

PROCEEDINGS OF THE BROWN COUNTY
EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE

Pursuant to Section 19.84 Wis. Stats., a regular meeting of the Brown County Executive Committee was held on Monday, June 11, 2018 in Room 200 of the Northern Building, 305 E. Walnut Street, Green Bay, Wisconsin.

Present: Chair Lund, Vice Chair Moynihan, Supervisor Kaster (for Supervisor Erickson), Supervisor Van Dyck, Supervisor Buckley, Supervisor Hoyer, Supervisor Kneiszel (for Supervisor Sieber)
Also Present: Deputy Corporation Counsel Bree Madison, Deputy Executive Jeff Flynt, Internal Auditor Dan Process, Supervisors Tran, Borchardt, Suennen and Linssen, Chief Deputy Todd Delain, Director of Administration Chad Weinger, Director of Human Resources Kathryn Roellich, media

I. Call meeting to order.

The meeting was called to order by Chair Tom Lund at 5:30 pm.

II. Approve/modify agenda.

Motion made by Supervisor Moynihan, seconded by Supervisor Kaster to take Item 7 following Item 1 and approve as amended. Vote taken. **MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY**

III. Approve/modify Minutes of May 7, 2018.

Motion made by Supervisor Kaster, seconded by Supervisor Buckley to approve. Vote taken. **MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY**

Comments from the Public. None.

1. Review Minutes of: None.

Although shown in the proper format here, Item 7 was taken at this time.

Supervisor Buckley was excused at 5:35 pm and rejoined the meeting at 6:03 pm.

Legal Bills

2. Review and Possible Action on Legal Bills to be paid.

Motion made by Supervisor Moynihan, seconded by Supervisor Hoyer to pay. Vote taken. **MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY**

Communications

3. Communication from Supervisor Linssen re: To require all standing committees to meet between 5:00 PM and 7:30 PM on Monday through Thursday. Referred from May County Board.

Supervisor Linssen informed he brought this forward as there is one committee that meets during the day which precludes a large number of Supervisors as well as much of the public from attending. He does not feel having standing Committees hold their meetings during hours which the public and other Supervisors can attend would be overly restrictive. He feels this is a policy the Board should have and his recommendation is open enough to allow the committee that currently meets during the day to find one day out of the month that they can meet during those times.

Linssen continued that when we are talking about spending what we spend on some of our projects, members of the Board should be able to attend standing committee meetings to take part in the discussions. He is not looking for his proposal to apply to subcommittee meetings or ad hoc committees, but for standing committee meetings only.

Vice Chair Moynihan pointed out that the language regarding "regular" standing committee meetings could present an issue in the case of a special or emergency meeting. Lund agreed and noted that there are times standing committee meetings are held prior to the budget meeting and this would fall outside of these proposed times. Linssen responded that he would not be opposed to having this apply to the regularly scheduled meetings. He is not looking to have this codified, but he does think it should be an expectation of committee chairs to find a time in the early evenings to meet.

Moynihan said he is not opposed to this, but he would be more receptive if it was stated that this would be implemented for the next term of the County Board.

Motion made by Supervisor Moynihan, seconded by Supervisor Kneiszel to refer to Corporation Counsel to draft a resolution requiring all regular standing committee meetings to begin no earlier than 5:00 pm or later than 7:30 pm Monday through Thursday beginning with the next term of the County Board and bring back next month. *Second withdrawn; no vote taken.*

Linssen indicated he would like this to start immediately rather than with the next term of the County Board in light of the jail expansion discussions currently taking place at the Public Safety Committee meetings which are currently scheduled during the day. Supervisor Kneiszel said he would also like this to take effect immediately, especially since meetings are no longer videotaped.

At this time Supervisor Kneiszel withdrew the second to his motion as "beginning with the next term of the County Board" was added after he had seconded the motion.

Linssen said he would not be opposed to staying this for three months to allow Public Safety to come up with a different meeting schedule.

