aggressive and, according to some, unlawful and unethical marketing practices; and

WHEREAS, certain opioid manufacturers have faced civil and criminal liability for their actions that relate directly to the rise of the Opioid Epidemic; and

WHEREAS, Grant County has spent millions in unexpected and unbudgeted time and resources in its programs and services related to the Opioid Epidemic; and

WHEREAS, Grant County is responsible for a multitude of programs and services, all of which require Grant County to expend resources generated through state and federal aid, property tax levy, fees and other permissible revenue sources; and

WHEREAS, Grant County's provision of programs and services becomes more and more difficult every year because the costs associated with providing the Opioid Epidemic programs and services continue to rise, yet Grant County's ability to generate revenue is limited by strict levy limit caps and stagnant or declining state and federal aid to Grant County; and

WHEREAS, all sums that Grant County expends in addressing, combatting and otherwise dealing with the Opioid Epidemic are sums that cannot be used for other critical programs and services that Grant County provides to Grant County citizens, residents and visitors; and

WHEREAS, Grant County has been informed that numerous counties and states across the country have filed or intend to file lawsuits against certain opioid manufacturers in an effort to force the persons and entities responsible for the Opioid Epidemic to assume financial responsibility for the costs associated with addressing, combatting and otherwise dealing with the Opioid Epidemic; and

WHEREAS, Grant County has engaged in discussions with representatives of the law firms of von Briesen & Roper, S.C., Crueger Dickinson LLC and Simmons Hanly Conroy LLC (the "Law Firms") related to the potential for Grant County to pursue certain legal claims against certain opioid manufacturers; and

WHEREAS, Grant County has been informed that the Law Firms have the requisite skill, experience and wherewithal to prosecute legal claims against certain of the opioid manufacturers on behalf of public entities seeking to hold them responsible for the Opioid Epidemic; and

WHEREAS, the Law Firms have proposed that Grant County engage the Law Firms to prosecute the aforementioned claims on a contingent fee basis whereby the Law Firms would not be compensated unless Grant County receives a financial benefit as a result of the proposed claims and the Law Firms would advance all claim-related costs and expenses associated with the claims; and

WHEREAS, all of the costs and expenses associated with the claims against certain opioid manufacturers would be borne by the Law Firms; and

WHEREAS, the Law Firms have prepared an engagement letter, which is submitted as part of this Resolution ("Engagement Letter") specifying the terms and conditions under which the Law Firms would provide legal services to Grant County and otherwise consistent with the terms of this Resolution; and

WHEREAS, Grant County is informed that the Wisconsin Counties Association has engaged in extensive discussions with the Law Firms and has expressed a desire to assist the Law Firms, Grant County and other counties in the prosecution of claims against certain of the opioid manufacturers; and

WHEREAS, Grant County would participate in the prosecution of the claim(s) contemplated in this Resolution and the Engagement Letter by providing information and materials to the Law Firms and, as appropriate, the Wisconsin Counties Association as needed; and

WHEREAS, Grant County believes it to be in the best interest of Grant County, its citizens, residents, visitors and taxpayers to join with other counties in and outside Wisconsin in pursuit of claims against certain of the opioid manufacturers, all upon the terms and conditions set forth in the Engagement Letter; and

WHEREAS, by pursuing the claims against certain of the opioid manufacturers, Grant County is attempting to hold those persons and entities that had a significant role in the creation of the Opioid Epidemic responsible for the financial costs assumed by Grant County and other public agencies across the country in dealing with the Opioid Epidemic.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED: Grant County authorizes, and agrees to be bound by, the Engagement Letter and hereby directs the appropriate officer of Grant County to execute the Engagement Letter on behalf the Grant County; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED: Grant County shall endeavor to faithfully perform all actions required of Grant County in relation to the claims contemplated herein and in the Engagement Letter and hereby directs all Grant County personnel to cooperate with and assist the Law Firms in relation thereto.

The Grant County Clerk shall forward a copy of this Resolution, together with the signed Engagement Letter, to the Wisconsin Counties Association, 22 E. Mifflin Street, Suite 900, Madison, Wisconsin, 53703.

Recommended for passage by the Executive Committee of the Grant County Board of Supervisors.

/s/ John Patcle, Chair
Mark Stead, Vice Chair
Mike Lieurance, Secretary
/s/ Donald Splinter

/s/ Robert Keeney
John Beinborn
/s/ Gary Ranum

Adopted by the Grant County Board of Supervisors on this 3rd Day of October, 2017.

