



BOARD WORKSHOP MINUTES

BOARD OF WRIGHT COUNTY COMMISSIONERS

JULY 12, 2022

DATE APPROVED: JULY 19, 2022

Christine Husom	District 1
Darek Vetsch	District 2
Mark Daleiden	District 3
Mary Wetter	District 4
Michael Kaczmarek	District 5

Members Present: Christine Husom, Darek Vetsch, Mark Daleiden, Mary Wetter, Mike Kaczmarek

Others Present: Lee Kelly, Matthew Fomby, Marc Mattice, Clay Wilfahrt, Greg Kryzer, Barbara Chaffee, Tricia Bigaouette, Laine Stephan Phil Hodges, David Kelly, Tim Dahl, Christine Partlow, Leslie Wojtowicz, Kim Johnson, Elizabeth Karels, Barry Rhineberger, Tony Kothlow, Pete Sorensen, Lindsey Meyer, Alan Wilczek, Heather Lemieux, Joe Rotz, John Holler, Sheriff Deringer, Captain O'Malley, Don Baron, Greg Pickard, Ryan Kotila
(Remote): Steve Jobe, Schawn Johnson, Lori Pawelk, Delia Scepaniak, Mike MacMillan

The Wright County Board met for a workshop session at 9:00 A.M. with Husom, Vetsch, Daleiden, Kaczmarek and Wetter present.

I. Schedule Meetings as Needed

Commissioner Christine Husom asked County Administrator Lee Kelly if there were any scheduled meetings needed. Kelly said the only issue was if Commissioner Mark Daleiden had someone to cover the Personnel meeting while he was out of town. Daleiden said it was taken care of.

II. Barbara Chaffee, CEO of Central Minnesota Jobs and Training Services, Inc. (CMJTS) present annual County Report

Wright County Financial Services Manager Kim Johnson introduced CMJTS Chief Executive Officer (CEO) Barbara Chaffee. CMJTS had handed out packets before the meeting containing the Annual Program Performance Report along with a detailed breakdown of Wright County's demographics. Chaffee said CMJTS staff would present the Annual Fiscal Audit. She said that according to federal law county boards had fiduciary accountability for education and training funds according to the Workforce Innovation and Opportunity Act (WIOA). Staff would focus on programs and services provided in Wright County. Chaffee updated the board on requests the board had made regarding the liability insurance it carried. Chaffee said that under the Management Liability policy, the director's and officer's liability per claim was raised to \$2 million. She said that Cyber insurance coverage was also increased to \$2 million.

CMJTS Director of Finance and Economic Development Tricia Bigaouette addressed the results of the annual fiscal audit. Bigaouette said the annual fiscal audit was performed by CliftonLarsonAllen (CLA) in December 2021. The audit looked at 82 managed grants, thousands of general ledger transactions, payroll transactions and accounts payable transactions. The results of the audit showed no material weaknesses, no significant deficiencies reported, and no noncompliance material to financial statements noted. She reported that in regard to federal awards the audit found no material weaknesses identified and no significant deficiencies reported.

CMJTS Development Manager Leslie Wojtowicz highlighted the Pre-Release Training Program, a new program focused on providing offenders welding or maintenance technician skills prior to being released from jail. The program would give the inmates a head start to get back into the workplace quickly. The Pre-Release Training Program was awarded a Pathways to Prosperity (PTP) Competitive Grant from the Minnesota Department of Employment and Economic Development (DEED). Wojtowicz said the PTP grant gave \$75,000 for State Fiscal Year 2022 and \$75,000 for State Fiscal Year 2023.

Wojtowicz said the Adult and Dislocated Workers Program helps people get back to work as quickly as possible. With the adult and dislocated worker program the priority of service was public assistance recipients and veterans first. The services were tailored to each individual's unique needs and included: career planning and counseling, approved training services, job search assistance and support services. Wojtowicz said that this program only supported high growth and high wage situations.

