

# **AGENDA**

## **Task Force on County Operations & Organization**

Jefferson County Courthouse  
311 S. Center Avenue, Room 202  
Jefferson, WI 53549

March 13, 2015 – 8:30 a.m.

### **Members**

Kathi Cauley, Jennifer Hanneman-Chair, Sue Happ, George Jaeckel, Ron Krueger,  
Russell Kutz-Vice Chair, Steve Nass, Joe Nehmer, Timothy Smith-Secretary

1. Call to Order
2. Roll Call
3. Certification of Compliance with Open Meeting Law Requirements
4. Introductions
5. Review of Agenda
6. Public Comment (Members of the public who wish to address the committee on specific agenda items must register at this time)
7. Approval of February 25, 2015 Task Force meeting minutes
8. Follow-up and discussion on Department Audits
9. Further discussion on CQI/LEAN Process
10. Discussion and possible action on principle statement
11. Review information from Department Heads regarding comparable counties
12. Discuss scheduling topics for future agendas
13. Communications
14. Tentative Future Meeting and Agenda Items (March 25, 2015)
15. Adjourn

The Committee may discuss and/or take action on any items specifically listed on the agenda

Individuals requiring special accommodations for attendance at the meeting should contact the County Administrator 24 hours prior to the meeting at 920-674-7101 so appropriate arrangements can be made.

**JEFFERSON COUNTY BOARD  
COMMITTEE MINUTES**

**February 25, 2015**

Task Force on County Operations & Organization

1. **Call to Order**  
Meeting was called to order by Hanneman at 10:00 a.m.
2. **Roll Call**  
**Task Force Members**  
Members present: Kathi Cauley, Jennifer Hanneman, George Jaeckel, Ron Krueger, Russell Kutz, Steve Nass, Joe Nehmer, Timothy Smith and Susan Happ.  
  
Others Present: Tammie Jaeger, Administration; Benjamin Wehmeier, County Administrator; Jim Schroeder, County Board Chair; Chief Deputy Jeffrey Parker; Sheriff Paul Milbrath; J. Blair Ward, Corporation Counsel; Brian Lamers, Finance Director; Steve Grabow, Community Development Agent; Supervisor Carlton Zentner and Barb Frank, County Clerk.
3. **Certification of compliance with Open Meeting Law Requirements**  
Wehmeier certified compliance with the open meeting law.
4. **Introductions**  
None
5. **Review of Agenda**  
No changes
6. **Public Comment**  
Zentner expressed confidence in this group to investigate savings for the citizens and taxpayers in the county.
7. **Approval of February 13, 2015 Task Force meeting minutes**  
Motion by Schroeder; Second by Nass to approve the February 13, 2015 Task Force meeting minutes as printed. (Ayes-All) Motion carried.
8. **Review of Audit - Sheriff's Office**  
Audit information was provided for the committee to review. Parker and Milbrath discussed the audit recommendations and actions in the audit and addressed questions. No action taken.
9. **Follow-up on Department Audits**  
This item will be discussed at the next meeting. No action taken.
10. **Presentation on Continuous Quality Improvement (CQI)**  
Cauley showed a video providing an over view of NIATx, a CQI model. She provided handouts showing some examples of CQI projects that were done in the Human Services Department. Lamers showed a Power Point presentation on LEAN, another CQI model.
11. **Discussion and possible action on principle statement**  
This item will be discussed at the next meeting. No action taken.
12. **Review information from Department Heads regarding comparable counties**  
This item will be discussed at the next meeting. No action taken.
13. **Discuss scheduling topics for future agendas**  
See below.
14. **Communications**
  - Handouts on Human Services CQI projects
15. **Tentative Future Agenda Items and Meeting Dates (March 13, 2015 8:30 a.m.)**
  - Approval of February 25, 2015 Task Force meeting minutes (March 13<sup>th</sup>)
  - Follow-up on Department Audits (March 13<sup>th</sup>)
  - Overview Strategic Plan- Steve Grabow (March 13<sup>th</sup>)

- Overview of Comprehensive Plan – Rob Klotz (March 13th)
- Further discussion on CQI (March 13<sup>th</sup>)
- Revisit the audit discussions (March 13<sup>th</sup>)
- Discuss LEAN course outline (March 13th)

**Future Agenda Items:**

- Review future capital projects
- Review county department structure
- Review County Board Committee structure
- Report from the Finance Department on future projections – State Levy Caps
- Discussion on shared services:
  - a. Discussion with Mayors & Village Presidents regarding shared services
  - b. Department Head reports including current and potential possibilities for shared services
  - c. Discuss possible shared services with agencies outside of Jefferson County
- Discuss reports from Department Heads regarding their ideas on how things can be done better
- Presentation from other counties on their CQI process
- Information on the barriers and opportunities that may exist with combining services such as Fire and EMS – Krueger
- Possible topics presented by the Wisconsin Counties Association (WCA)

**16. Adjourn**

Motion made by Krueger; Second by Jaeckel to adjourn at 10:01 a.m. (Ayes-All) Motion Carried.