/s/ Linda K. Gebhard, County Clerk

Amendments to the ATV Trail Ordinance 65: Dave Lambert, Highway Commissioner presented the amended ATV/UTV Ordinance to the Board of Supervisors. These are not new routes; in an effort to consolidate the current listing of routes and establish them in a more user friendly state Dave listed the County Trunk Highways alphabetically.

ORDINANCE NO. 65
(Proposed Hwy Committee 09/14/17)

AN ORDINANCE TO REPEAL AND RECREATE SECTION 268-4(a)-(jjj) OF THE CODE OF ORDINANCES OF GRANT COUNTY, WISCONSIN, RELATING TO ALL-TERRAIN AND UTILITY VEHICLE ROUTES.

NOW, THEREFORE, THE COUNTY BOARD OF GRANT COUNTY, WISCONSIN, DO ORDAIN AS FOLLOWS:

Section I: Section 268-4(a)-(jjj) of the County's Code of Ordinances is hereby repealed and recreated to read as follows:

"268-4 AREAS DESIGNATED: The areas designated as an all-terrain vehicle/utility-terrain vehicle route shall be as follows:

- (a) County Highway A, from County Highway X, southeast to State Trunk Highway 133;
- (b) County Highway A, from McKinley Street at the City of Lancaster City Limits, west to Badger Road;
- (c) County Trunk Highway A, from Cannon Road east to Dry Hollow Road;
- (d) County Trunk Highway A, from Canal Street, south to the park entrance, within the Village of Bloomington;
- (e) County Trunk Highway B, from US Highway 61, east to City of Platteville City Limits;
- (f) County Trunk Highway B, from Moundview Road, east to the County Line;
- (g) County Trunk Highway C, from CTH X, northwest across US Highway 18 to Kussmaul Hollow Road;
- (h) County Highway E beginning at Pine Grove Road, extending east through the Village of Stitzer and to Sleepy Hollow Road;
- (j) County Highway E, from Old Highway 80, east to Barber Avenue, within the Village of Livingston;
- (k) County Highway F beginning at County Highway E, extending north through the Village of Stitzer and to Fennimore-Liberty Road;
- (l) County Trunk Highway G, from CTH Q, north to Shemak Road;
- (m) County Trunk Highway H, from the Lafayette County Line, west to Washington Street within the City of Cuba City;
- (n) County Trunk Highway H, from CTH HHH, extending north along the frontage road to Peddle Hollow Road;
- (o) County Trunk Highway H, from Shoestring Road, extending east to Louisburg Road;
- (p) County Trunk Highway HHH, from CTH H, through the Village of Kieler, under US 151 to CTH H (frontage Road);
- (q) County Trunk Highway I, from Badger Road, south to a point 50 feet north of US Highway 18, within the Village of Montfort;
- (r) County Trunk Highway J, from CTH JJ, north to US Highway 18;
- (s) County Trunk Highway J, from Brookens Road, extending north to CTH JJ;
- (t) County Trunk Highway JJ, full length from US Highway 18 to US Highway 18;
- (u) County Trunk Highway K, from Pine Knob Road, east to Ihm Street;
- (v) County Trunk Highway K, from Bluff Road, north to Badger Road;
- (w) County Trunk Highway K, from Town of Mount Ida/North Lancaster Town Line, north to US Highway 18 and from US Highway 18, north to Town of Mount Ida/Marion Town Line;
- (x) County Trunk Highway N, from Chaffie Hollow Road, south to East Park Lane;
- (y) County Trunk Highway N, from State Trunk Highway 133, south to McCartney Landing;
- (z) County Trunk Highway N, from Hurricane Road, west to Pigeon River Road;
- (aa) County Trunk Highway O, from US Highway 61, east to Elm Road;
- (bb) County Trunk Highway P, from CTH A, northeast to Morgan Road;
- (cc) County Trunk Highway Q, from Baumgartner Road, northeast to Blue School Road;
- (dd) County Trunk Highway Q, from Cedar Road, east to CTH G;

- (ee) County Trunk Highway U, full length from Stage Road at the US 61 intersection, northwest through the Villages of Potosi and Beetown to CTH V;
- (ff) County Trunk Highway V, from Squirrel Hollow Road, west to the Glen Haven Boat Landing;
- (gg) County Trunk Highway V, from Maine Road, east to State Trunk Highway 133;
- (hh) County Trunk Highway V, from CTH U, west to State Trunk Highway 133;
- (jj) County Trunk Highway V, from CTH VV to CTH VV;
- (kk) County Trunk Highway VV, from CTH A, south to CTH V;
- (ll) County Trunk Highway VV, from State Trunk Highway 133, northwest to CTH V;
- (mm) County Trunk Highway W, from the Lafayette County Line, west to Church Street, within the Village of Hazel Green;
- (nn) County Trunk Highway X, from CTH A, north to Gasner Hollow Road;
- (oo) County Trunk Highway X, from CTH P, westerly to and through the Village of Wyalusing;
- (pp) County Trunk Highway Y, from State Trunk Highway 81, southeast to a point 50 feet from State Trunk Highway 133;
- (qq) County Trunk Highway Z, from Sinsinawa Road, north to Murphy Road;

Section II: This ordinance shall take effect upon its passage and publication or posting as required by law.

