

MINUTES

Executive & Legislative Committee – Special Meeting

Tuesday, February 13, 2018 at 6:00 p.m.

Sauk County West Square Building, Room 213, 505 Broadway, Baraboo WI

Members Present: Krueger, Fordham, Polivka, Hambrecht and Czuprynko

Members Absent:

County Personnel: Debra O'Rourke, Interim Corporation Counsel; Alene Kleczek Bolin, Administrative Coordinator and Rebecca C. Evert, Sauk County Clerk

Others Present: David Riek, Tom Kriegl, Peter Vedro, David Moore, Clark Petterson, Chuck Spencer, John Dietz, Becky Hovde, Scott Von Asten, Tim Damos, Judy Brey, Trish Henderson, Tim Reppen, Mary Carol Solum, Bill Waser, Bill Dagnon, Sam Pocernich, Dan Holzman, Pat Nash, Tammy Wood, Sharon Terry, Sylvia Kriegl, Marcia Wollschlager, Martha Barrett, Paul Beagan, Carol Bonanno, Sandy Von Eschen, Carol Waser, Matt Joyce, Ann Joyce, Stuart Koehler, Evan Wollschlager, Tony Bonanno, Lisa Fichler, Arlene Beagan

Chair Krueger called the meeting to order at 6:00 p.m. and compliance with the Open Meeting Law was verified.

MOTION (Polivka/Czuprynko) to adopt the agenda. Motion carried unanimously.

Public Comment:

- 1) Judy Brey, re: Reducing public comment time limit.
- 2) Trish Henderson, re: Reducing public comment time limit and communication.
- 3) Tim Reppen, re: Reducing public comment time limit.
- 4) Mary Carol Solum, re: Reducing public comment time limit.
- 5) William Waser, re: Reducing public comment time limit.
- 6) Bill Dagnon, re: Reducing public comment time limit.
- 7) Sam Pocernich, re: Leadership.
- 8) Dan Holzman, re: Reducing public comment time limit.
- 9) Pat Nash, re: Reducing public comment time limit.
- 10) Tammy Wood, re: Reducing public comment time limit.
- 11) Sharon Terry, re: Reducing public comment time limit and how often a person is able to speak at county board meetings.
- 12) Sylvia Kriegl, re: Opposed to rules of board changes.
- 13) Marcia Wollschlager, re: Reducing public comment time limit and how often a person is able to speak at county board.
- 14) Martha Barrett, re: Reducing public comment time limit.
- 15) Paul Beagan, re: Reducing public comment time limit.
- 16) Carol Bonanno, re: Reducing public comment time limit.
- 17) Sandy Von Eschen, re: Reducing public comment time limit.

Communications:

- 1) RollCall Systems, Inc. Demonstration at March 6, 2018 E&L Meeting.
- 2) SB777 Relating to County Executive/County Administrator Authority.
- 3) Three e-mails to County Clerk regarding limiting the public comment time limit.
- 4) 02/04/2018 e-mail re: Sauk County Vietnam Veterans Day.

Consideration of Resolution Proclaiming March 16, 2018 Sauk County Vietnam Era Veterans Day:

MOTION (Polivka/Fordham) to approve the resolution and forward to county board for approval. Motion carried unanimously.

Consideration of Possible Amendments and/or Changes to Rules of the Board:

O'Rourke, Interim Corporation Counsel distributed a document containing proposed amendments to the Rules of the Board, submitted by supervisors and staff.

Proposed Rule Change #1:

Current Rule Text: IV.P.4.If enough supervisors who are not on that committee attend so as to constitute an unnoticed quorum of the County Board or any other committee, board, or commission of the County, the non-committee members attending are not permitted to address the committee at that meeting because to do so would violate the Open Meetings Law.