Emily Lentner, an Adult and Dislocated Worker Employment Specialist from the Monticello office shared a clients success story. Lentner said Jai McGee connected to CareerForce Monticello after hearing about its Adult and Dislocated Worker Program while receiving unemployment benefits due to losing his job at a treatment center. Lentner said McGee was assigned to her and showed right away he was eager to get back to work and went through the enrollment program before he chose to receive training at 160 Driving Academy in St. Cloud. Prior to starting McGee hit a snag and had to complete a treatment program due to a positive Minnesota Department of Transportation (MnDOT) drug screening. After he successfully completed two months in treatment, McGee returned to the diving academy and graduated two weeks early. He went on to pass his Commercial Driver's License (CDL) test on the first try. He later told Lentner that he felt like after everything CJMTS had done for him he did not want to let them down and so worked hard to pass the training. McGee went on to get hired with food distributor SYSCO as a driver.

Wojtowicz next highlighted CMJTS's youth programs. She said there were a lot of different programs the CMJTS youth team worked with making it easy to get confused with which program went with which funding. She said the youth programs were available for 14-year-olds to 24-year-olds. This year CMJTS went back to hands-on camps, one was for the medical field and the other for trades. Operation Exploration Camp gave 15 students the opportunity to interact with healthcare professionals where they experienced a "day in the life" of each position represented. The Trades Camp, in collaboration with Wright Technical Center in Buffalo, had participants interacting directly with professionals working in the field of manufacturing, agriculture, welding, energy transportation and automotive. Wojtowicz said that the camps reached their maximum participation with waiting lists.

Wojtowicz said CMJTS's Tim Zipoy wanted the board to know that KRWC AM 1360's Work Wright radio would be at the Wright County Fair this year and he would be bringing employers who were seeking applicants. Wojtowicz said she wanted to promote the Incumbent Worker Training Program. There had been an influx in incumbent worker applications from Wright County since May. She said that CMJTS had six applications approved to upskill a total of 49 employees and another business had just applied. The Incumbent Worker Training Program was designed to provide direct financial assistance to train employees and improve economic competitiveness for regional businesses. The program provided reimbursements to eligible businesses for specific training costs accrued during training. Wojtowicz said the program was intended to offset a portion of the businesses costs to train and upgrade the skills of its incumbent workers. In total 509 individuals in Wright County had been trained through this program with an average exit wage of \$21.29.

III. ERP Update

Kelly said for background information, the project to implement the Oracle Enterprise Resource Planning (ERP) system was approved in 2019. The first vender proved problematic, and the contract was cancelled. He said the county next hired Sierra-Cedar. The county was currently working on Phase I of the project which included the implementation of the following applications: general ledger with budgetary control, accounts receivable and billing, expense management payables, fixed assets, cash management, project costing, project contract receiving, and procurement. He said Phase I will go live Monday, November 7, 2022, and was on pace to meet the deadline.

Looking ahead, Kelly said the ERP team was working toward Phase II of the project, which is due to begin implementation in January 2023. Phase II of the project would include human capital management, payroll, and budget. Kelly said the ERP system would minimize errors through automated processes. ERP would reduce data redundancy, improve decision making with quick, real-time information, secure processes of tracking and reporting of revenues and expenditures for audit and regulatory purposes, and modernize back end administrative processes through rule-based workflows. He said all these improvements would serve to create transparent processes across the county. He said, starting Wednesday, June 8 the system had been going through System Integration Testing (SIT) 1, which was to be completed Friday, July 15. SIT 2, due to start Tuesday, July 18, would run until Wednesday, August 10. Kelly said through the testing as problems came up, they were dealt with. He said that part of the contract with Sierra-Cedar was

hyper care, technical support that was intended to continue a month after the go live date, with Phase I it was due to expire Friday, December 2.

Daleiden asked if with SIT-1 there were any issues. Kelly said finding issues was the purpose of SIT-1 and the team was able to find some issues and get them fixed. Kelly said as of the most recent status update dated Thursday, July 7, the project was coming in under budget. Kelly then showed the board the most recent Oracle ERP Implementation Status Report. He highlighted the activity status which used green, yellow, and red circles to indicate the status of project activity while it also laid out the timeline. In addition, Kelly said the Oracle ERP Implementation Status Report described decisions that needed to be made, issues that needed to be discussed, what needed to be focused on in the next two weeks, what was deliverable in the process, what was submitted, and what was signed.

According to Kelly, the report showed only two items at the time of the report's printing that were described as moderate risks. Kelly said both those areas, Technical Specifications and Integrations, were being tested and were on track for the schedule to go live. Kelly said there are 338 areas that had been tested. He pointed out that some tests failed and needed to be retested.