Principle Statement Ideas / Suggestions & Ideas	What to look for in Comparable Counties
<p>“Working with county employees, elected officials, municipalities and residents to find ways to provide services to the community in an efficient manner while maintaining current staff and without incurring additional debt”</p>	<p>Population Size, Mean Income, Location</p> <p>More importantly will be for department heads to give us important characteristics.</p>
<p>Incorporate the Jefferson County Strategic Plan into the discussion; Utilize resources from UW Extension, Center for Local Government for data research; Provide an avenue for county employees to provide input and pass information to them. Explore services and research provided through our membership in the WI Counties Association, National Association of Counties and others; Make continuous improvement part of the culture through employee training; Understand major revenue flows from State funding formulas to department.</p>	
<p>Avoid bonding for operational costs except in the case of natural disaster or war.</p> <p>Establish staffing models, measurable operational efficiencies and capital improvement plans, which at minimum, sustain current county services and ideally improve these services in the future.</p>	
<p>Target efficiency across all departments within the current county structure</p> <p>Focus on the financial future as well as current</p> <p>Not looking for opportunities to cut positions but rather areas for both stability and growth</p> <p>Maintain a pure shareholders first mentality</p>	



# Notes:

## Clerk of Courts

- The counties selected have the same number of judges.

## Human Resources

- The counties selected were used when completing the classification/comp study. We also used Waukesha and Dane for HR purposes – this is where we recruit from and lose employees to

## County Fair

- Fairs that offer musical entertainment
- Fairs that offer music entertainment above \$50,000 per night
- Fairs run by the county
- Fairs with 50,000 visitors or greater
- Fairs with over \$500,000 in revenue

## Fair Park

- Counties in the southwest part of the state
- Fair Parks with year round activities
- Fair Parks with 200,000 – 250,000 yearly visitors
- Fair Parks with over \$1,000,000 in revenue
- Fair Parks with over 100 camping sites
- Fair Parks with horse shows
- Fair Parks with similar type events – i.e. car shows, animal auctions, gun shows, swap meet etc.
- Fair Parks with over 50 events per year

## Health Department

The following counties are listed because they are the ones where we either draw nurses from or lose nurses to – making them our “market” for future nurses: Dane, Rock, Waukesha, City of Watertown (Jefferson & Dodge).

Nurses either come here to work or go out to work in the other counties due to better pay and benefits such as tuition reimbursement.

So when I think of comparative counties I look to where our employees live, shop, get medical care. I also think of “like” population and characteristics.

Although we are considered more rural, we have two major roads intersecting our county that makes it easy for people to travel into Dane/Waukesha/Rock counties to either work or get goods and services. We also have more social issues related to travel between our county and Dane/Rock/Waukesha and onto Milwaukee and Rockford.

Other comparative counties are related to population include: Sauk, Portage, Wood, St. Croix, Manitowoc, Ozaukee, Dodge, Eau Claire, Walworth, Fond du Lac, and LaCrosse. This is not to imply that these counties have the same programs and services, especially in Public Health. I was looking merely at the population. Not all of them have Environmental Agent status or WIC. This has always been a hard question to answer. Very hard to compare as no two counties are alike.

### **Highway**

- geographic location
- number of lane miles
- urban vs. rural (suburban)
- construction vs. maintenance (types of work performed)
- presence of freeway/interstate
- size/type of workforce
- number/type of trucks/equipment
- functional classification of roads
- number of bridges

### **Land Information**

- Total real estate parcel records
- Real estate transactions each year
- Number of parcel records changed each year
- Total personal property records

### **Surveyor**

- Total public land survey monuments to maintain
- Certified survey maps and subdivisions reviewed each year

### **UW Extension**

- Extent to which their individual “needs assessment” matches with the needs identified in our “UW Extension/Jefferson County Office Multiyear Needs Assessment and Program Plan.”
- An expectation for having experienced faculty with a capacity to address complex issues from many stakeholders. (i.e. similar staffing and programming expectations)
- A county with rural and smaller, individual community characteristic roots, but a county that is now urbanizing with proximity to one or more larger metropolitan areas. (i.e. values and culture from its heritage but complexity of modern, and diverse urban life--- we have a unique location between Madison and Milwaukee that is the epicenter of a market area of 11 million people within a relatively short distance)
- A county with similar aspirations for economic success (such as an articulated vision similar to ours): “A leader in home-grown business development and innovation linkage, agricultural enterprise and healthy, small town living.”