Approved by the Highway Committee on this day of the 14th of September, 2017 and recommended for passage by the Grant County Board of Supervisors.

Highway Committee Members:

/s/ Donald Splinter, Chair	/s/ John Patcle, Vice Chair
/s/ Mark Stead, Secretary	/s/ Lester Jantzen
/s/ Grant Loy	

Approved by the Grant County Board of Supervisors on this day of the 3rd of October, 2017.

GRANT COUNTY BY /s/ Robert Keeney, County Board Chair
 COUNTERSIGNED: /s/ Linda Gebhard, County Clerk

Date Adopted: April 16, 2013
 Date Recorded: October 3, 2017
 Date Published: October 11, 2017
 Effective Date: October 11, 2017

ATTEST: I Linda K. Gebhard do attest that the ATV Ordinance Amendment was approved by the Grant County Board of Supervisors at a meeting held on this day of the 3rd of October, 2017.
 /s/ Linda K. Gebhard, County Clerk

Amendment to the Grant County Address and Road Name Ordinance—Law Enforcement: Sheriff Nate Dreckman presented the amendment to Ordinance 68 Address and Road Names. In an effort to help clarify a permanent structure status in assigning fire numbers, Law Enforcement added one standard that will apply in assigning an address to a property.

John Beinborn, seconded by Robert Scallon, made a motion to approve the following addition under (8)Address Assignment Standard (C) A permanent structure is defined for this ordinance as a structure that is permanently attached to a slab, footing, or pilings or has a permanent electrical utilities provided by an electric company. Motion carried.

Ordinance follows in its entirety:

General Provisions

1. Authority

These regulations are adopted under the authority granted by 59.54(4) and (4m) Statute, Public Protection and Safety.

59.54

(4) RURAL NAMING OR NUMBERING SYSTEM. The board may establish a rural naming or numbering system in towns for the purpose of aiding in fire protection, emergency services, and civil defense, and appropriate and expend money therefor, under which:

(a) Each rural road, home, business, farm or other establishment, may be assigned a name or number.

(b) The names or numbers may be displayed on uniform signs posted on rural roads and intersections, and at each home, business, farm or other establishment.

(4m) RURAL NAMING OR NUMBERING SYSTEM; TOWN COOPERATION. The rural naming or numbering system under sub. (4) may be carried out in cooperation with any town or towns in the county.

2. Purpose

The purpose of this Ordinance is to establish and maintain a consistent rural address number and road name system within the unincorporated areas of Grant County WI. The intent in establishing an addressing system is to assign each location a unique address which will aid emergency services as well as being a convenience for delivery of services and citizenry.

It is further intended that this Ordinance is to establish a method by which address numbers are assigned, as well as how address signs are obtained, installed, and maintained in all unincorporated areas in Grant County. It is further intended to provide for review and acceptance of all private and public road names in order to ensure compatibility with the county's computer aided dispatch system.

3. Jurisdiction

The jurisdiction of this Ordinance shall include all lands and waters within Grant County outside the limits of incorporated cities and villages.

4. Repeal and Greater Restrictions

It is not intended by this Ordinance to repeal, abrogate, annul, impair, or interfere with any existing ordinances, rules, or regulations adopted by Grant County. However, wherever this Ordinance imposes greater restrictions, the provisions of this Ordinance shall govern.

5. Severability

If any section, clause, provision, or portion of this Ordinance is adjudged unconstitutional or invalid by a court of competent jurisdiction, the remainder of this Ordinance shall not be affected thereby.

6. Title

This Ordinance shall be known as, referred to, or cited as the "Grant County Address and Road Name Ordinance.

7. Effective Date

This Ordinance shall be effective after adoption by the County Board of Supervisors and take effect the date of adoption.