In an effort to move this communication along, both Van Dyck and Kneiszel said they would support the motion.

Motion made by Supervisor Moynihan, seconded by Supervisor Lund to refer to Corporation Counsel to draft a resolution requiring all regular standing committee meetings to begin no earlier than 5:00 pm or later than 7:30 pm Monday through Thursday beginning with the next term of the County Board and bring back next month. Vote taken. MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

4. **Communication from Supervisor Linssen re: To review downtown parking for County employees, such as purchasing property or providing vouchers when employee offices are located in certain areas. *Referred from May County Board.***

Linssen said it was his understanding the administration is still working on this and will hopefully be bringing something forward soon.

Motion made by Supervisor Moynihan, seconded by Supervisor Hoyer to hold until the next regularly scheduled Executive Committee meeting. Vote taken. MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

5. **Communication from Supervisor Linssen re: To amend Chapter 2.13 (3)(2) by striking the word "Invocation" and replacing it with "Moment of Reflection." *Referred from May County Board.***

Linssen said he has had a lot of questions regarding this since he put the communication in. He clarified that this is not meant to be as contentious as it probably sounds. He continued that he has been reviewing the ordinances and found that the invocation is actually written into the ordinance and he feels this is out of place. He said it is the tradition of the Board to do a prayer at the opening of the meeting and Linssen is often not comfortable with this. He feels Vice Chair Lund does a good job of keeping it appropriate, but the mere fact that it is a prayer that is religion-specific does not always sit well with Linssen. When looking at the First Amendment and government involvement in religion, Linssen questions if the religion is replaced with a different religion, would it still be appropriate and that is the question the Board needs to ultimately ask itself. He is not aware of any other governmental entity in the area that does a prayer at their meetings and he does not think it is necessary. He proposed the invocation be changed to

a moment of reflection as he feels that would provide several options that are more appropriate. Specifically, there would be the option of doing something very similar to what is currently being done, but dropping the religious intonation to it and following it with a moment of silence for those who wish to say their own prayer. The intention is not to strip Board members of their ability to pray. Another option would be to have people from various religions come in on a rotating business to give the invocation.

Linssen continued that he feels a change in the ordinance is appropriate because invocation, if you look it up, the definition implies a religious prayer and he feels the phrase "moment of reflection" is more appropriate for what the Board is attempting to do and intends to do and would not eliminate prayer all together.

Chair Moynihan appreciated Linssen's sentiments but said with all due respect, once he sees the United States Senate and House of Representatives get rid of chaplains and providing invocations and the same at the Wisconsin legislature, he would give some thought to eliminating it here at the Board level, but it has been a long-standing tradition and he does not see any need to change that at this time.

Motion made by Supervisor Moynihan, seconded by Supervisor Kaster to receive and place on file. Vote taken. Ayes: Moynihan, Kaster, Buckley, Lund, Van Dyck Nay: Kneiszel, Hoyer MOTION CARRIED 5 to 2

Supervisor Kneiszel said he agreed with Linssen on this. He noted that De Pere eliminated their prayers at meetings several years ago for the same reasons Linssen spoke of. He said this does not have anything to do with Vice Chair Lund and he thinks Lund does a great job with the prayers, but he does not feel they have a place at a public meeting and for those reasons he will not support the motion.

Van Dyck referenced Linssen's comment that the invocation is religious-specific and asked him to expand on that. Linssen responded that Lund does a good job for the most part in keeping the invocation pretty general, but there are words that come up like Lord and God. Lund said he has never said Lord. Linssen said the most specific reference is the amen at the end and it unmistakable what religion the prayers references. He does not necessarily think the content is inappropriate, he just feels we should keep the religious and biblical aspect out.

