

**JEFFERSON COUNTY BOARD MINUTES
TUESDAY, AUGUST 9, 2011, 7:00 P.M.**

Mr. John Molinaro presiding.

Mr. Jones led the Pledge of Allegiance.

A moment of silence was observed.

County Clerk Barbara A. Frank called the roll. Supervisors Morris and Kuhlman gave prior notice of their inability to attend. Supervisors Peterson and Poulson were also absent.

District 1	Richard C. Jones	District 2	Vic Imrie, Jr.
District 3	Greg David	District 4	Augie Tietz
District 5	Jim Braughler	District 6	Ron Buchanan
District 7	Dwayne C. Morris	District 8	Rick L. Kuhlman
District 9	Amy Rinard	District 10	Lloyd Zastrow
District 11	Donald Reese	District 12	Mike Burow
District 13	Ed Morse	District 14	Pamela Rogers
District 15	Steven J. Nass	District 16	John Molinaro
District 17	Mary Delany	District 18	Jennifer Hanneman
District 19	Jim Schroeder	District 20	Jan Rooou
District 21	Craig Peterson	District 22	Blane Poulson
District 23	George Jaeckel	District 24	Gregory M. Torres
District 25	Walt Christensen	District 26	Carlton Zentner
District 27	Glen D. Borland	District 28	Dick Schultz
District 29	Paul Babcock	District 30	Jim Mode

County Administrator Gary Petre informed the Board that it was in compliance with the Open Meetings Law.

Mr. Schultz moved to suspend the rules to discuss agenda items 9d, e, f and g (Resolutions 2011-37, 38, 39 and 40) before a vote on any of said resolutions. Seconded and carried: Ayes 26, Noes 0, Absent 4 (Morris, Kuhlman, Peterson, Poulson).

Mr. Mode moved that the minutes of the July 12, 2011, meeting be approved as printed. Seconded and carried.

**GENERAL FINANCIAL CONDITION
JEFFERSON COUNTY, WISCONSIN
AUGUST 1, 2011**

Available Cash on Hand		
July 1, 2011	\$ (513,214.24)	
July Receipts	<u>15,304,520.18</u>	
Total Cash		\$14,791,305.94
Disbursements		
General - July 2011	\$10,926,833.31	
Payroll - July 2011	<u>1,291,726.68</u>	
Total Disbursements		<u>12,218,559.99</u>
Total Available Cash		\$ 2,572,745.95
Cash on Hand (in banks) August 1, 2011	\$ 3,252,548.27	
Less Outstanding Checks	<u>679,802.32</u>	
Total Available Cash		\$ 2,572,745.95

AIM Government & Agency Portfolio	3,990,921.92
Local Govt. Invest. Pool - General	39,028,117.02
Institutional Capital Management	15,811,419.90
Local Government Investment Pool – Clerk of Courts	160,844.02
Local Government Investment Pool – Farmland Preservation	251,911.40
Local Government Investment Pool – Parks/Liddle	<u>112,134.18</u>
	\$59,355,348.44
2011 Interest - Super N.O.W. Account	\$ 1,586.25
2011 Interest - L.G.I.P. - General Funds	14,576.86
2011 Interest - ICM	132,675.62
2011 Interest - AIM	259.18
2011 Interest - L.G.I.P. - Parks/Carol Liddle Fund	121.36
2011 Interest – L.G.I.P. – Farmland Preservation	213.91
2011 Interest - L.G.I.P. – Clerk of Courts	<u>136.58</u>
Total 2011 Interest	\$ 149,569.76

JOHN E. JENSEN
JEFFERSON COUNTY TREASURER

County Board Chair Molinaro presented the following communication:

Notice of Public Hearing from the Planning & Zoning Committee for a hearing to be held on August 18, 2011, at 7:00 p.m. in Room 205 of the Jefferson County Courthouse, Jefferson.

The notice was received and placed on file.

The floor was opened for public comment. John Kannard, Helenville, and Buck Smith, Johnson Creek, spoke on the highway shop location. Michael Wallace, President/CEO of Fort Health Care, encouraged the Board to support Resolution 2011-28.

Special Order of Business.

At 7:14 p.m. a public hearing commenced regarding Jefferson County reapportionment/County Board supervisor redistricting. Mr. Mode read the Notice of Public Hearing. No one from the public requested to speak. The Clerk advised no written comments had been received. The public hearing was closed at 7:16 p.m.