8. Address Assignment

It shall be the duty of the Grant County Sheriff's Office or their designee to assign an address number to all property within the jurisdiction of this ordinance. All homes, businesses, farms, structures for human habitation, multifamily dwellings and other establishments shall have an assigned address. The following standards shall apply when assigning addresses:

- A. An address number shall be assigned upon the issuance of the first land use permit allowing construction on said property, or with the written request of a property owner or Town Board.
- B. Address numbers will not be assigned to vacant land unless a permanent structure is to be constructed or placed on the vacant property within a time agreed upon by both the township having jurisdiction and Grant County Sheriff's Office. Property with only a moveable structure will not have an address assigned.
- C. A permanent structure is defined for this ordinance as a structure that is permanently attached to a slab, footing, or pilings or has a permanent electrical utilities provided by an electric company.
- D. Upon issuance of an address, the Grant County Sheriff's Office will notify the affected property owner, and the town in which the property is located of the official address.
- E. The address assigned by the Grant County Sheriff's Office shall be the official address for said property and replace any prior address used.
- F. There shall be no duplication of address numbers assigned along the same road.
- G. Properties with more than one single family residence shall have a separate address for each residence.
- H. Industrial or business complexes shall be assigned one address number with extensions given for individual units.
- I. Multifamily dwellings of more than two units shall be assigned one address number with extensions assigned for each unit. Multifamily dwellings shall have distinct markings adjacent to the door to identify the individual unit.
- J. Numbers shall be assigned according to where the access driveway intersects the public road along a grid system extending from the southeast corner of Grant County with numbers increasing to the north and west. Starting with fire number 100.

- K. In the case where the private driveway intersects a public or private road in another county or in a city or village, the number shall be agreed upon by both jurisdictions with deference to the jurisdiction providing emergency services.
- L. There shall be 400 numbers assigned for every mile of the grid with even/odd numbers assigned as follows:
 - a) Along north/south roads: even numbers shall be on the east side of the road and odd numbers on the west side of the road.
 - b) Along east/west roads: even numbers shall be on the north side of the road and odd numbers on the south side of the road

9. Placement

An address sign for a property shall be placed by the Town in which the property is located according to the following standards:

The sign shall be installed so that the numbers are perpendicular to the public road and the post shall be located not more than ten (10) feet within the right of way of the road and not more than ten (10) feet from the driveway serving the building

The sign shall not be less than 3 ½ feet or more than 4 ½ feet from ground level and shall not be concealed from view from the road by trees, shrubs, bushes, etc.

In cases where more than one property is served by a common private access, an address sign for each property shall be placed as described in this section.

The Town may propose an alternate placement option for an address sign so as to make it best visible for local responding emergency services and so as not to obstruct road maintenance responsibilities, such as snowplowing, grading, etc. The town shall notify the Grant County Sheriff's Office of the new location of the address sign and the reason for the alternate location. The sign may be placed after review and approval by the Grant County Sheriff's Office or their designee

Multifamily dwellings shall have distinct markings on the door or doorway to identify the individual units.

Any manufactured/mobile home park or campground shall consecutively number the lots. A map of the property showing the lots shall be given to the Grant County Sheriff's Office to be used for mapping. Any changes or addition of lots shall require a new map be sent to the Grant County Sheriff's Office.

Any relocation of an address or road name sign must be done with the consent of the affected Town and in compliance with the provisions of this ordinance.

10. Sign Design, Procurement and Replacement

All address signs shall be of a size, shape and design so as to comply with the standards established by County Board resolution. All posts and fastening hardware shall meet with the approval of the Grant County Sheriff's Office.

Address signs shall include the township name, address and road name.

All address signs shall be procured by the towns based upon a vendor or vendors chosen by the towns.

When either damaged, destroyed or aged beyond usefulness, an existing address sign may be requested for replacement by the affected property owner, Town in which the sign is located or Grant County Sheriff's Office. If an emergency response agency feels a replacement sign is needed, they shall contact the Town the address is located to have a new sign ordered. The affected Town may then choose to pay the fee and seek reimbursement from the effected property owner. When it is unclear as to whether a sign needs replacement, the Town shall make the final decision.

11. Maintenance

It shall be the responsibility of the property owner to maintain all address signs for his/her property. Maintenance includes notifying the town for need of replacement, repairs

The property owner is responsible for reinstallation and keeping the sign(s) in a physical condition whereby the address is easily and clearly legible at any time. The property owner shall also ensure the sign is clearly visible from the public road and not obscured by vegetation, structures, snow, etc.

12. Existing Addresses

Addresses which exist at the time of the adoption of this Ordinance but do not meet all the provisions of this Ordinance may be allowed to remain the official address for said property if they are registered at the Grant County Sheriff's Office as an official address. If it is determined that there is potential risk to life and safety, an existing number shall be changed in order to comply with the provisions of this Ordinance. Any such address not listed on the index shall be deemed void and an official address shall be assigned by the Grant County Sheriff's Office.

