

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE BROWN COUNTY
PLANNING, DEVELOPMENT & TRANSPORTATION COMMITTEE**

Pursuant to Section 19.84 Wis. Stats., a regular meeting of the **Brown County Planning, Development & Transportation Committee** was held on Monday, November 24, 2014 in Room 161, UW Extension, 1150 Bellevue Street, Green Bay, WI

Present: Chair Bernie Erickson, Supervisors Tom Sieber, Supervisor Dantine, Supervisor Dave Kaster, Supervisor Landwehr
Also Present: Cathy Williquette, Bill Bosiacki, Paul Van Noie, Jeff Oudeans, Brandy Younger, Chad Weinger, Executive Streckenbach and other interested parties.

I. **Call Meeting to Order.**

Meeting was called to order by Supervisor Bernie Erickson at 6:15 p.m.

II. **Approve/Modify Agenda.**

Motion made by Supervisor Sieber, seconded by Supervisor Dantine to approve.

Vote taken. MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

III. **Approve/Modify Minutes of October 27, 2014.**

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

1. **Review minutes of:**

- a. **Board of Adjustment (October 27, 2014).**
- b. **Land Information Council (July 29, 2014).**
- c. **Planning Commission Board of Directors (October 1, 2014).**
- d. **Planning Commission Board of Directors Transportation Subcommittee (September 15, 2014).**
- e. **Solid Waste Board (September 22, 2014).**

Motion made by Supervisor Dantine, seconded by Supervisor Sieber to suspend the rules to take Items 1a-e together. Vote taken. MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

Motion made by Supervisor Dantine, seconded by Supervisor Landwehr to receive and place on file Items 1a-e together. Vote taken. MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

Comments from the Public None.

Register of Deeds

2. **Budget Status Financial Report for October, 2014.**

Register of Deeds Cathy Williquette informed that they were still lagging in real estate recording fees, transfer fees were at budget and all other fees and expenses were within budget. She didn't think they would hit budget.

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

3. **LaBaye Project 4th Quarter Deliverables.**

Williquette referred to the handout re: the LaBaye Project 4th Quarter Deliverables located in the agenda packet, which was a request to make the final payment at the end of December. She informed that she wanted to bring this forward in December but it was tentative on whether the committee would be meeting due to where the meeting fell. The Finance Department had asked if she could have it processed so the payment could be made out of the 2014 funds.

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

Planning and Land Services

Land Information (No items)

Planning Commission

4. **Update regarding development of the Brown County Farm property – standing item.**

No report.

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

5. **Budget Status Financial Report for October, 2014.**

Expenditures: all categories were progressing as anticipated; Revenues were at or near expectations.

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

Property Listing

6. **Budget Status Financial Report for October, 2014.**

Expenditures were within anticipated levels; Revenues were progressing as anticipated.

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

Zoning

7. **Request from Thomas Goede to waive shoreland permit fees and reduce Board of Adjustment appeal fee.**

Zoning Administrator Bill Bosiacki provided a handout with pictures to the committee members. He informed they had received a complaint from the Town of Scott so they went out and took a look at it and sure enough the structures were there. The waterway was considered navigable at this time by the DNR, any structures within 300' of that waterway, either side, required a Shoreland permit. They had one when they built the house originally. The other issue was that it was mapped as a floodplain; they needed some assurances, from a county standpoint, that it

was not affecting flood elevation at all. It put it in a permitting zone for them and they had to issue permits. They were working with the DNR Floodplain Engineer on that.

Mr. Goede did not do the work, it was done by the previous owner of the home. They were willing to take care of it and get it through its process but they were asking for zoning to waive the permit fee and reduce the Board of Adjustment fee to essentially around \$200 for the publishing in the newspaper, a class 2 public notice, two weeks prior to the hearing, and the members of the Board of Adjustment get \$20 a meeting.

Dantinne informed that it was in his district so he went out to take a look at it. He felt it was unfair, they were chasing small potatoes, a little walking bridge over a waterway that was put in prior to them purchasing it. He felt it was unrealistic.

Responding to Sieber, the fee for the bridge would normally be an accessories structure fee of \$100. The slab, where it was located, was within 35', they couldn't have anything within 35'. The slab was at-grade so it wouldn't have any impact on the floodplain.

Motion made by Supervisor Landwehr, seconded by Supervisor Erickson to approve the fee waiver for Thomas Goede and reduce it to the actual cost. Vote taken. MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

8. Budget Status Financial Report for October, 2014.

Expenditures were progressing as anticipated; Revenues: Public charges were progressing at their anticipated rate.