Norman Barrientos, representing Barrientos Designs, Inc., presented the proposed Highway Department facility site locations.

Mr. Burow presented a report from the Land & Water Conservation Committee.

**Report
Land & Water Conservation Committee
as presented on July 27, 2011**

Part of the following information was obtained from the land records office and also from tax assessment bills. The purpose of this information is to attempt to put a value on the county farm land where there is a proposal to build a new highway shop facility. We attempted to get some realtors to give us an idea of the land value, but they would not commit a price without appraisals. In our opinion, it is not worth spending money for an appraisal because it would not reflect what the value of the land would be if developed. In an attempt to come up with

a ball park figure, we used existing properties that are in close proximity to this land for comparison purposes.

In addition to the land information we obtained, we created 3 different cost scenarios for lot prices for homes, and added a \$175,000 home on each lot. We feel that these figures are in the low end of what we could expect to see, as most new homes are higher than what we used, and also in a mixed use zoning there would be businesses that would most likely pay more for land and build a more costly facility.

Walmart land purchase in 2007 = \$1,719,000 for 22 acres of unimproved land. This figures out to \$78,136 per acre.

County Market purchased 5 acres of land in 1991 for \$247,500 or \$49,500 per acre. Accounting for inflation for 20 years, this land could very well sell today for close to \$100,000 per acre. (Figure at least the Walmart cost as value.)

McDonald's current assessment for 2011 for their 1.2 acres of land is \$147,000 or \$122,500 per acre.

The above 3 parcels are all near the proposed land site for the new highway shop. The average value per acre of these 3 parcels is about \$93,000 per acre, with that figure based on purchase prices and tax bill assessments. In addition, most tax bill assessments are not always as high as what the parcels could be sold for, especially in a seller's market, when businesses want to come into a mixed zoning area.

The proposed highway shop will take 30 acres of land right away, with an additional 10 acres of land set aside for future use for a total of 40 acres.

If we sold the 40 acres to a developer for \$86,750 per acre (\$6,250 less than the above figure of \$93,000 per acre, to cover deed transfers, title policy and other expenses) we would receive \$3,470,000 for the land.

If the developer made 4 residential lots per acre, there would be the potential for 160 lots. Lots in Jefferson were selling for \$30,000 or more prior to the market downturn. I figured lot prices at \$20, \$25 and \$30,000 per lot. Then I figured a \$175,000 home on each lot. The total cost of a home and a lot would be \$195,000, \$200,000, or \$205,000. I believe that these figures are actually low, as most new homes are higher than what I have used, and also if any businesses locate in the area, the selling prices and improvements would most likely be higher. This is what I consider a minimum amount to expect. It's possible that not as many as 160 lots could be made, or a combination of larger and smaller lots, or business lots could be put in. Still, on an average, I feel that this would be feasible, and my figures are actually \$6,250 less per lot than what seems to be average costs.

All homes and lots are multiplied by 160 as follows:

\$195,000 homes/lot = a value of \$31,200,000

\$200,000 homes/lot = a value of \$32,000,000

\$205,000 homes/lot = a value of \$32,800,000

Multiply the above values by 2011 county tax levy of \$3.9813 (does not include library or debt service levies). Taxes we (Jefferson County) would get

from the above homes' figures:

\$195,000 homes = \$121,409 per year or \$2,428,171 in 20 years without yearly increases

\$200,000 homes = \$124,522 per year or \$2,490,432 in 20 years without yearly increases

\$205,000 homes = \$127,635 per year or \$2,552,693 over 20 years without yearly increases

The following is how much Jefferson County would lose over 20 years if the tax rate never increased. These figures are the loss of money from the sale of the land, and the loss of taxes from after the land is sold and improved.

\$195,000 property (all combined) = \$5,898,171

\$200,000 property (all combined) = \$5,960,432

\$205,000 property (all combined) = \$6,022.693

In other words, if the County were to build the highway shop on this land, we could lose a minimum of around \$6 million and in reality, it would be much more, with yearly increases in the tax levy and this does not include taxes levied for library and debt service.

