AGENDA

Administration & Rules Committee

Jefferson County Courthouse 320 S. Main Street Jefferson, WI 53549

> March 27, 2013 Room 112

> > 8:30 a.m.

Committee Members

Paul Babcock - James Braughler - Rick Kuhlman - Jim Mode - John Molinaro, Chair

- 1. Call to Order
- 2. Roll Call
- 3. Certification of Compliance with Open Meeting Law Requirements
- 4. Review of Agenda
- 5. Public Comment
- 6. Approval of February 25, 2013 Administration & Rules Committee meeting minutes
- 7. Approval of the March 12, 2013 County Board meeting minutes
- 8. Communications
- 9. Discussion and possible action on Donation Policy
- 10. Discussion and possible action on review of highway facility projects
- 11. Discussion and possible action on County Board Rule changes regarding rescheduling a County Board meeting
- 12. Discussion and possible action on resolutions, letters or reports from other governmental agencies
 - Outagamie County Resolution Exempting off-duty officers from current state law prohibiting a licensee from carrying a firearm on school grounds and certain posted private properties.
 - b. Outagamie County Resolution Authorizing Lobbyist to request the state legislature re-examine WI State Statute 968.255 regarding strip searches
 - c. Outagamie County Resolution Extending the time period from 12 months to 24 months for a county to seek reimbursement for certain expenses it incurs from a person sentenced to a county jail
 - d. Outagamie County Resolution Oppose any proposal which gives the State Legislature the ability to dictate the amount of local property tax dollars spend on a specific county department
 - e. Price County Resolution Petition State Legislature to reconsider requirement for Counties to set constitutional officer salaries for their entire four-year term.
 - f. Price County Resolution Urging State legislators to vote in favor of transportation dollars for transportation
 - g. WCA DRAFT Resolution Tax-Exempt Status of Municipal Bonds
- 13. County Administrator's monthly report
- 14. Discussion and possible action on 2013-2014 meeting schedule
- 15. Tentative Future Meeting schedule and Agenda Items

April 24th .2013

All meetings in Room 112 at 8:30 a.m. unless noted.

16. Adjourn

The Committee may discuss and/or take action on any item specifically listed on the agenda Individuals requiring special accommodations for attendance at the meeting should contact the County Administrator 24 hours prior to the meeting at 920-674-7101 so appropriate arrangements can be made.

JEFFERSON COUNTY BOARD COMMITTEE MINUTES



February 25, 2013 Administration & Rules Committee

1. Call to Order

Meeting was called to order by Supervisor Molinaro at 10:30 a.m.

2. Roll Call

Administration and Rules Committee Members

Members present: James Braughler, John Molinaro, Paul Babcock, and Jim Mode. Rick Kuhlman, present at 10:33 a.m.

Others Present: Gary Petre – County Administrator; Tammie Jaeger – Administrative Assistant – Confidential; Connie Freeberg – Paralegal II; Phil Ristow – Corporation Counsel; Lydia Statz – Reporter, Jefferson Daily Union; Kathi Cauley – Human Services Director; Supervisor Don Reese; Barb Frank – County Clerk; Bill Kern – Highway Commissioner; Brian Lamers – Finance Director; Carla Robinson – Clerk of Courts; Supervisor Amy Rinard.

3. Certification of compliance with Open Meeting Law Requirements

Gary Petre certified compliance with the open meeting law.

4. Review of Agenda

No changes were made.

5. Public Comment

None

6. Approval of January 30, 2013 Administration & Rules Committee meeting minutes

Motion made by Supervisor Babcock; Second by Supervisor Mode to approve the January 30, 2013 Administration & Rules Committee meeting minutes as printed. (Ayes-All) Motion carried.

7. Approval of February 12, 2012 County Board minutes

Corrections were distributed for the committee members to review.

Motion made by Supervisor Mode; Second by Supervisor Braughler to approve the February 12, 2013 Administration & Rules Committee meeting minutes as corrected. (Ayes-All) Motion carried.

8. Communications

Job Announcement for the Deschutes County, Oregon County Administrator

9. Discussion and possible action on the process to determine how the administration office will function during the vacancy of the County Administrator

John Molinaro told the committee that he researched options available to cover the County Administrator vacancy. 1) The law states that a County Board member can be appointed for up to 15 days 2) UW Extension has retired administrators available to fill these temporary vacancies 3) The position can remain vacant. The Administration & Rules Committee is in charge of determining how this vacancy will be handled. According to the Personnel Ordinance, an interim appointment can be made to cover a vacancy. Gary Petre's recommendation was for the committee to consider appointing Kathi Cauley, Human Services Director, for the interim administrator position. Kathi Cauley addressed questions and concerns from the committee. The committee will recommend this appointment to the County Board at the March 12th meeting. Supervisor Reese suggested that department heads be given more authority on certain projects to alleviate the interim Administrator's duties during this vacancy. John Molinaro understood that filling this vacancy will need to be a team effort.

Motion made by Supervisor Molinaro; Second by Supervisor Kuhlman to take a recommendation to the County Board to appoint Kathi Cauley as interim County Administrator for a period of 30 calendar days, but less than 1 year, as interim administrator

including a fiscal note stating that the salary will be paid out of the Administration budget at the first step of the pay grade. (Ayes-All) Motion carried.

10. Discussion and possible action on resolutions, letters or reports from other governmental agencies

Supervisor Braughler told the committee that the WCA has narrowed down the number of resolutions that they focus on.

11. County Administrator's monthly reports

Gary Petre reviewed his February 2013 monthly report and addressed questions from the Committee.

12. Tentative Future Agenda Items and Meeting Dates

- Approval of February 25, 2013 Administration & Rules Committee meeting minutes
- Approval of March 12, 2013 County Board meeting minutes
- Discussion and possible action on resolutions, letters or reports from other governmental agencies
- County Administrator's monthly report

13. Adjourn

Motion made by Supervisor Kuhlman; Second by Supervisor Babcock to adjourn at 11:12 a.m. (Ayes-All) Motion Carried.

Future Tentative Meeting Dates

The next regular meeting is scheduled for March 27th @ 8:30 a.m.

DRAFT Jefferson County, Wisconsin

Acceptance of Monetary, Non-Monetary and In-Kind Donations Policy

1.) Definitions.

"Donation" is defined as any monetary, non-monetary or in-kind donation, devise or bequest to Jefferson County.

"Monetary Donation" includes cash or a check, money order or other negotiable instrument. In the event of a stock donation, since a government entity is not legally able to own stock, such a donation would be liquidated and turned into cash or other liquid asset, and treated as a monetary donation.

"Non-Monetary Donation" includes real or personal property.

"In-Kind Donation" is defined as services or labor supplied for an identified project or program.

"Established Fundraising Efforts" includes donations extended to recurring annual events, in-kind donations associated with annual events, or donations for the maintenance and upkeep of donated materials by the original donor.

2.) Purpose.

To establish a policy and procedures for the acceptance of monetary, non-monetary and in-kind donations, devises, or bequests from private citizens, business groups or other organizations. Considerations include the use of the donation, restrictions associated with the donation, cost associated with and effective use of the donation.

3.) Donation Administration.

Department Heads are responsible for informing the Administrator and Finance Director of all donations over \$5,000 or donations that do not fall under the County's established fundraising efforts.

A resolution will be required to go to the County Board to accept donations over \$5,000 or donations that do not fall under the County's established programs or fundraising efforts.

All donations may be recognized formally in a letter from the Department Head, Administrator or the County Board.

4.) Monetary Donations.

If a monetary donation is to be used on a project budgeted in the year in which the donation is received or on a project consistent with the County's policy, subject to #3 above, the Department Head is authorized to accept all unrestricted, monetary donations whether solicited or not. If no terms or conditions are attached to the donation, devise or bequest, the County may expend or use the same for any municipal use. If conditions are appended by the donor, the Department Head will consult with the Administrator to determine the acceptance or denial of the gift, which decision may be referred to the

County Board. After acceptance, the donation is to be deposited into the appropriate fund by the County Treasurer.

5.) Non-Monetary Donations.

The Department Head is authorized to determine the appropriateness, usefulness and the value to the County of all non-monetary donations, whether solicited or not and accept same if less than \$5,000 in value. The department head shall recommend, if greater than \$5,000 value or land of any value, to the County Board the retention, improvement, return to donor, transfer, trade, sale, donation to other agency, or other disposition. Non-monetary donations from other governmental units may be accepted by the Department Head regardless of value.

6.) In-Kind Donations.

