

**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, March 11, 2019 in the auditorium of the Central Library, 515 Pine Street, Green Bay, Wisconsin.

Present: Chair Lund, Supervisor Moynihan, Supervisor VanDyck, Supervisor Sieber, Supervisor Hoyer, Supervisor Erickson
Excused: Supervisor Buckley
Also Present: Corporation Counsel Hemery, Public Works Director Paul Fontecchio, Supervisors Tran, Landwehr, Brusky, Kneiszel, Borchardt, Director of Administration Chad Weininger, Register of Deeds Cheryl Berken, Village of Denmark President Greg Mleziva, Golf Course Superintendent Scott Anthes, Internal Auditor Dan Process, other interested parties

I. Call meeting to order.

The meeting was called to order by Chair Tom Lund at 7:05 pm.

II. Approve/modify agenda.

Motion made by Supervisor Hoyer, seconded by Supervisor Sieber to modify the agenda and move items 4, 15 and 16 to follow Comments from the Public. Vote taken. MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

III. Approve/modify Minutes of February 11, 2019.

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

Comments from the Public- None.

Although shown in proper format here, items 4, 15 and 16 were taken at this time.

1. Review Minutes of:

- a) Benefits Advisory Committee (September 24, 2018).

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

Legal Bills

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

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

Communications

- 3. Communication from Supervisor Tran re: For Corporation Counsel to draft a lobbyist registration ordinance that would require any individual or for-profit business that hires someone to influence County Board actions to register with the County Clerk, that registration be made part of the public debate so residents know who is being lobbied, a statement of who is paying the lobbyist to lobby, and how much the lobbyist is being paid, who they lobbied and provide penalty for noncompliance; *Referred from September 2018 County Board.***

Supervisor Tran wished to amend the language of the first part of this to say "for Corporation Counsel to draft a lobbyist registration ordinance that would require any individual, business entity or organization profit or non-profit..." The legislative intent of this ordinance is to provide the fullest opportunity for individuals or organizations to petition the Board and to express freely their opinions on legislation and policies. With that

said, the public is owed full disclosure and has the right to know who seeks to influence the actions of our Counties' government. This full disclosure process will allow the public to evaluate any undue influence the decision making process of Board members. This is meant to preserve integrity of our government. Currently we do not have a procedure or guideline where the persons that act as lobbyists provide a full disclosure to the public of who they are, who employ their services and so forth. The City of Green Bay has an ordinance similar to this.

Corp Counsel Hemery stated that he did start looking at it and there are some model ordinances out there. So they wouldn't have to recreate the wheel if they were directed to do this. They would need some time to work through this though.

Supervisor Van Dyck asked about the City of Green Bay having something in place and wondered if she had any information about how many people have ever registered under their language.

Tran replied that the information she had was dated July 12, 2011 and this document defined what was passed and she read an excerpt from that document. This proved that they have had an ordinance such as this in place for some time.

Van Dyck wondered where the responsibility for a Board member lied. His concern was that do they have to ask people if they are a paid lobbyist or something to that effect every time someone contacts them in the future.

Hemery said in the ones he looked at, this wasn't the case. It is more on the lobbyist themselves to register if they are engaging in certain types of activities. If they don't, there would be a penalty against the lobbyist. He said that he has not seen anything that indicated a Board member would be required to do that.

Tran noted that she would have no problem waiting until January 1st, 2020 to give Corp Counsel ample time to work on this. She informed them that nothing has to be done in the next 30 days, she just wants more transparency and that's the intent.

Supervisor Sieber mentioned that if Corp Counsel found certain issues that they wanted to come back and run by the committee in 30 days for some additional direction they would be welcome to do so.

Van Dyck asked Corp Counsel if this was an item that could be pulled at the County Board.

Hemery answered that it could be pulled from the referral as it has been acted upon.

Van Dyck stated that a lot of times these things are passed at the committee level and they send Corp Counsel off to prepare them for the full Board. Then they argue about them at the Board and shoot them down emphatically after all that time was spent. Maybe what should be done is a line item on the agenda and if it isn't going to pass then it can be done before all the effort is made to come back with it. He felt as though, in general, before they go through the exercise on any of these resolutions that they should get a preliminary go ahead.