Proposed Change: IV.P.4. amended as follows: remove this sentence and replace with: A notice of a 'potential quorum MAY EXIST' should be placed on the agenda (or amended agenda) of any committee when its Chair or Vice Chair is informed 24 hours before said meeting that other supervisors plan to speak on the agenda topic.

Proponent: Peter Vedro

Legal Review:

The proposal is not legal as worded because an agenda must be posted not less than 24 hours prior to a meeting. If a change is implemented, suggest not less than 48 hours notice to the chair of the committee preparing the agenda, excluding weekends and holidays, with confirmation that the chair of the committee received the notice and was able to communicate it to staff.

Concerns about this include possible discussion amongst supervisors planning to attend a meeting – such discussion raises possible open meeting law violations. Additional concerns with this proposal is that this will result in routine last-minute requests to amend agendas every single time a supervisor intends to attend a meeting of which he or she is not a member, which may be burdensome to staff.

Supervisor Vedro made an amendment to his proposal to include the following statement “The potential for a quorum may exist” so that all supervisors can remain at meetings when there is a quorum. Discussion took place.

O'Rourke opined that boiler plate language cannot be used on all agendas based on an attorney general opinion. O'Rourke made the recommendation that we craft some type of language that can be used on agendas where a quorum is expected.

Committee consensus was to have O'Rourke and Supervisor Vedro work together to try to remedy a solution.

Proposed Rule Change #2:

Current Rule Text: IV.P.7. Only Chair of the Board may serve on both the Finance and the Executive & Legislative Committee.

Proposed Change: Eliminate rule.

Proponent: Peter Vedro

Legal Review: No legal objection

Supervisor Vedro spoke to his proposal and discussion took place.

Committee consensus was to support this rule change.

Proposed Rule Change #3:

Current Rule Text: VI.C. Any member wishing to speak to a question shall be permitted to do so at least once, and a motion for the previous question shall not be in order until every member has had such opportunity. No member may speak twice on any question until every member choosing to speak has spoken; nor shall any member, or other person, speak more than three minutes upon being recognized on a question.

Proposed Change: Add to last sentence: No member may speak twice on any question until every member choosing to speak has spoken; nor shall any member, or other person, speak more than three minutes upon being recognized on a question, other than if a supervisor yields a portion of time to the speaker.

Proponent: Peter Vedro

Legal Review:

This proposal would eliminate the 3-minute rule, would likely lead to disagreements about how long a supervisor could speak, and lead to filibustering.

Additional concerns: this will be a time-keeping nightmare, should representatives give up their ability to speak to a question? What if they change their mind and wish to reply later in a round?

Vedro gave a brief overview of the proposal and discussion took place.

Committee consensus was that they do not support this rule change.

Proposed Rule Change #6:

Current Rule Text: VI.C. Any member wishing to speak to a question shall be permitted to do so at least once, and a motion for the previous question shall not be in order until every member has had such opportunity. No member may speak twice on any question until every member choosing to speak has spoken; nor shall any member, or other person, speak more than three minutes upon being recognized on a question.

Proposed Change: Amend VI.C. to read as follows: Any member wishing to speak to a question shall be permitted to do so at least once, and a motion for the previous question shall not be in order until every member has had such opportunity, however, the opportunity to speak does not include the ability to make an amendment to the pending question. No member may speak twice on any question until every member choosing to speak has spoken; nor shall any member, or other person, speak more than three minutes upon being recognized on a question.

Proponent: Chuck Spencer

Legal Review:

As written, this proposal could be interpreted as taking away one's right to make an amendment.

Suggest this language:

Any member wishing to speak to a question shall be permitted to do so at least once, and a motion for the previous question shall not be in order until every member has had such opportunity. *The opportunity to speak once a motion for the previous question has been made does not include the ability to make amendments.* No member may speak twice on any question until every member choosing to speak has spoken; nor shall any member, or other person, speak more than three minutes upon being recognized on a question.

Spencer spoke to this proposal and discussion took place.

Committee consensus was that they are in favor of this rule.