With regard to the form of the communication, Van Dyck said the invocation does not need to be religious-specific, however replacing the word invocation with moment of silence does not control what comes after that. Removing the word invocation does not change the fact that the person could use the word, God, Lord, Jesus or anything else so it is Van Dyck's opinion that in order to get what Linssen wants you are going to have to instruct the person giving the invocation that they cannot use any of those particular references, but if they do, what will be done? If that is the intent, the only sure way of getting around that would be to eliminate it completely versus changing the terminology because he does not feel you can then turn around and direct the Vice Chair as to what they can or cannot say. If that is the case, it would need to be added to the communication as well.

Linssen did not disagree with Van Dyck but said he was hoping the change in language would express the Board's will enough. He feels a change in language is a starting point and Linssen was hoping it would be sufficient for the Board to go in the direction that is more appropriate. He is not looking to stamp out everything and when he proposed the language he did, he felt it was a more measured approach to dealing with this rather than striking any potential opportunity for a prayer

Supervisor Tran informed that she is a Buddhist and she does not understand why any prayer is necessary. This is a government entity and she feels there should be separation of church and state. She understands that Senate and Congress do this, but that does not mean it is right. She said there are many religions represented within the County and she sees every religion as being good. For her it comes down to why do we need to have any prayer prior to a Board meeting?

Supervisor Hoyer asked if Linssen would like to have this reviewed by Corporation Counsel. Linssen did not feel that was necessary as he did not think there was a belief that this is unconstitutional, the question is whether it is appropriate. There are things that are legal but are still not appropriate.

Kaster does not feel Lund's prayers are religion-specific. He himself thinks of God or Jesus, and he says amen, but he does not know that everyone does. He feels religion should be kept in a lot of things. It has been removed from a lot of thing under the guise that we have to separate church and state. Linssen disagreed with Kaster and said the prayers are usually tastefully done.

Supervisor Borchardt feels a moment of silent reflection would be sufficient. If someone has a specific prayer they would like to say to themselves prior to the meeting, they could do that. She also feels if we want to be more inclusive as a county and rebuild relationships, it is important to just do that. Moynihan asked what relationships she was referencing rebuilding. Borchardt responded relationships with any particular group; the Muslim community and the Somali community in particular. Moynihan asked what has been done to denigrate those communities. Borchardt said we have not done anything, but just taking a moment of silence would include everyone; it would not make anyone feel like they were excluded.

Supervisor Buckley said he has been out walking and talking to people and campaigning for a number of years and this issue has never been brought up to him. He continued that Lund does a very good job at keeping it very basic and neutral and he appreciates the fact that it is done that way and feels perhaps more people should take note of the invocation. He feels this is making something out of nothing and reiterated that he has not heard any complaints about this. Buckley feels we should continue as normal and he would support a motion to receive and place on file.

Hoyer noted that just because something has been done the same way for a long time does not mean it is a great idea. The fact of the matter is would you say that Supervisor Lund's words could be classified as an invocation or a moment of reflection. Just because Lund is tasteful and has kind words that we can all get behind, his predecessor was awful in his opinion. We do not make the rules for the person; we make the rules for the job. Just because Lund does it tastefully does not mean the next Vice Chair won't come in and praise Jesus up and down as part of the invocation because that is an invocation as well, not a moment of reflection. He feels this shift is not offensive to what we have done or what one particular person has done, it is to create a policy to inform a better community. It is not taking anything away and he is against receiving and placing on file.

Van Dyck said he is going to support receiving and placing on file because he feels the way the communication is worded is an attempt to avoid controversy which ultimately does not get to the point trying to be made. He feels you are either on board or off board and any kind of moment of reflection could be construed as religious and to him you either do it or do not do it, but you do not put the Vice Chair or the Board in a position in the future that the person sitting in the chair, should they choose to say whatever they wish to say, and then have a big argument about it. He feels we should either have a moment of reflection and take what you get or say we are not going to risk it and get rid of it entirely. He does not feel there is an in between and he does not see a need for a moment of silence in the sense that if someone feels they want to call upon someone or something for strength for the meeting, that is their own personal choice, just like a sports figure does it before they play.