Supervisor Hoyer felt that this proposal would have a chilling effect on the overall committee structure. He cannot think of an instance where something like this has been an issue.

Chair Lund agreed with Hoyer. If they stopped sending things to Corp Counsel to look into they might as well get rid of the committee structure and have 2 meetings a month as a whole. Every committee gives certain things for directors to look into and then they come back and bring those before the committees.

Lund then had a different question for Hemery. This was that a lot of people are lobbyists but they also have the right to freedom of speech and may be asking about a whole different item then what they are getting paid to do, in that case do they have to emphasize they are a lobbyist but they are calling about something else?

Hemery thought that was an interesting question and he would keep that in mind as he worked through it.

Tran spoke to the fact that this doesn't impede any constitutional rights in any way. In Washington D.C. lobbyists are speaking before Congressmen and Senators all the time. There are procedures on what is considered the norm for these types of activities and those are spelled out pretty well in the ordinances.

Van Dyck asked about when the "not for profit" terminology was added, which he agreed with, he wondered if paid individuals were the only ones being talked about because if that was the case then it should be added. He was thinking about some of the individuals that have contacted him in the past few months and specifically mentioned the League of Women voters being quite active in petitioning to have a redistricting committee put together. Would they have to register then?

Tran replied that she knew that the League of Conservation voters went to the City of Green Bay and registered there. None of their work is paid but it is still influencing the decision making process. They would have to look at the ordinances and see what is in there. At this point she cannot definitively answer this question. She knows of individuals who went to register and were told that there is no ordinance.

Hemery said that all the paid lobbyists are indeed regulated. He hasn't yet seen a regulated unpaid one but he hasn't necessarily delved that deep.

Van Dyck says this idea of "paid vs. unpaid" is a slippery slope.

Hemery highlighted that there is always a lot of questions when regulating speech.

Motion made by Supervisor Sieber, seconded by Supervisor Moynihan to refer to Corp Counsel and report back in 60 days. Vote taken. MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

4. Communication from Supervisor Landwehr re: I request a procedure be considered on how meeting date changes be communicated to all board members.

Supervisor Landwehr started off by explaining the situation. When there was a stretch of bad weather in the County this winter, some committee meetings were rescheduled and/or canceled. He understood the fact that when the County Board office is closed it's difficult to get that word out. There were some calls made to Administration and they helped with that. He noted, the Board has a good relationship with Administration at the moment, but some of these things need to be looked at long term. He wants this to be as simple as possible, so he suggested a policy that the Board office staff sends out an email notification as the first option. In an event where they are not available then the committee chair of the committee that is being rescheduled could send out an email to the Board members to indicate that change.

Supervisor Moynihan spoke about the storm that canceled PD&T on a particular Monday, in that case the employees were informed of a shutdown from Administration on that Sunday. Staff does not have the ability to work from home to send out communications so they never got the opportunity to do so. He highlighted the fact that he took care of that capability already.

Supervisor Van Dyck spoke along the lines of communications and to the fact that he doesn't feel that everyone is getting their emails on a regular basis. Maybe this is something that could be taken up by Administration down the line. With work emails, County emails, and personal emails the County emails may not always be something that is looked at on a regular basis. The County could possibly look into a texting option because if a meeting gets canceled or something along those lines where a Supervisor wants to contact another as soon as possible this may be a good option.

Landwehr agreed due to the fact that the company he works for owns the phone where he has his work email. Therefore, he doesn't have his County email on that phone. Making it hard, at times, to check County emails all the time.

Lund thought it could be looked into with IT and asked Corp Counsel Hemery to look into the legalities of having a text chain for Supervisors.

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

Referral from February County Board

5. Discussion and possible action regarding a determination of the appropriate oversight committee for the Department of Administration and for Human Resources. *Motion at February Executive Committee: To have Administration and Human Resources report to Administration Committee and refer to Corporation Counsel to draft appropriate ordinance change.*

Supervisor Moynihan said that this was sent back because the line of communication was perhaps blurred last month. Now the Department of Administration and Human Resources report to Administration Committee and this is what is reflected in the resolution and that's why it was killed. He felt that Supervisor Sieber was looking for something more.