Proposed Rule Change #4:

Current Rule Text: VI.C. Any member wishing to speak to a question shall be permitted to do so at least once, and a motion for the previous question shall not be in order until every member has had such opportunity. No member may speak twice on any question until every member choosing to speak has spoken; nor shall any member, or other person, speak more than three minutes upon being recognized on a question.

Proposed Change: Amend by removing first sentence: ~~Any member wishing to speak to a question shall be permitted to do so at least once, and a motion for the previous question shall not be in order until every member has had such opportunity.~~ No member may speak twice on any question until every member choosing to speak has spoken; nor shall any member, or other person, speak more than three minutes upon being recognized on a question.

Proponent: Joan Fordham, Henry Netzinger and Chuck Spencer

Legal Review: No legal objection. This would essentially mean that Robert's Rules is followed on a motion for the previous question.

Supervisors spoke to this proposal and discussion took place.

Supervisor Fordham and Spencer agreed to withdraw proposed rule change #4 and not forward on to the county board.

Proposed Rule Change #17

Current Rule Text: Rule VI.C. Any member wishing to speak to a question shall be permitted to do so at least once, and a motion for the previous question shall not be in order until every member has had such opportunity. No member may speak twice on any question until every member choosing to speak has spoken; nor shall any member, or other person, speak more than three minutes upon being recognized on a question.

Proposed Change: Revise Rule VI.C. as follows: Any member wishing to speak to a question shall be permitted to do so at least once, and a motion for the previous question shall not be in order. ~~until every member has had such opportunity.~~ No member may speak twice on any question until every member choosing to speak has spoken; nor shall any member, or other person, speak more than ~~three~~ five minutes upon being recognized on a question.

Proponent: Tom Kriegl

Legal Review:

No legal objection. This results in modifying Robert's Rules and results in a motion for the previous question never being in order at a meeting.

No legal objection to changing to five minutes.

Supervisor Kriegl spoke to his proposal and discussion took place.

Committee consensus was to not support the proposed rule change.

Proposed Rule Change #5:

Current Rule Text: VI.B. Any person, not a Board member, may address the Board for a period of time not to exceed three minutes during the public comment period indicated on the agenda....

Proposed Change: Amend VI.B. by removing this sentence and creating a new rule for public comment, (resulting in renumbering of Rule VI.)

VI.B. Any person, not a Board member may address the Board during the public comment period as follows:

1. for a period of time not to exceed ninety seconds; 2. Speakers may not participate in public comment for more than two consecutive months; 3. Public comment shall be directed to the Board in general without naming specific supervisors, county officials or employees; 4. public comment speakers shall not advocate violence or threats to break the law; 5. a violation of rules VI.B.3 or VI.B.4. will result in speaker being immediately ruled out of order and loss of commenting privileges.

Proponent: David Moore

Legal Review:

No legal objection to proposals number 1 and 2, as they are content-neutral and would apply to everyone.

Concern with 2 is that, while it would apply to everyone, it limits a person's ability to speak on issues placed on future agendas of which they are unaware. Recommend against it.

Proposals 3 and 4 are not content-neutral and would not be legal.

Proposal 5 is not addressed as numbers 3 and 4 are not legal.

Supervisor Moore withdrew the proposed rule change #5 and to not forward to the county board.

Proposed Rule Change #7:

Current Rule Text: VI.C. Any member wishing to speak to a question shall be permitted to do so at least once, and a motion for the previous question shall not be in order until every member has had such opportunity. No member may speak twice on any question until every member choosing to speak has spoken; nor shall any member, or other person, speak more than three minutes upon being recognized on a question.

Proposed Change: Amend Rule VI.C. to add at the end of the paragraph: There shall be a 30 minute time limit on discussion of any question, including any amendments to the original question.

Proponent: Chuck Spencer

Legal Review: No legal objection, however, it should be clarified that this rule does not eliminate the right of each supervisor to speak for 3 minutes or the right to speak at all on a question.