6. **Communication from Supervisor Patrick Moynihan, Jr. re: For your consideration and ultimately the full County Board, I would like Corporation Counsel to present a more defined policy in regard to county board compensation regarding mileage reimbursement for attending Brown County meetings. Chapter 3 speaks of county business related travel, but does not define county related meetings as does various segments of State Stats. Sec. 59.**

Moynihan put this communication in because there have recently been some questions as to what can and cannot be reimbursed to Supervisors for mileage. The current ordinance does not really define a lot and Moynihan would like to come back with an ordinance that is far more defined for all Supervisors.

Motion made by Supervisor Moynihan, seconded by Supervisor Buckley to refer to Corporation Counsel to create a resolution to bring back to the next regularly scheduled meeting. Vote taken. MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

Resolutions, Ordinances

7. **An Ordinance to Create Subsection 3.01(5) (Responsible Bidder Criteria) of Chapter 3 of the Brown County Code of Ordinances.**
 - a) ***Alternate Version* An Ordinance to Create Subsection 3.01(5) (Responsible Bidder Criteria) of Chapter 3 of the Brown County Code of Ordinances.**

Supervisor Suennen informed he found some discrepancies from both an operational standpoint as well as a legal standpoint. He indicated he spoke with the Risk Manager, an attorney who used to work in the Corporation Counsel office, about this at length and the items he disagreed with. The Risk Manager agreed on every item and Suennen then met with Corporation Counsel Dave Hemery who spoke with the Risk Manager and the modified version attached to the agenda was drafted. Suennen feels the alternate version reflect the position of the Risk Manager as well as that of Corporation Counsel and himself.

Supervisor Kaster questioned why we would care about an apprenticeship program. Moynihan said he originally brought this forward because we are going to have some generational buildings in the future and we want the very best people with the very best education and the very best skills and Chapter 3 did not really reflect that.

Supervisor Van Dyck indicated he had the same concern as Kaster, however, he noted that this is limited to contracts over \$2 million dollars and the likelihood of someone bidding on a project in excess of \$2 million dollars without having an apprenticeship program is probably fairly slim.

Motion made by Supervisor Moynihan, seconded by Supervisor Van Dyck to approve alternate version as presented. Vote taken. MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

8. An Ordinance to Amend Section 4.66 (Vacation) by adding Subsection 4.66(6) to Chapter 4 of the Brown County Code of Ordinances.

Director of Administration Chad Weininger said this has been before the Committee a number of times and it is now being presented in its final version. There are a lot of qualified people with a lot of experience, but the people with a lot of experience in government do not want to come to work at Brown County because they have to start all over from the bottom when it comes to vacation. Department heads had the ability to offer more vacation if approved by the Board, but this ordinance allows this to be done at the supervisory level. It is becoming harder to recruit qualified people and this would allow the County to be on the same playing field so people would not lose any vacation time moving from one county to Brown County. The department head would request the additional vacation and then work with HR and the final approval would come from administration. This will ensure it is done uniformly and equitably to avoid issues or lawsuits.

Kaster said his interpretation from reading the language is that the County may perhaps give more than 200 hours of vacation to new hires. He is not debating that they should not start over at the bottom if they have a lot of experience, but the ordinance says the County wants to grant vacation in addition to the amount shown in 4.661 which is in addition to the 16th year of service. Lund clarified that what this means is that if someone has 20 years of experience elsewhere and then they come here, they would be able to be given the 20 years of vacation benefit here as well. Kaster said he understood the intent, but the language could be interpreted differently. He is not debating some people should be granted more vacation instead of starting over, but the way it is written could be interpreted that a new hire could get more vacation than what is granted employees at the 16th year.

