GENERAL FINANCIAL CONDITION
JEFFERSON COUNTY WISCONSIN
August 1, 2011

Available Cash on Hand				
July 1, 2011	$	(513,214.24)		
July Receipts	$	15,304,520.18		
Total Cash			$	14,791,305.94
Disbursements				
General - July 2011	$	10,926,833.31		
Payroll - July 2011	$	1,291,726.68		
Total Disbursements			$	12,218,559.99
Total Available Cash			**$**	**2,572,745.95**
Cash on Hand (in bank) Aug 1, 2011	$	3,252,548.27		
Less Outstanding Checks	$	679,802.32		
Total Available Cash			**$**	**2,572,745.95**
AIM Government & Agency Portfolio			$	3,990,921.92
Local Government Investment 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			$	112,134.18
			$	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			$	136.58
Total 2011 Interest			$	149,569.76

JOHN E. JENSEN
JEFFERSON COUNTY TREASURER

Item 12b

RESOLUTION NO. 2011-_____

Resolution creating one full-time Economic Support Specialist position at Human Services

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, Economic Support Specialist 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 Economic Support Specialist 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.

AYES _______
NOES _______
ABSTAIN ____
ABSENT _____

Requested by
Human Resources Committee

Addendum to Agenda 08-09-11

Terri M. Palm-Kostroski: 07-27-11; 08-08-11

Jefferson County Sustainability Task Force
Recommendation on a New Highway Department Shop

August 9, 2011

After reviewing the Jefferson County Highway Department New Site Selection Study and Concept Design Final Report by Barrientos Design Architects Engineers,
and after considerable discussion, The Jefferson County Sustainability Task Force recommends the following:

Do not build on green-space, prime farmland, and specifically, do not build on the County Farm. Green space provides ecological services such as; water infiltration and retention, wildlife diversity, bio-remediation of toxins, carbon sequestration, hunting and recreation opportunities and the capture of solar energy for human use. Prime farmland offers the ability to grow food, fiber, fuel and pharmaceuticals, as well as many of the ecological services listed above. It is contrary to our land ethic, as exemplified in our Zoning and Land Use Planning documents.

Build on the existing Puerner Street site, which is already used for that purpose and can be retrofit to accommodate most if, not all of Hwy Department needs. Reuse is the highest form of recycling.
There is a cost saving to this measure.

Reuse Briggs and Straton, old Countyside Home or Schweiger site. These options reuse both site and potentially buildings and cause less ecological foot-print than building on green space.

Re-examine notion of building for a 110% of perceived need for this infrastructure. The availability of cheap energy is likely to change as the effects of Peak Oil hit, causing a change in the motoring habits of citizens. Traditionally, oil is the life-blood of industry and transportation. A shortcoming in supply will mean changing how we do business and how we transport goods. Building beyond need, costs tax dollars.

Think in terms of transportation needs, not just highway department needs. People will use alternative transportation if it is available. Change the focus of this department to transportation, not simply highway.

Use energy efficiency building design and materials. LEEDs certification and other energy saving standards should be the default position, because they save the most money and energy.

Be wary of setting ourselves up for privatization. What is happening now is very similar to what happened to the Countryside home several years ago. In the end, the newly built home was sold to the private sector at an loss, and both wages and services are being cut by corporate operators.

Sincerely,
Jefferson County Sustainability Task Force Mike Burow, Walt Christensen, Greg David – chair, Amanda Goetsch, Bill Riechertz, Kevin Wiesmann, Jill Wiess

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. I 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 attempted 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 sellers 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 ($6250 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 $6250 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 " " " " " $32,000,000
$205,000 " " " " " $32,800,000

Multiply the above values by 2011 county tax levy of $3.9813 (does not include library or debt service levy's)
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 " " = $124,522 per year, or $2,490,432 " " " " "
$205,000 homes = $127,635 per year or $2,552,693 over 20 years without yearly +'s.

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 lose of taxes from after the land is sold and improved.

$195,000 property (all combined) = $5,898,171
$200,000 " " = $5,960,432
$205,000 " " = $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 levy'd 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 tan 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 tax payers, rather than by a renter. This will also increase the tax levy. It also puts Land & Water department in a position that they maybe 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 LWCC 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.