In addition, Land & Water receives around \$10,000 - \$12,000 per year rent income on this property. (\$200,000 to \$240,000 loss of income over 20 years, without any future increases figured in.) With corn prices continuing to rise, land rents could go even higher than they are now. Land & Water has been told that if this land is used, the lost income will be restored with levy money. However, this will be funded by the taxpayers, rather than by a renter. This will also increase the tax levy. It also puts Land & Water Department in a position that they may be requested to lower their levy in the future, where this part of our budget is not levy money now.

There needs to be a consideration for the value of the proposed building site, and the loss of future property taxes included in the cost of a new facility on County owned land. Land costs were figured into all other sites, but not this one. If we added a minimum of \$6 million in lost revenue to the cost of building on this site, that would make this site the most expensive option considered. The current site doesn't count because it already is in use as a county facility.

Motion made at the 7-27-11 Land & Water Conservation Committee meeting passed with a unanimous vote.

If it is decided by the Jefferson County Board to build a new Jefferson County Highway Department facility, the Jefferson County Land & Water Conservation Committee, as stewards of the county farm land, recommends that it not be built on county owned land for the following reasons:

1. Premature loss of prime farmland.
2. Loss of department yearly non-tax levy income.
3. Loss of future income from sale of land and tax income from improvements, on what we consider the most valuable land that Jefferson County currently owns.
4. The proposed site(s) may create drainage issues on the remaining land that could affect future rent income and expenses. NOTE: If the C1 or C2 sites are used, the new building will go right over the top of extensive field drain

tiles. This will totally disrupt the existing system, and will need to be replaced. The addition of asphalt drives and parking lots, and extensive roofs will only add to an already wet area and create more drainage issues.

5. One of the reasons for not staying at the current site is that it is in a residential area. The new site will also be in a residential area and may affect the value of the remaining land.
6. Other sites or the current site are available.
7. Insufficient credible analysis of the Puerner and other existing industrial sites unfairly elevates the county farm site as the preferred site in the Barrientos report.

Mr. Burow requested that the report be printed in the record. Discussion.

Mr. Burow read Resolution No. 2011-37.

WHEREAS, several committees have been advised by a consultant as to the pros and cons of a number of different potential locations for a new Highway Department facility, and

WHEREAS, using county owned land has opportunity costs for loss of potential sale value of the property, agricultural rents until the property is sold and a diminished future tax base resulting from no increase in taxable development on the land to be used for the county facility, and

WHEREAS, the Land & Water Conservation Committee believes the County Board should consider these economic factors as part of a final decision to proceed to locate a new highway facility on county property,

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED that prior to authorizing construction of a new county highway shop facility on county owned land, the Board will have prepared for its review and to inform the public, information including the undeveloped and developed values of the land to be used and the potential impact on the county tax base for public vs. private use of the land over the next twenty year period.

Fiscal Note: If this data is prepared by staff, there should be no additional expenditures. In the event it is determined that the data would be prepared by a consultant, the cost of that is unknown at this time. The Highway Department's 2011 budget has a balance of approximately \$220,000 available for continued work on this project.

Mr. Burow moved that Resolution No. 2011-37 be adopted. Seconded. Discussion. (No vote was taken pursuant to previous suspension of the rules.)

Mr. Reese read Resolution No. 2011-38.

WHEREAS, the Highway Department's 2011 Adopted Budget includes \$250,000 for consultant fees relating to site assessment, planning and preliminary design for Highway Department facilities, and

WHEREAS, in December 2010 a Request for Proposal process was initiated by the Highway Department, under the oversight of the Highway and Infrastructure Committees, to hire a consultant to analyze potential sites for a new County Highway Department main facility and satellite facilities, and

WHEREAS, the firm of Barrientos Design, Inc. was hired to perform the site

analysis and presented its report to the full County Board on May 10, 2011, and

WHEREAS, the consultant was requested by the Highway, Infrastructure and Land and Water Conservation Committees to perform additional analysis of optional sites for a new Highway Department main facility, and

WHEREAS, a total of nine potential sites have been analyzed by the consultant, and

WHEREAS, the consultant's analysis of potential sites has been discussed on numerous occasions at public meetings held by several County Board Committees, including at seven joint meetings of the Highway and Infrastructure Committees, of which three meetings also included the Land and Water Conservation Committee; and at least four separate meetings of each of the three committees, and

WHEREAS, on August 3, 2011, the three Committees met in joint session and separately took action on motions to recommend a final site for a new highway facility, and