Supervisor Spencer withdrew the proposed rule change #7 and to not forward to the county board.

Proposed Rule Change #8:

Current Rule Text: IV.R. As far as practicable and with prior chair approval, standing and special committee members may participate in committee meetings via telephonic conferencing, however those members appearing by phone for meetings that take place within Sauk County will not count toward quorum, may not vote, and shall not receive per diem compensation. At no time shall more than one committee member be participating by telephone. Upon prior approval by the Executive and Legislative Committee, committee members may count toward quorum, may vote and are eligible to receive per diem compensation for telephonic meetings where the committee meeting is convened outside of Sauk County.

Proposed Change: Replace all but the last sentence of IV.R with: Members of county board, and standing and special committees, may participate in meetings convened within Sauk County by telephone/ video conferencing, and members appearing by telephone/video shall count toward quorum, may vote, and shall receive per diem compensation. At no time may more than three members appear by telephone/video for a board meeting, and not more than two for a committee meeting. Supervisors are limited to not more than two board and two committee telephonic/video meeting appearances per year. Upon prior approval by the Executive and Legislative Committee, committee members may count toward quorum, may vote and are eligible to receive per diem compensation for telephonic meetings where the committee meeting is convened outside of Sauk County.

Proponent: Wally Czuprynko

Legal Review:

Physical presence is required to count toward a quorum and thus the right to vote. This applies to both board meetings, as well as committee meetings.

The board may choose to extend telephonic appearance ability for board meetings, similar to current rule for committees, however, recommend against this, for the following reasons and concerns: If supervisors are allowed to attend a board meeting by telephone or video, should not the public be allowed to do so? The technological constraints of such, as well as the possibility of malfunctions, point toward not allowing telephonic appearances.

With respect to increasing the number of members who may appear at a meeting by phone, this may frequently present lack of a quorum, and raises concerns about the technical capability to do so.

Suggestion of Int. Corp. Counsel:

Add the following to the last sentence of the current rule: "if permitted by the rules of the committee, board, or commission holding said meeting."

Supervisor Czuprynko spoke to his proposal and discussion took place.

Supervisor Vedro proposed an amendment to this rule stating: with prior chair approval, standing and special committee members may participate in committee meetings via telephonic conferencing, once per committee assignment for each year of their elected terms, and may count toward quorum, may vote and are eligible to receive per diem compensation. At no time shall more than one committee member be participating by telephone.

Committee consensus was that more study needs to take place regarding this proposed rule change.

Proposed Rule Change #9:

Current Rule Text: New Rule I.G.

Proposed Change: Create new Rule I.G.: As Supervisors for the citizens of Sauk County, County Board Supervisors wish to show their transparency and respect for those they represent, and want to set a good example for the people and employees of Sauk County, and therefore will be allowed to voluntarily participate in drug-testing for illegal substances.

Proponent: Wally Czuprynko and Henry Netzing

Legal Review:

The board may not mandate drug-testing for supervisors, this would be a violation of their privacy rights. The board may, however, have a rule offering supervisors the opportunity to participate voluntarily in testing for illegal drugs. However, the proposal raises a number of questions: who will pay for the testing, who will oversee this optional program, what will be done with the results, is this a proper use of county resources, will testing be random for those volunteering, or at the volunteering supervisor's discretion.

Any person has the right to take a drug test and make the results public. I see no reason to create something called a rule, which isn't really a rule governing conduct or procedure.

Supervisor Czuprynko spoke to his proposal and discussion took place.

Committee consensus was that Supervisors Czuprynko, Von Asten and Vedro work together to come up with a compromise regarding the proposed rule.

Proposed Rule Change #10:

Current Text Rule: New Rule I.G.

Proposed Change: New Rule I G. to read as follows: If the voting machine is not used to record attendance, the clerk will visually inspect the room and initially record and announce the names of missing members, instead of taking time to call every member's name.