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

Public Works

9. Summary of Operations.

Public Works Director Paul Van Noie informed that operations were doing pretty well through October. They continue to hold about a \$457,500 net positive year-to-date variance between the 660 and 240 Funds.

Further highlights of the written report (located in agenda packet) covering the period ending 10/31/2014 were given for the Highway and Facilities Departments.

Responding to Dantinne, Van Noie informed that the bridge on EE was completed the weekend of November 3. As a follow-up, Landwehr believed that before it was done a deal was made with Hobart to temporarily run heavy trucks up Fernando. Van Noie interjected that they had some repair work yet to do on that. There was one or two spots that needed to be patched up. Landwehr informed that he just wanted to make sure that it was all signed off on. Van Noie informed that they documented what it was before and will work again with the Village to determine what needed to be repaired.

In the 400s—Capital Projects, Landwehr questioned Public Works intentions to apply \$175K to future projects and \$102K to transfer out to Debt Service. Van Noie informed that a portion of those funds went to satisfy debt service the following year. Landwehr informed that the totals listed came up to a lot more than \$181,490. Business Manager Brandy Younger informed that

the amount was larger from 2013 projects but they made some payments in 2014 to debt service which happened by October.

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

10. **Director's Report.**

In addition to the Twelve-Hour Days under the Public Works Department Director's Report, Van Noie reported that they started crushing concrete from the former Mental Health Center location. There will be about 40,000 ton and an additional 15,000 ton of shoulder from some of the stone on the outside of the building. It will be crushed before the end of the year. He informed they will do better than the \$500,000 that was budgeted and set up for that. They also took down the buildings associated with the purchase by Cardinal Capital, it had been disposed of and he believed the project was complete.

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

11. **Possible discussion regarding Brown County Health Department facility – standing item.**

Erickson informed that there was a brief meeting with Health Department Director Judy Friederichs, Supervisors Kaster and Zima, Facilities, Administration and the Executive's office. They discussed a few things such as moving or staying as well as the various costs involved, etc.

Director of Administration Chad Weininger informed there were three sections of material (provided and attached) which included the Summary Cost Analysis, the floor plan and a parking map. He suggested looking at this in three sections: What made the most financial sense for the county in the move, what made the most reasonable alternative, factoring in other things than financial, and what was the best long term strategy for this move looking out 5, 10, 20 years from now.

Weininger went over the numbers on the Profit and Loss Summary handout with the committee. He informed that they were looking at the current location on Broadway/White Store, the Mason Street location and the Sophie Beaumont Building. Weininger noted that all the detail was in the packet material, such as, with regard to operating expenses the Mason Street numbers were determined by looking at the UW Extension building as it was an equivalent building, so they pro-rated it to come up with their numbers. Family Care will be moving out of the Sophie Beaumont building and Human Services will have to make up the \$75,000 for the square footage because it was now a vacant space and it was a cost that they were going to have regardless. That was the total cost for operating and it needed to be somewhere because it was a true expense; it couldn't be billed back to the feds or state any longer. If they were to move the Health Department to there, they would be paying \$75,000 which would make up the shortfall. Streckenbach added that it would be closer to \$400,000, which had been billed to the Federal Government to run the program that had helped support staffing, Corporation Counsel, Human Resources, Accounting, etc. The Human Services budget will need to find \$400,000 to offset the revenue that wasn't coming in. \$75,000 of the \$400,000 was facility rental. Looking at the 20 Year Cost Review at Present Value, the reason Sophie Beaumont was less was because they had the vacant space that they already owned and already pay the \$75,000 for. It was still cheaper if you didn't factor in the \$75,000.

When looking at the second handout re: 7835 total square feet, Weininger felt they were very close to having something that could work. Originally there were a lot of concerns so Facilities expanded the space. Their garage could also be used for their infant/car seat checks/installation.

The larger issue on the practicality piece of it was parking. Referring to the map, Weininger believed the County Executive would propose vacating the approximate 15 parking spots in the Sophie Beaumont parking and create free public parking for the Health Departments clientele. They would take the cars currently using the space and relocate them to Associated Bank Lot 1 or 2. Associated Bank Lot 2 ran approximately \$25 per stall; they would also have the possibility of purchasing it. Cherry St. Ramp was around \$69/month; Pine Street was around \$50 a month, so Lot 2 was a pretty good deal. There was public metered parking on the side streets. The other issue was that the sanitarians had large vehicles that they had to inspect and it may be problematic in that spot, they could possibly park in the alleyway however, they can't block it, so that would be a concern.