WHEREAS, the Infrastructure Committee approved a motion to recommend to the full County Board that the site identified as "Site A", located near the intersection of Junction Road and the Highway 26 Bypass, be approved as the general site location for a new Highway Department main facility,

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED that the County Board approves "Site A" as the general location for a new County Highway Department main facility, and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that County staff, under the oversight of the Highway and Infrastructure Committees, are authorized to proceed with identifying the specific location and negotiating the cost of obtaining the land in the area of "Site A", that would meet the requirements of a new Highway Department main facility, and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that with the approval of the Highway and Infrastructure Committees, Barrientos Design, Inc. provide additional assistance to the County in identifying specific site location needs and costs, including revised facility space requirements for this site, and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the two committees bring back to the full County Board, their joint recommendations on actions necessary to secure this site for a new Highway Department main facility.

Fiscal Note: It is unknown at this time what the cost could be for securing a location in the area of "Site A". The consultant's estimated cost of land in the "Site A" cost analysis report is \$800,000. The total estimated cost of building a new highway main facility in the area of "Site A" is \$18.9M, which includes \$800,000 for the purchase of land and \$3.1M for bringing utilities to the site which could possibly be partially offset through deferred assessments. Adoption of this resolution will require the expenditure of staff time and potentially additional cost for the consultant's time. The Highway Department's 2011 budget has a balance of approximately \$220,000 available for continued work on this project.

Mr. Reese moved that Resolution No. 2011-38 be adopted. Seconded. Discussion. (No vote was taken pursuant to previous suspension of the rules.)

Mr. Schultz moved to table Resolution No. 2011-37. Seconded and carried: Ayes 22, Noes 4 (Burow, Jaeckel, Torres, Zentner), Absent 4 (Morris, Kuhlman, Peterson, Poulson).

Mr. Zentner moved to table agenda items e and f (Resolutions 2011-38 and 39). After a brief discussion on procedure, Mr. Zentner withdrew his motion.

Mr. Buchanan presented Resolution No. 2011-39.

WHEREAS, the Highway Department's 2011 Adopted Budget includes \$250,000 for consultant fees relating to site assessment, planning and preliminary design for Highway Department facilities, and

WHEREAS, in December 2010 a Request for Proposal process was initiated by the Highway Department, under the oversight of the Highway and Infrastructure Committees, to hire a consultant to analyze potential sites for a new County Highway Department main facility and satellite facilities, and

WHEREAS, the firm of Barrientos Design, Inc. was hired to perform the site analysis and presented its report to the full County Board on May 10, 2011, and

WHEREAS, the consultant was requested by the Highway, Infrastructure and Land and Water Conservation Committees to perform additional analysis of optional sites for a new Highway Department main facility, and

WHEREAS, a total of nine potential sites have been analyzed by the consultant, and

WHEREAS, the consultant's analysis of potential sites has been discussed on numerous occasions at public meetings held by several County Board committees, including at seven joint meetings of the Highway and Infrastructure Committees, of which three meetings also included the Land and Water Conservation Committee; and at least four separate meetings of each of the three committees, and

WHEREAS, on August 3, 2011, the three Committees met in joint session and separately took action on motions to recommend a final site for a new highway facility, and

WHEREAS, the Highway Committee approved a motion to recommend to the full County Board that the site identified as "Site C2", located south of the County's Parks Maintenance Facility on county farm land, be approved as the site location for a new Highway Department main facility,

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED that the County Board approves "Site C2" as the location for a new County Highway Department main facility, and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that County staff, under the oversight of the Highway and Infrastructure Committees, are authorized to proceed with identifying the specific location and cost of obtaining utilities to the land of "Site C2", that would meet the requirements of a new Highway Department main facility, and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that with the approval of the Highway and Infrastructure Committees, Barrientos Design, Inc. provide additional assistance to the County in identifying specific site location needs and costs, including

revised facility space requirements for this site, and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the two committees bring back to the full County Board, their joint recommendations on actions necessary to proceed with this site for a new Highway Department main facility.

Fiscal Note: The consultant's estimated cost of building a new highway main facility "Site C2" is \$15.2M, which includes \$387,000 for bringing utilities to the site. Adoption of this resolution will require the expenditure of staff time and potentially additional cost for the consultant's time. The Highway Department's 2011 budget has a balance of approximately \$220,000 available for continued work on this project.