Proponent: Tom Kriegl

Legal Review: No legal objection, however, calling the names of supervisors and having them affirm their attendance is preferable to requiring the clerk to visually inspect the room trying to locate people. It takes minimal time to take roll call.

Supervisor Kriegl spoke to his proposal and discussion took place.

Committee consensus was to not support the proposed rule change.

Proposed Rule Change #11:

Current Text Rule: Rule III.D. Any subject that comes before the Board without a committee recommendation or resolution may be referred to the appropriate committee by the Chair without motion. Resolutions brought forward by individual supervisors must be presented to all committees having jurisdiction over the proposed matter. Except under emergency conditions as provided in Rule III. A., only after at least one committee having jurisdiction over the matter has approved the resolution shall it be in order for the Board to consider the resolution.

Proposed Change: Rule III. D., Strike the following language: Any subject that comes before the Board without a Committee recommendation or resolution may be referred to the appropriate Committee by the Chair without motion. Resolutions brought forward by individual supervisors must be submitted to all committees having jurisdiction over the proposed matter. Once the committees having jurisdiction over the proposed matter have had a meeting in which the matter could have been agendaized, the matter shall be placed on the county board agenda at the request of two or more board members. Only after all the committees having jurisdiction over the matter have had the opportunity to consider and approve the resolution shall it be in order for the Board to consider the resolution.

Proponent: Tom Kriegl

Legal Review:

The County Board is a board of committees who exercise jurisdiction over certain matters. This may become problematic with regard to statutory boards or commissions that exercise certain legal authority under the statutes such as the Human Services Board. The committee should consider whether it is prudent to create a bypass mechanism for individual supervisors to go directly to the Board where there is no committee support by the committee charged with oversight over a matter. If the Board wishes to do this, I have no legal objection, but these extraordinary resolutions will need to be scrutinized carefully.

Supervisor Kriegl spoke to his proposal and discussion took place.

Committee consensus was to not support the proposed rule.

Proposed Rule Change #12:

Current Rule Text: New Rule III.F. (note, no Rule III.E. currently exists)

Proposed Change: New Rule III F.: County board member's requests for information needed to carry out their county board duties, shall be accommodated, even if the request results in the creation of a new document, by any county employee, department, or constitutionally elected county officer. County board members shall not be charged for information requested to carry out their county board duties.

Proponent: Tom Kriegl

Legal Review: Creates a mandate upon departments to comply with supervisor requests for any information, which may or may not be lawful. This could conflict with statutes where a supervisor is asking for confidential information to which they are not entitled. Further, the rule is vague. It does not specify who determines what is necessary for a supervisor to carry out their duties. Conceivably, county employees would be redirected from their duties to serve the public to answering voluminous requests of supervisors. Further, the County Board does not have the authority to direct constitutional officers to simply produce any information on the whim of a supervisor. It also potentially violates the Code of ethics by providing supervisors with a waiver of fees charged to the general public.

Supervisor Kriegl spoke to his proposal and discussion took place.

Committee consensus was to not support the proposed rule change.

Proposed Rule Change #13:

Current Rule Text: Create a new Rule III G. (Again, no Rule III E exists)

Proposed Change: New Rule III G. to read as follows: Sauk County will not contest open record lawsuits without approval by resolution of the Sauk County Board.

Proponent: Tom Kriegl

Legal Review: This is not an appropriate rule of the board. The rules of the board prescribe the rules for the operation of the county board. Ordinances and policies prescribe the operations of county government. A policy of this nature would need to be adopted by ordinance. Even if done correctly, it would infringe on the authority of records custodians and could lead to violations of the law if records were released in violation of state law.

Kriegl gave a brief overview of this proposal and discussion took place.

Committee consensus was to not support the proposed rule change.

Proposed Rule Change #14:

Current Rule Text: Create a new Rule IV P (7) and renumber existing Rule IV P (7) to (8).