Weininger said the intent is to allow the County to be competitive in hiring new employees. Van Dyck understood what Weininger was saying and feels everyone agrees with the intent, but he agreed with Kaster in that the language, if read literally, says that a new hire could be granted more vacation than what is on the schedule. He is okay with the intent of the ordinance, but the language does not reflect the intent.

The language of the document was discussed further and Van Dyck suggested the addition of "not to exceed 200 hours" in (6) following 4.66(1), so it would read as follows: In order to promote the hiring and retention of highly qualified and experienced employees that often have significant years of relevant job experience and that often have built up significant vacation allotment with their previous employer, new hires and employees may be granted vacation in addition to the amounts shown in 4.66(1) above, not to exceed 200 hours, if recommended by the Human Resources Director and if approved by the Director of Administration.

Motion made by Supervisor Van Dyck, seconded by Supervisor Kaster to add "not to exceed 200 hours" following the word *above* in (6). Vote taken. MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

Motion made by Supervisor Hoyer, seconded by Supervisor Buckley to approve as amended. Vote taken. MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

9. Resolution regarding Reclassification of a Social Worker/Case Manager position and deletion of a .4 FTE Clinical Social Worker position in the Health and Human Services – Community Treatment Center Table of Organization.

Motion made by Supervisor Hoyer, seconded by Supervisor Kneiszel to approve. Vote taken. MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

10. Resolution re: Reclassification of a Medical Transcriptionist position in the Health and Human Services – Community Treatment Center Table of Organization.

Motion made by Supervisor Hoyer, seconded by Supervisor Moynihan to approve. Vote taken. MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

Internal Auditor

11. Board of Supervisors Budget Status Reports (Unaudited) – April 2018.

Motion made by Supervisor Van Dyck, seconded by Supervisor Kaster to receive and place on file. Vote taken. MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

12. Status Update: May 1 – May 31, 2018.

Internal Auditor Dan Process said Van Dyck had an earlier question regarding the legal bills and noted that he provides information on a quarterly basis.

Motion made by Supervisor Moynihan, seconded by Supervisor Hoyer to receive and place on file. Vote taken. MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

Corporation Counsel

13. Discussion and Action regarding the Expo Center Project MOU between the Village of Ashwaubenon and the County of Brown (an Up or Down Vote without modification is requested here if the County Board is willing, but it is not required - the Village of Ashwaubenon needs to pass an MOU *identical* to what Brown County passes, and the Village currently has the *exact same* MOU going through their Committee(s) and Village Board).

Van Dyck questioned where to find details regarding the project management services, architectural services and engineering services because he does not see where it says who has responsibility for the project. Weininger responded that the agreement has been modified over time and that is the scope of what the agreement covers. On Page 3, Item H it states decisions will be made by the Village and the County over the scope. Van Dyck was expecting more definition such as who in the County is going to be making the decisions. Weininger said final decisions will be made by the Village President and the County Executive and it is the County Executive's intention to consult with the Board prior to making decisions. Van Dyck has a problem approving something where that is not defined as this is rather important information. Kaster added that the MOU said the details will be set forth in the document; however, there are no details.

Weininger said basically what the MOU says is we need to do a project, similar to the Resch Center. The scope is the memorial complex and we have to make decisions regarding a project manager, engineer, architect and professional services and the County Executive and Village President will be making those decisions. Van Dyck pointed out that it does not say anywhere that the Village President and County Executive is going to make those decisions. Weininger said he talked to Corporation Counsel about this and was advised that it either needs to be defined in the document or stated in the minutes that the County Executive and Village President will be the decision makers. Lund pointed out that both the County Executive and Village President could change, but Moynihan said that is moot because there will always be someone in those positions. Lund responded that the Board typically decides on things, especially on a big project like this. In addition, the MOU does not state who is going to be running the complex. Moynihan said this is the same thing that was done for the Resch Center.

