

**JEFFERSON COUNTY HIGHWAY COMMITTEE
INFRASTRUCTURE COMMITTEE
LAND & WATER CONSERVATION COMMITTEE
JOINT MEETING MINUTES**

Wednesday, August 3, 2011

The Jefferson County Highway Committee, Infrastructure Committee, and Land & Water Conservation Committee met on Wednesday, August 3, 2011, at 8:30 A.M. for a joint meeting at the Jefferson County Courthouse, Room 202.

ROLL OF THE HIGHWAY & INFRASTRUCTURE & LAND & WATER COMMITTEES:

Members present: Ron Buchanan; George Jaeckel; Craig Peterson; Glen Borland; Blane Poulson-
Excused: Donald Reese; Richard Jones; Mary Delany; Rick Kuhlman; Jim
Schroeder; Mike Burow; Walt Christensen; Greg Torres; Carlton Zentner; Scott
Zimmerman

Also Present: William Kern, Highway Commissioner
Gary Petre, County Administrator
John Molinaro, County Board Chairperson
Phil Ristow, Corporation Counsel
Erik Coonen, Highway Department
Brian Udovich, Highway Department
Ann Jenswold, Highway Department
Bill Buglass, Payne & Dolan
Norman Barrientos, Barrientos Design
Ryan Thacker, Barrientos Design
Jan Rouu, County Board Supervisor
Greg David, County Board Supervisor
Amy Rinard, County Board Supervisor
Mark Watkins, Land and Water Conservation Director
Dennis Heling, Economic Development Director
Chris Welch, Daily Jefferson County Union
Tony Peyer, Whitewater
Maurice Kieffer, Watertown

Purpose of the meeting was to review site selection and alternate site recommendations for a new Highway Department facility by Barrientos Design.

PUBLIC COMMENT

- Maurice Kieffer, Watertown, commented on site selections for the Highway Department facility

HIGHWAY/INFRASTRUCTURE/LAND & WATER COMMITTEE MINUTES: The minutes from the June 30, 2011 Highway Committee, Infrastructure Committee, and Land & Water Committee joint meeting, having been distributed in advance, it was moved by Mr. Buchanan and seconded by

Mr. Borland to approve the minutes as printed, noting the change made regarding Item 9. Motion Carried.

The minutes from the June 30, 2011 Highway Committee, Infrastructure Committee, and Land & Water Committee joint meeting, having been distributed in advance, it was moved by Mr. Torres and seconded by Mr. Burow to approve the minutes as printed, noting the change made regarding Item 9. Motion Carried.

The minutes from the June 30, 2011 Highway Committee, Infrastructure Committee, and Land & Water Committee joint meeting, having been distributed in advance, it was moved by Mr. Reese and seconded by Ms. Delany to approve the minutes as printed, noting the change made regarding Item 9. Motion Carried.

7. Discussion and possible action on report from Land and Water Conservation Committee

Mike Burow, Chairman of the Land and Water Conservation Committee, reported on how the Committee attempted to put a value on the county farm land where the proposed highway shop facility would be built. The Committee obtained information regarding land purchases for McDonald's, County Market, and Wal-Mart. The Committee estimated the number of potential residential lots per acre that could be developed on the county owned farmland, where the new Highway facility is being considered. A motion was made at the July 27, 2011 Land & Water Conservation Committee meeting, passing with a unanimous vote, that 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 the county owned land for reasons noted. 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. 4) The proposed site(s) may create drainage issues on the remaining land that could affect future rent income and expenses. 5) New site will be in residential area and may affect remaining land value. 6) Other sites or 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.

A motion was made by Mr. Burow that in the event a resolution goes to County Board regarding development of a Highway facility on the county farm land, prior to construction, the public and public officials are made aware of the potential loss of revenue of the county farm land over the 20 years of development, seconded by Mr. Zentner. Motion carried.

10. Status report from the Highway Commissioner on discussions with the State Department of Transportation on site locations for the two Highway Department satellite facilities as recommended in Barrientos Design's Highway Facility Site Analysis Report and possible State funding for Highway facility salt sheds.