Kelly said he had met with Commissioner Michael Kaczmarek Monday, July 11 to go over the ERP project and other projects and he would address some of the questions Kaczmarek had brought up during the meeting. Kelly said since the switch to Sierra-Cedar the contract was changed from an internal business analyst to a contracted Program Manager (PM). The initial contract with the PM was a six-month contract which was characterized at the time as being six-months only which Kelly did not think was accurate and he had discussion regarding that after the vote. He said that contract now was in need of being renewed.

Kaczmarek asked Kelly what the board figured the cost of the project would be when the project was voted in 2019. Kelly said at the time Phase I was understood to cost \$1.6 million. Vetsch said it was understood that the project from beginning to end would be \$2 million to \$5 million over two to five years. At the time Infotech was the vendor. Kaczmarek asked what the estimate would be in January 2023. Kelly said that as of Monday, November 7, 2022, the project will go live, \$2.5 million will have been expended. Kelly said the start of Phase II in January would expend about \$1.6 million with a go live period sometime in late 2023. Kaczmarek asked what the total would be. Kelly said the total was \$5.6 million.

Kaczmarek asked Kelly what the understanding of cost savings the project would bring. Kelly said initially with Infotech it was noted that there were 12 systems that could be eliminated once ERP was up and running. He said the discussion started during the discovery phase because the Integrated Financial Systems (IFS) didn't talk to Human Resources (HR) Optimum system that didn't talk to Paymates. He said there was a lot of paper pushing. Kelly said he did not get cost estimates as to what those programs cost at the time. Kaczmarek asked what the amount being saved per program was and requested staff researched those numbers. Vetsch said this number would be harder to quantify because it would be subjective. From a staffing perspective this doesn't necessarily reduce staff, but it does eventually reduce staff needs, but there was no benchmark. He said in five to six years there may be some positions that can be eliminated, but at this time there was no way to know. Kaczmarek said he wanted to know what would be saved in the 12 systems being eliminated.

Kaczmarek said that he had spoken with county staff and was aware that over the past year the county had brought in new positions specifically for the implementation for ERP. He said that finance staff members assured him that these staff were kept busy with other work while the ERP was being put in action. Daleiden said that at the beginning of the process one of the things ERP was said to stand for was "Excel Replacement Plan" due to the high number of Excel spreadsheets the county utilized. He said ERP was a long-term plan for the county as it was no longer a small county. He said there was no way to affix an exact dollar amount for the savings in time and material that ERP would give the county. Vetsch said the savings may not be quantifiable in the first five years, but the next five years the savings would be more apparent. Vetsch said the heaviest lifting would be done in the frontend of ERP.

Kaczmarek asked if coming into the budget process the county would see any new staff requests. Kelly said that budget workbooks were due Tuesday, July 12, but from what he had seen already the county was not anticipating any new staff requests due to ERP. Daleiden asked Finance Director Lindsey Meyer to confirm what Kelly said. Meyer said from the finance team perspective there would be no additional finance team members added due to ERP.

Kaczmarek said Kelly had brought up the person six months ago Information Technology (IT) Director Matthew Fomby had brought in as a third-party Program Manager (PM) with a six-month contract and the understanding that after six months the PM would no longer be needed. Kaczmarek noted that the PM was still working, and he wondered if there was an update on this aspect of the contract as he noted the board had not been approached to approve an extension nor had it received an update. Kelly said the contract had come to the board mid-December 2021, started Monday, January 3, and expired July 1, was never intended to be only six-months. He said he knew when the contract would need to be signed that he had to hold off signing it to speak to the board and cover any questions the commissioners had. He said it was known that there would need to be a PM throughout Phase I as well as any future phases. The new contract was received and waiting to be signed and would keep the current PM through the implementation of Phase I and expire January 3, 2023. Kelly said it would need to be renewed again at that point. Kaczmarek asked if the contract was on the agenda to come to the board for a vote. Vetsch said that as the contract was a professional contract it did not need board approval but could be signed by the administrator. Kaczmarek said for the consistency he felt it needed another discussion and vote since it was for \$120,000. Vetsch asked Kaczmarek what he proposed to do instead of having the PM.