The question was, long term, what made more sense? To move to the Sophie Beaumont, to purchase the current building/getting the rent down even less to match the Sophie, or look at West Mason and work a better deal down and have a second building.

Landwehr felt that looking at this, he was a complete believer that Sophie Beaumont made the most sense, however, he wanted to make sure, for a relatively long term meaning minimum five years, hopefully longer. If they were looking at something shorter, the cost of the current location and Sophie Beaumont were so close together that they were insignificant. If they weren't looking at it long term, at least five year, he felt they were better off staying where they were right now until they did get a long term plan. Streckenbach added that one of the big drivers was the relocation costs, Landwehr responded that that was his point.

Streckenbach stated that at the end of the day there was the question of whether or not the county was prepared to have a serious conversation about the possibility about taking Human Services, UW-Extension, Land Con, Parks, and Health Department and located them by the Tech Park, which cost money. They were in the process of determining whether how much in savings they could generate by the consolidation, projecting it out to see if they could pay for some of the bonding cost by the efficiencies they were going to generate by consolidating. There were initial proposals out there right now that needed to be sharpened and fine-tuned to justify the numbers. If there was the wiliness right now, they would not be able to move into that facility into the Sophie Beaumont for at least another 9 months at minimum. They had time to gauge what their best options were. His gut told him that the Mason Street property was going to be on the market for a little more time yet, that could still be on the table as an option for them to consider. On a financial standpoint, they still had to deal with the \$75,000 in 2016's budget on top of the other \$325,000 in 2016's budget to offset that decrease in revenue.

When talking about moving to the Tech Park location, Dantine believed there were always concerns about moving the Health Department away from downtown due to the clientele they served. Streckenbach informed that there was bus service. Friederichs informed that they had talked about it in the past but they had started serving clientele as they come in and most of them were coming by vehicle. Whether it was a barrier driving a distance, she couldn't say for sure. They had tried asking clients at one point about how far they would drive but when they currently reside in a central location, clients will say they wouldn't want to drive any further. It was a leading question.

Referring to Kaster's concerns, Weininger stated that for the numbers that they worked into this, it was 15 parking spots at \$25. If they wanted to do something more for employee parking, the numbers would be larger but there were huge amounts of space there. The other option would be to take down the Sophie Beaumont Building, locate a number of departments in one central location and have a sellable asset with the Northern Building with parking, as parking was at a premium downtown because there was not a lot of it. There were 135 spots if they knocked down Sophie. Van Noie informed the ballpark to knock it down would be about a \$1M.

Streckenbach felt if they didn't want to build a building, there was still the option of the co-location idea of the Downtown Library and Neville Museum. There was enough space in the library to house basically all these organizations that they talked about building a new building for. However, they would run into the same problem with parking unless they purchased the Associated Bank Lot 2. Landwehr felt that if they were looking at something for the library long term with whatever departments, it would make sense to try and get ahold of Associated Bank Lot 2.

Weininger stated that through the WHEDA tax credit, a company could come in and say if you allow them to do the project, such as merge the library and museum, and build in some office space, condo units and additional parking, they could use a lot of those dollars to fund the overall costs. The nice thing about using them was, they pay for all of the architecture and do the design. He suggested inviting them up to shoot some ideas out there and to see what may work. It would take the burden off of staff. These people have done it so they had realistic numbers on what the cost could be. This would be another approach and make it financially feasible for the county.

Streckenbach informed that the library wasn't opposed to a merge, there may have been a space issue but he could walk into the library and showcase duplicated space. To him, the opportunity presented a very solvable solution. The museum didn't need 60,000 sq. ft. There was an opportunity for the museum to adjust themselves, the challenge was, the cost to renovate was in the million dollar range. They wanted to be able to accomplish that but how do you do it when you have a museum out there asking for money and a library out in the community asking for money to renovate, if you could join forces and state that they were protecting two very important cultural institutions but their overall space was going to be modified not only for adjusting for the future but more importantly ideally to bring it to the 21st century in terms of what the programs and services were being delivered. Ironically the library wanted to expand their first floor to increase its children programming. To the right of the auditorium in the museum, they had a children's area. You could take the first floor and design it to be the library/museum children's area for programming and services. Second floor you have for traveling exhibits, and third floor would be office and management. The question would be, how much more space did they need to add on for the adult and computer area. Regarding the genealogy and collections, Streckenbach had a firm belief that they could work something out with UWGB to have the library move those types of operations to UWGB, make everything centrally located.