If an in-kind donation is to be used on a project budgeted in the year in which the donation is received, the Department Head may approve the donation. If the in-kind donation is intended for use on a project that is not budgeted in the year in which it is received, it shall be approved in accordance with procedures for non-monetary donations.

For tax record purposes, donors providing in-kind donation will have the option of invoicing the County, indicating the service provided and the estimated value but no charge will be imposed upon the County. As an alternative to the donor invoice, the County may provide documentation for the in-kind donation to the donor in the form of a letter indicating the services provided.

7.) Established Fundraising Efforts.

Established fundraising efforts, which are implicitly authorized in the annual budget process, will be specifically coordinated and managed by the appropriate department. If the fundraising effort is not a recurring annual event or part of the annual budget process, the department shall obtain prior committee approval before starting fundraising. Department Heads are required to follow standard donation administration, as specified in #3 of this policy.

8.) Ownership.

Any donations to the County become the property of the County.

9.) Non-Acceptance of Donation.

The Administrator may decline to accept a donation if such donation is not consistent with the policies, plans, goals or ordinances of the County or the acceptance of same is contrary to law. The Administrator will report any donations that have been declined at the following Administration and Rules Committee meeting.

10.) Donation Listing.

Annually the Department Head will provide the annual donations that were received in their department and submit it to the Finance Department and will also be required to be part of their annual reports that are presented to the County Board.

HIGHWAY FACILITY ACTIONS

DATE	COST	COUNTY BOARD / COMMITTEE ACTION		
9/17/2009		Infrastructure Committee ° Supervisor John Kannard introduced to the Committee representatives from the firms WM Corporation and Strucrite Design regarding the benefits of design/build construction at the existing Highway Department location		
11/17/2010		Joint Highway/Infrastructure Committee meeting ° Proceed with RFP to review all potential sites for new facility		
1/19/2011	\$8,000	Received 12 Proposals for Site Selection Analysis (from 12/3/10 RFP) ° Highest ranked firm was Barrientos Design (\$8,000) ° Infrastructure Committee motion to proceed with Barrientos Design ° Contract approved 2-8-2011 for \$8,000		
3/16/2011	\$8,732	Joint Highway/Infrastructure Committee meeting Requesting Barrientos Design to proceed with further investigations into the recommended Site C ° Contract Addendum #1 approved 3-24-11 for \$8,732 Infrastructure Committee - Approve motion to authorize Highway Commissioner to proceed with RFP for analysis of all sites		
	\$2,000	° Contract Addendum #2 Site D Analysis		
6/2/2011	\$11,781	Joint Meeting (3 Committees) ° Authorize Barrientos to look at other industrial type areas, including Briggs & Stratton and Schwieger, at a cost not to exceed \$10,000 plus reimbursable expenses ° Contract Addendum #3 approved 8-31-11 for \$10,000		
8/9/2011		RFP for plans for Puerner site and industrial sites approved by County Board (Resolution 2011-40)		
9/6/2011	and the second seco	Joint Highway/Infrastructure Committee meeting ° Approve RFP for proceeding with County Board Resolution 2011-40, to obtain proposals for plans for use of existing site or other industrial sites		

10/4/2011	\$12,739	Joint Highway/Infrastructure Committee meeting ° Receipt of 9 proposals to review industrial sites or current facility site for a new facility ° Approve Bray Architect proposal for \$12,000 plus reimbursable expenses
12/6/2011	\$20,371	Highway Committee * Authorized Highway Commissioner to work with and contract with Barrientos on the design of the land and salt shed with DOT for the Lake Mills satellite shop
2/14/2012	\$14,681	County Board Resolution 2011-80 & 2011-84 ° Authorize contract with Bray Architect (no RFP). Total cost of both resolutions is \$14,600 plus reimbursable expenses to obtain additional information on Site A & C and gather more information on the existing site
5/30/2012	\$18,835	Joint Highway/Infrastructure Committee meeting ° Authorized staff to contract with Barrientos Design for A/E planning services for the Lake Mills satellite shop annexation and site plan approval, in the amount of \$18,760 plus reimbursable expenses
	\$1,950	Main Facility Zoning Plan for CSH
10/17/2012	\$3,500	Infrastructure Committee meeting ° Authorize staff to proceed with hiring consulting firm to do a review of prior environmental inspections/removal of CSH
12/19/2012	\$18,290	Infrastructure Committee meeting ° Authorize staff to contract with Delaney Industries for a pre-demolition environmental inspection, not to exceed \$20,000

JEFFERSON COUNTY HIGHWAY DEPARTMENT CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT MONEY AVAILABLE (03/31/13)

		53284	
2011 AVAILABLE 2011		250,000.00	
BARRIENTOS	4,000.00		
BARRIENTOS	6,366.00		
BARRIENTOS	9,366.00		
BARRIENTOS	2,426.75		
BARRIENTOS	8,354.70		
JC APPRAISALS	2,000.00		
EHLERS	3,500.00		
GILES	1,900.00		
RIVER VALLEY TESTING	2,935.00	40,848.45	_
ENDING BALANCE 2011		209,151.55	
BUDGET 2012		416,646.00	
2012 AVAILABLE 2012		625,797.55	
TRANSFER 2012		325,000.00	
AVAILABLE 2012		950,797.55	
02/07/12 BARRIENTOS	14,238.00		(BILL WAS FOR 17,588.96, 3,350.96 WAS CHARGED
03/06/12 BRAY	12,738.64		
04/25/12 BARRIENTOS	1,582.00		
08/07/12 BRAY	14,681.45		
10/16/12 BARRIENTOS	5,702.93		
11/01/12 BARRIENTOS	9,380.00		
12/04/12 DELAHEY INDUSTRIES	3,500.00		
12/31/12 BARRIENTOS	3,752.00		
01/31/12 LAND INFO/SURVEYOR	1,362.50	66,937.52	-
		883,860.03	
5/30/2012 JC APPRAISALS	500.00		
10/17/12 COLLIERS-MADISON	50,000.00		
11/16/12 ANDERSON GUERRERO	348,381.97		
12/31/12 TWN LAKE MILLS	3,047.23		
12/31/12 K TOPEL ENTERPRISE	124.79	402,053.99	_
2042		481,806.04	
2013 1/8/2013 CITY OF JEFFERSON	250.00		
3/26/2013 DELAHEY INDUSTRIES	250.00		REZONING APPLICATION FEE (COUNTRYSIDE)
3/26/2013 BARRIENTOS	18,290.00		ADDITIONAL ENVIRONMENTAL (COUNTRYSIDE)
3/26/2013 BARRIENTOS	1,950.00 1,200.00		ZONING SITE PLAN (COUNTRYSIDE)
3/20/2013 BARRIENTOS	1,200.00	21,690.00	LM APPLICATION/ANNEXATION FEES
		460,116.04	
F-11			
Estimated/Current/Unbilled Cha	_	450,000,00	
COLLIERS-MADISON	150,000.00	150,000.00	ADDITIONAL PURCHASE PRICE
ESTIMATED AVAILABLE 03/31/13		310,116.04	

RESOLUTION NO.: 127--2012-13

TO THE HONORABLE, THE OUTAGAMIE COUNTY BOARD OF SUPERVISORS

LADIES AND GENTLEMEN: Majority 1 Under current law, a law enforcement officer may carry a concealed weapon if he or she 2 has a license issued by the Department of Justice or if he or she carries photographic 3 identification issued by the law enforcement agency that employs him or her. Current 4 state law prohibits a licensee from carrying a firearm on school grounds and certain 5 posted private properties. A proposal has been drafted exempting law enforcement officers who are acting in their official capacity, qualified law enforcement officers, 6 without regard to whether they are on duty, from these prohibitions. This resolution 7 supports exempting off-duty officers from this prohibition in such designated areas. 8 9 10 11 12 NOW THEREFORE, the undersigned members of the Public Safety Committee recommend 13 adoption of the following resolution. 14 BE IT RESOLVED, that the Outagamie County Board of Supervisors does support any proposal exempting off-duty officers from current state law prohibiting a licensee from carrying a firearm on 15 16 school grounds and certain posted private properties, and 17 BE IT FINALLY RESOLVED, that the Outagamie County Clerk be directed to forward a copy 18 of this resolution to all Wisconsin counties, members of the Wisconsin Legislature, the Outagamie County Lobbyist, the Outagamie County Sheriff and the Outagamie County Executive. 19 Dated this 26th day of February, 2013 20 21 Respectfully Submitted, 22 PUBLIC SAFETY COMMITTEE 23 24 25 26 27 James Duncan 28

29 30 31

i	- I part !
2	100 Kneed
3	Tony Krueger
4	
5	
6	Duly and officially adopted by the County Board on: Teloruscu 26,2013
7	
8	Signed: Signed
9	Board Chairperson County Clerk
10	
11	Approved: 2.28.13 Vetoed:
12	
13	Signed:
14	County Executive
15	

1

2

3

4 5

6



State of Misconsin 2013 - 2014 LEGISLATURE



2013 BILL

AN ACT to renumber 943.13 (4m); to amend 948.605 (3) (b) 1., 948.605 (3) (b) 2. and 948.605 (3) (b) 3.; and to create 943.13 (4m) (bm), 948.605 (2) (b) 2d., 948.605 (2) (b) 2f. and 2h. and 948.605 (3) (b) 5., 6. and 7. of the statutes; relating to: law enforcement officers who are on duty, off-duty law enforcement officers, and former law enforcement officers and going armed with firearms.