Supervisor Sieber explained that Human Resources and the Department of Administration are one department. The ordinances say the Administration is a finance committee whereas Executive is a personnel committee. Right now there is one person reporting to different to different committees and the way committees are set up is that each department head reports to one committee only. Last month they decided that Administration is probably the place for that. He thought that the Director of Administration should be reporting to one committee and one committee only. They can always request for department heads to report before Executive Committee to talk about any issues. He believed the motion made last month was the right motion. All committees are fairly strong and have different departments that report to them, so he looked at this as an effort to keep Administration a strong committee. He suggested remaking the motion that was mad last month.

Van Dyck agreed with what Sieber was trying to accomplish. He saw a differentiation with the ongoing management of those two departments. When it comes to budget time, for example health insurance and pay raises, since those go over all departments a report should come before this committee once per year.

Director of Administration Weininger explained that the special revenue funds are through Executive Committee which is reviewed in the Administration Committee. But, other than those, there is only one other set of funds that are approved through Executive Committee. The reason being is that around budget time there are some concrete numbers for some funds that are always in flux.

Sieber asked if they wanted to send those funds over to Administration.

Lund agreed to do this.

Weininger explained that the reason that bonding comes before Executive Committee is that bonding encompasses many different departments, not just Administration. He felt that one nice thing about going to both, Executive and Administration is that more people on the County Board hear issues and can offer insight for them.

Motion by Supervisor Sieber, seconded by Supervisor Hoyer to have Administration and Human Resources report to Administration committee and refer to Corporation Counsel to draft appropriate ordinance change. Vote taken. MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

Internal Auditor

6. Status Update: February 1 – February 28, 2019.

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

7. 2018 – 2019 Carryover Funds.

Internal Auditor Dan Process added that there were some dollars set aside for tablets and they requested that to be carried over in case supervisors would want them. This was denied but it was something that was being

carried over since 2016 and those funds are no longer there. If there were supervisors that wanted the tablets then Administration would work with the County Board on this.

Van Dyck asked if these types of funds could be carried over for the system they were talking about getting.

Weininger replied that this is what contingency funds would be for.

Motion by Supervisor Erickson, seconded by Supervisor Sieber to suspend the rules and take items 7, 9 and 10 together. Vote taken. MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

Motion by Supervisor Erickson, seconded by Supervisor Moynihan to approve items 7, 9 and 10. Vote taken. MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

Corporation Counsel

8. Oral Report.

Corp Counsel Hemery said the only thing that he has is that he misses one County Board meeting every year and the March meeting next week is that meeting. He will be out of town and Attorney Greg Gerbers will be acting as Corp Counsel.

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

9. 2018 – 2019 Carryover Funds.

See action in item 7 above.

County Executive

10. 2018 – 2019 Carryover Funds.

See action in item 7 above.

Resolutions, Ordinances

11. Resolution Approving Budget Carryover Requests From 2018 Budget to 2019 Budget.

Motion by Supervisor Van Dyck, seconded by Supervisor Moynihan to approve. Vote taken. MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

12. Resolution Regarding Table of Organization Change Register of Deeds – Real Estate Specialist.

Motion by Supervisor Erickson seconded by Supervisor Hoyer to approve. Vote taken. MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

13. Resolution Regarding Table of Organization Change for the Public Works – Facilities Department – Reclassification and Deletion of Positions.

Lund had a question about the fact that they used to have a supervisor for the individuals that were doing these jobs so he wondered if there was anyone in the organization that would supervise these roles.

Public Works Director Paul Fontecchio noted that at the downtown campus they have one manager that supervises both housekeepers and mechanics and they are going with that same model. They've had a couple of retirements giving them the opportunity to reorganize these positions. Specifically by merging 2 managerial positions into one and that person has already been hired and is starting on Monday March 18th. This deletion of a managerial position frees up some money to have some additional housekeepers.

Moynihan noted that underneath the 3rd whereas, the way it's worded seems like they are hiring positions for a facility that doesn't exist.

Fontecchio replied that one of the positions they are hiring will be hired immediately, while the other position they are waiting on STEM funds for that position making it around a July hire.

Motion by Supervisor Erickson seconded by Supervisor Sieber to approve. Vote taken. MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

14. Resolution Supporting the Village of Denmark Business Development Corridor.

Motion made by Supervisor Erickson, seconded by Supervisor Moynihan to approve. *No vote taken.*

Sieber noted that it looks pretty straightforward and the County is basically putting \$900,000 into this. He asked if it was the Counties' commitment with the reimbursement of the \$450,000 in 2021 and 2022.