In all cases, when an existing nonconforming address sign needs replacement, a new address number shall be assigned and a sign obtained in compliance with the provisions of this Ordinance and the original existing address shall become null and void. Any existing address sign that is not a valid sign shall be removed.

13. Road Names

All proposed public and private road names, whether new or proposed as a change in name, shall be subject to approval by the Grant County Sheriff's Office for compatibility with the county's computer aided dispatch system and geographic information system (GIS). Duplicate and like-sounding names shall be prohibited.

No Town shall accept any new public road or rename an existing public road without first having the proposed name accepted by the Grant County Sheriff's Office

Road name signs shall meet the standards established by county board resolution. Said signs shall be installed and maintained by the affected town.

14. Official Map

There shall be created the Grant County Road Name and Address Map. This map shows the official road names and addresses as accepted under the provisions of this ordinance.

Any address number or road name not shown on this map and its associated database shall not be considered official and may be considered violations to the provisions of this ordinance.

15. Violations

It shall be the duty of the Grant County Sheriff’s Office, to enforce the provisions of the Ordinance, investigate complaints, and give notice of violations. Said Office shall have the power to issue a written order to correct any violation of this Ordinance that shall specify the following:

- a) The nature of the violation and the steps needed to abate and/or correct it.
- b) The penalty or penalties the violator will be subject to if the alleged violation is not abated and/or corrected within a specified time period.

If the owner does not comply with a written order from the Of Grant County Sheriff’s Office, the owner shall be subject to one or more of the following penalties:

- a) Full cost of all damages including sign replacement.
- b) Receipt of a citation for each violation with a forfeiture of no less than \$250 per violation, plus costs of prosecution

Referral by written complaint to the Grant County Corporation Counsel for prosecution

Examples of violations may include, but are not limited to:

- a) The placements of a non-official address sign or road name sign at or near the location of the official signs.
- b) The placement of any sign that resembles the official address or road sign in form, shape, color or design.
- c) The destruction, removal, vandalism of an official address or road name sign.
- d) The unapproved relocation of an official address or road name sign.

Comprehensive Plan Change: None

Zoning Amendment(s): 541th Zoning Amendment: Justin Johnson, Conservation, Sanitation and Zoning presented the 541st Zoning Amendment to the Grant County Board of Supervisors. All changes were recommended for approval by the Town Boards, and the Conservation, Sanitation and Zoning Committee. All changes are in compliance with the Comprehensive Plans.

A motion was made by Mark Stead, seconded by Dwight Nelson, to approve Zoning Amendment 541st including Petition 17-17 Sam and Nancy Droessler, Jamestown Township and Petition 17-18 Darold Rux, Muscoda Township. Motion carried.

**541st AMENDMENT TO THE
GRANT COUNTY ZONING ORDINANCE
October 3rd, 2017**

WHEREAS, a petition for map amendment was filed and a public hearing was held by the Grant County Conservation, Sanitation and Zoning Committee, meeting the requirements of Chapter 59.69 (5) (e) 2.

WHEREAS, a proof of publication and giving notice to each affected township clerk of such hearing is attached to this document. Chapter 59.69 (5) (e) 4

WHEREAS, the Conservation, Sanitation and Zoning Committee now recommends to the Board of Supervisors of Grant County the adoption of the following map amendments.

NOW THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that the Grant County Board of Supervisors does ordain as follows. That the Zoning District Map for Grant County will be amended to reflect the following:

PETITION #17-17: Rezone request for Sam & Nancy Droessler, PIN: 026-00311-0020, to change the zoning classification from R1 to R2, to allow for the use of a multi-family dwelling. This is for +/- .42 ac in the SW ¼ of the SE ¼ and SE ¼ of the SE ¼ of Section 4, T1N, R2W for lot 52, in Jamestown Township

PETITION #17-18: Rezone request for Darold Rux, PIN: 042-00604-0000 & PIN: 042-00606-0000, to change the zoning classification from R1 to A2, to allow for an agricultural use. This is for +/- 10.42 ac in the SW ¼ of the SW ¼, SE ¼ of the SW ¼ of Section 12, NE ¼ of the NW ¼, and NW ¼ of the NW ¼ of Section 13, T8N, R1W for lots 3 and 5, in Muscoda Township

Adopted by the Grant County Board of Supervisors this 3rd day of October, 2017

/s/ Robert Keeney, County Board Chairman **Attest:** /s/ Linda Gebhard, County Clerk

Zoning Amendment: 542nd Zoning Amendment: Justin Johnson, Conservation, Sanitation and Zoning presented the 542nd Zoning Amendment to the Grant County Board of Supervisors. All changes were recommended for approval by the Town Boards, and the Conservation, Sanitation and Zoning Committee. All changes are in compliance with the Comprehensive Plans.