Analysis by the Legislative Reference Bureau

Under current law, a law enforcement officer or a former law enforcement officer may go armed with (carry) a concealed weapon if he or she has a license issued by the Department of Justice or if he or she carries a photographic identification issued by the law enforcement agency that employs or, in the case of a former law enforcement officer, employed, him or her and meets other qualifications such as meeting any standards established by the agency to carry a firearm, not being under the influence of an intoxicant, and not carrying a machine gun or a firearm silencer. Federal law explicitly preempts any state law prohibiting a qualified law enforcement officer or a qualified former law enforcement officer from carrying a concealed firearm, but federal law allows a state to permit private persons to prohibit the possession of concealed firearms on their property and to prohibit firearms on any state or local government property, installation, building, base, or park. Current state law prohibits a licensee from carrying a firearm on school grounds and on

	2013 – 2014 Legislature – 3 – LRB-1229/1 CMH:kjf:ph
	BILL Section 6
1	Section 6, 948.605 (3) (b) 2, of the statutes is amended to read
2	948.605 (3) (b) 2. As part of a program approved by a school in the school zone.
3	by an individual who is participating in the programs.
4	SECTION 7. 948.605 (3) (b) 3, of the statutes is amended to read:
5	948.605 (3) (b) 3. By an individual in accordance with a contract entered into
6	between a school in a school zone and the individual or an employer of the individual;
7	$o_{\mathbf{f}}$
8	SECTION 8. 948,605 (3) (b) 5., 6. and 7. of the statutes are created to read:
9	948.605 (3) (b) 5. By a person who is employed in this state by a public agency
10	as a law enforcement officer and to whom s. 941.23 (1) (g) 2, to 5, and (2) (b) 1, to 3.
11	applies.
12	6. By a qualified out-of-state law enforcement officer, as defined in s. 941.23
13	(1) (g), to whom s. 941.23 (2) (b) 1. to 3. applies.
14	7. By a former officer, as defined in s. 941.23 (1) (c), to whom s. 941.23 (2) (c)
15	1. to 7. applies.
16	(END)

OUTAGAMIE COUNTY BOARD MEETING FEBRUARY 26, 2013

Resolution No. 127--2012-2013

ROLL CALL to adopt as amended. RESOLUTION NO. 127--2012-2013 IS ADOPTED.

1 T. RABEC	YES	19 P. STUECK	WES YES	
2 H. NAGLER	YES	20 M. THOMAS	YES	
3 C. SCHMIDT	NO	21 T. THYSSEN	YES	
4 K. PATIENCE	YES	22 J. HAGEN	YES	
5 J. IVERSON	YES	23 N. HOFACKER	YES	
6 J. MAHAN	YES	24 J. PLEUSS	Not Present	
7 L. HAMMEN	YES	25 J. NOOYEN	YES	
8 T. KRUEGER	YES	26 J. DUNCAN	YES	
9 M. TRENTLAGE	YES	27 D. CULBERTSON	YES	
10 J. KARL	YES	28 K. STURN	YES	
11 L. DeGROOT	YES	29 B. BUCHMAN	YES	
12 J. Mc DANIEL	YES	30 S. GRIESBACH	Not Present	
13 L. VAN ASTEN	YES	31 R. THERN	YES	
14 D. DE GROOT	YES	32 M. RAHMLOW	YES	
15 VANDENHEUVEL	Not Present	33 N. AUSTIN	YES	
16 B. LEMANSKI	Not Present	34 D. RETTLER	YES	
17 K. GROAT	YES	35 J. SCHUETTE	YES	
18 R. GOSSE	YES	36 C. ANTHONY	YES	
Results	Results Item 9 Passed (31 YES - 1 NO) Maj			

OUTAGAMIE COUNTY BOARD MEETING FEBRUARY 26, 2013

Resolution No. 127--2012-2013

Supervisor Krueger moved, seconded by Supervisor Hofacker, strike the following wording: Line 1 "or a former law enforcement officer"; line 3 and 4 "or, in the case of a former law enforcement officer, employed"; lines 7 and 8 "and qualified former law enforcement officers"; line 9 "and qualified former law enforcement"; and line 15 "and qualified former law enforcement."

RESOLUTION NO. 127--2012-2013 IS AMENDED.

1 T. RABEC	YES	19 P. STUECK	YES
2 H. NAGLER	YES	20 M. THOMAS	YES
3 C. SCHMIDT	YES	21 T. THYSSEN	YES
4 K. PATIENCE	YES	22 J. HAGEN	YES
5 J. IVERSON	YES	23 N. HOFACKER	YES
6 J. MAHAN	YES	24 J. PLEUSS	Not Present
7 L. HAMMEN	YES	25 J. NOOYEN	YES
8 T. KRUEGER	YES	26 J. DUNCAN	YES
9 M. TRENTLAGE	YES	27 D. CULBERTSON	YES
10 J. KARL	YES	28 K. STURN	YES
11 L. DeGROOT	YES	29 B. BUCHMAN	YES
12 J. Mc DANIEL	YES	30 S. GRIESBACH	Not Present
13 L. VAN ASTEN	YES	31 R. THERN	YES
14 D. DE GROOT	YES	32 M. RAHMLOW	YES
15 VANDENHEUVEL	Not Present	33 N. AUSTIN	YES
16 B. LEMANSKI	Not Present	34 D. RETTLER	YES
17 K. GROAT	YES	35 J. SCHUETTE	YES
18 R. GOSSE	YES	36 C. ANTHONY	YES
Results Item 8 Passed (32 YES - 0 NO) Maj			

RESOLUTION NO.: 120--2012-13

TO THE HONORABLE, THE OUTAGAMIE COUNTY BOARD OF SUPERVISORS

MAJORITY

1 2 3 4 5	A recent U.S. Supreme Court decision has granted the authority to jails to strip search anyone arrested who will be placed in general population. While this is good for Corrections, our current Wisconsin State Statute related to strip searches (968.255) is more stringent and puts difficult limitations on who can be strip searched and why.
6 7	NOW THEREFORE, the undersigned members of the Public Safety Committee recommend
8	adoption of the following resolution.
9	BE IT RESOLVED, that the Outagamie County Board of Supervisors does authorize the
10	Outagamie County Lobbyist to request the state legislature re-examine Wisconsin State Statute 968.255
11	regarding strip searches and to clarify the language contained therein in light of the recent U.S. Supreme
12	Court decision in Florence v. Board of Chosen Freeholders of the County of Burlington, April 2012, and
13	to consider permitting strip searches of newly incarcerated inmates who have been taken into custody on
14	existing warrants, probation holds or who are returning from work release resulting from arrests or
15	convictions for any felony or a misdemeanor charged under Wis. Stat. s. 167.30(1), 940.19, 941.20(1),
16	941.23, 941.237, 941.24, 948.60 or 948.61 instead of restricting those searches to persons newly arrested
17	for felonies or certain misdemeanors, and
18	BE IT FINALLY RESOLVED, that the Outagamie County Clerk be directed to forward a copy
19	of this resolution to all other Wisconsin Counties, the Outagamie County Sheriff, the Outagamie County
20	Lobbyist for distribution to the State Legislature and the Outagamie County Executive.
21	Dated this All day of February, 2013
22	
23 24 25	Respectfully Submitted, PUBLIC SAFETY COMMITTEE