He was told that it was.

Sieber replied that this sounded good to him. Underneath the second "be it further resolved" on the last page it states "be it further resolved, that any and all cost overruns, or additional funds needed for the aforementioned projects shall be borne by the Village of Denmark." He thought that the verbiage "...be borne by the Village of Denmark" should actually read "...not be borne by the County of Brown." He doesn't want a situation like they had with Green Bay Packaging and he doesn't want anyone coming back and asking for more money for cost overruns and things like that.

Van Dyck wanted Fontecchio to confirm that this \$900,000 is not being removed from some specific road project to where they're going to have a municipality calling them who has a road project in their area and speak of a deferral of that \$900,000.

Fontecchio said that they are not moving one specific project out for another or anything like that. It's going to reduce their overall total in those years that they can apply to County projects. When they start the budget they will revise their 6 year CIP and then projects end up getting put on hold. They move things around as they have to, but every year they redo the 6 year plan and that's where adjustments will be made.

Van Dyck wondered about when they passed the \$60 million for roads if there was a specific list of roads in there.

Fontecchio said there was not and they just kept working through their 6 year road plan and that somewhat encompassed that list but that does get changed every year. They make adjustments based on things like fast deterioration to certain roads and things like that.

Lund wondered about the economic impact and if he had the numbers on how much this would cost the taxpayers.

Greg Mleziva The Village President from Denmark

Mleziva came up and said that they looked at it and said they really need to monitor their return on investment. They are a small municipality and they have annual revenues of around \$800,000 through taxpayers and a lot of that is concentrated on homeowners so they looked to diversify their portfolio. The Village was told they would boom with investment and it never happened so they went out and tried to strategically purchase property. With this, they quickly got a Kwik Trip interested almost immediately but the traffic flow wouldn't allow it, so Fontecchio suggested a roundabout. The closest they could put it was 888 ft. from the interstate because of the 1000 ft. setback and this opened up other property they had South. Salm Partners is looking to expand out of the County and saw this as a great opportunity. The Village got a commitment of over \$35 million for phase 1 of this. Including all the commitments they have to date, they figure the County would net around \$148,000 a year and this is minimal as they have a lot more property yet to develop. When they did the math it makes sense as long as they have some help.

Lund wanted this for the record to show the real payoff of this. There is some payoff and it pays off pretty quickly.

Mleziva said the payoff is 2 fold, cash payoff, and \$3 million in jobs and then more homes are built etcetera.

Motion made by Supervisor Sieber, seconded by Supervisor Erickson to amend the last "Be it Further Resolved" of the Resolution by striking the wording "...be borne by the Village of Denmark" and adding the wording "...not be borne by the County of Brown" in its place . Vote Taken. MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

Motion made by Supervisor Moynihan, seconded by Supervisor Sieber to approve as amended. Vote Taken. MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

15. Resolution Regarding the Sale of Four Parcels of Land – Brown County Golf Course.

Van Dyck started by giving some background. About 4 years ago at the Ed & Rec Committee they did vote to consider selling this particular property. From the Golf Course's standpoint it doesn't appear to be in the long term plans. It was purchased for that years ago, but with changes in laws with wetlands and things like that there is just not enough land there.

Golf Course Superintendent Scott Anthes indicated that this property was not in the long term plans of the Golf Course. Those 4 parcels are right around 80 acres and some of that is utilized for parking, so some of that acreage would not be sold. But, only about 23 acres of that 80 is not considered wetland.

Van Dyck said that they brought it forward because it was the desire of the committee to sell this property. Landwehr and himself met with the Village of Hobart because they had expressed some interest in developing the property. The intent of the Ed & Rec Committees' communication at that meeting was to enter into some kind of memorandum of understanding with the Village to go out and find someone that would develop this, they had a 6 month timeframe to do so. It was decided that the Village was in a better position than the County to go about finding someone. He knew that Corp counsel had an issue with the memorandum of understanding so the resolution boils down to that the County wants to sell the property, but they won't do so for a 6 month period of time. He understands what they're trying to do but he doesn't necessarily agree with the approach. The memorandum of understanding puts the Village that it is only being held onto specifically for them to do something with it within a 6 month timeframe.

Landwehr said that they might be overthinking this. What it comes down to is something like, if your house needed painting someone lives next door who is a good painter, are you going to get tied up in a bunch of questions, or are you going to allow them to help? He noted that Hobart isn't asking for any exclusive rights they are basically offering up their abilities in the best interests of the Village, the County and the Pulaski School District. Any proposals the Village comes back with will be filtered through the County for approval. Hobart knows what they are doing, and they've also already passed a resolution offering up their services.

Lund noted that they have the resolution before them at this meeting. It specifically says that they won't sell the property for 6 months, this tells Hobart or any other developer that is interested that Brown County does have interest in selling the property. But they want to hear requests for proposals and those would be heard in the October timeframe. Lund feels this resolution would allow anyone who wants to develop the property to start undertaking it.

Anthes concern with giving it out to developers is that if nobody comes back and wants to develop this then they are shooting themselves in the foot with another known entity on a price. They may be undercutting themselves because the other entity may know that nobody wants the land so they will not offer the highest dollar they may have without that information.

Lund responded that they are already going to know that they've discussed the land because it's been at a meeting. If they never discussed it and somebody came out nowhere with a dollar amount for them then they would have to find out what the value of it is.

Van Dyck pointed to Landwehr's point that the resolution reads, "Brown County desires to entertain offers to purchase the 4 parcels and is willing to hold off on putting the 4 parcels on the market for sale for a period of 6 months in order to provide entities and individuals with the time necessary to prepare offers for purchase." He

highlighted that it is not going to be put on the market for 6 months but they're entertaining offers for purchase, which is selling it. He doesn't understand what the original thought was because someone doesn't entertain offers for purchase unless they're selling something. He understands that trying to develop this land in the long run is more beneficial from a tax revenue perspective but he has his concerns with someone coming forth to develop it. He doesn't understand why they don't want to go down the road with the memorandum of understanding with the Village for 6 months and then simply put it on the open market for anybody to bid on it and the highest bidder takes it.

Corp Counsel Hemery offered a bit of history regarding this property. First, it started at Ed & Rec and then it came to Corp Counsel. It was pointed out that it deals with real estate so it had to go to Executive Committee. Executive committee discussed this matter and in the end resolved to allow all entities six months to put together their proposals so the County could receive offers and determine which is most advantageous to the County. Responding to the excerpt that was read this was not to sell the property for 6 months "in order to provide entities and individuals time necessary to prepare offers for purchase." This does not mean they can submit them in the period of 6 months, they could, but they made it clear that they are not selling it. The whole idea initially was that Hobart needed time to put together an offer to purchase, so they wanted the County to wait 6 months before selling the property. He believed that this resolution does both what Hobart wanted and what the Executive Committee asked for, which is basically refraining from selling the property for six months and that gives any entity time to get everything together and make an offer to the County, whether that be Hobart, another entity, or a private person. He thought this is as simple as it gets. It sounded like the main point was that the County was willing to hold off on selling land or even entertaining an offer for 6 months while Hobart in particular, or any entity can prepare offers. He informed them that he can change the resolution however the Committee wants.

Van Dyck noted that in a normal sale process bids would be in by a certain date and they would be looked at and decided upon after that date. All this resolution says is that they can prepare offers to purchase and they can't sell it until on or after September 20th 2019 but they still haven't come up with a way of marketing this. In the grand scheme if they make this decision, he highlighted that they haven't put together a plan on how it is marketed, who's going to market it and so forth. He said unless they actively market it, they won't get any offers back unless they simply tell an entity or Hobart it is for sale. His concern is what happens on or after September 20th 2019. Does it come back again, and they have to say they are accepting offers up until a certain date and they are either going to accept or reject those offers then?

Hemery said this resolution wouldn't allow the sale before that date anyways so they come back on that date and weigh the offers and they determine what is most advantageous to the County. He tried to keep this simple and the main thing was that an entity needed time to come up with a proposal and they just wanted a 6 month timeframe to do so and they didn't want it sold in the meantime.

Lund wondered if there was a way to write it saying that proposals are due on or before September 20th. The way it is set up right now would concern him as a developer so now if he sends one in 2 months from now, would it be public information at that point?