Commissioner Kern stated that he has been involved with WisDOT discussions regarding the site locations, both for the main shop and the satellite locations. He stated that the salt sheds need to be attached to the WisDOT project looking at all three sites. The WisDOT is receptive to our county owned land site and is looking to fund the salt shed at that location. Jefferson County is ranked on the low end for salt storage in the state. Commissioner Kern stated that this may be the last chance Jefferson County has to have their salt shed funded by the state. "Time is running out, the State will not hold up a multi million dollar project for our salt shed", he stated. "In the end, the salt shed will not be included in the State's project, and will not be funded at all". This loss of opportunity equates to \$600,000.00 to \$700,000.00 for Jefferson County. The other proposed main sites are not as

favorable to WisDOT because the sites wouldn't be included in the scope of their project. Satellite sites still have the possibility of funding for the fact that there is still time pending. STH 26 project is the main concern right now and time is of the essence.

Mr. Zimmerman questioned the \$600,000.00 loss based on Mr. Burow's previous report, wondering if the County would be better off to forgo the State's money. Mr. Torres questioned whether the possibility still existed for sheds to be funded on other sites. Commissioner Kern stated that the funding for the main shop existed, the others possibly. Mr. Christensen commented on farm land loss due to both State and Federal governments. Commissioner Kern closed noting that the salt sheds would be a benefit to the County as well as the State. No motion.

8. Presentation by Barrientos Design and discussion of possible alternate sites for the construction of a proposed new Highway Department main facility

Norman Barrientos and Ryan Thacker, Barrientos Design & Consulting, Inc., presented an updated presentation to the Joint Committees. They stated that their presentation revolved around site performance and operational efficiency. They focused on Site E-Briggs & Stratton, Site F-Schweiger, and Site C2-County Land. The presentation would review cost comparisons, life cycle cost analysis, site selection matrix ranking, and the window of opportunity.

Site E – Briggs & Stratton: The site is tight fitting for operation functions; there would be a need to purchase the rear six acres, and no room for expansion. The distance to STH 26 is 2.1 miles. The building itself has low ceiling clearances, too low for truck activity. The floor is flat, offering no drainage. Structural capacity of floor slab is unknown if it would handle heavy trucks. Column spacing is inefficient, creating wide drive aisles and straight parking stalls. There is more area to heat, making greater operational costs. Concrete panels need to be knocked out for larger overhead doors, fire separation areas need to be constructed, HVAC sized up for vehicle exhaust, loading docks need to be filled in for level approach, and costs don't include green features.

Site F – Schweiger: There would only be a need to occupy one quarter of this facility, much of the site needs paving, the property lines would constrict trucks exiting and turning areas, and the unknown if the owner would sell a portion, or the County lease remaining area. The distance to STH 26 is 1.6 miles. It is a large space, increasing heating and operational costs. There is an entry choke point at one corner for vehicles. The floor is flat, offering no drainage. Structural capacity of floor slab is unknown if it would handle heavy trucks. Column spacing is inefficient, creating wide drive aisles and straight parking stalls. Metal panels need to be knocked out for larger overhead doors, HVAC sized up for vehicle exhaust, loading docks need to be filled in for level approach, and costs don't include green features.

Site C2 – County Land: Ability to access County Parks shop and Industrial Drive, quick access to STH 26, synergy and efficiency of co-locating with other County Departments, and would start the beginning of infrastructure for future subdivision. There is sufficient space and land for future growth, it could accommodate a combined Public Works approach, land is flat and easy to grade, access for railroad spur, and ability to screen yard operations with existing land features. The distance to STH 26 is .25 miles. C2 complies with the County Master Plan of 2005, allows for economic development, and County owns the land, alleviating third party negotiations. Building a new structure alleviates the reconstruction of pre-existing. The building would be constructed with the needed heights and widths for the equipment to maneuver. The building would be designed for efficient staffing relationships, and allow for growth and expansion. Heating and power efficiencies would be incorporated with

green features. The projected 30 year energy costs would be notably less with a new building compared to pre-existing.