Proposed Change: New Rule IV. P (7) (current 7 to be renumbered to 8.): Working together, the committee chair and appropriate department head(s) will construct the committee meeting agendas. Items must be added to the agenda in compliance with the Wisconsin Open Meeting Law, if requested by any committee member.

Proponent: Tom Kriegl

Legal Review:

Concerns with this: the chair of a committee and the department head prepare the agenda. Typically committee members inform the chair of items they wish to be placed on the next agenda. The proposal would remove from the committee chair their discretion to prepare the agenda.

It is unclear the intent of this proposal, as some items may not be placed on the agenda if sufficient notice is not possible pursuant to Wisconsin Open Meeting Law.

Kriegl spoke to his proposal and discussion took place.

Committee consensus was to not support the proposed rule change.

Proposed Rule Change #15:

Current Rule Text: New Rule IV.S.

Proposed Change: New Rule IV.S.: All meetings of the county board and standing committees will be videotaped and made available for public viewing within 3 days of the end of each meeting.

Proponent: Tom Kriegl

Legal Review:

No legal objection. However, some committees do not meet in rooms with video capability. Will these rooms be retrofitted? Will committees be instructed to meet in rooms with this capability? Where will the funds come from to retrofit rooms? Has anyone coordinated with MIS to determine if the three-day time-period can be met?

What if there are technical difficulties?

Kriegl gave a brief overview of this proposal and discussion took place.

Committee consensus was to not support the proposed rule as this will be addressed as we move forward with new technology.

Proposed Rule Change #16

Current Rule Text: Rule V.C. Any increase in the number of days of committee work for which supervisors may be paid compensation and mileage in any year shall require approval by two-thirds vote of the members of the Board present, prior to payment. In addition to the above, the Chair shall receive compensation for performance of the duties of that office. The Chair is authorized to act as a member of all committees in an ex officio capacity, and per diem shall be paid under this rule for attendance at all committee meetings attended by the Chair.

Proposed Change: Revise Rule V. C. as follows:

Any increase in the number of days of committee work for which supervisors may be paid compensation and mileage in any year shall require approval by two-thirds vote of the members of the Board present, prior to payment. In addition to the above, the Chair shall receive compensation for performance of the duties of that office. **The Chair may vote on committees of which he is not a regular member only if his participation is needed to reach a quorum.** ~~is authorized to act to make a quorum as a member of all committees in an ex-officio capacity,~~ and Per diem shall be paid under this rule for attendance at all committee meetings attended by the Chair.

Proponent: Tom Kriegl

Legal Review: No legal objection. (Please note that the text changes provided by the requesting supervisor do not reflect the current language of the rule).

Supervisor Kriegl spoke to her proposal and discussion took place.

Committee consensus was to not support the proposed rule.

Proposed Rule Change #18:

Current Rule Text: New Rule VI.M.

Proposed Change: New Rule VI.M.: **All motions and points of order made during county board meetings shall be recorded in the meeting's minutes whether or not the motion passes, fails, is not seconded or is ruled out of order.**

Proponent: Tom Kriegl

Legal Review: (The rule numbering both referenced and suggested by the supervisor does not reflect current rules. Therefore, I have identified the proposal as a New Rule VI.M.)

No legal objection.

Supervisor Kriegl spoke to her proposal and discussion took place.

Committee consensus was that this was not a needed rule change and to have the County Clerk begin including all points of order, motions and anything ruled out of order included in the county board minutes.

Proposed Rule Changes #19

Current Rule Text: Rule VI.I. Any budget alterations shall require authorization by two-thirds of the membership of the Board, except that the Finance Committee may authorize transfers of funds between budgeted items of an individual office, department or activity which have been separately appropriated by the Board in its budget, in accordance with Wis. Stat. § 65.90(5).

Proposed Change: Amend Rule VI.I. as follows: Any budget alterations shall require authorization by two-thirds of the membership of the Board, in accordance with Wis. Stat. § 65.90(5). Alterations include but are not limited to amounts exceeding \$10,000 moved between budget line items within departments, salary and wage adjustments recommended by the Personnel Committee after research as described in Personnel Policy 13.21(1).

Proponent: Tom Kriegl

Legal Review:

This proposal appears to confuse budget alterations with expenditures within line items of adopted budgets.

Wis. Stat. § 65.90(5)(a) states that budget alterations require authorization by two-thirds of the entire membership of the board.

Wis. Stat. 65.90(5)(b) states that a county board may authorize its finance committee to transfer funds between budgeted items.

Both of these are contained in the current rule of the board, and both are contained in Sauk County Financial Policy 15-95.

While it is listed as a rule of procedure of the board, it is actually a policy and its change is within the purview of the Finance Committee.

Supervisor Kriegl spoke to the proposal and discussion took place.

Supervisor Kriegl withdrew the proposed rule change #19 and to not forward to the county board.

Proposed Rule Change #20:

Current Rule Text: New Rule V.E.

Proposed Change: New Rule V.E.: County board members who attend, the intergovernmental meetings scheduled by Sauk County for all county, city, town, and village officials can claim per diem and mileage for attending said meetings.

Proponent: Tom Kriegl

Legal Review: Compensation for attending these meetings is to be paid only if directed to attend by the board or the standing committee. Wis. § Stat. 59.13.

Kriegl spoke to his proposal and discussion took place.

Committee consensus was to not support the proposed rule change.

Proposed Rule Change #21:

Current Rule Text: Create Rule V.E.

Proposed Change: Create Rule V.E. The supervisor elected Vice-Chair shall be entitled to receive the compensation provided for the part-time position of Vice-Chair consisting of a salary of \$400 per month in addition to any other per diem and mileage entitlement available to other supervisors in accordance with Rule V.A.

Proponent: Ad Hoc Committee

Legal Review: No legal objection.

Supervisor Moore spoke to the proposal and discussion took place.

Committee consensus was to not support this proposed rule change.

Proposed Rule Change #22:

Current Rule Text: Rule IX Current Standing Committees of the Board Rule charges the Aging & Disability Resource Center Committee with policy direction and oversight for the County Veterans Service Officer.

The Committee description also states: "Responsible for providing services to veterans pursuant to Wis. Stat. Ch. 45."

Proposed Change: Rule IX proposal to amend rule to remove Veterans Service Officer from ADRC Committee, and place the VSO into the Executive and Legislative Committee for oversight and policy direction:

Rule IX

Aging & Disability Resource Center Committee Responsible for providing services to the general public with respect to matters related to aging and disability and to improve the life of those with aging and disability related issues.

~~Responsible for providing services to veterans pursuant to Wis. Stat. Ch. 45.~~ This committee will serve as the official statutory Commission on Aging pursuant to Wis. Stat. § 46.82(4) and shall be advised by the Aging, and Disability Advisory Committee. Responsible for policy direction and oversight for the ~~following departments: Veterans Service Officer and~~ Aging and Disability Resource Center. Sauk Co.

Code Ch. 16. Members: 5.

Add to Executive & Legislative Committee: ... Responsible for policy direction and oversight to the following departments: Administrative Coordinator, Corporation

Counsel, County Clerk, Management Information Systems, Emergency Management, ~~and Veterans Service Officer.~~

Proponent: Ad Hoc Committee

Legal Review:

No legal objection to this change in oversight committee.

The sentence "Responsible for providing services to veterans pursuant to Wis. Stat. Ch. 45." should be removed, as it is not accurate. Neither the committee nor ADRC is responsible for providing services to veterans.

Supervisor Moore spoke to the proposal and discussion took place.

Committee consensus was that Alene would have a discussion with Tony in Veteran Services and report back to E&L with the findings.

Proposed Rule Change #23:

Current Rule Text: Rule IX Standing Committees of the Board: ADRC Committee

Proposed Change: Proposal to eliminate ADRC Committee and have the ADRC Department receive oversight and policy direction from the Human Services Board

Proponent: Ad Hoc Committee

Legal Review: No legal objection, however, I advise against this, as this committee serves at the official statutory Commission on Aging pursuant to Wis. Stat. § 46.82(4). While it may be possible to have the Human Services Board become the official commission on aging, the statutory composition requirements of each board are different and may result in difficulty creating a board that meets both requirements. See Wis. Stat. § 46.82(4) and § 46.23(4).

Additionally, the complexities and issues surrounding serving this growing population point toward retaining ADRC as a separate committee. The Human Services Board has the same for its population.

Supervisor Moore spoke to the proposal and discussion took place.

Committee consensus was to withdraw the proposed rule change #23 due to the board size remaining the same at this time.

Proposed Rule Change #24:

Current Rule Text: Rule IX Standing Committees of the Board: Communications Infrastructure Committee and Property & Insurance Committee

Proposed Change:

Merge Communications Infrastructure Committee into Property & Insurance Committee

Amend Property & Insurance Committee as follows: add as second to last sentence:

Responsible for the communications infrastructure, including fiber optic cable, towers, and associated equipment.

Proponent: Ad Hoc Committee

Legal Review: No legal objection. This change helps to eliminate three committee assignments.

Discussion took place regarding the proposed rule change.

Committee consensus was to support the proposed rule change.

Proposed Rule Change #25:

Current Rule Text: Rule IX Standing Committees of the Board: Create a new Personnel & Finance Committee

Proposed Change: Proposal is to disband the Personnel Committee and form a joint Personnel & Finance Committee comprised of 7 supervisors.

Proponent: Ad Hoc Committee

Legal Review:

No legal objection. This proposal makes sense as much of their work dovetails, such as:

- Setting pay
- Considering new/reclassified positions
- Considering benefits offered
- Departmental programmatic review, of which labor costs are almost always the largest cost

A subcommittee will need to be formed for negotiations

Supervisor Moore spoke to the proposal and discussion took place.

Committee consensus was to support the proposed rule change.

Proposed Rule Change #26:

Current Rule Text:

Proposed Change: Proposal to move oversight of and reports of Worker's Compensation and Risk Management, and Property & Liability from Property & Insurance Committee to the newly formed Personnel and Finance Committee.

Proponent: Staff

Legal Review: No legal objection. Quarterly reports could still be made for information purposes to P&I.

Discussion took place regarding the proposed rule change.

Committee consensus was that there needs to be more discussion between staff and property insurance committee and that findings be reported back to the E&L committee.

Proposed Rule Change #27:

Current Rule Text: Rule IX Standing Committee of the Board

Proposed Change: Proposal is to move Arts & Culture from the UW Extension Committee into Economic Development Committee

Proponent: Ad Hoc Committee

Legal Review:

No legal objection. Must decide which committee (UW Extension or Econ Development) will be designated the Landmarks Commission.

If UW Extension is not the Landmarks Commission, § 38.03 of Code will need to be changed.

Supervisor Moore spoke to the proposal and discussion took place.

Committee consensus was to withdraw the proposed rule change #27 and to not forward to county board.

Other Organizational Issues

Reduce the size of the board to 27 supervisors. Proposed by the Ad Hoc Committee. This action is authorized pursuant to Wis. Stat. § 59.10(3)(cm), however, it is not appropriate for proposal as a rule change.

Supervisor Moore spoke to the proposal and discussion took place.

Committee consensus was to withdraw the proposed rule change and not forward to county board.

MOTION (Czuprynyk/Polivka) to adjourn. Motion carried unanimously and the meeting adjourned at 10:10 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Becky Evert
Sauk County Clerk