Van Dyck said he appreciated the simplicity and understood where it was going but he would like to see a firm process where somebody is putting forth some kind of an offer. He's okay with if they want to accept offers up until September 20th 2019 and they will open those offers like they do any other time.

Hemery reminded them that this is why they have full RFP, RFQ, and RFIs and those all lay out how many bids you submit, who they are awarding everything to such as the lowest bidder in certain circumstances or the bid that is most advantageous to the County in the long run. He summarized that this should be referred back for further discussion because it would be more than just saying the bids are due by this date because what bid are they taking? Is it the highest bid, the bid that's most advantageous to the County? The idea here was to keep it simple because there was one main entity that was interested and the County wanted to give them time to write a proposal.

Lund asked them to make a motion to pass this and then refer the actual sale of the property back. They could take it up next month at the Executive Committee to outline what the process is going to be. But, if they don't

pass this at this meeting then they could take a bid in the next 2 weeks to sell the property to whoever comes forward.

Supervisor Sieber said the County doesn't sell property that isn't for sale and the bottom line is this property is not at this time. The treasurer has employed the services of a realtor for the County so if you want to market the property then this would be the way. He thought this got lost in making sure it was in order when it is really simple and straightforward. They can put the property on the market and if they wanted it marketed more the realtor could take over they could put it out there, give it a closing date, and attach the minimum offer they would take. There is a process and procedure this is done by as this is not the first property they've sold as a County. Determining the wait period and how you want to sell something are the normal challenges of a realtor.

Lund would look to have a motion to approve this and all the other things can be talked about. This is not about selling the property it is about holding off on a sale for 6 months.

Van Dyck asked about changing the resolution to say "hereby resolves to sell parcels... on or after September 20, 2019." Because then you're saying that you're going to sell it, then next month it can be referred back. This doesn't really say it's going to be sold, it just says they are entertaining offers to purchase and it says it's not going to be sold until on or after this date.

Lund simplified that he wanted to remove the words "not" and "until" from the 5th paragraph of the resolution.

Hoyer clarified that it would mean that they would not sell it before that.

Motion made by Supervisor Van Dyck, seconded by Supervisor Hoyer to amend the 5th paragraph of the resolution by striking the word "not" in the second line and the word "until" in the third line and to bring back to the next Executive committee meeting. Vote Taken. MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

Motion made by Supervisor Van Dyck, seconded by Supervisor Hoyer to approve as amended. Vote Taken. MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

16. **Ordinance to Amend Section 4.71 of Chapter 4 of the Brown County Code of Ordinances (Organ or Bone Marrow Donation or Receipt).**

Hoyer thought that this brought all of the pieces together nicely and that it gives the opportunity for HR to pay for extended leave.

Motion made by Supervisor Hoyer, seconded by Supervisor Sieber to approve. Vote Taken. MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

Department of Administration & Human Resources

17. **Director of Administration Report.**

Director of Administration Weininger reported that they are moving at lightning speed on the expedited schedule. They will be taking bid packages on the steel so if they are looking at moving the document storage it may need to be done within the next month. If they are going to try and save some money and offset it then it should be done soon.

Lund reiterated that the documents have to be stored someplace in the meantime anyways regardless. There are other projects in the county as well.

Weininger listed off some of the projects that are going to be upcoming and subsequently ruled out some places where the documents couldn't go. His main point was that they should have something resolved within the next month or so.

Van Dyck knew and understood why Administration went through the exercises that they did. He felt that the County Board needed to make a determination as to whether or not that is the best alternative they have available. He understood that it may be the least expensive immediate space, but he asked if it was what made the most sense in the long run. It may cost money but then the County Board will need to come up with where is the most logical place to put the documents. He didn't think that money should be the sole decision maker as to where to put it.

Weininger said that this is definitely a Board decision. He just wanted to inform them of the timing aspect. It should really be figured out sooner rather than later.

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

18. Human Resources Report. No Report; *No Action Taken.*

County Executive- No Report.

Other

19. Such other matters as authorized by law. None.

20. Adjourn.

**Motion made by Supervisor Moynihan, seconded by Supervisor Sieber to adjourn at 8:20 pm. Vote Taken.
MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY**

Respectfully submitted,

Therese Giannunzio
Administrative Specialist/Transcriptionist

Cayden S. Lasecki
Transcriptionist