Norman Barrientos presented information regarding key site selection criteria such as distance to state highways, site size, expansion area within the site, access road capacity and cost to purchase and develop. He talked about costs of infrastructure, temporary quarters cost, economic development impact, city land use compatibility, and zoning conformance. He evaluated the minimal site grading requirements, soils foundation suitability, drainage and storm water issues, availability of utilities, amount of demolition and renovations required, and operational and energy efficiency.

After reviewing, looking at costs, and matrix ratings, Site C2, County land off Industrial Drive remains most compatible for the Highway facility. Barrientos still recommends this site for development.

The Window of Opportunity reviewed was the fact that the WisDOT sharing in cost of the main salt shed off STH 26 will close in a few months, the satellite salt shed construction data needs to be provided upfront for DOT negotiations, construction costs and financing rates are low, County has paid for and conducted four studies to date on this facility, and finally Jefferson County continues to grow – road usage will increase, resulting in an increase for Highway Department operations.

Discussions from each Committee transpired with many view points being heard.

Chairman Reese asked for input from his Infrastructure Committee. Mr. Jones stated his approval of site C2 as the best site, but has concerns for how the Board will view it. Mr. Kuhlman stated that a new structure needs to be built, and pre-existing buildings are not a good idea.

A motion was made by Mr. Kuhlman and seconded by Mr. Jones to make a recommendation to the County Board regarding the selection of Site A for the location of the new Highway facility. Ayes: Kuhlman, Jones, Delany. Noes: Reese and Schroeder. Motion passed 3 to 2.

Chairman Buchanan asked for input from his Highway Committee. Mr. Peterson stated his preference of Site C1 or C2. Mr. Borland stated his approval of Site C2, but has concerns about County Board. Mr. Buchanan feels Site C2 is the best site. Mr. Jaeckel also stated he approves of Site C2. He has concerns regarding the County Board, similar to Mr. Borland. He also approves of Site A. Mr. Poulson was absent.

A motion was made by Mr. Buchanan and seconded by Mr. Peterson to make a recommendation to the County Board regarding the selection of Site C2 for the location of the new Highway facility. Ayes: Buchanan, Borland, Peterson. Noes: Jaeckel. Absent: Poulson. Motion passed 3 to 1.

A motion was made by Mr. Zimmerman, Land and Water Conservation Committee, to support Site A. There was no second to the motion, motion failed.

Mr. Christensen, Land and Water Conservation Committee, shared concerns from his constituents regarding the economy, Countryside, and the future.

County Board Chairman, John Molinaro, asked if the LWCC wanted to make a recommendation on a Site.

A motion was made by Mr. Zimmerman and seconded by Mr. Christensen to make a recommendation to the County Board regarding the selection of Site A for the location of the new Highway facility.

Ayes: Christensen, Zimmerman. Noes: Burow, Torres, Zentner. Motion failed.

A motion was made by Mr. Christensen to hold on to the Barrientos report for reference and then, fund multiple independent competing companies or qualified individuals to develop creative plans to use Puerner or other industrial sites which would meet essential needs of a highway department facility. A funding of \$5000.00 per study to attract bidders for construction and be let to winner. Motion was seconded by Mr. Zentner. Ayes: Zentner, Christensen, Burow. Noes: Zimmerman, Torres. Motion passed 3 to 2.

11. Discussion and possible action on a recommendation to the County Board to continue with Highway Facility Design and Construction Document Services

It was stated by County Administrator, Gary Petre, that twelve different firms submitted proposals in Phase I of this project. There is a possibility that twelve may submit proposals in Phase II. Discussion evolved to have Barrientos continue with project or ask for another RFP. The estimated cost for design is 4.5% of the construction costs. No Motion.

12. Set next joint meeting date and possible agenda items.

The next joint meeting of the Highway and Infrastructure Committees, and if necessary, Land & Water Committee will be on Tuesday, September 6, 2011, at 8:30 a.m., in Room 202 of the Court House.

It was moved by Mr. Reese and seconded by Mr. Torres to adjourn at 10:28 a.m.

Motion Carried.

Approval:

