

**SPECIAL ORDERS SESSION  
COUNTY BOARD MEETING  
TUESDAY, JANUARY 10, 2006**

Chairman David Albrecht called the meeting to order at 6:00 p.m. in the County Board Room, Fourth Floor, Courthouse, 415 Jackson Street, Oshkosh, Wisconsin.

The meeting was opened with the Pledge of Allegiance and an invocation by Supervisor Lennon.

The following Supervisors were present: Weber, Barker, Griesbach, Hotynski, Maehl, Koziczowski, Sim, Widener, Lauson, Albrecht, Thompson, Steineke, Lennon, Farrell, Sundquist, Wingren, Jacobson, Norton, Warnke, Robl, Schmuhl, Kline, Kramer, Schaidler, Finch, Farrey, Sievert, Arne, Diakoff, Brennand, Egan, Ellis, Rengstorf and O'Brien.

Excused: Scoville, Pech and Tower.

Motion by Supervisor Robl and seconded to approve the agenda. CARRIED BY VOICE VOTE.

**COMMUNICATIONS, PETITIONS, ETC.**

A notice of claim from State Farm Insurance for Sara R. Benes for damage to her car caused by a Winnebago County Highway Department snow plow was referred to the Personnel & Finance Committee.

**REPORTS FROM COMMITTEES, COMMISSIONS AND BOARDS**

Supervisor Robl asked that the Board members read through the transportation plan that they received, as it contains very important information.

Supervisor Barker reported that the Legislative Committee will have a meeting on January 23. Supervisors or department heads that have an item for the agenda should contact her as soon as possible.

Supervisor O'Brien asked that the Board members read the FoxComm Case Study that was placed on their desks. He stated that a presentation on the FoxComm initiative will be given to the Board at a future meeting.

**CHAIRMAN'S REPORT**

Chairman Albrecht stated that Supervisor Pech is excused from tonight's meeting.

Chairman Albrecht informed the Board and the public that because of the number of people present at tonight's meeting, anyone addressing the Board during the Public Hearing portion will be limited to four minutes. If someone would like to submit their comments on the Comprehensive Land Use Plan to the Board in writing, they will have one week to do so.

**PUBLIC HEARING**

John Ralph, 2858 Manor Drive, Oshkosh, suggested that the proposed new Park View Health Center facility be built larger than proposed.

Jennifer Sundstrom of the Realtors Association of Northeast Wisconsin, spoke in support of Winnebago County's proposed comprehensive land use plan and commended those involved in the project.

John Reinert, 8746 County Road MM, Larsen, questioned the county's action on their 1988 resolution that began the comprehensive land use plan process.

Donna Lohry, 511 West Bent Avenue, Oshkosh, recommends that the Board consider building the new Park View Health Center larger than originally proposed.

Don Wagner, 8220 State Highway 91, Ripon, expressed his concern about the proposed comprehensive land use plan and its affect on property values.

Jerry Fry, Chairman for the Town of Oshkosh, 4804 Island View Drive, Oshkosh, expressed his concern about the proposed comprehensive land use plan and how it will affect urban townships.

Jim Erdman, Supervisor for the Town of Oshkosh, 2492 Hickory Lane, Oshkosh, expressed his concern about the proposed comprehensive land use plan. He feels the county has and should take more time developing this plan.

John Stone-Wilms, speaking on behalf of Eva Wilms of 1735 County Road A, Neenah, expressed concern about the administration of zoning issues at the municipal and county levels.

## STATE HIGHWAY 21 PROJECT UPDATE

Jenny Cavanaugh of the Wisconsin Department of Transportation and State Highway 21 Project Manager, and Mark Unger of the URS Corporation, gave a Power Point presentation on the scope and status of the State Highway 21 Project.

Ms. Cavanaugh explained that this plan studies that portion of State Highway 21 between Rivermoor Road and U.S. Highway 41 and what is anticipated to happen in that corridor over the next 30 years.

Ms. Cavanaugh stated that they have spent a significant amount of time identifying problems in the area and then determining need and identifying goals and objectives to address these problems. These problems are identified by working with the people and agencies—the “stakeholders”—that are affected by Highway 21. They include users, local officials, area businesses and agencies and residents.

The five major problems identified in this area:

- Traffic congestion
- Safety
- Conflicts between local and through traffic
- Poor traffic flow
- Transition from two to four lanes

Ms. Cavanaugh stated the following objectives for this project:

- Improve mobility and capacity; reduce congestion and travel time
- Improve safety
- Improve aesthetics – minimize billboards, use community design techniques
- Improve economic “viability” – reduce congestion & improve accessibility
- Find a balance “between mobility and accessibility”
- Be compatible with comprehensive plans
- Use cost effective strategies
- Keep “negative impacts” to aesthetics, environment and community to a minimum

Ms. Cavanaugh stated that determining these objectives required the gathering of a lot of data on land use and traffic. Land use data is important because that helps to determine what type and how much traffic will be in a particular area. She displayed maps that indicated current land use and proposed land use and pointed out that there is a significant difference between the two.

Mr. Unger went into more detail about the transportation planning process for this project. He explained that along with studying the projected land use of the area, they also use demographic and economic information. It’s important to determine where the people are employed, where they live and what travel routes will they use. Some of this information came from the East Central Wisconsin Regional Planning Commission’s Cube Model, which is a transportation plan model.

Mr. Unger explained that this model looks at travel origination and destination data by zone and between these zones. This information is then transferred and applied to another model called Paramics, which combines the travel data with traffic intersection counts that have been taken through October 2004. Other things that this model studies is traffic delays and traffic speed. Other statistics that these models and studies have produced included intersection levels of service, travel times, traffic growth, crash/accident statistics.

Mr. Unger explained that crash analysis indicates that the two-lane rural portion of this area is below the state average for all crashes and crashes with injuries, but higher for crashes with fatalities. The four-lane urban portion of this area is significantly higher than the state average in all crashes and crashes with injuries, but lower for crashes with fatalities.

Other information that was shared with the Board included:

- maps indicating where future traffic signals may be placed based on projected traffic flows
- patterns and speeds in the years 2015 and 2035
- peak hour traffic volume, speeds and levels of service
- east-bound and west-bound mean network travel speeds
- comparisons of total and average amounts of time that a trip will take in the project area in 2005, 2015 and 2035.

Ms. Cavanaugh explained the project’s timeline:

- Public information meeting yet this winter
- Develop criteria and measures after public information meeting
- Develop alternatives – Spring 2006
- Analyze alternatives – Summer 2006

- Public information meeting – Fall 2006
- Develop recommendations – Winter 2006
- Public Information meeting – Winter 2006

Ms. Cavanaugh explained that additional information on this project is available on the Wisconsin Department of Transportation's website.

### **PARK VIEW HEALTH CENTER PROJECT UPDATE**

Margie Rankin, Park View Health Center Administrator, stated that in August, 2005 the Board voted unanimously to hire Horty Elving to do the architectural work for the new Park View Health Center facility. At that same meeting, the Board supported the construction of a downsized facility for the approximate cost of \$18,000,000, with the project's total approximate cost to be \$20,000,000. Ms. Rankin went on to explain that at that time, the Board also stated that they would review these cost amounts after the design for the new facility was completed. Tonight's presentation will show the Board the design to date and review the costs.

Ms. Rankin is very happy with the design of the facility. She feels it is a "very efficient design", and that will "dramatically improve the comfort and the quality of life for our residents."

Ms. Rankin then introduced Rick Moore of Horty Elving, the principal architect for the project; Tim Kippenhan and Jim Stahl from Miron Construction.

Ms. Rankin told the Board that a model residence room has been constructed and is on display at the Park View Health Center Pavilion for them to view. She also encouraged them to contact her or members of the committee if, after tonight's meeting, they have additional questions, comments or concerns about the project.

Mr. Moore explained the intent of the schematic design of the Park View Health Center project and their goals and objectives.

The intent of the schematic design is:

1. Space program – identify quantity, size and general category of location; establish target overall gross area of the building
2. Floor plans – show overall size, shape and configuration of spaces
3. Site plan – show general location, grading, roads and basic utility information
4. Preliminary Exterior Elevation – show general shape and materials
5. Typical wall or building section – illustrate building construction
6. Roof plan – show roof configuration and mechanical equipment
7. Preliminary typical room finishes
8. Outline specifications
9. Code search
10. Exterior image rendering
11. Cost estimate

The goals and objectives that were established are:

1. State-of-the art skilled care facility
2. 150-189 bed facility
3. Construction cost limited to \$18,000,000
4. Provide for an unspecified number of future beds
5. Design for social model instead of the current medical model, but maintain the same level of care
6. Residential look and feel
7. Family friendly
8. Maximize staff efficiency – largest share of this facility's budget is staffing
9. Building value engineered to arrive at optimal first cost and longer-term operating & maintenance costs
10. No disruption of existing soccer fields
11. Build away from existing railroad tracks

The project design team is made up of Park View Health Center administration and staff, Winnebago County representatives and County Board Supervisors, Horty Elving designers and engineers and Miron Construction.

Mr. Moore then went through the design process. He explained that the efficiency of the facility is one of their main goals, so staff was consulted to determine that the optimal unit size would be 21 residents—7 residents to 1 aide. Other "optimal design parameters" include:

- Ideal social living unit = 9 – 12 residents
- Shift coordinator and social service person can each effectively handle approximately 40 residents

- Dietary cook/chill carts in each remote dining room hold 24 meals
- Activities for a group of 20-25 residents is most efficient and consistent with current staff levels
- Large group activities area —130 residents based on a total of 168 residents—meet twice a month
- Separation of service and resident/visitor traffic – high priority
- Sunlight in each resident’s room
- Build as far from train tracks as possible
- Allow more direct access to the resident for the family
- Solar panels for hot heating
- Maintain cook/chill food preparation system
- Two floor facility – proposed number of beds makes it too large for a one floor facility
- More cost efficient to build a two-story facility

Mr. Moore explained that the design parameters translate into the following building design:

- 168 resident facility
- 16 households of 10 or 11 residents each; 2 households form a neighborhood; each neighborhood (2 households) are connected at their dining rooms, which allows them to share activities and staffing
- 2 neighborhoods (4 households) are positioned back-to-back with a “connector” on the first level that provides an exterior entry for family visitors. This connector also links the neighborhoods to the resident center.
- 8 neighborhoods (nursing units) of 21 residents each
- The resident center, which is located between the neighborhoods, includes administrative spaces, resident accounts, resident activities areas, a workshop, therapy area, chapel, coffee shop and the main entrance.
- The lower level of the facility will house mechanicals, storage areas, the dietary area and hallways that allow for food and other service delivery directly to the neighborhoods. Public hallways will not be used for food or service delivery to residents.
- Park View Health Center will be a two-story building
- 136,042 gross square feet = 809.59 gross square feet per resident
- Future expansion of facility by 21, 42, 63 or 84 residents in one or two phases/locations; cost for expansion is \$128,500 per bed for construction cost or \$139,200 per bed for total project cost

Mr. Moore presented cost comparisons between the Park View Health Center project and other area facilities:

	Bed Construction Cost	Bed Project Cost
• Park View Health Center	\$128,500	\$139,220
• Brewster Village in Appleton:	\$141,400	\$153,800
• Badger Prairie Health Center, Dane County:	\$141,666	\$180,000

Mr. Moore explained that the facility will be built using steel frame construction and pre-cast plank with concrete topping. It will have a “residential look and scale” with the exterior made of rock face masonry, brick and synthetic stucco. It will be a two-story facility with a flat roof and sky light over the resident center. They are also planning on installing three 40’ solar panels to heat water and reduce utility costs.

The facility will be built on the southwest corner of the existing campus. It will keep the facility as far away as possible from the railroad tracks, while still avoiding construction on county park property. Each of the resident’s rooms are positioned so they will have sun light at some time during the day. Mr. Moore explained that the current road network will be incorporated into the building’s layout.

Images and blueprints of the facility were presented to the Board.

Mr. Kippenhan of Miron Construction explained that as construction managers during this portion of the project, it is their responsibility to work with Park View Health Center’s staff to determine their requirements and then work with Harty-Elving to develop the budget for the project. He stated that at this time the project’s cost is \$20,572,728, which is slightly more than the \$20,000,000 that was budgeted. He explained that the \$20,572,728 also includes a 6% contingency (\$1,164,000) that might be needed to cover additional costs for project drawings and other under estimated expenses. If this contingency amount is not used, it is returned to the county.

Ms. Rankin then went through the various items that had to be changed or eliminated because of their estimated costs:

- 189 beds has been reduced to 168
- To allow for future expansion, they had hoped to build “core space”--the kitchen and large group activity areas—large enough to accommodate future expansion of the facility. However, it was determined that the

increase in cost to build those areas larger in anticipation of expansion, would require them to reduce the size of the initial project to less than 168 beds. These larger core spaces were excluded from the project.

- The proposal to build the facility so that 2/3's of the residents would be on the first floor was also eliminated because of the cost.
- The square footage of all areas was reduced. The large activity area was reduced by 20%.
- Resident rooms were reduced by approximately 6". Bathroom doors were angled, which gives them a little less space in the bathroom, but a little more space in the resident's room.
- Storage & kitchen space was reduced. They will discontinue preparing the meals for Advocap meal sites.
- Private family areas have been eliminated.
- A covered garage has been eliminated.
- Library space has been eliminated.
- A facility-wide keyless entry system has been eliminated. Only the main doors and the medicine room will have keyless entry.
- Green space was reduced.
- The emergency generator system was reduced from restoring full power to restoring just partial power.
- To reduce square footage, six resident rooms will not be directly off living space, but will be on a hall across from another room.

Executive Harris explained the costs of and funding for the project. He started with the Miron's estimated cost of \$20,572,728 for the project and added the following anticipated costs:

• Voice & data installation	\$ 50,000
• Additional furniture, fixtures & equipment	500,000
• Architectural fees	1,223,740
• Architectural reimbursables	60,000
• Construction Management fees	493,609
• Reimbursables	417,423
• General conditions	45,500
• Pre-design costs	<u>26,000</u>
	Subtotal
	\$23,389,000
	Interest
	<u>5,952,000</u> – 10 year bond project
	Total project cost with interest
	<u>\$29,341,140</u>

Executive Harris explained that the State of Wisconsin's current property allowance of approximately \$3.00 per bed will increase to approximately \$16 per bed at the new facility. This increase will provide the county with an additional \$583,405 in property allowance annual for 10 years.

The state also provides a private room allowance of approximately \$2 per day. Because the new Park View Health Center will be all private rooms, that allowance will increase to approximately \$80,638 annually.

Executive Harris explained that, taking these allowances into consideration, the annual cost to the county for this project for the first 10 years will be approximately \$2.2 Million per year. Once this debt is paid off in 10 years, the county will begin to realize a positive net levy impact of approximately \$605,311 annually for 25 years because the State of Wisconsin will continue to pay the county property and private room allowances.

Executive Harris explained that when you take the project's projected total cost of \$29,341,140 and deduct the projected property and private room allowance revenues of \$21,773,205, the total net cost to the tax payer is only \$7,567,935 over a 35 year period.

Questions on the project and its funding were then taken from the Board.

### **WINNEBAGO COUNTY COMPREHENSIVE PLAN**

Jerry Bougie, Winnebago County Planner, and Catherine Neiswender, UW-Extension Community Development Educator, presented the Winnebago County Comprehensive Plan.

Mr. Bougie explained that tonight's public hearing on the comprehensive plan is a statutory requirement at this point in the process and that people present at this meeting will be allowed to address the Board.

Mr. Bougie stated that the actual process for developing the comprehensive plan began in 1988 with the comprehensive plan law going into effect in 1998. In 2001, at the request of the towns, a committee of

representatives from the towns and the county was formed to work on the plan. A planning advisory group made up of representatives from each municipality in the county was also formed.

Mr. Bougie stated that in November 2005 the Planning & Zoning Committee adopted the comprehensive plan and now it is coming to the Board for tonight's public hearing.

Ms. Neiswender explained that there are ten steps that the plan has gone through and that tonight's public hearing comes between steps 9 and 10, with step 10 being the County Board's vote on the comprehensive plan. She stated that the plan has gone through extensive review at various steps of the process.