Mr. Buchanan moved that Resolution No. 2011-39 be adopted. Seconded. Discussion. (No vote was taken pursuant to previous suspension of the rules.)

Mr. David, representing the Jefferson County Sustainability Task Force, read its recommendation on a new Highway Department shop.

Board recessed at 9:00 p.m. Resumed at 9:05 p.m.

Mr. Burow read Resolution No. 2011-40.

WHEREAS, several committees have been involved with the assistance of a consultant in looking at location of a new Highway Department facility, and

WHEREAS, multiple sites including the current location have been considered, and

WHEREAS, previous studies have recommended a new location for the Highway Department at a different site, although the first study was completed before the department downsized and the second study provided two different cost estimates for remodeling, and

WHEREAS, a new site would have numerous advantages over reuse of the existing site, but it is recognized that the advantages come at potentially significant cost, and

WHEREAS, the current economic climate affecting architects, engineers, builders and the taxpayers may offer the opportunity to economically meet the essential needs of the Highway Department at its current location or another existing industrial site at a significant lesser cost than building new, recognizing that an optimal design is probably not possible at the current site, and

WHEREAS, the Land & Water Conservation Committee believes revisiting the possibility of reuse of the existing site or other available local industrial sites will serve to assist the Board members in making the best decision possible given potential tradeoffs between costs and functionality, and

WHEREAS, \$220,000 remains in the Highway Department budget for location studies, which could be used to fund this work,

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED that a request for proposals be prepared seeking individuals or companies to develop creative plans and cost estimates to use the Puerner Street site or other industrial sites in a fashion that would meet the essential needs of the County Highway Department.

Fiscal Note: Approximately \$220,000 remains in the Highway Department budget for location studies.

Mr. Burow moved that Resolution No. 2011-40 be adopted. Seconded. Discussion.

Mr. Zentner moved to table agenda items 9e and f (Resolutions 2011-38 and 39). Seconded and carried: Ayes 21, Noes 5 (Buchanan, Delany, Torres, Borland, Schultz), Absent 4 (Morris, Kuhlman, Peterson, Poulson). Mr. Torres wishes to be recorded as “aye” after voting in error.

A roll call vote was taken on Resolution No. 2011-40 and carried: Ayes 16, Noes 10 (Jones, Buchanan, Reese, Rogers, Molinaro, Delany, Hanneman, Schroeder, Borland, Schultz), Absent 4 (Morris, Kuhlman, Peterson, Poulson).

Mr. Nass moved to take off the table Resolution No. 2011-37. Seconded and carried: Ayes 20, Noes 6 (Buchanan, Morse, Schroeder, Schultz, Babcock, Mode), Absent 4 (Morris, Kuhlman, Peterson, Poulson).

Mr. Schroeder moved, with a second, to amend Resolution No. 2011-37 by adding the following:

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that this information shall be prepared by existing county staff.

After further discussion, the amendment was reworded as follows:

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that this information shall be developed without spending further county money.

Roll call vote on amendment to Resolution No. 2011-37: Seconded and failed: Ayes 12, Noes 14 (Jones, David, Tietz, Braughler, Burow, Morse, Nass, Molinaro, Hanneman, Jaeckel, Torres, Christensen, Borland, Schultz), Absent 4 (Morris, Kuhlman, Peterson, Poulson).

Mr. Mode moved to amend Resolution No. 2011-37 to read “on vacant county owned land”. Second and carried.

Roll call vote on amended Resolution No. 2011-37 carried: Ayes 24, Noes 2 (Schroeder, Borland), Absent 4 (Morris, Kuhlman, Peterson, Poulson).

No motion was made to remove agenda items 9e and f (Resolutions 2011-38 and 39) from the table.

Highway Commissioner William Kern, Parks Director Joseph Nehmer and Fair Park Director Paul Novitzke presented their department’s annual report. The annual reports were received and placed on file pursuant to Board Rule 3.03(12).

Mr. Nass read the report of the Planning & Zoning Committee.