Dwight Nelson made a motion seconded by Lester Jantzen to approve Zoning Amendment 542 including Petition 17-19 Donavin and Delvin Wilhelm, Potosi Township. Motion carried.

**542nd AMENDMENT TO THE
GRANT COUNTY ZONING ORDINANCE
October 3rd, 2017**

WHEREAS, a petition for map amendment was filed and a public hearing was held by the Grant County Conservation, Sanitation and Zoning Committee, meeting the requirements of Chapter 59.69 (5) (e) 2.

WHEREAS, a proof of publication and giving notice to each affected township clerk of such hearing is attached to this document. Chapter 59.69 (5) (e) 4

WHEREAS, the Conservation, Sanitation and Zoning Committee now recommends to the Board of Supervisors of Grant County the adoption of the following map amendments.

NOW THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that the Grant County Board of Supervisors does ordain as follows. That the Zoning District Map for Grant County will be amended to reflect the following:

PETITION #17-19: Rezone request for Donavin & Delvin Wilhelm, PIN: 052-01074-0000, to change the zoning classification from FP to A2, to allow for the use of a non-farm residence. This is for +/- 1.88 ac in the NE ¼ of the SE ¼ of Section 2, T3N, R10W, in Potosi Township

Adopted by the Grant County Board of Supervisors this 3rd day of October, 2017

/s/ Robert Keeney, County Board Chairman **Attest:** /s/ Linda Gebhard, County Clerk

Dog Claim(s): Grant County Humane Society: Roger Guthrie presented one invoice for dog claims from Grant County Humane Society for \$270.00 for two dogs taken in.

Roger Guthrie, seconded by Grant Loy, made a motion to approve the dog claim to be paid in full for the amount of \$270.00 to the Grant County Humane Society. Motion carried.

County Board Insurance Policy: Chair Keeney stated that this item was clarified when the line item of the August 15, 2017 minutes were discussed so this item can be skipped.

Committee Structure and Board Rules: Chair Keeney stated the Administrative Committee meet and outlined some recommendations that he would like the Board Members to review. He stated in the current committee structure these are about \$1325 per diem events, this could possibly be cut in half for County operations. Chair Keeney said there can be no action taken on this item, if changes are made the County Board Rules would have to be amended according to Ben Wood, Corporation Counsel.

Ben Wood, Corporation Counsel stated back in April 2016 the following amendment was added to the County Board Rules because previously when the Board wanted to make any changes the County did not have a policy to address changes. Before any changes can be made to committees or the structure of the rules the following procedure would have to be followed. ***“BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED: That any modifications or amendments to the rules of the Grant County Board of Supervisors and Committees shall first be reviewed and recommended for approval by the Administrative Committee. The full County Board of Supervisors shall take action at a subsequent Board meeting. A copy of the proposed amendments shall be distributed to the County Board by the County Clerk for review and comment prior to final approval”.***

The following ideas were discussed:

- 1.) Cut down the members on some committees.
- 2.) Some committees could meet every other month.
- 3.) Carol Beals asked if tele-conferencing could be implemented. *There seemed to be some opposition regarding allowing members to participate by phone. Quorums came into question, closed sessions may be compromised, what is a good reason to simply not attend the meeting but attend via the phone.*
- 4.) Do not pay per diem during the days while attending a convention.
- 5.) Carol Beals stated there should be wording in the rules that stipulates how a vacant County Board Supervisor position is to be filled.

Mark Stead stated in the Administrative Committee there was discussion to combine Public Property/Technology with Executive or Administrative. Carol Beals was very much against that move because the technology of the County has come ahead in the last few years it would be a shame to let

that go back to what it was and John Beinborn stated Executive Committee has enough to address already. Carol asked Corporation Counsel if legally committees can be combined. He stated as long as the State Statutes are followed per meetings it can be done.

Dale Hood stated he would not like to see any more combining or eliminating committees being done, services to the County are going to suffer if this keeps happening. Don Splinter stated if too many committees are eliminated and some committees handle too much that could cause some problems with oversight of issues for the county.

Combining Health Committee with Social Services Committee was discussed.

Carol Beals asked if there could be language made to set the time of the meetings at a permanent time.