Mr. Bougie went through the impacts of the plan:

- Establish future vision for the county's land use
- Analyzes and addresses current trends – population growth, housing needs, etc.
- Brings together planning at the local and county level for more consistent land management
- Policies, procedures and Future Land Use Map provides better justification for land use decisions by the Planning & Zoning Committee and the County Board
- Plan allows the county to legally continue to make land use decisions as of January 1, 2010
- Plan provides a coherent framework on the provision of public services
- Contains a list of implementation actions for the county to pursue after adoption

Ms. Neiswender went through the components of the plan:

1. General county-wide policies and goals for future action by the County
  - Agriculture
  - Natural resources
  - Housing
  - Utilities and community facilities
  - Regional issues
2. Framework policies for review of local plans
  - Rural
  - Urban & urbanizing
  - Shoreland & environmental corridors
  - Housing
  - Commercial uses
  - Agriculture, cultural and natural resources
  - Utility community services
3. Future land use map – composite of local maps
  - Combination of all town, village and city future land use maps = county future land use map
    - A. Recognizes local planning efforts and visions
    - B. Creates consistency between local plans and county plan
4. Process for amending town and county plans – “two green light” process
  - Formal citizen inquiry for land development
  - Determination of local plan compliance = local plan amendment + county plan amendment

Mr. Bougie explained that an ordinance is needed to enact the comprehensive plan. The ordinance will also layout how the plan will be implemented. The ordinance will do the following:

- Blend all four plan components
- Describe how and when the plan will be used and implemented
- Contain language on plan-ordinance consistency and a process for how the county plan will be amended and revised
- Contains procedures on addressing conflicts

Mr. Bougie explained that the main difference on how requests for development proposals will be handled is that, “any request will be measured against a Plan first, before looking at zoning and other ordinances.” He then presented various development proposal scenarios and how the plan would affect the process and outcome.

Mr. Bougie outlined the key issues and concerns of the process which include:

- Amount of open space required in rural and urbanizing housing developments
- Statutory requirement to include the city and village plans into the county plan verbatim
- Another review step is being added to the Development Proposal review process
- Interpretation/intent of local plans and related future land uses

Ms. Neiswender explained that the next step will be the County Board's vote on the plan. If it is adopted, the plan will be implemented on July 1, 2006. She stated that attorneys are discussing how to, “formalize an agreement

on how to handle disagreements or conflicts” between county and local plans.

Mr. Bougie and Ms. Neiswender took questions from the Board.

Supervisor Schaidler, on behalf of the Planning & Zoning Committee, thanked all the people who participated in this process. He particularly wanted to thank Mr. Bougie and Ms. Neiswender for their efforts and all the work that they have done on this project.

Supervisor Schaidler explained the reasons for not waiting until the January 2010 deadline for enacting a comprehensive plan in Winnebago County. He explained that having it in place now gives them time to work through any problems or issues that may develop. He also stated that the towns can continue to work on their maps/plans until December 2009 and the county will “fold” them into the county’s comprehensive land use map.

Chairman David Albrecht reconvened the public hearing, pursuant to the requirements of Section 66.1001, Wisconsin Statutes.

The following people addressed the Board about the Winnebago County Comprehensive Plan:

1. Jim Erdmann, Supervisor for the Town of Oshkosh, 2492 Hickory Lane, Oshkosh, expressed his concern about the Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) issue. He is concerned that the City of Oshkosh’s plan will supercede the Town of Oshkosh’s plan.
2. Donna Lohry, 511 West Bent Avenue, Oshkosh, expressed her concern about the cities’ power over towns and the property owners’ options for their property.
3. Dennis Briggs, 6780 Woodenshoe Road, Neenah, commended all the people who have been involved in this process. He realizes it is not a perfect document, but feels the county has listened to the concerns of the towns and individuals and has tried to make the necessary adjustments.
4. Walt Wright of the East Central Wisconsin Regional Planning Commission, commended the county on their comprehensive plan and stated their support of the plan.

## **EMERGENCY MANAGEMENT DEPARTMENT REPORT**

Don Wilmot, Emergency Management Director, gave a report on the duties and responsibilities of his department. He explained that their mission is to, “lessen the affects of any manmade or natural disaster” and to provide for the “continuity of government” in case of a disaster.