**REPORT
TO THE HONORABLE MEMBERS OF THE JEFFERSON COUNTY
BOARD OF SUPERVISORS**

The Jefferson County Planning and Zoning Committee, having considered petitions to amend the zoning ordinance of Jefferson County, filed for public hearing held on July 21, 2011, as required by law pursuant to Wisconsin Statutes, notice thereof having been given, and being duly advised of the wishes of the town boards and persons in the areas affected, hereby makes the following recommendation:

APPROVAL OF PETITION 3532A-11
DATED THIS 25th DAY OF JULY 2011
Donald Reese, Secretary

THE EFFECTIVE DATE OF THE PRIOR MONTH'S AMENDMENTS
3465A-10, 3466A-10, 3527A-11, 3528A-11, 3529A-11 AND 3530A-11
IS JULY 19, 2011.

Mr. Nass moved that the report be adopted. Seconded and carried.

Mr. Nass presented Ordinance No. 2011-09 as printed.

WHEREAS, the Jefferson County Board of Supervisors has heretofore been petitioned to amend the Jefferson County Zoning Ordinance, and

WHEREAS, Petition 3532A-11 was referred to the Jefferson County Planning and Zoning Committee for public hearing on July 21, 2011, and

WHEREAS, the proposed amendment has been given due consideration by the Board of Supervisors in open session,

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT ORDAINED that the Jefferson County Board of Supervisors does amend the zoning ordinance of Jefferson County (and official zoning maps) as follows:

FROM A-3, RURAL RESIDENTIAL TO A-2, AGRIBUSINESS

Rezone all of PIN 026-0616-0241-005 (1.766 acres) with conditional use to allow for storage of non-farm equipment near N4675 Highland Drive in the Town of Sullivan. (3532A-11 – Charles Couden/James & Nancy Couden property)

Mr. Nass moved that Ordinance No. 2011-09 be adopted. Seconded and carried.

Mr. Braugher presented Resolution No. 2011-41.

WHEREAS, the 2011-2013 State Biennial Budget (2011 ACT 32) built a new model for providing public assistance services by combining state and county resources to provide consistent, efficient administrative services while lowering costs, and

WHEREAS, the State budget requires all counties other than Milwaukee County, no later than October 1, 2011, to organize into no more than 10 multi-county consortia for purposes of administering Income Maintenance (IM) programs. The budget specifies that in those contracts, the consortia shall have the responsibilities of call/change center functions, application processing and eligibility determinations, ongoing case management, and lobby services, in addition to shared responsibilities of subrogation and benefit recovery, fair hearings, and fraud prevention and identification, and

WHEREAS, the budget provides that in the event a county does not participate in a consortium, or that DHS determines that a consortium does not meet performance requirements, DHS shall assume responsibility for providing IM services in that county or consortium either by contracting with another consortium or by providing the services with state resources and employees. If DHS assumes responsibility for providing IM services in a county, that county shall be required to pay DHS the amount of the county's local overmatch in CY 2009

(\$399,799), and

WHEREAS, to manage the needs of the new arrangement, the Human Services Director and the Human Services Board recommend creation of one (1) full-time, Support Services Planner position, and

WHEREAS, after due consideration, the Human Resources Committee recommends the change proposed by the Human Services Director and Human Services Board.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED that the 2011 County Budget setting forth position allocations at the Human Services Department be and is hereby amended to reflect the above change, to become effective upon passage of this resolution.

Fiscal Note: The Support Services Planner position in Income Maintenance is 76% funded by State and Federal funding. Any additional tax-levy cost will be covered by funds budgeted for a full-time Community Outreach Worker position, which currently is, and will remain, vacant. Therefore, no additional funds are required in 2011. As a budget amendment, 20 affirmative votes are required for passage.

Mr. Braugher moved that Resolution No. 2011-41 be adopted. Seconded and carried: Ayes 26, Noes 0, Absent 4 (Morris, Kuhlman, Peterson, Poulson).

Mr. Mode moved to take Resolution No. 2011-28 off the table. Seconded and carried: Ayes 23, Noes 3 (Zastrow, Morse, Rouu), Absent 4 (Morris, Kuhlman, Peterson, Poulson).

Mr. Braugher presented Resolution No. 2011-28.