Buckley said it would be a lot easier to identify the representation of the County as being the County Executive and the representative of the Village as the Village President so there are only two individuals involved instead of 26 on the Board trying to make decisions. Picking an architect and project manager needs to get done and getting the County Board to agree on that in a timely manner, and then having the Village Board agree as well is not going to happen and we are still going to be sitting here years from now trying to figure out how to get the shovel in the ground. Buckley continued that this process worked for the Resch Center and he does not have a problem as long as it is defined in the minutes that the County Executive and Village President are the representatives. At this time Buckley feels we need to move forward in this manner.

Weininger pointed out that when RFPs are done, the Board is not who actually selects the people who will be doing the work; that is an administrative function. Additionally, the decision making with regard to the memorial complex will be done jointly with two different governments.

Kaster said this is a County project, but Moynihan pointed out Ashwaubenon is who will be bonding for this. Kaster understands this but said it is still a County project and we do not know who the next Village President is going to be or who the next County Executive is going to be. Weininger responded that these decisions will be made while the current individuals are still in office.

Lund said he does not necessarily want to micromanage the project, but what if the County Executive and Village President approve a look the Board does not like? Moynihan responded that listening sessions will be held to get input from the public. Weininger added he went to a number of committee meetings after the project was passed to find out specifically what was wanted. Ed and Rec said they wanted the veteran aspect to be a component of the design and that is in the MOU. Listening sessions was another thing the Board wanted to ensure the public had a chance to weigh in because of the sales tax component of this and that is in the MOU. To have 26 Supervisors designing an expo hall and getting them all to agree would be a big deal. Managing this size of a project at that level will be problematic.

Kneiszel asked if it would be possible for the Board to get a monthly update on the project showing important actions that have been taken and a breakdown of what has happened and what the upcoming plans are. Weininger said the County Executive's plan was to assign a few Supervisors to keep everyone informed and in the loop. Kneiszel said that would allow the Board to look at things that are being done and he did not feel that would lead to micromanaging every decision. Moynihan said he suggested to the County Executive that he could lay that information out at each Board meeting under his report.

Kaster said one of the main reasons the 26 Supervisors are elected is to keep track of the purse strings of the County. He does not want to be asked by citizens about the expo project and not be able to answer the questions because the County Executive and the Village President are handling the project. Van Dyck agreed with Kaster and said in the end, if there are issues, they are going to be pointed back to the Board. He understands the concern about 26 Supervisors nitpicking this thing apart, but that is the risk you run. The way this MOU is currently written, it is wide open. He referenced the ice sheet provision under the Expo Center description as an example and said he does not remember that being agreed upon by everybody that we were automatically going to put that in. He would want to know the cost and the return on investment before something like that is included. He understands the concern about 26 Supervisors trying to agree on everything, but feels the Board should have some kind of kick at the can when it comes to the overall look of the building and what is going to go into it. He would be agreeable to having a committee formed of a number of Supervisors that would sign off, but to let it all up to the County Executive and Village President is not something he agrees with.

Lund said the Board will not know the cost of this until there is an architect that puts together plans. At that time, the costs can be vetted out. The study we had listed a number of things that could be done, but prices go up every year and the earlier this is done, the better. He agrees we need to get this started, but agreed with Van Dyck that a committee should be formed that the County Executive would have to report to with things like design. Moynihan suggested the County Executive come to the Executive Committee and speak to the project on a monthly basis. Lund would like to see this as more of collaboration so things are not shoved down our throat. He also referenced the sheet of ice and said he was of the understanding this was an expo hall, so once you start talking about freezing ice, it

is a major cost and there needs to be an evaluation of the use of that. Moynihan said the ice was talked about early on during the sales tax discussions.

Weininger said it is the prerogative of the County Board to form a committee. Buckley said the discussion going on here tonight is a prime example of why this project cannot be done this way. There are conversations going on about ice by people who do not really know anything about ice. Weininger said that is why they are getting experts around the table to talk about those things and generate a number to support a 100,000 square foot venue and this document includes all of that. When non-experts start talking about all this and going in all different directions, problems result. When this was passed originally the intent was to build an expo hall that met the needs of the County and they are trying to get the right people in the right place to make that happen.