Mr. Wilmot explained that the main phases of emergency management are: preparedness, planning, response and recovery. In regards to recovery, Mr. Wilmot explained that since 2000, his department has assisted municipalities in obtaining more than \$3,000,000 in direct tax assistance recovery money to help cover the costs associated with repairs, response and mitigation for various disasters. They’ve also assisted municipalities in obtaining grants for other projects.

Mr. Wilmot explained that his department must do damage assessments within the first 24 hours after a storm or flood. The assessment results are then reported to the state’s Department of Emergency Management who forwards the information to the federal government for appropriate action.

Other points made in Mr. Wilmot’s presentation:

- Emergency Management Department has annual revenues of approximately \$90,535, plus any grants that they might qualify for.
- They work with the Department of Military Affairs—Division of Emergency Management (WEM) and the Office of Justice Assistance
- They work with area businesses and the State of Wisconsin on emergency planning and community right-to-know grants—HAZMAT grants fall into this category.
- Weapons of mass destruction planning – terrorism; grants for these types of issues.
- Maintains the outdoor warning system, “Storm Sentry” Doppler Radar weather satellite receiver system; mobile command center, emergency lighting system, the Emergency Operations Center (EOC) and operations room; voice alert receivers, emergency shelters.
  - ✓ The mobile command center is available countywide; provides communications; is used for planning and training and exercises; supports field operations; and has mobile EOC capabilities.
  - ✓ There are 42 outdoor warning system sites with an annual maintenance cost of \$10,000. The county’s system could handle 50 sites if needed. Annual siren procurement costs are between \$48,000 to \$53,000. The Facilities and Property Management Department does the maintenance work on the sirens.
  - ✓ Voice alert receivers receive warning from the National Weather Service and are located in schools, nursing homes, businesses and government buildings. Non-county facilities and businesses are responsible for the maintenance of these receivers. The Emergency Management Department recommends people use NOAA weather radios instead of the voice alert receivers.

- ✓ Emergency shelters are coordinated with the American Red Cross, the county's Public Health Department and Human Services Department. Shelter is provided to people and animals in large-scale disasters.
- Public relations and communicating information to the public and private sector is a responsibility of the Emergency Management Department. They make presentations, conduct news briefings on radio and television, do public safety radio spots and work with public information officers.
- Work with the Homeland Security (HLS) grant program. Since 1999, they have secured \$1,025,000 in HLS equipment grants. They have worked with participating area police chiefs and the Winnebago County Sheriff's Department to prioritize the items they needed to purchase with these grants. Some of these purchases include:
  - ✓ \$50,000 buffer zone grant for the EAA Grounds – Winnebago County Sheriff's Department
  - ✓ \$200,000 airport security grant – Wittman Regional Airport
  - ✓ Personal protection equipment
  - ✓ Monitoring devices
  - ✓ Communications/Interoperability
  - ✓ Collapse structure rescue team training
  - ✓ Logistical support equipment
  - ✓ Infrastructure and physical security enhancement equipment
  - ✓ Intervention equipment
  - ✓ Information technology
  - ✓ Power equipment
- Emergency Management's future:
  - ✓ All hazards/Terrorism/Natural Disasters planning
  - ✓ Evacuation planning
  - ✓ New planning structure
  - ✓ Mitigation planning
  - ✓ Exercising
  - ✓ Training (NIMS)
  - ✓ Joint actions
  - ✓ Continuity of government
  - ✓ School planning
  - ✓ Regional response planning
  - ✓ Sharing of resources
  - ✓ Notification system
  - ✓ Grants – future grants may be less than 100%

Mr. Wilmot took questions and comments from the Board.

Motion by Supervisor Robl and seconded to adjourn. CARRIED BY VOICE VOTE.  
The meeting was adjourned at approximately 9:50 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,  
Susan T. Ertmer  
Winnebago County Clerk

State of Wisconsin)  
County of Winnebago) ss

I, Susan T. Ertmer, do hereby certify that the foregoing is a true and correct copy of the Journal of the Winnebago County Board of Supervisors for their Special Orders Session held January 10, 2006.

Susan T. Ertmer  
Winnebago County Clerk