	Resolution No. <u>1202012-13</u>	Page 2
1 2 3 4	James Duncan	Lee W. Hammen
4 5 6 7	Relating & Hapackon Nicholas Hofacker	Kaken Pakenal Katrin Patience
8	Tony Knieger Kunga	
10 11	Duly and officially adopted kind of a	
12	Bury and officially adopted by the County Board of	m: February 26,2013
13 14	Duly and officially adopted by the County Board of Signed: Board Chairmanan	Down & O'Bright
15	Board Champerson	County Clerk \(\triangle \)
16	Approved: 228/13 Vetoe	q,
17 18	Signed:	
19	County Executive	
20	y Johnny Executive	

OUTAGAMIE COUNTY SHERIFF'S DEPARTMENT



Sheriff BRADLEY G. GEHRING

320 S. Walnut Street
Appleton, WI 54911-5918
Phone (920) 832-5605
Fax (920) 832-5263
TDD (920) 832-5007
EMERGENCY 9-1-1
www.co.outagamie.wi.us/sheriff/index.htm

September 12, 2012

TO:

County Executive Thomas Nelson

FROM:

Sheriff Bradley G. Gehring

RE:

Inmate Searches

I would like to bring to your attention a recent U.S. Supreme Court decision that has a major impact on how jails search inmates. The specific case is <u>Florence v. Board of Chosen Freeholders of the County of Burlington</u>, April 2012. This new U.S. Supreme Court decision has granted the authority to jails to strip search anyone arrested who will be placed in general population. This is the good news for Corrections—the bad news is that our current Wisconsin State Statute related to strip searches (968.255) is more stringent and puts difficult limitations on whom and why a person can be strip searched. The current statute is outdated and needs be to be changed to mirror the decision of the U.S. Supreme Court.

There are over 70 jails in Wisconsin that are affected by this change. These jalls admitted more than 226,000 inmates in 2011. Jail staff has struggled with strip searches for many years. In 2004, St. Croix County settled a law suit for \$7 million related to strip search procedures. Also concerning is the fact that a "savvy criminal" understands the current strip search law which mandates certain criminal offenses or probable cause in order to conduct a strip search. This in itself creates a dangerous environment for other inmates, visitors and corrections staff.

Jalls need the authority to conduct a thorough strip search of an inmate entering general population for the safety and security of the facility, the safety of jail staff and visitors, and the wellbeing of all inmates. Strip searches are an important tool for corrections staff. Strip searches aid in identifying medical concerns, gang affiliations, and contraband. They also deter attempts to smuggle weapons, drugs or other prohibited items into the jail.

For your reference I have attached the U.S. Supreme Court's decision, Wisconsin State Statue 968.255, and articles related to this topic.

I am asking that you support the change in Wisconsin State Statute 968.255. Furthermore, if needed, I will avail my staff to be part of a group to rewrite the current Wisconsin State Statute to conform to the intentions of the U.S. Supreme Court.

BGG/dII

OUTAGAMIE COUNTY BOARD MEETING FEBRUARY 26, 2013

Resolution No. 120--2012-2013

ROLL CALL to adopt as amended. RESOLUTION NO--120 --2012-2013 IS ADOPTED AS AMENDED.

2 H. NAGLER 3 C. SCHMIDT	YES	20 M. THOMAS	YES
4 K. PATIENCE	YES	21 T. THYSSEN	YES
5 J. IVERSON	YES	22 J. HAGEN 23 N. HOFACKER	YES
6 J. MAHAN	YES	24 J. PLEUSS	YES
7 L. HAMMEN	YES	25 J. NOOYEN	Not Present
8 T. KRUEGER	YES	26 J. DUNCAN	YES YES
9 M. TRENTLAGE	YES	27 D. CULBERTSON	YES
10 J. KARL	YES	28 K. STURN	YES
11 L. DeGROOT	YES	< 29 B. BUCHMAN	YES
12 J. Mc DANIEL 13 L. VAN ASTEN	YES	30 S. GRIESBACH	Not Present
14 D. DE GROOT	YES	31 R. THERN	YES
15 VANDENHEUVEL	YES	32 M. RAHMLOW	YES
16 B. LEMANSKI	Not Present	33 N. AUSTIN	NO
17 K. GROAT	Not Present YES	34 D. RETTLER	YES
18 R. GOSSE	YES	35 J. SCHUETTE	YES
Results		36 C. ANTHONY sed (31 YES - 1 NO)	YES

OUTAGAMIE COUNTY BOARD MEETING FEBRUARY 26, 2013

Resolution No. 120--2012-2013

Supervisor Duncan moved, seconded by Supervisor Mahan, to amend Resolution No. 120--2012-2013 as follows: To eliminate on line 5 the sentence, "The current statute is outdated and needs to be changed to mirror the decision of the U.S. Supreme Court." Add on lines 14-16 the word after the words "work release" "resulting from arrests or convictions for any felony or a misdemeanor charged under Wis. Stat. s. 167.30(1), 940.19, 941.20(1), 941.23, 941.237, 941.24, 948.60 or 948.61".

ROLL CALL to amend. RESOLUTION NO. 120--2012-2013 IS AMENDED

YES YES YES YES	19 P. STUECK 20 M. THOMAS 21 T. THYSSEN	YES YES
YES		
	21 T. THYSSEN	
YES		YES
	22 J. HAGEN	YES
YES	23 N. HOFACKER	YES
YES		Not Present
YES		
YES		YES
		YES
		Not Present
		YES
		YES
		NO
	The second secon	YES
		YES
		YES
Item 3 Pass	ed (31 YES - 1 NO) Maj
	YES	YES YES YES 24 J. PLEUSS YES 25 J. NOOYEN 26 J. DUNCAN YES 27 D. CULBERTSON YES 28 K. STURN YES 29 B. BUCHMAN 30 S. GRIESBACH YES 31 R. THERN YES 32 M. RAHMLOW Not Present Not Present YES 35 J. SCHUETTE

OUTAGAMIE COUNTY BOARD MEETING January 22, 2013

Resolution No. 120—2012-2013

Supervisor Pleuss moved, seconded by Supervisor Schmidt, to refer this Resolution to the Legislative/Audit and Human Resources Committee for review.

RESOLUTION 120—2012-2013 IS REFERRED TO THE LEGISLATIVE/AUDIT AND HUMAN RESOURCES COMMITTEE.

1 T. RABEC	YES	10 D OTHER	
2 H. NAGLER		19 P. STUECK	YES
3 C. SCHMIDT	YES	20 M. THOMAS	YES
	YES	21 T. THYSSEN	YES
4 K. PATIENCE	YES	22 J. HAGEN	YES
5 J. IVERSON	YES	23 N. HOFACKER	YES
6 J. MAHAN	Not Present	24 J. PLEUSS	YES
7 L. HAMMEN	YES	25 J. NOOYEN	YES
8 T. KRUEGER	YES	26 J. DUNCAN	NO
9 M. TRENTLAGE	YES	27 D. CULBERTSON	YES
10 J. KARL	YES	28 K. STURN	YES
11 L. DeGROOT	YES	29 B. BUCHMAN	
12 J. Mc DANIEL	YES	30 S. GRIESBACH	YES
13 L. VAN ASTEN	YES	31 R. THERN	YES
14 D. DE GROOT	YES	32 M. RAHMLOW	YES
15 VANDENHEUVEL	YES	33 N. AUSTIN	NO
16 B. LEMANSKI	YES	And the second section of the contraction of the co	YES
17 K. GROAT	YES	34 D. RETTLER	YES
18 R. GOSSE		35 J. SCHUETTE	YES
and the second s	YES	36 C. ANTHONY	YES
Results Item 8 Passed (33 YES - 2 NO) Maj			

#120

RESOLUTION NO.: 128--2012-13

TO THE HONORABLE, THE OUTAGAMIE COUNTY BOARD OF SUPERVISORS

	LADIES AND GENTLEMEN: Majority
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	Under current law, a county may seek reimbursement for certain expenses it incurs from a person sentenced to a county jail or placed on probation and confined to jail, in relation to the crime for which the person was sentenced to or confined in jail. Expenses include the daily cost of maintaining the person in jail, costs incurred to investigate the person's financial status, and other moneys the county spends in order to collect payment of those expenses from the person. Current law allows the county 12 months after the person is released from jail to commence a civil action in circuit court for reimbursement of expenses. A proposal has been drafted extending that time from 12 months to 24 months. This resolution supports extending that time period from 12 months to 24 months.
11	NOW THEREFORE, the undersigned members of the Public Safety Committee recommend
12	adoption of the following resolution.
13	BE IT RESOLVED, that the Outagamie County Board of Supervisors does support any proposal
14	extending the time period from 12 months to 24 months for a county to seek reimbursement for certain
15	expenses it incurs from a person sentenced to a county jail or placed on probation and confined to jail, in
16	relation to the crime for which the person was sentenced to or confined in jail, and
17	BE IT FINALLY RESOLVED, that the Outagamie County Clerk be directed to forward a copy
18	of this resolution to all Wisconsin counties, members of the Wisconsin Legislature, the Outagamie
19	County Lobbyist, the Outagamie County Sheriff and the Outagamie County Executive.
20	Dated this Authoracy of February, 2013
21 22 23 24 25 26	Respectfully Submitted, PUBLIC SAFETY COMMITTEE