Kaczmarek asked if the person on contract was present to which Kelly told him he was. Kaczmarek asked contractor Tony Kothlow to present himself for questions. Kaczmarek asked Kothlow to give a status update on county staff, as the county had a PM in place for this project. He asked Kothlow if he had a timeframe when the county staff had the ability to manage the project on its own. Kothlow asked for clarification about the PM, as he himself was the PM of the ERP project. He asked if Kaczmarek was referring to a county PM. Kaczmarek said he was referring to a county PM. Kelly said going into Phase I the county switched up the contract as mentioned earlier from an internal business analyst to a PM who would manage Phase I which was due to go live in November. Kelly said that even though going live meant the team was closing out Phase I the team planned to implement Phase II in 2023, which also required a project manager. By the time the project was over there no longer be a need for a PM. Kelly said he had discussions with Kothlow, Sierra-Cedar, the Project Team, and Dakota County which was implementing the same system, about the resources needed after going live.

Kaczmarek said maybe he had the wrong terms and asked if the county had an ERP Administrator or manager on staff. Kelly said that the county had an ERP Administrator who managed the permissions and rights. It was his system to take to tier one support if any issues come up. Kelly said the ERP Administrator would take anything that needed configuring and would either do it himself, take it to IT staff or a vender after the phase was implemented.

Vetsch asked Kaczmarek if his question was whether the county had the staff to go forward with this project once it had gone live. Kaczmarek said that the county was working toward that and then asked Kothlow if he was working with any county staff that he was getting familiar with the project so it can be self-sufficient and independent.

Kothlow said he worked with a large project team. He said his job was to come in and help implement the system. He said he worked with Sierra-Cedar and county staff closely and he managed the implementation to ensure everything in the project was on track. He talked regularly with Kelly about post-go live support. Kothlow said that support was more than one person, rather it was the whole staff preparing to support ERP and that was the process the team was going through and what Kelly presented. Kothlow said he believed the staff would still need to be augmented with outside support besides himself for a certain period of time because it was a new system and new process, and the county staff would not be completely trained on everything. Kothlow said that over time the county staff would be familiar enough with the system that he would no longer be needed.

Kaczmarek asked why the contract was not completed within the six-month deadline. Kothlow explained that this was never a six-month plan. He came on in January with the plan to go live in November and this was the goal. Kaczmarek asked if Kothlow thought this was a one-year project or if he had a time period in mind. Kothlow said he knew coming into the project that Phase I would be a year and Phase II would be a year. It is not unusual with these types of contracts for a probationary period of six months to have been in place to ensure there was a match and that services had been presented as intended.

Vetsch said the probationary period was put in place due to the poor performance of the previous vendor, and the county found itself attached to them longer than was desired. Learning from the mistakes with the previous vendor, Vetsch said this contract allowed the county the ability to either continue or cut losses if needed. Husom said it was very difficult to

break with the previous vender. Kothlow added that the county had written the contract with Sierra-Cedar with this issue in mind. It was a time and materials contract where these contracts were typically a fixed bid where there was a dollar amount and a goal, and the project was delivered and done. The contract put into place by Kelly and the board allowed the county to end the contract if a situation arose similar to the first contract.

Kaczmarek asked Kothlow if he could stand in front of the board and say with confidence that six more months and another \$120,000 would be enough. Kothlow said that for Phase I, Monday, November 7, 2022, would be the implementation date and if the county chose to continue with Phase II, then it would continue on into 2023. Kaczmarek asked if it was the intention of Kelly to go forward with another six months or something else. Kelly said that the contract would go forward from July 1, 2022, to January 1, 2023. Kaczmarek said that there would be some overlap from Phase I to Phase II to which Kelly acknowledged and pointed out that if the county decided to end the contract it would do so. Kaczmarek said the contract was similar to a month-to-month contract. Kelly said that the county was billed monthly for service. Kaczmarek thanked Kothlow for answering his questions and explained that with the \$240,000 bill he wanted to ensure the board was in the loop to know where the money was going.

Kothlow said he had been doing this a long time and said this was one of the best implementations he had been a part of the staff was very knowledgeable and Sierra-Cedar had a very experienced staff. The defect rate on the testing was low and the project was going well.

Commissioner Mary Wetter asked if once it was decided which phase the county would go to, will there be updates throughout or beyond? Kelly said that Oracle included quarterly updates built into the price of the contract. Wetter asked if it would be changed regularly forever. Kelly said that what the county saw with legacy systems software was that it ran without updates until it became irrelevant. Oracle was constantly being updated with changing laws, policies and processes as needed or even as asked for.

Wetter asked when ERP was created. Kelly said ERP had been around for about 30 years. It is becoming more prevalent in counties and local governments. Kaczmarek asked if the ERP Administrator was available to answer questions from him. ERP Administrator Pete Sorensen came forward to speak. Kaczmarek asked what the communication was like with the staff and with Kothlow to ensure deadlines are being made and if the county staff was being utilized. Sorensen said Kothlow sets the timeline and sets the meetings. He said in the last four or five days the staff had four core meetings going over the tasks determining if everything was being done and on time. Kaczmarek said he wanted to know what was going on as the county was three years in. He asked when the project will be in-house. Sorensen said he would be handling the security and authorities for everyone and the approval workflows for Oracle to keep everybody up to date. He said every quarter Oracle will put out an update. The county will have two weeks to test and implement each update before it goes live. Sorensen said that the biggest challenge to each update was to be the testing of the system to ensure everything worked as the updates were not able to be ignored. Kaczmarek asked if Sorensen was confident, he would be able to take over when ERP went live. Sorensen said he had a lot to still learn but he was confident he would be ready.

IV. Compost Facility Discussion

Project Administrator Elizabeth Karels said there were updates on action items, next facility options Stantec had provided, and then looking for guidance on next steps. Over the past year there have been a number of third-party inspections resulting in more than 169 comments in the various reports. These were being tracked actively and were being addressed. As of Wednesday, June 22 Planning and Zoning Director Barry Rhineberger's team along with Facilities Administrator Alan Wilczek and Risk Manager Tim Dahl had completed 30 percent of identified issues, 35 percent of the identified issues were placed on hold pending the board's recommendation, and 20 percent were actively in progress. Stantec was hired last year to complete the assessment and evaluation, based on its report there were four options developed with probable cost estimates.

OPTION 1 – NEW BUILDING ADDITION ON NORTH END OF HANGAR BUILDING.

Rhineberger said Option 1 was a 13,200 square foot (SF) building addition on the north end of the existing hangar. The addition was approximately 81 feet by 165 feet and expanded the entire width of the hangar, it also extended 81 feet toward the current processing building. Rhineberger said this option had \$300,000 built in for demolition of the administration and processing building. Rhineberger said one con of this option was with the location of the compost. The

traffic issue created by the location of the compost was not fixed with this option as the entrance and exit for compost drop off remained the same while the household hazardous material drop-off circled around the existing building assuming it was not demolished. This option would keep 81 feet between the existing building and the new building to allow for forklifts or any other vehicles to travel.

OPTION 2 – ENCLOSE A PORTION OF THE HANGAR BUILDING

Rhineberger said Option 2 would enclose 24,000 SF of the existing building. He said originally this option included removing about 50 feet of the far southern end of the hangar to allow traffic to come out. He said that in discussions with Stantec it was decided to remove a portion of the middle of the hangar instead as this layout would create a better flow for traffic and would allow for better site controls. This option would also allow the outdoor storage area to be blocked off and gated so the public could drive without being concerned about running into a boat or other stored vehicle. This option also alleviated the crossflow traffic issue as compost and drop off both entered one way and exited another way. As with option 1 there was a \$300,000 estimate option for demolition as well as a \$600,000 cost for site improvements to the entranceways and exits.

OPTION 3-NEW HOUSEHOLD HAZARDOUS WASTE (HHW) BUILDING ON A TO BE DETERMINED (TBD) SITE.

Rhineberger said this was a 12,000 SF building requiring three to five acres. This option did not include a plan as to where the compost and recycling went as that was site specific.

OPTION 4-EXISTING OPERATIONS WITH MINIMAL IMPROVEMENTS.

No cost was built into to this option yet. Rhineberger said the cost included improvements such as reroofing of the hangar building, floor modifications, improved lighting, new storage containers, security cameras and/or additional signage. The county team had not got cost estimates because it was unknown what if anything would be done for this option.

Vetsch asked if Option 2 would be cutting cost especially considering the current cost to heat that building. Rhineberger said the cost should be cut as the plan was to reroof a portion of the hangar to be more efficient with heat and then fill in the aeration containers in the floor. The plan would also include new water collection for the winter so there would be floor drains to function as a secondary containment if there were any spills.

Daleiden asked what the current processing buildings SF was. Assistant County Administrator Marc Mattice said the current size was 16,000 SF. Rhineberger pointed out that the useable space was much less due to the height of the roof. Vetsch asked if the reroofing was imminent or if it could be worked into an option slowly. Rhineberger said before any construction the hangar had to be reroofed. Vetsch asked if the project could be done in a phased approach. Wilczek said if the board was not going to move forward with a construction plan at this time there would be no reason to reroof as there were no deficiencies that caused damage to the facility. Vetsch asked if it would be possible to take an incremental approach. Wilczek said it could be done but it would be inefficient and end up costing more with multiple starts and stops.

Husom asked if the plan was to remove the current processing building in both Options 1 and 2. Rhineberger said demolition was built into the plans as an option but was not necessary. He said that by way of usability the building could still be used for collection during construction as long as care was taken to direct the traffic flow. He noted that the hangar was not used in the winter and there would be a normal transition from inside to outside. Husom brought up concerns over potential dangers if there were children running around the site to which Rhineberger said while parents were not able to be controlled hopefully children would not be on foot in this area. Karels added that every option had demolition cost broken out separately and the demolition cost took into consideration scrap value which was subject to change with the market. The buildings covered in the demolition were the scale house and the processing building. Rhineberger clarified his earlier remark that the administration building demolition was in the cost as it was not. Rhineberger, in response to a question from Vetsch, said a few of the other buildings on site were the Fine Processing Building and a building attached to the hangar that includes the aeration pumps. Husom asked for clarification on winter operation if construction was ongoing and Rhineberger described what would be necessary to safely construct and continue operations on site during the winter at the same time.

Kaczmarek asked if with Option 3 – the county hadn't considered using a portion of the 26 acres already in use at this current site to rebuild elsewhere since the county was only using six of the 26 acres. He asked Karels what the value of the

land was currently at. Karels said she had talked with the assessor's office and the price was based on the land being unable to be rezoned so it would be priced as agricultural land and she was unsure of the value. Daleiden estimated the value to be at approximately \$10,000 an acre. Wetter asked, with so many acres owned by the county at this location would the county be able to use some of the acreage at that location for this project. Rhineberger said the only cost would likely be the preparation of the land as with any new construction. Husom said the county would want to put the new building where the current building was to lessen the amount of demolition and preparation needed. Rhineberger said it depended on the land. Wetter said it would not be necessary to buy more land in a different location. Wilczek said four or five years ago this was discussed and options were looked at. He said the current location provided an ideal location that would not require demolition prior to construction. He said it made sense to reclaim the current site. Wetter asked if it would be possible to still use the old site if the new site was being built at the same location. Wilczek said it was possible but staging areas would have to be looked at along with locations of areas being used. Husom said the cost of heating the processing building with its high ceilings made using them in the future along with new facilities not cost efficient.

Kaczmarek pointed out the northwest corner of the current Government Center campus as a possible location for consideration. He said with a pond and basin moved it could be a candidate. He asked what needed to happen for that part of the campus to be developed for this project. Mattice also said that County Road 37 was a 10-ton road year-round where Braddock was not. Kaczmarek asked if the Highway Department did not build up Braddock Avenue during construction to handle 10-ton traffic, Mattice said it had not. Wilczek said the northwest corner was not what it appeared as much of it was filled with topsoil from the new building construction that would need to be moved prior to building anything else on the site. Daleiden asked why Stantec did not provide an option to use the tipping floor. Wilczek said Braddock Avenue is a nine-ton road. He said the area Daleiden asked about was potentially discussed but the planning of the site location was not beneficial to the cost impact of the project. He said retrofitting the property would not provide savings over a new building.

Husom agreed with Wilczek that a new building was more ideal than retrofitting property. Daleiden was concerned with the size of the building, believing 12,000 SF was too small. Vetsch asked what type of building this would be. Karels said this was a premanufactured building. Risk Manager Tim Dahl said retrofitting any of the existing buildings would bring in safety issues that increased cost.

There was continued discussion about a similar building in Stearns County that Wilczek was very impressed with. Husom asked if the board could utilize the same plans as Stearns. Wilczek said he had discussed this with the architect, and it was a possibility. Karels said Rhineberger had submitted a Capital Improvement Plan (CIP) request as a hold for this project to ensure its addition to the 2023-2027 CIP pending the board's recommendation. Vetsch said he hadn't seen what was being proposed for the 2023-2027 CIP and wanted to know if the project would be within the boundaries set for the CIP funds. Husom said Rhineberger and Karels were looking for a recommendation to move forward with the project. Rhineberger said there was some carryover Select Committee on Recycling and the Environment (SCORE) funds that could be used to cover the design cost, but it was not enough to cover construction. Vetsch asked if the demolition cost could be put into the 2024 budget as a CIP, splitting the design, construction, and demolition cost. He said the construction could be a \$2.8 million CIP and demolition could be in the 2024 budget. Husom agreed that the construction would not begin right away meaning if the design was done quickly there would be some downtime before construction began.

Karels asked if this was a recommendation. Vetsch recommended starting with Option 3 and working on the flow budget to see what the cost would be for demolition in one or two phases. Husom said it may mean there are no operations for a period. Rhineberger said it depended on when the construction took place and if it was done quickly. He said there would also be a need to regrade.

Wetter said she had a problem with the 12,000 SF building whether it was large enough. She asked if the county staff had spoken with Stearns County about the size of its building and what they would do differently. Rhineberger said Stearns County would need to be asked what its services offered are to compare the amount of usage. Wetter asked if staff had been queried for its opinions and ideas. Rhineberger said the staff was concerned about whether there would be enough space. He gave an example that illuminated possible concerns staff had about the space. Daleiden mentioned that the Sheriff's Office needed to be considered as well.

The recommendation was to move forward with a combination of Options 1 and 3 once costs had been brought forth. Husom said two different commissioners were concerned that 12,000 SF was not adequate size and staff should gather further information from Stearns County regarding its operations, building size and cost. Wilczek said with the tipping floor and pavement the area would accommodate a larger building. Vetsch recommended staff bring forward costs.

Karels asked if the scale should be sold. Daleiden said sell it, there was no use for it. Karels said it will be put up for auction. Kaczmarek said we should investigate putting up the loose iron up for sale as well. He asked for a consensus to get rid of it. Daleiden and the county both recommended getting rid of what could be gotten rid of noting that getting rid of much of the loose iron would cost the county. Kryzer recommended if this was going to cost the county money just call Burdas Towing and have it towed to French Lake. Vetsch asked if the equipment in the building was part of the estimate. Wilczek acknowledged anything inside the building would be included in the demolition costs. He said it made sense to have the demolition crew take the scrap away while the demolition was in process.

Kaczmarek asked if since the county was doing an auction for the scale why wouldn't the county put a few pictures on the auction site and offer the scrap iron to whomever would come and haul it away. Wetter brought up the possible risk of having the public pick up the scrap iron and Dahl said it was possible to get an auctioneering firm out to try and take photos to see what it thought. Dahl said staff would work with an auction firm to discover a cost effective and safe plan. Wetter said she preferred the option to have the Demolition crew take all the scrap.

RECOMMENDATION: To have staff create a financial model for a combination of Options 1 and 3. To have staff reach out to Stearns County and other facilities to get information regarding the development, planning, and space of their compost facility. Update the CIP with financial impacts to go before the County Board in August and perform a site-plan with how the new building would fit on the existing site. To have staff sell the scale and work with an auction firm to investigate selling loose iron at auction.

V. Campus Signage

Kelly said Daleiden brought to his attention issues with traffic flow that have come in from the west approaching the main corner at the entrance to the main county campus and Kaczmarek brought up the lack of signage on the buildings. Daleiden mentioned numerous cars drove over the curbs at the entranceway. Wilczek acknowledged people are driving all over the campus seemingly lost. He said Loren Green of the Highway Department said about four to five cars stop in daily despite the large orange Highway Department sign. He said there was a delivery process in place now for the dock. When a delivery driver pulls up a call goes out to facilities staff and the staff that answers take care of the delivery. He said it was important to put signage up on Braddock Avenue directing delivery drivers to the appropriate entrances as there are some deliveries that drop off behind the Law Enforcement Center (LEC.) He said it had helped that many of the delivery drivers are the same week to week. This had helped fix many of the issues. He did say putting concrete in the front entrance would be helpful. Daleiden said he had seen some places utilize stakes to indicate where the sidewalk was. Wilczek said that stakes and signs would not help the situation as more signs are just more.

Vetsch asked if we put on the awning the address numbers. Wilczek said while the monument sign was very large with both the names and addresses there was a proposal to do cast aluminum numbers that are 10-inches tall and would go right on the canopy. Wilczek said the cost of numbers was approximately \$900 for the numbers that would be on the canopy. Boser Construction Inc (BCI) could come in and drill in the numbers on the two buildings. He estimated about \$2,200 to \$2,400 total.

Kaczmarek asked if the concrete would be sidewalk concrete or street concrete. Wilczek said that it would be street concrete. Daleiden asked about the signs on Highway 25. Wilczek said the request for signage had been submitted to MnDOT, approved by MnDOT, and waiting for delivery from the manufacturer. Wetter asked if there was extra cement for a sidewalk from the Government Centers back door to the Justice Centers door to keep staff from walking on the landscaping. Wilczek said a sidewalk from the southeast entrance of the Government Center to the Justice Center would be possible. Wetter asked who was watering the new pine trees. Wilczek said many of trees were being replaced under warranty along with the landscape fixes and irrigation repairs.

Wilczek asked what recommendation if any was wanted regarding the numbers on the buildings. Vetsch said he wanted numbers, especially for delivery drivers. Husom said it would help people who look for numbers. Kaczmarek said some city ordinances require numbers. The board had a consensus about the numbers on the canopies.

Wilczek asked about the sidewalk to go diagonally across from the corner from the southeast of the Government Center to the Justice Center and adding concrete to the curb line areas at the entrances and at the boulevard to help combat some of the vehicles driving over the corner into the mud. He also said there would be additional signage for deliveries being pursued to help lessen confusion regarding deliveries. The board had a consensus.

RECOMMENDATION: To have the county add numbers to the canopy of the Government Center and Justice Center. To put in a sidewalk from the southeast of the Government Center to go diagonal to the Justice Center. To have the signage for the delivery locations be looked at. To have flat concrete pads at entryways to the government campus and along curb lines be put in place.

VI. Review DOC Contract For Housing Of DOC Work Release Inmates

Jail Captain Patrick O'Malley appeared to help answer questions brought up in a previous board meeting regarding the Department of Corrections (DOC) contract and where costs were incurred. Kaczmarek said he had read the background and justification for the contract that hinged on finding jobs and housing inmates. He asked about who the \$80,000 in the contract went to, who paid it, and for what services did it pay. O'Malley said the \$80,000 in the contract was a do not exceed annual dollar amount. He said the purpose was to utilize the programs the Wright County Jail offered to inmates to learn job skills and to be prepared to be released back into society. Currently there are four work release inmates. The DOC pays for all the costs associated with the boarding. O'Malley said the jail ran the programs locally within the county's rules. The DOC inmates did not have jobs yet and were looking for work and housing prior to their release dates. Kaczmarek asked how it was determined who was released into Wright County. O'Malley said it was either due to their last known address, whether there were committed by Wright County, or if the inmate's family and resources were in the county.

Kaczmarek asked about the two staff people mentioned. He asked who paid their salaries. O'Malley said one of them was a staff person from the DOC and the other was from the jail. O'Malley said other than regular work release matters very little time commitment was required by county staff. The only difference with local inmates on work release was the DOC inmates don't have a current job, so they are out looking for work and housing.

Kaczmarek asked about statistics provided by the jail if inmates who are served and then commit crimes in other counties are included in the statistics for the programs the county performs. O'Malley said the statistics were from the program run by Jill Nettetstad with Health and Human Services. He said he was confident the stats were correct, but he could not speak to what they covered. Kaczmarek asked him to find out if they included statistics on Wright County inmates who had gone through the program and been arrested in other counties. Husom said that Kaczmarek should speak with Nettetstad as this was her program and not the responsibility of O'Malley. O'Malley said that the bottom line was that the DOC covered any costs associated with the programs the Wright County Jail ran to help get inmates back into the workplace.

The meeting adjourned at 11:20 a.m.

County Board Workshop Minutes submitted by Philip Hodges, Administrative Specialist