At one point there were discussions regarding adding up to either the library or museum, Streckenbach informed the library could go up. The challenge was, over the next five to 10 years, it will have ongoing maintenance.

Sieber informed that there was a Facility Master Plan Subcommittee a couple years back, he informed that they were supposed to be dealing with these things and questioned if it was something worth bringing back rather than spending too much time talking about what was

moving, where it was going, at this committee. He would like semi-regular updates whether it was through a separate subcommittee or this committee. Erickson suggested changing the agenda item to: Facilities Relocation.

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

12. **Airport – Budget Status Financial Report for October, 2014.**

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

Other

13. **Audit of bills.**

Motion made by Supervisor Sieber, seconded by Supervisor Dantine to audit the bills. Vote taken. MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

14. **Such other matters as authorized by law.**

Responding to an email Dantine received, Bosiacki responded that what happened based on the court case that came out of Waukesha County, the Judge's decision was that the towns had no use zoning in the shoreland area unless they had adopted their use zoning ordinance prior to the adoption of the Shoreland Ordinance. They had two towns in Brown County, the Town of Scott and the Town of Ledgeview that did that, so they were good. The rest of the towns all adopted their use zoning after the county shoreland zoning. Based on this decision there was no use zoning in those shoreland areas.

Motion made by Supervisor Landwehr, seconded by Supervisor Dantine to adjourn at 7:40 p.m. Vote taken. MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

Respectfully submitted,

Alicia A. Loehlein
Recording Secretary

Brown County
 Profit and Loss Summary
 Analysis Health Department Relocation

	Current Location	Mason St Location	Sophie Beaumont
Revenue (Additional)	-	54,000	-
Expenses(Additional)			
Operating Expenses	21,266	35,760	75,000
Utilities	17,673	24,700	-
Parking	3,990	-	4,500
Rent	84,000	-	-
Debt service	-	74,590	-
Sunk Cost	75,000	75,000	-
Corrective Maintenance	-	67,414	-
Relocation (Mason St. included in Debt Service)	-	-	120,000
Total Estimated Expenses	201,929	277,464	199,500
Net Loss - Year One	(201,929)	(223,464)	(199,500)
Cost to Brown County per Month - First Year	16,827	18,622	16,625
20 Year Cost Review at Present Value	4,038,580	3,458,070	1,620,000

Brown County
 Profit and Loss (Annual Summary)
 Analysis Health Department Relocation

	Mason St Location	Sophie Beaumont
--	----------------------	--------------------

Revenue (Additional)			
WIC	-	36,000	-
Seller Lease	-	18,000	-
Total Annual Revenue	-	54,000	-

Brown County
 Profit and Loss (Annual Summary)
 Analysis Health Department Relocation

Current Location	Mason St Location	Sophie Beaumont
------------------	-------------------	-----------------

Operating Expenses

Fire Alarm Permit		25	
Fire Extinguisher Inspection		120	
Fire Alarm Testing		2,000	
Fire Alarm Monitoring		220	
Elevator Inspection		90	
Elevator Maintenance		2,185	
Elevator Permit		50	
Trash Pickup	1,150	1,150	
Pest Control		300	
Lawn Service		1,000	
Backflow Testing		220	
Snow Removal	4,000	4,000	
Facility Worker with Commute	3,759	10,000	Compared to UW Ext
Housekeeping with Commute	12,143	13,800	Compared to UW Ext
Insurance	214	600	Barb West
Total Operating Expense	21,266	35,760	*****

***** the Operating Expense for locations other than the SB building are additional expenses. these additional expenses are above the operating expenses or in addition to those expenses that will be incurred if the county should an alternate site be selected.