WHEREAS, Fort Health Care has proposed to provide a physician or nurse practitioner to the Rock River Free Clinic for 32 hours per week in order to more cost effectively serve uninsured people in the county, and

WHEREAS, the Board of Health, the Rock River Free Clinic Board, and the Jefferson County Health Department Director/Health Officer, recommend the creation of a part-time, Public Health Technician (LPN) position to assist the physician/nurse practitioner provided by Fort Health Care in a public/private partnership arrangement, and

WHEREAS, this position could be scheduled up to full-time and would perform clinical duties and provide daily and scheduling assistance to the physician at the Rock River Free Clinic, and

WHEREAS, it is recognized that continued operations and increase of hours at the Rock River Free Clinic will increase access to care for low-income, uninsured patients and, therefore, decrease unnecessary emergency health issues, and

WHEREAS, it is understood the LPN position would be eliminated if clinic funding or structure is eliminated, and

WHEREAS, after due consideration, the Human Resources Committee recommends the change proposed by the Board of Health, the Rock River Free Clinic Board, and the Jefferson County Health Department Director/Health Officer.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED that the 2011 County Budget set-

ting forth position allocations at the Health Department be and is hereby amended to reflect the above change, to become effective upon passage of this resolution.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the County Administrator is authorized to execute an agreement with the Rock River Free Clinic to provide the personnel above at no net cost or liability to the County.

Fiscal Note: The 2011 Adopted County Board budget includes a \$50,000 donation to the Rock River Free Clinic. 100% of the Health Department's cost for this position will be billed to the Clinic. The payroll activity and related revenues for the Health Department will be accounted for within Business Unit 4501 (Public Health). As a budget amendment, 20 affirmative votes are required for passage.

Mr. Braughler moved that Resolution No. 2011-28 be adopted. Seconded and failed: Ayes 19, Noes 7 (Rinard, Burow, Hanneman, Schroeder, Roou, Jaeckel, Torres), Absent 4 (Morris, Kuhlman, Peterson, Poulson).

Mr. Burow read Resolution No. 2011-42.

WHEREAS, the County has contracted for many years with the United States Department of Agriculture Natural Resources Conservation Service (NRCS) to jointly serve each party's interest in implementing land and water conservation programs through the County, and

WHEREAS, renewal agreements have been executed every five years by the Land & Water Conservation Committee under its statutory authority, and

WHEREAS, the form now utilized by NRCS as of 2008 requires the additional signatures of the County Board Chair and Vice Chair, and

WHEREAS, the Land & Water Conservation Committee has approved the Operational Agreement and recommends County Board approval and authorization for execution,

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED that the Jefferson County Board Chair and Vice Chair are authorized to execute the Operational Agreement between Jefferson County and USDA NRCS for a five year term running from the date of execution.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the Land & Water Conservation Department Director is authorized to execute sub agreements with NRCS to further effectuate the Operational Agreement.

Fiscal Note: No expenditures are anticipated. Cost savings result from information and equipment sharing.

Mr. Burow moved that Resolution No. 2011-42 be adopted. Seconded and carried.

Mr. Borland presented Resolution No. 2011-43.

WHEREAS, the State of Wisconsin enacted legislation providing for allocation of funds to the respective counties on an acreage basis for the county fish and game projects on the condition that the counties match the state allocation, and

WHEREAS, Jefferson County desires to participate in county fish and game projects pursuant to the provisions of s. 23.09(12) of the Wisconsin Statutes,

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED by the Jefferson County Board of Supervisors, that the Board is hereby authorized to expend the funds appropriated and the funds to be received from the State of Wisconsin for the improvement of fish and wildlife habitat, and to operate and maintain or to cause to be operated and maintained the projects for their intended purpose, and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the Jefferson County Board authorizes the Parks Director to act on behalf of Jefferson County to submit a state grant application to the Wisconsin Department of Natural Resources (DNR) for financial aid for county fish and game projects; sign documents; and take necessary action to undertake, direct and complete the approved projects.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the Jefferson County Board does hereby appropriate a matching allocation for such project and such appropriations shall continue as long as state matching aids are available, or until this resolution is modified by this Board.

Fiscal Note: The County's 2012 state allocation is \$1,560. The County's match will be force account labor to do the projects. 2012's project will continue the woodland restoration at Carnes Park, providing nesting areas for wood ducks, ground nesting birds and song birds.

Mr. Borland moved that Resolution No. 2011-43 be adopted. Seconded and carried.

Supplemental information presented at the August 9, 2011, Jefferson County Board meeting will be available at the County Clerk's office upon request.

There being no further business, Mr. Buchanan moved that the Board adjourn. Seconded and carried at 10:25 p.m.