James Duncan

27

1	Ratur Patrinec	nacholan Hofosker
2	Katrin Patience	Nicholas Hofacker
3		
4		
5		
6	- Landing and the second	
7	Jony Knieger	
8	Tony Krueger	
		<u> </u>
9	Duly and officially adopted by the County Board of	m: teloryzrydli, 2013
10	a Mideal I before the	Comic or Breaks
11	Signed: Walk Hallette	A
12	Board Chairperson	County Clerk C
13	1/ 2 22 M	
14	Approved: $\frac{2 - 28 \cdot 13}{2 \cdot 28 \cdot 13}$ Vetoe	ed:
15	101/1	
16	Signed:	
17	Younty Executive	

1

2

3



State of Misconsin 2013 - 2014 LEGISLATURE



2013 BILL

AN ACT to amend 302.372 (6) (a) of the statutes; relating to: extending the time period for counties to seek reimbursement from prisoners for expenses associated with confinement in jail.

Analysis by the Legislative Reference Bureau

Under current law, a county may seek, from a person who is sentenced to a county jail or placed on probation and confined in jail, reimbursement for certain expenses it incurs in relation to the crime for which the person was sentenced to or confined in jail. These expenses include the daily cost of maintaining the person in jail, costs incurred to investigate the person's financial status, and other moneys the county spends in order to collect payment of those expenses from the person. Current law allows the county 12 months after the person is released from jail to commence a civil action in circuit court for reimbursement of the expenses.

This law extends, from 12 months to 24 months, the time in which a county may commence a civil action for reimbursement of its expenses from a person who is released from jail.

For further information see the *state and local* fiscal estimate, which will be printed as an appendix to this bill.

The people of the state of Wisconsin, represented in senate and assembly, do enact as follows:

2013 – 2014 Legislature

LRB-0750/1 PJH:jld:jf BILL SECTION 1 1 Section 1. 302.372 (6) (a) of the statutes is amended to read: 2 302.372 (6) (a) Within 42 $\underline{24}$ months after the release of a prisoner from jail, 3 the county where the jail is located shall commence a civil action in circuit court to 4 obtain a judgment for the expenses under sub. (2) (a) or be barred. The jailer shall 5 provide any assistance that the county requests related to an action under this 6 subsection. 7. (END)

-2-

OUTAGAMIE COUNTY BOARD MEETING FEBRUARY 26, 2013

Resolution No. 128--2012-2013

Supervisor Duncan moved, seconded by Supervisor Hofacker, for adoption. RESOLUTION NO. 128--2012-2013 IS ADOPTED.

1 T. RABEC	YES	19 P. STUECK	YES
2 H. NAGLER	YES	20 M. THOMAS	YES
3 C. SCHMIDT	NO	21 T. THYSSEN	YES
4 K. PATIENCE	YES	22 J. HAGEN	YES
5 J. IVERSON	YES	23 N. HOFACKER	YES
6 J. MAHAN	YES	24 J. PLEUSS	Not Present
7 L. HAMMEN	YES	25 J. NOOYEN	YES
8 T. KRUEGER	YES	26 J. DUNCAN	YES
9 M. TRENTLAGE	YES	27 D. CULBERTSON	YES
10 J. KARL	YES	28 K. STURN	YES
11 L. DeGROOT	YES	29 B. BUCHMAN	YES
12 J. Mc DANIEL	YES	30 S. GRIESBACH	Not Present
13 L. VAN ASTEN	YES	31 R. THERN	YES
14 D. DE GROOT	YES	32 M. RAHMLOW	YES
15 VANDENHEUVEL	Not Present	33 N. AUSTIN	YES
16 B. LEMANSKI	Not Present	34 D. RETTLER	YES
17 K. GROAT	YES	35 J. SCHUETTE	YES
18 R. GOSSE	YES 36 C. ANTHONY YES		
Results Item 10 Passed (31 YES - 1 NO) Maj			

RESOLUTION NO.: 122--2012-13

TO THE HONORABLE, THE OUTAGAMIE COUNTY BOARD OF SUPERVISORS

LADIES AND GENTLEMEN:

MAJORITY

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	population of greater than 500,000 to he if adopted by the electorate, would lime size of the Milwaukee County Board or levy. It is unprecedented that the Legistax dollars spent on a specific county depart which gives the State Legislature the adollars spent on a specific county depart	oposing a bill that would require counties with a sold a referendum on the April 2013 ballot which, it both the pay of supervisors to \$15,000 and the perating budget to 0.4% of the county property tax slature would dictate the amount of local property epartment. This resolution opposes any proposal sbility to dictate the amount of local property tax them.
11	Committee recommend adoption of the following	ng resolution.
12	BE IT RESOLVED, that the Outagamie	County Board of Supervisors does oppose any proposal
13		lictate the amount of local property tax dollars spent on a
14	specific county department, and	1 1 · J · m· nommo spom om a
15	BE IT FINALLY RESOLVED, that the	e County Clerk be directed to forward this resolution to
16		of the Wisconsin Legislature, Governor Walker and the
17	Outagamie County Executive.	beginning, Governor wanter and the
18	Dated this <u>Naw</u> day of February, 2013.	
19 20 21 22 23 24 25 26 27 28 29 30 31	James Mahan Shane Griesbach	Respectfully Submitted, LEGISLATIVE/AUDIT & HUMAN RESOURCES COMMITTEE Charles Schmidt Lloyd De Groot
32	James Pleuss	

1	Duly and off	icially adopted by the	County Board on:	Fobrary 12,2013
2	/	7		
3		1, n · 1 A	1 honte	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·
4	Signed: 🤟	Wall Th	LAUGU	Laboration of wast
5	A.	Board Chairperson	Co	ounty Clerk
6	4			•
7	Approvéd:		Vetoed:	
8				
9		278		
0	Signed:			
1		County Executive		



1

2

3

State of Misconsin 2013 - 2014 LEGISLATURE



2013 BILL

AN ACT to amend 59.10 (title), 59.10 (2) (c), 59.22 (1) (a) 1. and 59.60 (7) of the statutes; relating to: changing the compensation structure by which a Milwaukee County board supervisor may be paid and requiring a referendum.

Analysis by the Legislative Reference Bureau

Under current law, in a county with a population of at least 500,000 (presently only Milwaukee County), county board supervisors are paid an annual salary that is set by the board. In general, county board supervisors may receive other benefits such as life and health insurance, and supervisors in counties other than Milwaukee County are paid a per diem by the county for each day that the supervisor attends a county board meeting. Current law provides a maximum number of days for which a supervisor may receive such per diem payments, ranging from 20 to 30 days, based on the population of the county.

Subject to approval by the electors in a referendum to be held in Milwaukee County in April 2013, under this bill, county board supervisors in a county with a population of at least 500,000 (presently only Milwaukee County) may be paid an annual salary that does not exceed \$15,000. Under the bill, a Milwaukee County supervisor may not receive any additional compensation or benefits, that are not authorized or required by law. Current law authorizes reimbursement for mileage and expenses for supervisors in counties other than Milwaukee County.

Generally, under current law, the compensation level for elective county officials is set by the county board before the nomination papers for that office may be filed, and the compensation established may not be increased or decreased during

2013 - 2014 Legislature

-2-

LRB-1091/2 MES&JTK:kjf:ph

BILL

13

the officer's term. Under the bill, this current law provision does not apply to county board supervisors who serve in a county with a population of at least 500,000.

If the referendum is approved by the electors in Milwaukee County, the changes contained in the bill will take effect on January 1, 2014.

The bill also limits the Milwaukee County board's expenditures for expenses related to the county board, such as salaries and fringe benefits of county board members, costs for staff, and certain items related to the functioning of the board, to no more than 0.4 percent of the county portion of the property tax levy.

Under current law, a county board may schedule an advisory referendum or a referendum on the question of ratification of an ordinance or resolution of the county board. This bill prohibits a county board from scheduling a referendum on any matter that is subject to the approval of the electors of a county under this bill to be held concurrently with the election at which the question of approval is presented to the electors.