Brown County
 Profit and Loss (Annual Summary)
 Analysis Health Department Relocation

Current Location	Mason St Location	Sophie/Beaumont
------------------	-------------------	-----------------

Debt Service

Bldg. Price	-	950,000	-
Moving/ Computer	-	212,750	-
total Debt	-	1,162,750	-
Annual Payment			
20 YR life			
Interest 2.5%			
Total Debt Service	-	74,590	-

Formula (74,587)

Brown County
Profit and Loss (Annual Summary)
Analysis Health Department Relocation

Current Location	Mason St Location	Sophie Beaumont
------------------	----------------------	--------------------

Sunk Cost incurred at the SB Building
and duplicated if alternate site is selected

75000

75000

75000

Brown County
 Profit and Loss (Annual Summary)
 Analysis Health Department Relocation

Current Location	Mason St Location	Sophie Beaumont
------------------	-------------------	-----------------

Utilities

Gas	3,101	3,950	Compared to UW Ext
Electrical	14,572	18,050	Compared to UW Ext
Water	-	2,700	Compared to UW Ext
Total Utilities	17,673	24,700	-

Brown County
 Profit and Loss (Annual Summary)
 Analysis Health Department Relocation

Current Location	Mason St Location	Sophie Beaumont
------------------	-------------------	-----------------

Preventive Maintenance	-	337,068	-
------------------------	---	---------	---

Total Preventive Maintenance	-	337,068	-
------------------------------	---	---------	---

5 Years Amortization	-	67,414.00	-
----------------------	---	-----------	---

Roof, boilers, air handlers, carpet, paint, lighting upgrades.

Current Location
20 Year Cost Review

Currently Location

Revenue (Additional)

Expenses(Additional)

Operating Expenses

Utilities

Parking

Rent

Debt service

Sunk Cost

Corrective Maintenance

Relocation (not included in Debt Service)

Total Estimated Expenses

Net Loss

	Year 1	Year 2	Year 3	Year 4	Year 5	Year 6	Year 7	Year 8	Year 9	Year 10	Year 11	Year 12	Year 13	Year 14	Year 15	Year 16	Year 17	Year 18	Year 19	Year 20	Total	
21,266	21,266	21,266	21,266	21,266	21,266	21,266	21,266	21,266	21,266	21,266	21,266	21,266	21,266	21,266	21,266	21,266	21,266	21,266	21,266	21,266	21,266	425,520
17,673	17,673	17,673	17,673	17,673	17,673	17,673	17,673	17,673	17,673	17,673	17,673	17,673	17,673	17,673	17,673	17,673	17,673	17,673	17,673	17,673	17,673	353,460
3,990	3,990	3,990	3,990	3,990	3,990	3,990	3,990	3,990	3,990	3,990	3,990	3,990	3,990	3,990	3,990	3,990	3,990	3,990	3,990	3,990	3,990	79,800
84,000	84,000	84,000	84,000	84,000	84,000	84,000	84,000	84,000	84,000	84,000	84,000	84,000	84,000	84,000	84,000	84,000	84,000	84,000	84,000	84,000	84,000	1,680,000
75,000	75,000	75,000	75,000	75,000	75,000	75,000	75,000	75,000	75,000	75,000	75,000	75,000	75,000	75,000	75,000	75,000	75,000	75,000	75,000	75,000	75,000	1,500,000
201,929	201,929	201,929	201,929	201,929	201,929	201,929	201,929	201,929	201,929	201,929	201,929	201,929	201,929	201,929	201,929	201,929	201,929	201,929	201,929	201,929	201,929	4,038,580
(201,929)	(201,929)	(201,929)	(201,929)	(201,929)	(201,929)	(201,929)	(201,929)	(201,929)	(201,929)	(201,929)	(201,929)	(201,929)	(201,929)	(201,929)	(201,929)	(201,929)	(201,929)	(201,929)	(201,929)	(201,929)	(201,929)	(4,038,580)