Weininger continued that it is not the intent that the County Executive was be making decisions unilaterally; he intends to reach out to the Board and the people managing the facility to help make the best decisions. Kaster and Van Dyck both said there is nothing in the MOU that states that.

Buckley said we can sit and debate all night long, but this is exactly why it will never work having this reported out to 26 supervisors. A small advisory committee has been discussed since day one and he feels that is appropriate. He feels there have to be a few people responsible for the project that the Board can go to with questions or thoughts or things that need to be changed. What is before the Committee right now is a general agreement to get the process rolling. The County Executive can inform the Board of his intent to put together a committee on this. Buckley said if there are certain things the Board wants to approve, they can bring that forward. He feels we need to move forward and at least get the architect and project management in place so we can find out what the conceptual ideas are that can work on that piece of property and what the cost is going to be.

Van Dyck said he will not vote for this with the caveat that the County Executive and Village President are the ones who are going to administer the document because he feels there needs to be a definition of who the decision maker is going to be. Van Dyck said although the County Executive intends to form a committee, there is no obligation for him to do so and he feels there needs to be more oversight of the approval process for this project. Kaster also said he will not be voting for this the way it is due to the lack of details because if things do not go right, the County Board is going to take the heat for it and he does not want to be involved in that.

Weininger suggested creating a working team and suggestions were made as to who would be best on such a committee. It was suggested that the Executive Committee be designated as the committee to make the decisions. Buckley would like to have something saying that the County Executive has to report to the Executive Committee at a separate Executive Committee in order to have the authority to represent the Board. Weininger said the functionality has to be considered and there are several ways this could be done and several ideas were discussed.

Weininger asked what level of decisions the Board wishes to be involved in. Van Dyck said from his viewpoint it appears the County Board was smart enough to make the decision on whether to build the expo center or not build it, but now the Board is not smart enough to be involved in the details of what it looks like, the functionality, etc. and he finds that offensive. He understands that decisions will need to be made on a daily basis, but noted that at some point in time there are going to be several packages on which a decision needs to be made and he does not see anything wrong with the Board making that decision. He has enough faith in the Board that even though the majority may not like everything in a package, they will take the package that serves the County best. He does not think this MOU gives the Board that ability.

Weininger asked specifically what the Board would like to have oversight on. Lund responded that the most important thing to most people is what the building is going to look like and what programming it can handle. Weininger suggested allowing the Executive to make the decisions regarding project management, selection of an architect and engineer as long as the regular County RFP process is followed and then the Board can vote on the final design. Weininger said he is trying to come up with a system that will work while still giving some flexibility on some of the smaller pieces provided the County Executive notifies the Board with a reasonable explanation based on a reasonable level of expertise as to why the changes need to be made.

Moynihan pointed out that everything Weininger just outlined can be done by the County Executive outside of the document before them and he encouraged everyone to approve the MOU to get the ball rolling. Lund said he intends to vote in favor of the document. He feels this is such an important issue with millions of dollars being put into the facility and it is very important for the Board to have the final say on the design. A discussion ensued as to where to place language in the MOU directing the Board to make the final decision on design. Hoyer questioned if the MOU is the correct place for that as the MOU is an agreement between the County and another municipality to work together and how we clarify how our portion of things goes is something we should do for ourselves and does not necessarily involve the other municipality. Moynihan said we can vote on the MOU without amending it, and then the Executive can come back and set forth what he plans to do.

Lund suggested a separate document be drafted outlining how the County Executive will work with the Board and then the document before us tonight can be passed. Weininger said when this goes out for bonding, they will have to do an agreement that says the County pledges to do the project that will need to be voted on and at that time the Board could potentially approve what the actual project is going to look like.