For further information see the *local* fiscal estimate, which will be printed as an appendix to this bill.

The people of the state of Wisconsin, represented in senate and assembly, do enact as follows:

1	SECTION 1. 59.10 (title) of the statutes is amended to read:
2	59.10 (title) Boards: composition; election; terms; compensation
3	compatibility; staff.
4	SECTION 2. 59.10 (2) (c) of the statutes is amended to read:
5	59.10 (2) (c) Compensation. Each supervisor shall be paid by the county ar
6	annual salary set by the board. The board may provide additional compensation for
7	the chairperson. Section 66.0505 applies to this paragraph at an amount that may
8	not exceed \$15,000. A supervisor may not receive any other benefits or compensation
9	not specifically authorized or required by law.
10	Section 3. 59.22 (1) (a) 1. of the statutes is amended to read:
11	59.22 (1) (a) 1. The board shall, before the earliest time for filing nomination
12	papers for any elective office to be voted on in the county, other than supervisors and

circuit judges, which officer is paid in whole or part from the county treasury,

2013 - 2014 Legislature

-3-

LRB-1091/2 MES&JTK:kjf:ph Section 3

BILL

establish the total annual compensation for services to be paid to the officer exclusive of reimbursements for expenses out—of—pocket provided for in sub. (3). Except as provided in subd. 2., the annual compensation may be established by resolution or ordinance, on a basis of straight salary, fees, or part salary and part fees, and if the compensation established is a salary, or part salary and part fees, it shall be in lieu of all fees, including per diem and other forms of compensation for services rendered, except those specifically reserved to the officer in the resolution or ordinance. The Except for a county board supervisor who serves in a county with a population of at least 500,000, the compensation established shall not be increased nor diminished during the officer's term and shall remain for ensuing terms unless changed by the board. Court fees shall not be used for compensation for county officers.

SECTION 4. 59.60 (7) of the statutes is amended to read:

59.60 (7) Publication of Budget and public Hearing. The board shall refer the executive's or administrator's budget to the finance committee and such committee shall publish as a class 1 notice, under ch. 985, a summary of the executive's or administrator's budget and comparative figures together with a statement of the county's bonded indebtedness, in the 2 daily newspapers having the largest circulation in the county, and shall make available to the general public reprinted copies of the summary as published. The publication shall also state the date, hour, and place of the public hearing to be held by the board on such executive's or administrator's budget. The board shall, not less than 14 days after publication of the summary of the executive's or administrator's budget, but not later than the first Monday in November of each year and prior to the adoption of the property tax levy, hold a public hearing on such executive's or administrator's budget, at which time citizens may appear and express their opinions. After such public hearing, and on

2013 - 2014 Legislature

- 4 -

LRB-1091/2 MES&JTK:kjf:ph SECTION 4

BILL

i

or before the annual meeting, the finance committee shall submit to the board its recommendations for amendments to the executive's or administrator's budget, if any, and the board shall adopt the budget with such changes as it considers proper and advisable. The board of a county with a population of at least 500,000 may not adopt a budget in which the total amount of budgeted expenditures related to the compensation of county board members, and to any other costs that are directly related to the operation and functioning of the county board, including staff, is greater than 0.4 percent of the county portion of the tax levy for that year to which the budget applies. When so adopted, the sums provided shall, subject to the provisions of sub. (8), constitute legal appropriations and anticipated revenues for the ensuing year.

Section 5. Nonstatutory provisions.

- (1) (a) Notwithstanding section 8.37 of the statutes, if this act is enacted on or before February 16, 2013, there shall be submitted to a vote of the electors of each county with a population of at least 500,000 at the spring election to be held on April 2, 2013, the following question: "Shall that portion of 2013 Wisconsin Act (this act) which limits the compensation of members of the board of supervisors of (name of county) to receipt of an annual salary of not more than \$15,000; which prohibits supervisors from receiving any compensation or benefits not specifically authorized or required by law; and which prohibits the compensation of supervisors from being increased or decreased from the earliest time for filing nomination papers through the end of a supervisor's term become effective in this county on January 1, 2014?"
- (b) If the question under paragraph (a) is approved by a majority of all votes cast on the question at the election in the county, the portions of this act specified in

	2013 - 2014 Legislature	- 5 -	LRB-1091/2
•	BILL		MES&JTK.kjfiph Section 5
<u>i</u>	paragraph (a) shall take effect in	that county; otherwise,	the portions of this act
2	specified in paragraph (a) shall no		
3	(2) Notwithstanding section	59.52 (25) of the statutes,	no board of supervisors
4	of any county may schedule a refe		
5	to any matter that is subject to the		
6	under subsection (1).		
7	Section 6. Effective dates.	This act takes effect on th	e day after publication.
8	except as follows:		
9	(1) Subject to approval by the	e electors of each affected	county of the question
10	submitted under Section 5 of this		
11	(c) and 59.22 (1) (a) 1. of the statut		
12		(END)	-

The Wisconsin State Legislature is proposing a bill that would require counties with a population of greater than 500 000 icurrently only Milwaukee County, to hold a referendum on the April 2013 ballot which if infinited by the electorate, would limit both the pay of supervisors to \$15,000 and the size of the Milwaukee County Board operating budget to 0.4% of the county property tax levy.

The legislation specifies that the referendum question must appear as follows

"Shall a portion of the Act, which limits the compensation of members of the board of supervisors of (County name) to receipt of an annual salary of not more than \$15,000 which prohibits supervisors from receiving any compensation or benefits not specifically authorized or required by law; and which prohibits the compensation of supervisors from being increased or decreased from the earliest time for filing nomination papers through the end of a supervisor's term become effective in this county on January 1, 2014?"

Background

- Milwaukee County is the only county with a full-time board and is the largest, most complex county in the state
- Each member of the 18-member Milwaukee County Board represents approximately 52,000 constituents, approximately equivalent to the number of constituents represented by State Representatives
- Milwaukee County Board Supervisors currently earn approximately \$50,000 annually (approximately
 equivalent to State Legislators' \$49,000 annual salary). The Milwaukee County Board Chair earns approximately
 \$71,000 annually.
- The bill would result in a 70% pay cut for supervisors and an 84% cut to the County Board's budget

Discussion

- As of 2009, eight counties paid their Board chair more than the \$15,000 allowed under this legislation
- The legislation is an unprecedented usurpation of local control of local government bodies. This legislation sets a precedent for legislative interference in all local government operations.
- It is unprecedented that the Legislature would dictate the amount of local property tax dollars spent on a specific county department. Again, this legislation sets a precedent for legislative oversight of local spending decisions, including locally levied property tax dollars without oversight by local taxypayers
- The legislation would for the first time, we believe, require a county referendum by the state legislature
- Madison should not make decisions for local governments
- If this legislation is adopted, it would open the door for the Legislature to mandate the terms of other local spending decisions without local taxpayers being allowed to weigh in
- Governing by ballot initiatives has not worked well elsewhere. Wisconsin doesn't need to be more like California.
- During the recalls, citizens and legislators alike argued that there already existed an appropriate mechanism
 for voters to express their discontent with elected leaders. ELECTIONS. That same option also already exists for
 Milwaukee County residents.
- Milwaukee County has a full time board and operates differently because of its size. All county issues are complex, but Milwaukee County's size magnifies it's the scale of its issues.
- The Milwaukee County Board voluntarily downsized itself from 25 to 19 in 2001 and from 19 to 18, it's
 current size, in 2011. A corresponding cull to county board staff and the county board's budget were made.
- Although the bill currently only applies to Milwaukee County. Dane County's population will soon make the
 provisions of the bill applicable to that county as well.

- The bill seeks to limit the logislative branch of government. Checks and balances between the branches of government is an important part of any government.
- The legislature is suggesting that by requiring a county-wide referendum, that they are respecting local control. However, the required referendum question-although specific-excludes large parts of what the bill actually does, namely limiting the amount of local property tax dollars that can be spent on a specific county department.
- In 1985, the Legislature gave counties administrative home rule authority which specifically authorizes counties to make decisions regarding county board compensation, term limit and vacancies legislature gave counties the ability to self-govern, directly in opposition to this legislation
- Although the bill specifically states what the referendum question must say, the language leaves out an
 important part of the bill—the amount of locally levied property tax dollars can be spent on a specific countly
 department. The omission of this information precludes the local community from having enough information to make
 a decision and defies local control.