Mason Location
20 Year Cost Review

	Year 1	Year 2	Year 3	Year 4	Year 5	Year 6	Year 7	Year 8	Year 9	Year 10	Year 11	Year 12	Year 13	Year 14	Year 15	Year 16	Year 17	Year 18	Year 19	Year 20	Total	
Revenue (Additional)	54,000	54,000	54,000	54,000	54,000	54,000	54,000	54,000	54,000	54,000	54,000	54,000	54,000	54,000	54,000	54,000	54,000	54,000	54,000	54,000	54,000	1,080,000
Expenses(Additional)																						
Operating Expenses	35,760	35,760	35,760	35,760	35,760	35,760	35,760	35,760	35,760	35,760	35,760	35,760	35,760	35,760	35,760	35,760	35,760	35,760	35,760	35,760	35,760	715,200
Utilities	24,700	24,700	24,700	24,700	24,700	24,700	24,700	24,700	24,700	24,700	24,700	24,700	24,700	24,700	24,700	24,700	24,700	24,700	24,700	24,700	24,700	494,000
Parking	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Rent	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Debt service	74,590	74,590	74,590	74,590	74,590	74,590	74,590	74,590	74,590	74,590	74,590	74,590	74,590	74,590	74,590	74,590	74,590	74,590	74,590	74,590	74,590	1,491,800
Sunk Cost	75,000	75,000	75,000	75,000	75,000	75,000	75,000	75,000	75,000	75,000	75,000	75,000	75,000	75,000	75,000	75,000	75,000	75,000	75,000	75,000	75,000	1,500,000
Corrective Maintenance	67,414	67,414	67,414	67,414	67,414																	337,070
Relocation (Included in Debt Service)																						
Total Estimated Expenses	277,464	277,464	277,464	277,464	277,464	210,050	210,050	210,050	210,050	210,050	210,050	210,050	210,050	210,050	210,050	210,050	210,050	210,050	210,050	210,050	210,050	4,538,070
Net Loss	(223,464)	(223,464)	(223,464)	(223,464)	(223,464)	(156,050)	(156,050)	(156,050)	(156,050)	(156,050)	(156,050)	(156,050)	(156,050)	(156,050)	(156,050)	(156,050)	(156,050)	(156,050)	(156,050)	(156,050)	(156,050)	(3,458,070)

Sophie Beaumont Location
20 Year Cost Review

	Year 1	Year 2	Year 3	Year 4	Year 5	Year 6	Year 7	Year 8	Year 9	Year 10	Year 11	Year 12	Year 13	Year 14	Year 15	Year 16	Year 17	Year 18	Year 19	Year 20	Total	
Revenue (Additional)																						
Expenses(Additional)																						
Operating Expenses																						
Utilities																						
Parking																						
Rent																						
Debt service																						
Sunk Cost	75,000	75,000	75,000	75,000	75,000	75,000	75,000	75,000	75,000	75,000	75,000	75,000	75,000	75,000	75,000	75,000	75,000	75,000	75,000	75,000	75,000	1,500,000
Corrective Maintenance																						
Relocation	120,000																					
Total Estimated Expenses	195,000	75,000	75,000	75,000	75,000	75,000	75,000	75,000	75,000	75,000	75,000	75,000	75,000	75,000	75,000	75,000	75,000	75,000	75,000	75,000	75,000	120,000
Net Loss	(195,000)	(75,000)	(75,000)	(75,000)	(75,000)	(75,000)	(75,000)	(75,000)	(75,000)	(75,000)	(75,000)	(75,000)	(75,000)	(75,000)	(75,000)	(75,000)	(75,000)	(75,000)	(75,000)	(75,000)	(75,000)	(1,620,000)

BROWN COUNTY HEALTH DEPARTMENT

		SQ FT	
General Lab		1165	1155
	Phlebotomy/Blood draw station/office		
	Fume Hood		
	Eye Wash Station		
	Hand washing Sink		
	Refrigerator		
	Freezer		
	Utility sink-- two compartment sink with drain boards		
	Incubator		
	Tiling/linoleum and cleanable surfaces		
	Laboratory benches from current area		
Exam Room #1	Hand Washing Sink; refrigerator/freezer; cabinets; counters	146	159
Exam Room #2	Hand Washing Sink; refrigerator/freezer; cabinets; counters	146	138
Exam Room #3	Hand Washing Sink; refrigerator/freezer; cabinets; counters	146	146
Plan for general area UPS must run refrigerators and lab during and outage			
Reception area	3 cubicles	246	228
	Office manager	82	77
	Reception waiting area and counter area (computer at counter)	450	286
	Storage area and mail area	246	77
	Access to all clerical from counter area		
	One exam room located off the side of reception area		
	Other Exam rooms close to reception area		
Storage	Storage	965	832
Nursing	Cubicle for students (2)	164	140
	23 cubicles for nurses, health aides	1886	2132
	Two managers	300	241
	Work area of display work	300	358
Sanitarian	8 cubicles (Incl 7th SAN if approved)	656	695
	Manager office	150	137
	Cubicle for intern	82	75
Other	Preparedness (2 cubicles)	164	177
	Conference room	300	168
	Director office	150	123
Garage	Vehicle area	485	491
	Cubicle for garage staff	82	
	TOTAL SQUARE FOOTAGE	8311	7835

7835 total square feet



FIRST FLOOR PLAN
SCALE 1/4" = 1'-0"