Chair Keeney stated the ideas he is hearing are to consider cutting the number of members, cutting some of the number of committee meetings to every other month instead of every month. Look into teleconferencing meetings. He informed the Board that in the next couple weeks he would call another Administrative Committee to discuss these recommendations and bring them back to the full county board for the final discussion and possible action.

Implementation of Grant County Classification and Compensation Plan: Patrick Glynn, Carlson-Dettman addressed the Board and Nancy Scott presented a power point of the reasons the County needed to pursue this wage study; a wage study that was based on market, consistent and affordable.

Carol Beals asked why two wage studies, Orchard Manor and General County. Glynn stated it was because of the difference in a Nursing Home type facility that is tied to so many different kinds of funding verses general county positions. This tends to confuse their regression analyses graphs based on market value and financial is the driving force in a study. Also, there are a lot of nursing home data surveys to help separate these entities from general working employees.

Carol Beals asked questions about why there is so much difference between an Orchard Manor RN's and the Health Department RN's. Glynn stated this is an issue that has been discussed at length, he will dodge that question for now but he feels this issue has been agreed upon and will be addressed.

Carol went on to question the Office Manager at the Highway verses the Office Manager at Orchard Manor. Carol felt their skill set and markets should be the same for both of those positions, but Glynn disagreed stating market is different for those positions, a title does not dictate the job, but the description does. Carol stated there is a \$3.00 difference between those two positions that should both have the same skill set; Glynn stated a different set of market data for Orchard Manor and the second reason is that those positions have different job duties. Carol asked where someone goes to get market value data on an Administrative Secretary/Clerical positions that will dictate the differences in the Highway, Social Service, Health Department, etc. Glynn stated the job descriptions were analyzed, some having more financial, some more clerical; data used by Carlson-Dettman from data from communities in the region, county governments, private sector data to determine the employee market. Carol stated how you can compare Grant County to Dane, Milwaukee, LaCrosse that is not apples to apples.

In further discussion it was stated by Nancy Scott, Finance Director that 90% of the County employees would be eligible for an increase. Carol Beals stated that on a good common compensation study the results are usually 30% or 40%; 90% seemed extremely high. Carol Beals wondered how the County became so far behind market value. Glynn stated yes the County is behind. Carol stated the County will have some employees who could be stuck in their position wage only eligible to receive a cost of living raise. On the other hand, some could wait until 2023 to receive a raise; she wondered why that would not be harmful to those employees. Explanations were given by Glynn and Nancy Scott, Finance stated that all may not be happy but the recommendation needed to be sustainable.

Mike Lieurance asked questions regarding appeals processes. Glynn explained there is a "pre-appeals process which the employee can go through the Personnel Director asking to see the point system used to rank their job. To go forward from there the Department Head must sign the appeal to continue. There are basically two criteria that would allow the appeal to go forward 1.) Error in classification/documentation or 2.) Substantial changes in job. Glynn stated if the employee simply feels they have been placed in the wrong ranking; they should not waste their time in an appeal. Each appeal will cost \$175.00 per appeal.

Mike also asked if the plan is implemented is the county still looking at across the board increases. Chair Keeney stated that is the ultimate goal but it will take 8 years to reach market. Greg Fry asked what the time frame for the step increases are; Chair Keeney stated annual progression. Greg wondered how the county keeps quality employees. Chair Keeney stated the County will also have to be committed to keep the wage schedule up to market.

Carol Beals stated would it be better to have all the classifications placed in the correct grade before implementing this wage schedule. Glynn stated he would measure his words carefully here. As a board he stated they had the ability to do anything they want with any classification you want; they have the final decision. But he would caution to pay attention to the regression analysis. Carlson Dettman has the market data to back them up.

Greg Fry asked who determines what step the employee comes into in each grade, Glynn stated ultimately it would be a County Administrator, Administrative Coordinator, the person who holds the purse strings; Glynn would hesitate to bring this to any committee because of the time line. In Grant County Human Resource took on this role, it was stated Human Resource should be charged with maintaining the internal equity of the County. Greg asked how are personality conflicts kept out of these placements? Glynn stated this system does not guard against that at all; that is where you trust the Department Heads who would be very mindful of where other employees exist on this structure. He cautioned leapfrogging an employee up through the steps but it should be based on skill and ability and market value, internal discipline is required.

Roger Guthrie asked about reclassifications. Glynn stated from June to October is when they generally receive those; it cost \$250.00 per job.

John Beinborn, asked about the ongoing conversation with the dynamic conversation going on between the Public Health Nurses and CNA's between Orchard Manor and Health Department, will that be

resolved. Carol Beals asked about Social Workers classified in a grade, one for Social Service and one in Health Department, one having a master degree one not but have the same pay. Her question was is the County going to be in the same situation there as with the RN's, one having an Associate Degree, one having Bachelor of Science Nurse getting the same pay. Glynn stated there has been a lot of discussion regarding that situation. Health Department can cross utilize those nurses in Public Health so a schedule for Bachelor Degree RN and Associate Degree RN was made. Jeff Kindrai addressed the question Carol Beals had in regard to the Social Workers; Health Department Social Worker for Hospice has to follow State Statutes qualification was grandfathered in but he has concerns in the future if another Social Worker will need to be hired. Carol Beals asked in the rehiring of new people that do not fit the scale there needs to be a discussion; the pay grade may need to be looked at according to degree.

Chair Keeney addressed the Board in what direction they want to go. Because there has been discussions going on regarding the Health Department Aides and RN's and was felt an agreement had been worked out, but there was no time to submit the amendment in writing to present at the County Board Meeting, there was confusion in how a motion should be addressed regarding the wage study. Carol Beals wondered how the Board could implement the wage study without having the agreement in writing from Carlson-Dettman. Glynn stated he could have the formal written explanation for the County Board to address at their next meeting. That came into question by the Personnel Director, Joyce Roling. Carol Beal asked how can the Board agree to approve implementing the wage study as presented when all the information is not available at this time. After discussion between Chair Keeney, Patrick Glynn and Joyce Roling, if the amendment for the Health Department was agreed upon by all parties and it was stated in the motion the wage study could be approved for implementation. Patrick Glynn would send the amended changes to the County in writing as soon as he had them in completed.

Dale Hood asked how many years is this good for? Glynn stated 15 years plus depending on the organization desire; if the structure is maintained, or if desired, going out every three to four years to refresh the market. There needs to be a goal by the organization to recruit and maintain, there needs to be some discussion in the future as it related to the control mark, or if a performance based structure is implemented.

Dale Hood asked how the County got so out of whack. Glynn blamed things like "silver tsunami, as the Baby Boomers move out of the workforce, the market moved, and an economic upturn that contributed to a tighter labor market, the world is changing". There are not the employees coming into the workforce to fill those jobs. There are a number of organizations who work diligently to keep competitive with the market.

Dale Hood asked what the time line for this wage study is. Glynn stated the total implementation has to be done by the end of December which included time for the appeal process in order for the County to implement on January 1, 2018. Dale felt there seems to be some urgency to get this wage study passed immediately, if all the documentation is not available at this time could this be brought back in the November meeting for consideration. Joyce Roling stated she felt all the Board Members understand what the amendment for the Health Department would be, there is a trust factor here that Patrick Glynn will get the amended information back to the County as soon as possible, she then will send it out to all members.

A motion was made by Roger Guthrie, seconded by Gary Ranum, to implement the Grant County Classification and Compensation Plan completed by Carlson-Dettman as presented contingent on receiving the additional information discussed regarding Health Department revisions made to decrease the Public Health and Home Health Aids one grade, and increasing the BSN and ADN positions up one grade. This plan has been already considered in the budget. Roll Call vote was called for.

ROLL CALL VOTE

DATE: October 3, 2017

QUESTION: To implement the Grant County Classification and Compensation Plan.

	YES	NO	ABSTAIN	ABSENT
1. GARY RANUM	X			
2. GRANT LOY		X		
3. ROBERT SCALLON			X	
4. ROBERT KEENEY	X			
5. ROGER GUTHRIE	X			
6. JOHN PATCLE		X		
7. GREGORY FRY	X			
8. RONALD COPPERNOLL		X		
9. MIKE LIEURANCE	X			
10. MARK STEAD		X		
11. DALE HOOD	X			
12. DWIGHT NELSON	X			
13. CAROL BEALS	X			
14. LESTER JANTZEN	X			
15. JOHN BEINBORN		X		
16. DONALD SPLINTER	X			
17. DANIEL TIMMERMAN				X

County Clerk took the roll call vote resulting in 10 yes votes, 5 no votes, 1 abstained, and 1 absent. Therefore motion carried.

Committee Reports: Mark Stead, seconded by Roger Guthrie, made a motion to postpone the committee reports due to the length of the meeting until the next meeting in November.

Adjournment: John Beinborn, seconded by Lester Jantzen, made a motion to adjourn the meeting pursuant to the next meeting on Tuesday, November 14, 2017 at 10:00 a.m. Motion carried.