Petition Wisconsin State Legislature to Reconsider Requirement for Counties to Set Constitutional Officer Salaries for Their Entire Four-year Term

WHEREAS, per §59.22 of the Wis. State Statutes, *Compensation, fees, salaries and traveling expenses of officials and employees*, §59.22(1)(a)(1) states each county is required to "establish the total annual compensation for services to be paid to the officer": and

WHEREAS, §59.22(1)(a)(1) also states "the compensation established shall not be increased nor diminished during the officer's term"; and

WHEREAS, the term for all County Constitutional Officers was two years until 2006 when the State Legislature changed the term to four years, with the Sheriff, Clerk of Courts and Coroner being elected concurrent with the Gubernatorial Election and the County Clerk, Treasurer and Register of Deeds being elected concurrent with the Presidential Election; and

WHEREAS, with the alternating terms, it has become increasingly difficult to set compensation fairly between the elective official positions; and

WHEREAS, compensation for other county positions are typically set for a one or two year period; and

WHEREAS, with the volatility of the current economy, it has become increasingly difficult for the County Board of Supervisors to set compensation for any position for four years; and

WHEREAS, counties normally do not know what funds they will have available for their budget until the two-year State budget is released; and

WHEREAS, compensation for elective officials must be set in April of their election year and County Board budgets are not adopted until November; and

NOW THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that the Price County Board of Supervisors hereby requests the Wisconsin State Legislature to reconsider Wisconsin State Statute §59.22 to allow counties to review and adjust the compensation paid to elective officials during their four-year term based on changing economic conditions.

BE IT ALSO RESOLVED that the Price County Board of Supervisors directs the County Clerk to forward this resolution to the Governor, representatives of the state legislators, the Wisconsin Counties Association and all Wisconsin counties.

Submitted by the Price County Board Chair. Robert Kopisch, Chair
Adopted by the Price County Board of Supervisors this 19 th day of February, 2013.
Robert Kopisch, County Board Chair #ean Gottwald, County Clerk
For: 7 Against: 2

#128

RESOLUTION 7-13

URGING STATE LEGISLATORS TO VOTE IN FAVOR OF TRANSPORTATION DOLLARS FOR TRANSPORTATION

WHEREAS, Wisconsin's transportation infrastructure is a fundamental component of its ability to attract and retain business and produce jobs; and

WHEREAS, gas tax and vehicle registration fees comprise over 85% of the state's segregated transportation account. Revenues from these two user fees have been declining and are inadequate to meet the existing transportation needs in this state; and

WHEREAS, Wisconsin's past practice of transferring money from the segregated transportation fund to the general fund has eroded the public's confidence that the "user fees" they pay through the state gasoline tax and vehicle registration fees will be used for their intended purpose; and

WHEREAS, Wisconsin's practice of replacing the dollars transferred from the state's segregated transportation fund with general obligation (GO) bonds put our state in the precarious position of bonding to fund ongoing operations; and

WHEREAS, the debt service for these bonds are being paid for out of the state's general fund which hinders its ability to fund other programs like Shared Revenue, Youth Aids, Community Aids and courts in the future; and

WHEREAS, Price County placed an advisory referendum on the November 2010 ballot asking "Should the Wisconsin Constitution be amended to prohibit any further transfers or lapses from the segregated transportation fund?"; and

WHEREAS, the people of Price County voted overwhelmingly in favor of this constitutional amendment — over 70% "yes"; and

WHEREAS, Fifty-three other counties in Wisconsin also asked the same advisory referendum question and the support was similar across the state with an average "yes" vote of 70%; and

WHEREAS, first consideration of this constitutional amendment passed the Wisconsin State Legislature overwhelmingly last session, on a bipartisan basis; and

WHEREAS, the 2012-13 session of the Wisconsin State Legislature has the opportunity to pass second consideration of this constitutional amendment and in so doing will give the citizens of the entire state the opportunity to vote for amending the state constitution to ensure transportation revenues are spent for transportation purposes; and

WHEREAS, providing constitutional protection for transportation user fees will align Wisconsin with our neighbors in Minnesota, Iowa and Michigan.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED that the Price County Board of Supervisors strongly urges our state representatives to vote in favor of second consideration of the joint resolution to protect the transportation fund, thereby giving voters across this state the opportunity to vote on a binding referendum to amend the constitution and ensure the transportation user fees they pay will be spent for transportation purposes.

FURTHER RESOLVED, by the Price County Board of Supervisors that the County Clerk shall forward a copy of this resolution to the Governor of the State of Wisconsin, Wisconsin Department of Transportation Secretary, Price County's Legislative Representatives, to the Wisconsin Counties Association and to all Wisconsin Counties.

Submitted by the Price County Highway and Transportation Committee

Larry Palecek, Chair	Ronald Heikkinen, Vice chair
James Hintz	_absent Dick Laws
<u>cubsen</u> + Dennis Wartgow	
Adopted by the Price County Board of S	Supervisors this 19 th day of February, 2013.
Robert Kopisch, County Board Chair	John Attue Colork Sean Gottwald, County Clerk
For 9 Against O	-

Wisconsin Counties Association

To: Wisconsin County Officials

From: Kyle Christianson, Legislative & Research

Associate

Date: March 20, 2013

Subject: Draft Resolution: Tax-Exempt Status of

Municipal Bonds

At the request of several counties, below please find a draft resolution regarding support of maintaining the tax-exempt status of municipal bonds. We encourage you to bring up this resolution before your board and pass along to your federal delegation.

Click here for a draft resolution on supporting the tax-exempt status of municipal bonds.

Below please find the text of the original email sent out this morning that addresses this issue:

The United States Senate and House of Representatives is currently reviewing the tax–exempt status of municipal bonds. The exemption is nearly a century old and its continuance is vital to funding local Wisconsin infrastructure and economic development.

Any move to change the current tax treatment of local government bonds would lead to higher borrowing costs for Wisconsin's counties and other units of local government. This means it would

cost additional taxpayer dollars to build schools, libraries, roads and other public construction projects. Without access to tax-exempt financing, much-needed infrastructure improvements would likely be delayed, as Wisconsin counties have few financial resources available. This is particularly true in an era of declining aid dollars and unprecedented restrictions on local property taxes.

REQUESTED ACTION:

Please contact your <u>U.S. Senator</u> and <u>Representative</u> this week to stress the importance of maintaining the tax-exempt status of municipal bonds. Ask your Senator to sign on to Senator Begich's letter to President Obama and your House member to cosponsor House Resolution 112 to voice their support for this exemption.

Additional information is available from the National Association of Counties (NACo) by reading their *NACo Policy Brief here.*

For questions, please contact WCA Legislative & Research Associate <u>Kyle Christianson</u> at 866.404.2700. Thank you and we appreciate your help!

Forward this email





This email was sent to garyp@jeffersoncountywi.gov by <a href="mailto:m

County Board Resolution

Approved this	Day of	, 2013 by
		County

Supporting Efforts to Maintain the Tax-Exempt Status of Municipal Bonds

WHEREAS, the tax-exempt status of municipal bonds is nearly a century old and is vital to funding local infrastructure and economic development; and

WHEREAS, any move to change the current tax treatment of local government bonds would lead to higher borrowing costs for local governments; and

WHEREAS, without tax-exempt financing much-needed infrastructure improvements would likely be delayed; and

WHEREAS, tax-exempt bonds are a critical tool for Wisconsin counties that facilitates the budgeting and financing of long-term investments in the infrastructure and facilities necessary to meet public demand for government services; and

WHEREAS, at a time when infrastructure demands are great, increasing the cost of local government borrowing could have serious impacts on the national, state, and local economies; and

WHEREAS, without the tax-exemption, the effectiveness of the bond market would be significantly dampened, creating higher borrowing costs for county governments, less investment in infrastructure, and fewer jobs.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED that _____ County does hereby support maintaining the current tax-exempt status of municipal bonds.