Kneiszel wished to clarify that the MOU is between Ashwaubenon and the County and if anything were to happen during the project that the County Board feels is outlandish and wants to step in, that is a completely different thing that can be done. Lund said that is what will be coming back next month; details on how the County Executive will answer to the County Board. Kneiszel feels that should have come at the same time as the MOU and Lund agreed but if we are under the understanding that the County Executive will work with the Board in good faith according to a resolution it should be fine. Moynihan said that part has to be a side piece because if we add what Kneiszel stated to the MOU, when it goes to Ashwaubenon they will amend it and then it will have to come back here again. Those things noted earlier can be done as a side piece with the Executive in resolution form and the MOU can be voted on tonight in its entirety. The will of this Committee is known to the Director of Administration and he will make it work.

Kaster said by the time we get to the final design, if the Board would vote against it, we will have to spend a half a million more for a new design. He said we make decisions every day at every meeting and that is our job. He also questioned the listening sessions and said he would like a listening session to be held before the County Board and then have the County Board decide what is going to go in the building. The design will reflect what is brought forward at the public listening sessions and will include the functionality and it will be designed in a way to maximize profits.

Weininger said this MOU is a prelude which gets all the people in the room to pull everything together so we can start designing this. This will also have to go through finance people to be sure projections are right and then we will have to work with the Board on the financing. All this will be going on while the design is being put together and then when the design is decided on, that is when we go out to market and issue the bonds and that is when the next vote will be taken.

Motion made by Supervisor Moynihan, seconded by Supervisor Buckley to approve MOU as presented. Vote taken. Ayes: Moynihan, Buckley, Hoyer, Kneiszel, Van Dyck, Lund Nay: Kaster MOTION CARRIED 6 to 1

14. Corporation Counsel's Report.

Deputy Corporation Counsel Bree Madison reported briefly on the letter received from the Village of Hobart and noted there was no decision making to be done by the County on that; that is something that would have to be decided by the Circuit Court.

Van Dyck would like to get an update from Corporation Counsel as to what the County's perspective is at this time. He have the perspective of Oneida and the Hobart perspective conflicts with itself in that the gist of the letter is that the County made a mistake by recording deeds, but then at the same token, their assessor assessed the property to the Oneidas and then started charging property taxes and then paid the 2014 taxes. Van Dyck does not know how Hobart can take a positions that the County messed up and deeded it to the Oneidas and it does not legally belong to them and should have reverted back to the adjacent land owners, but then turn around and charge property taxes to those individuals. It seems like Hobart is playing both sides of the fence.

**Motion made by Supervisor Moynihan, seconded by Supervisor Kneiszel to receive and place on file. Vote taken.
MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY**

Human Resources

15. HR Director's Report.

Human Resources Director Kathryn Roellich reported on several items. She said the class and comp is continuing to move forward. They did presentations for a benefits broker RFP and hope to make a decision next month. With regard to HR staff, they have recently had an administrative coordinator, two analysts and a benefits specialist start in the office. With regard to specialty pay, Roellich said one group has already received specialty pay, another group will receive it on the next paycheck and the final group will receive the specialty pay two weeks after that.

**Motion made by Supervisor Hoyer, seconded by Supervisor Moynihan to receive and place on file. Vote taken.
MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY**

Department of Administration

16. Director of Administration's Report.

No report; no action taken.

County Executive

17. County Executive's Report.

No report; no action taken.

Other

18. Such other matters as authorized by law.

Moynihan asked if anyone was interested in being part of the Employee Benefit Committee that was formed several years ago. He is currently the representative for the Board, but noted that it is hard to attend because the meetings are held during the day.

Also, there will be a special joint Administration Committee and Executive Committee meeting on June 14, 2018 at 5:30 pm at the Neville Public Museum.

19. Adjourn.

Motion made by Supervisor Hoyer, seconded by Supervisor Moynihan to adjourn at 7:41 pm. Vote taken. MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

Respectfully submitted,

Therese Giannunzio
Administrative Specialist