YOUR COUNTY GOVERNMENT AT WORK - SCHEDULE OF MEETINGS 2013-2014

	POOMETHE.	1	WON	****	LILL		O COT		DDC		CEED	MAD	ı DD
COMMITTEE / BOARD	ROOM/TIME	MAY	JUN	JUL	AUG	SEP	OCT	NOV	DEC	JAN	FEB	MAR	APR
Administration & Rules/ICC Committee 8:30 a.m. / 9:00 a.m.	Administrative & Rules Last Wednesday; 8:30 a.m. Rm 112 ICC 3rd Monday	29 20	26 17	31 15	28 19	25 16	30 21	27 18	25 16	29 20	26 17	26 17	30 21
Blue Spring Lake Mgmnt District	Called by President												
County Board of Health	Bi Monthly 3rd Wed 1:00 p.m. Conf. Rm	8	Х	17	Х	18	Х	20	Х	15	Х	19	Х
Economic Development Consortium	2nd Wednesday 8:30 a.m. UWX Rm 12	8	12	10	14	11	9	13	11	8	12	12	9
Fair Park Committee	1st Thursday 8:00 a.m. Conf. Rm	2	6	4	1	5	3	7	5	2	6	6	3
Farmland Conservation Easement	2nd Monday 12:30 p.m. Rm 203	13	10	8	12	9	14	11	9	13	10	10	14
Finance Committee	2nd Thursday 8:30 a.m. Rm 112	9	13	11	8	12	10	14	12	9	13	13	10
Highway Committee	1st Tuesday 8:00 a.m. Hwy Office	7	4	2	6	3	1	5	3	7	4	4	1
Historic Sites Preservation Commission	4th Thursday 6:30 p.m. UWX	23	27	25	22	26	24	28	26	23	27	27	24
Home Consortium Board	3rd Thursday 9:00 a.m. Waukesha	16	20	18	15	19	17	21	19	16	20	20	17
Human Resources Committee	3rd Tuesday 8:30 a.m. Rm 112	21	18	16	20	17	15	19	17	21	18	18	15
Human Services Board	2nd Tuesday 8:30 a.m. Workforce	14	11	9	13	10	8	12	10	14	11	11	8
Infrastructure Committee	3rd Wednesday 10:30 a.m. Rm 112	15	19	17	21	18	16	20	18	15	19	19	16
Jefferson County Library Council	7:00 p.m. TBD												
Lake Ripley Management District	3rd Saturday 9:00 a.m. Oakland	18	15	20	17	21	19	16	21	18	15	15	19
Land & Water Conservation Committee	3rd Wednesday 8:30 a.m. Rm 202	15	19	17	21	18	16	20	18	15	19	19	16
Law Enforcement Emergency Mgmt	4th Friday 8:30 a.m. Rm 112	24	28	26	23	27	25	22	27	24	28	28	25
Mid-WI Federated Library Systems Bd	Last Tuesday 6:00 p.m. Horicon	28	25	30	27	24	29	26	31	28	25	25	29
Parks Committee	1st Monday 1:00 p.m. Rm 202	6	3	1	5	2	7	4	2	6	3	3	7
Planning & Zoning Committee	Last Monday 8:30 a.m. Rm 203	TBD	24	29	26	30	28	25	30	27	24	31	28
Planning & Zoning Public Hearing (PH)	3rd Thursday 7:00 p.m. Rm 205	16	20	18	15	19	17	21	19	16	20	20	17
Planning & Zoning Board of Adjustment (Site Inspections followed by PH)	2nd Thursday 1:00 p.m. Rm 203/205	9	13	11	8	12	10	14	12	9	13	13	10
Planning & Zoning Site Inspections	Mon prior to PH 8:00 a.m. Rm 203	13	17	15	12	16	14	18	16	13	17	17	14
Solid Waste & Air Quality Committee	3rd Friday 8:30 a.m. Rm 203	17	21	19	16	20	18	15	20	17	21	21	18
University Extension Education Committee	2nd Monday 8:30 a.m UW Rm 12	13	10	8	12	9	14	11	9	13	10	10	14
Utility Tax Association	Quarterly	Called by Chair or the Board											
Veterans Service Commission	Annually 2:30 p.m. Rm 112	Called by Chair											
COUNTY BOARD	2nd Tuesday 7:00 p.m. *Monday	14	11	9	13	10	8	12	10	Х	11	11	15
	7:00 p.m.	Budge	t Publi	ic Hear	ring		22						

Elections
February 18, 2014
April 1, 2014

Board of Canvass February 20, 2014 February 25, 2014

April 8, 2014 Septem
April 8, 2014 Septem
Septem
Septem
Septem

Finance Committee
Budget Hearings
September 11, 2013

September 13, 2013 September 16, 2013 September 18, 2013 WI Counties
Annual Conference
September 22-24, 2013

County Fair July 10-14, 2013 Clean Sweeps

May 18, 2013 Watertown September 21, 2013 Fort Atkinson October 4, 2013 Whitewater April 12, 2014 Fair Park

HOLIDAY

3/22/2013

County Administrator's Monthly Activity Report March, 2013

1. Department Head Meeting

There was a department head meeting held on 3/11 (copy of agenda attached). The department heads agreed that they would continue to meet on a monthly basis. Their next meeting is scheduled for 4/17 at 2:30 p.m. Most of the meeting centered on the discussion of providing input to the County Administrator selection process. That input was shared with the County Administrator Search Committee on 3/19. Terri Palm also talked to department heads about an on-line training library and Brian Lamers requested departmental updates to their 5-year Capital Plans.

2. Committee/Board, Staff and Other meetings

I will have attended 14 Committee/Board meetings by the end of this month. In addition, I will have had at least 15 meetings with staff and other officials this month.

By the end of the month I will have had 4 meetings with Kathi Cauley, Interim County Administrator. There are numerous items that we discussed relating to current and upcoming projects; office operations and files; attendance at committee meetings and meeting follow –up; ongoing duties and responsibilities; etc. Tammie Jaeger will work closely with Kathi to ensure that office mail is prioritized and processed; emails will be accessed by Tammie and responded to or forwarded to Kathi as needed; telephone calls coming to my direct line will be redirected to Tammie's phone. I have assured Kathi that she can contact me anytime with questions relating to the job as Interim Administrator.

3. Old Countryside Home Property Purchase

On 3/20, the Infrastructure Committee discussed the status of the pre-demolition environmental inspection of the property. Phil Ristow is pursuing cost estimates for identified abatement work that needs to be done and discussing this matter with the current owner. The result of these discussions will be presented at the Committee's next meeting on 3/26. A determination on the potential closing for the purchase will need to be made.

4. Courthouse Bathroom Renovation

On 3/20, Phil Ristow reported to the Infrastructure Committee that construction documents have been signed and that the remodeling should start on approximately 4/1. Related to that project, it is planned that the Sheriff's security station in the Courthouse lobby will be able to remain at that location during the project. However, the station will need to be relocated during the construction of the new Courthouse Security Entrance.

County Administrator's Monthly Activity Report March, 2013

5. Courthouse Security Entrance

There is no update on this project. It is anticipated that this project will not get started until the spring.

6. Personnel Matters

Department Head performance evaluations are up to date. The next evaluation is due on 4/1, which should be completed in the near future, with the assistance of the Administration and Rules Committee in the setting of annual goals for this position.

On 3/19, the Human Resources Committee acted upon the last of the Classification and Compensation Study reviews. Staff research is being done to address the question of employee premium pay for Winter Maintenance operations in the Highway Department. Upon Committee action on that issue, implementation of the Plan should be completed.

7. Highway Department Facilities

On 3/20, the Infrastructure Committee discussed a report from Bill Kern on the results of proposals received for architectural and engineering services for the Highway department's new main facility. There were 13 proposals received with an average cost of approximately \$705,000, ranging from \$438,000 to \$1,250,000. The Committee authorized staff, with the assistance of individuals from other counties, to proceed with an evaluation of the proposals. Staff will take their findings to the Highway Committee and then report back to the Infrastructure Committee with a recommendation.

Also on 3/20, the Infrastructure Committee reviewed a draft of an RFP for architectural and engineering services for the final design and site plan of the Lake Mills and Concord satellite facilities. With a minor change to the draft, the Committee authorized staff to issue the RFP.

8. Board/Commission Appointments

It is anticipated that there will not be any appointments submitted to the County Board for confirmation at its 4/16 meeting. The next County Administrator appointments requiring Board confirmation will be to the Land Information Council and the Zoning Board of Adjustment. The terms of two of the members of this Council expire on 6/30 and the terms of two of the members of this Board expire on 7/1.

Gary R. Petre

County Administrator

Gay R. Petre

Jefferson County Department Head Meeting

March 11, 2013

1:30 p.m.

Workforce Development 874 Collins, Rm 103 Jefferson, WI

- 1. County Board agenda items
- 2. Kathi Cauley Appointment as Interim County Administrator
- 3. Community Supported Agriculture (CSA) Program (Terri Palm)
- 4. 2014 Budget New Position and Reclassification Requests (Terri Palm)
- 5. Jefferson County Maps (Andy Erdman)
- 6. Discussion regarding department head input in the County Administrator selection process (Steve Grabow facilitator)
 - a. Department heads may also send their comments to Steve Grabow via email
- 7. Department Head Items
- 8. Next Meeting April 17, 2013 (Tentative)